The Effects of Interviewer-Offered Structure, Cognitive Style, and Internal-External Locus of Control on Selected Interviewee Variables.

by

Jack De Stefano

Department of Educational Psychology and Counselling

McGill University, Montreal

August, 1986

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

ISBN 0-315-34436-9

ABSTRACT

Within an analogue interview setting, the effects of counsellor-offered structure, cognitive style of field-dependence and independence, and internal-external locus of control on several criterion variables were examined. The criterion variables were talk-time, total number of words, reaction time, mean words per response, mean amount of unfilled pausing, rate of speech, positive and negative self-referencing statements, ratings of counsellor attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness and the interviewee's state anxiety. Using a two-factor multivariate analysis of variance design, 48 female college students were randomly assigned to either a low structured or a high structured interview format.

It was found that increases in talk-time and reaction time were associated with the high structured interview format. Longer silent pauses were associated with low structure. No significant differences for the structure condition were noted for the other criterion variables. There was a significant main effect for personality and a structure-by-personality interaction for negative self-referencing statements. It was found that the locus of control of the interviewee was associated with both positive and negative self-referencing statements in the high

structured interview format. This study concludes that talk-time, reaction time, amount of silent pauses are significantly affected by structure. It also concludes that negative self-referencing statements are affected by the interaction of internal-external locus of control and structure.

RÉSUMÉ

Dans une situation analogue à celle du counseling, les effets de la structure de l'entrevue, le style cognitif de la dépendance et de l'indépendance environnementales et la localisation interne ou externe du contrôle du sujet selon plusieurs variables de critère ont été examinés. Les variables de critère étaient la durée de la conversation, le nombre total de mots, le temps de réaction, la moyenne de mots par interaction, la moyenne du nombre de silences, le débit d'élocution, les révélations positives et négatives de soi et les perceptions de l'attirance, de l'expertise, de la confiance du conseiller et l'anxiété situationelle du sujet. Employant une analyse multivariées à deux facteurs, 48 etudiantes collégial ont été choisies au hasard pour passer une entrevue à format structuré ou non structuré.

Les résultats ont indiqués que l'augmentation de la durée de la conversation et le temps de réaction étaient reliés a l'entrevue structurée. Des pauses prolongées étaient associées à l'entrevue non structurée. Aucune différence significative n'a été notée en ce qui trait à la condition de structure pour les autres variables de critère. Il y a eu un effet principal significatif pour la personnalité et une

interaction entre la structure de l'entrevue et la personnalité du sujet pour les revelations négatives du soi. Les résultats montrent que dans les entrevues structurées, la localisation du contrôle du sujet était associée aux révélations positives et négatives du soi. En conclusion, l'expérience a démontré que la structure influence grandement la durée de la conversation, le temps de réaction, et le nombre de moment de silence. De plus, cette étude démontrent que les révélations négatives de soi sont modifiées par l'interaction de la localisation interne ou externe du contrôle du sujet et par la structure de l'entrevue.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Florent Dumont, the chairman of the committee for his patience, guidance, and friendship during the course of this research and in the years that preceded it. I feel especially indebted to Dr. Socrates Rapagna for his constant availability and for the countless hours that he gave me throughout this project. To the other members of the doctoral committee, Dr. Robert Bracewell and Dr. Ted Maroun, I am especially grateful for their valuable criticisms and suggestions.

Sincere thanks are also duly extended to Susan Herschorn of Dawson College for her assistance during various aspects of the data collection, to Renee Greenberg, Suzan MacKenzie, and Debbie McAskell for acting as interviewers, and to Lucy Pasquale for help in scoring the interview samples.

I am also especially grateful for the assistance, support, and friendship of Tony Bernardelli. He has always been generous with both his time and energy during our long association.

Above all, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my wife, Mary Louise, for her constant love, understanding, and patience throughout the completion of this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Overview of the Problem

Most research in the area of counselling has been dominated by studies that focus exclusively on the person of the counsellor, especially his[1] personal characteristics, training, and counselling orientation. Such personological variables have long been correctly regarded as having a prepotent influence on the therapeutic relationship. Counsellor-offered conditions flow from these variables, and researchers have been conditioned to the notion that an examination of some counsellor-offered conditions (especially empathy) was sufficient to describe what transpired in counselling. This tendency seems to persist. Even a brief survey of the counselling literature will reveal that the major variables under investigation have been operationalized by varying some aspect of the counsellor's behavior and assessing its impact on the client. Less frequently do we find studies that focus on the client's contribution to the dyadic interaction. Most notably, client organismic variables, with the exception of clinical or demographic categories, have been absent from research paradigms.

Recently, a number of investigators has argued for the use of experimental paradigms that consider the joint

contributions of the counsellor's behavior and the client's characteristics in assessing questions related to the process of counselling (Kiesler, 1966; Gelso, 1979; Gottman & Markham, 1978; Strupp, 1978). This is obviously warranted in view of the extensive range of individual client differences and the numerous counselling approaches that are currently in use. The recent popularity of counsellor-client matching in counselling and psychotherapy research is just one example that reflects this emphasis (Berzins, 1977; Posthuma & Carr, 1975; Carr, 1970; Goldstein,1971). The underlying assumption of a matching hypothesis is that certain counsellor - client pairings (whether done on similarity of cognitive dimensions, values orientation or other criteria) are thought to have an important influence on the counselling endeavor. This notion is hardly unique to "matching-researchers" since a growing number of researchers from diverse orientations are recognizing that experimentation must move beyond the separate assessment of counsellor and client characteristics and toward the investigation of the interaction of these features (Gelso, 1979; Kiesler, 1971; Krumboltz, 1966; Paul, 1967; Strupp & Bergin,1969).

Not long ago, participants in the counselling arena observed that viewing "counselling" as the experimental effect in research paradigms was not potentially useful in unravelling complex process issues (Strupp & Bergin, 1969; Strupp, 1978;

Gottman & Markham, 1978). Kiesler (1966) pointed out that the field had incorporated a number of harmful myths. Among these was the notion that classes of counsellors or clients could be considered as homogeneous groups. He stated:

> Our psychotherapy research designs can no longer incorporate these uniformity myths. Rather, they need to incorporate relevant patient variables and crucial therapist trait and behavior dimensions so that one can assess what therapist behaviors are more effective with which type of patients producing which kind of patient change. (Kiesler, 1971, p.40)

What Kiesler (1971) proposed was an elaborate "grid model" that would allow the examination of both the main effects of treatments as well as the interaction of those treatments with the organismic variables of the counsellor and client.

Earlier, Cronbach (1957) made similar points when he called for a rapprochement of the two major streams of scientific psychology. He noted that the field had been dominated by the two camps of experimental and correlational psychology. Although different in many respects, a salient point of departure between the two is in their methodological orientations. Experimental methods are primarily interested in variation that occurs as a

function of different manipulations or treatments. On the other hand, correlational approaches focus on the variance that exists between individuals and groups of individuals. Cronbach (1957) advocated a crossbreeding of the two and concluded that:

> Ultimately we should design treatments not to fit the average person, but to fit groups of students with particular aptitude patterns. Conversely, we should seek out the aptitudes which correspond to (interact with) modifiable aspects of the treatment. (p. 681)

He suggested that experimental treatments be differentiated so as to increase their likelihood of interacting with organismic variables. Conversely, clients should be selected according to those organismic variables that have the greatest likelihood of interaction with treatment variables.

It is apparent that these formulations have made an impact on research in the counselling domain (Gelso, 1979; Hill, 1982). Counselling researchers are increasingly examining the joint effects of treatment variables and moderator variables that represent counsellor or client organismic features (Stein & Stone, 1978; Fry & Charron, 1980; Kelly & Stone, 1982; Malkiewich

& Merluzzi, 1980). This trend is obviously warranted if we wish to answer questions relative to which types of clients are better suited for which counselling approaches conducted by which kind of counsellor. Thus, the present study focuses on one aspect of the counselling situation, to wit, the amount of ambiguity or specificity that the counsellor generates through his verbal responses. Also, the client organismic variables of field-dependent/independent cognitive style and internal-external locus of control are selected as client characteristics suspected to be sensitive to the level of counsellor-offered structure of the counselling situation.

Counselling Variable

Counsellor Ambiguity

Among the various counselling variables that have been discussed, several authors have suggested that the dimension, counsellor ambiguity, is a significant feature of the therapeutic situation (Blocher,1966; Bordin, 1955, 1968; Goldstein, Heller, & Secherest, 1966; Siegman, 1979a). Bordin (1955) explained ambiguity in this way: "when the stimulus configuration to which we are exposed is incomplete or vague, in that no clear cut response is predetermined, we say that the stimulus configuration is ambiguous" (p.13). By implication, the lack of a clear-cut response would dictate that ambiguity possess a stimulus quality

whose demand character differs from one person to the next.

Bordin (1955, 1968) described the pragmatic effect of ambiguity largely within the context of psychoanalytic practice and the theory of projective testing. This rationale is grounded on the fact that loose and undefined situational characteristics permit the client to invest a greater amount of his own personal and emotional life in the therapeutic interaction. The classical analytic stance of the partially mute therapist, sitting out of view of the analysand and uttering an occasional brief phrase like "Tell me whatever comes to your mind" is an appropriate example of the control and exercise of the ambiguity dimension. Of course it is also possible to control the focus of the interview through the use of more specific statements and when factual information is required some direct questioning is often necessary. But, as many counsellors have noticed, the more significant data are found in the contact behaviour of the client and in the dynamics that take place between the two parties. It is for this reason that more experienced interviewers often prefer to approach new clients without an array of specific questions and comments.

The use of ambiguity as a sine qua non of psychoanalytic practice is grounded on that system's major theoretical underpinnings. According to psychoanalysts, the working through

of the transference (especially the transference neurosis) is the prime curative factor in psychotherapy (Greenson, 1967). The therapist encourages the occurrence of the transference through the use of free association and by remaining a shadowy figure throughout the therapeutic contact. As the therapist maintains his use of minimal verbal and non-verbal cues, explanations, and directives, the patient is able to regress to earlier stages of his previous developmental history (Blanck, 1976; Fenichel, 1945; Greenacre, 1954).

Ambiguity is certainly a salient aspect of psychoanalysis and because of the strong theoretical justification for its use it pervades the entire life of the therapeutic contact. Less obvious is the fact that some degree of ambiguity is inherent in all therapeutic systems. Some authors have pointed out that the dimension of ambiguity might be a way of differentiating theoretical positions (Bordin, 1955; Brunink & Schroeder, 1979; Hill, Thames, & Rardin,1979; Lennard & Bernstein, 1960). This is not to say that any two therapists with identical training in the same theoretical school operate in identical fashion. This point is obvious to anyone who has had the opportunity to observe classes of therapists (e.g., psychoanalysts, Rogerians, etc.) interview clients.

Approaching from theoretically different vantage points,

Lennard and Bernstein (1960) described psychotherapy as a system of information exchange. Clients communicate data about their current and past lives, their feelings, and behaviours. The therapist communicates information about this information, that is, he provides feedback that is intended to help the client understand his own interpersonal and intrapersonal dynamics (Goldfried, 1980). Within this paradigm, the primary goal of therapy is to maximize the available information to both parties. Therefore, the counsellor's use of ambiguity and its converse, specificity, become significant variables in the informational quality of his verbal behaviour.

The above model contends that the therapist's informational structuring (e.g., the level of ambiguity-specificity of his verbal message) will influence certain aspects of the client's verbal output. The more specific a therapist remark is, the less the amount of latitude given to a client about what he is expected to talk about. Lennard and Bernstein (1960) tested this model in a naturalistic setting and found that messages of high informational specificity (e.g., active encouragement to engage in talking about his problems and concerns) were useful in keeping the client on topic but were less effective in eliciting other desirable behaviors. They concluded that:

> ... for moving the communication

> along a coherent and consistent path, there is an advantage to employing categories of high informational specificity. On the other hand, when seeking new subject matter areas for exploration and for transferring the initiative to the patient, probes of low informational specificity appear to be useful. (p.242)

Thus, whether the counsellor's ambiguity is explained within a psychoanalytic framework or within a system of informational exchange, conceptualizing the verbal behaviour of the counsellor along a continuum of ambiguity-specificity has heuristic qualities especially for the study of therapeutic interactions.

Despite theoretical interest in how the construct, ambiguity-specificity, operates within the counselling dyad, its value as a research variable has been largely overlooked. The empirical literature has focused primarily on two areas: (a) the relationship between the counsellor's ambiguous posture and levels of client discomfort such as anxiety (Dibner, 1958; Clemens & D'Andrea, 1965; Heller, 1968; Smith, 1957); (b) the impact of the ambiguity-specificity of the counsellor's verbal messages on subsequent client verbal behaviors (Heller, 1968; Pope, Blass, Cheek, Siegman, & Bradford, 1971; Siegman &

Pope,1972). With reference to anxiety, a relationship seems to exist between ambiguous verbal message and the induction of anxiety in a client (Lennard & Bernstein, 1960; Siegman & Pope, 1962). More research has been conducted regarding the influence of the counsellor's ambiguity-specificity on verbal productivity (usually measured by the number or length of client verbalizations) and other non-content categories such as hesitations, silent pauses, and speech reaction time (Pope et al., 1971; Siegman & Pope, 1965)

There is some evidence supporting the contention that ambiguous therapist remarks elicit longer and in some instances more meaningful verbal data from the client (Pope & Siegman, 1965; Siegman & Pope, 1972). Heller (1968) found that client self-disclosure was greater in situations of therapist ambiguity. Taken together, it would seem that an interviewer's verbal style characterized by greater ambiguity might be desirable if the intent is to create a climate that is conducive to client participation, self-exploration, and disclosure. On the other hand, it seems that a positive relationship exists between the therapist level of ambiguity and the amount of anxiety that this generates in a client. This might account for the fact that clients seem to prefer the more active counsellors to the passive ones (Heller, Davis, & Myers, 1966) and that less specific counsellor probes are responsible for a certain amount

of strain in the interview (Lennard & Bernstein, 1960).

Clearly then, it would seem that regardless of the theoretical or personal orientation that counsellors take with respect to the function of the ambiguity dimension, the choice of which level to use is not simply a matter of a theoretical disposition. Factors such as the goals of counselling, the experience of both parties, their abilities to tolerate certain debilitating emotions like anxiety, and other considerations will have much bearing on how a counsellor proceeds throughout an interview. Among other things, the counsellor will need to ask himself how the level of ambiguity-specificity contained in his verbal messages will affect the different types of clients that request counselling.

Client Characteristics

Cognitive Style

In recent years there has been a growing interest in extending the cognitive variable, field-dependence/ independence, to the area of social and interpersonal behavior. Originally, the field-dependence construct was conceived as a perceptual analytic ability that manifested itself in performance on several orientation and restructuring tasks (Witkin, Dyk, Faterson, Goodenough, & Karp, 1962). In early studies,

the term field-independent referred to individuals who relied primarily on internal, bodily cues rather than on the perceptual field in locating the vertical in space (e.g., the Rod and Frame Test, Witkin et al., 1962). The current definition of the construct is as a cognitive style feature and emphasizes the pervasive manner with which individuals rely on external or internal cues in their modes of functioning in perceptual, intellectual, emotional, and social activities.

The utility of applying the cognitive style construct beyond the perceptual domain has met with some interesting results (Witkin & Goodenough, 1977). There is evidence that people who are field-independent with respect to adjusting the vertical in space are more autonomous, impersonal, and distant in their interpersonal functioning. This greater self-reliance makes them less susceptible to being influenced by the social cues and behaviors of other people. This behavioral aspect is expressed particularly in social situations that are ambiguous or where informational cues are unclear or inadequate.

In contrast, field-dependents have greater difficulty with ambiguity in social situations and tend to rely on others as sources of information for social behavior (Witkin & Goodenough, 1977; Witkin, Goodenough, & Oltman, 1979). This makes field-dependents more interpersonally oriented in that they are

more attentive to stimuli of socially meaningful material. That both field dependents and independents function adequately in situations where information is clear suggests that ambiguity might have a strong moderating influence on an individual's particular style of social and interpersonal functioning. Consistent with the behavioral implications of the field-dependent construct, people who use external social referents make more frequent use of the informational properties of other people (Busch & De Ridder, 1973; Rosner, 1957). When other people are seen as potential reducers of situational ambiguity, field dependents will demonstrate greater attention to their reinforcing qualities (Culver, Cohen, Silverman, & Shmavonian, 1964; Freedman, O'Hanlon, Oltman, & Witkin, 1972; Steingart, Freedman, Grande, & Buchwald, 1975). The fact that field-independents do not demonstrate this tendency is taken as evidence of an inherent ability to provide their own structure and to define for themselves the meaning of ambiguous situations.

The expectation that ambiguity would have a greater impact on field-dependents was demonstrated in a number of studies using interpersonal and educational paradigms (Busch & De Ridder, 1973; Freedman et al., 1972; Linton, 1955; Oltman, Goodenough, & Witkin, Freedman, & Friedman,1975; Solar, Davenport, & Bruehl, 1969; Wachman, 1964). The differential behavioral styles of field-dependents/independents was also

studied in the context of counselling and psychotherapy (Fry & Charron, 1980; Pardes, Papernik, & Winston, 1974; Posthuma & Carr, 1975). The evidence seems to indicate that field-dependents prefer to interact with counsellors that are highly structured in their approach and specific in their verbal content (Witkin, Moore, Goodenough, & Cox, 1977; Witkin & Goodenough, 1980). Russakoff, Fontana, Dowds, and Harris (1976) found that field-dependent clients expressed greater dissatisfaction with interviews lacking in structure (e.g., ambiguous ones). The preference of field-dependents for interviews of greater structure has been observed by others (Witkin & Goodenough, 1980). Also, field-dependents have greater difficulty in producing verbal content in free-association monologue experiments (Steingart et al., 1975) and are more affected by the lack of feedback in analogue interviews (Freedman et al., 1972). Interestingly enough, sensitive therapists have little difficulty in assessing the structure needs of clients. Witkin et al. (1977) reported that therapists asked more specific and closed-ended questions of field dependents but used more open-ended probes with independents. Consistent with this observation is the contention by Karp, Kissin, and Hustmyer (1970) that the cognitive style of a patient is a consideration in assigning a particular treatment for him.

Taken together, the research evidence seems to indicate

that highly structured and specific counselling approaches are more appropriate for field-dependents. In contrast, the more autonomous and self-reliant field-independent might be more suited to the traditional forms of therapy that place a high premium on self-direction and self-involvement. This would be in keeping with the major behavioral feature of the field-dependent/independent concept in its use of internal-external referents as definitional parameters of distinctive types of personality functioning.

Locus of Control

Another construct that makes considerable use of the dimension of self is internal-external locus of control. The locus of control construct was originally proposed by Rotter (1966) as a generalized expectancy to attribute responsibility for reinforcement either to the internal capacities of the self or to forces outside the individual. Individuals with an internal locus of control tend to perceive reinforcement as contingent upon their own attributes and hence under personal control. Those who are externally controlled tend to rely on forces outside of themselves for reinforcement and therefore perceive consequences for their actions as unrelated to their own behavior (Lefcourt,1982; Phares, 1976; Rotter, 1966,1975).

The locus of control construct has been the object of an

enormous amount of interest since its introduction and its value as a predictive tool seems well-established. Generally speaking, individuals with an internal orientation tend to be more self-reliant, more assertive, and more autonomous. In contrast, externals are less likely to manifest a belief in their ability to change the course of destiny, and generally feel helpless and powerless (Brown & Strickland, 1972; Hersch & Scheibe, 1967; Tseng, 1970; Wolk & Ducette, 1974).

The usefulness of the locus of control construct as a discriminator of different behavioral orientations has also been extended to the domain of counselling and psychotherapy. Typically, these studies have used locus of control as a measure of personality change or as an index of the impact of counselling and psychotherapy (Balch & Ross, 1975; Gillis & Jessor, 1973; Gregory, 1978; Pierce, Schauble, & Farkas, 1970). The rationale for this approach is founded on the notion that a particular benefit of effective counselling is an increase in a client's self-reliance and a change in his sense of responsibility, in short, an increase in internal control (Dua, 1970; Nowicki & Barnes, 1973; Smith, 1970).

Another class of studies focused on the locus of control construct as a moderator variable in the treatment situation (Abramowitz, Abramowitz, Roback, & Jackson, 1974; Friedman &

Dies, 1974; Manuck, Henrichsen, & Ross, 1975). Since internals are characteristically more autonomous and less susceptible to persuasive messages, the prediction that internals are better suited to therapeutic regimens that are less structured or directive is reasonable. The external client's reliance on authority and his greater susceptibility to conformity pressures might allow him to benefit from therapeutic approaches that are more structured and specific.

That internals and externals are differentially affected by counselling and psychotherapy seems to be borne-out in the literature (Foulds, 1971; Friedman & Dies, 1974 Kilmann & Howell, 1974). Externals tend to show a preference for therapists who are more structured whereas internals seem to prefer more open-ended approaches (Phares, 1976). Thus, the locus of control of the client seems to interact with the particular approach of the counsellor. Externals tend to derive more benefit from therapeutic interventions that are well explicated and structured by the counsellor. The plausible expectation that internals would benefit from a counsellor who is less directive has received some encouraging support (Friedman & Dies, 1974; Kilmann & Sotile, 1976; Kilmann, Albert, & Sotile, 1975).

The accumulated data seem to suggest that like

cognitive style, the locus of control dimension may have a strong moderating influence in certain types of interpersonal and social situations. The prediction that externals react in more positive ways under conditions of structure (and hence low ambiguity) is warranted in light of the strong construct validity of locus of control. An individual's control orientation may have more impact in ambiguous situations since, like field-dependence/independence, situations that are clear may require little recourse to internal referents (Rotter, 1975). Phares (1976) emphasized this point thus:

> Presumably, the lack of specific situational cues (instructions) allows the subjects to react in their own characteristic fashion - as an "internal" or an "external". Internally oriented subjects who feel they are in control of the reinforcements that occur could be expected to engage in greater information seeking than externally oriented subjects. On the other hand, the behavior of externals given skill instructions would be less external than it would be in an ambiguous situation. We can state generally: the presence of

> explicit situational cues about the contingency between behavior and outcome should diminish the importance of a generalized expectancy for internal or external control. (p. 22)

The existing research in the locus of control domain suggests that the numerous personality and behavioral correlates associated with an individual's control orientation bear a strong similarity with field-dependence or independence. While field-dependence/independence is derived from perceptual tests and not from pencil and paper measures, the behavioral responses of internals and independents and externals and dependents have striking parallels. However, the two measures have been found to be uncorrelated in spite of conceptual similarities. Therefore, the combined use of both dimensions in an attempt to bolster their predictive power seems warranted especially in view of the recurring suggestion by researchers to use statistically unrelated but theoretically relevant variables (Finn, 1974; Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973).

Purpose of the Study

Conceptually speaking, the counselling interview is regarded as primarily a dyadic communication system. The task of the counsellor, especially in early stages of the

counselling contact, is to obtain information about the client. Thus, the counsellor is concerned with those factors that facilitate the expression of personal information in a dyadic encounter. Consequently, the focus of this study is on certain features of the counselling interview.

How then should the counsellor conduct an interview so as to foster the optimal exchange of personal information? Several investigators have noted that researchers have been largely interested in operationalizing theoretical positions or in emphasizing the personal attributes of the counsellor (Siegman, 1979a; Strupp, 1977). Less has been said about the more appropriate ways of conducting various interviews. The foregoing implies that consideration be given to the actual technical operations of the counsellor in an attempt to differentiate between what he actually does and who he is.

An important technical aspect of the counsellor's interview approach consists of the construct, ambiguity-specificity. This may be operationalized in terms of the structure level of the counsellor's verbal messages. It is the intent of this study to examine the influence that the two levels of counsellor-offered structure have on several language characteristics and reactions of clients.

Also, it is hypothesized that the counsellor who behaves with all clients as if they reacted in a stereotyped manner to the interview situation will make serious errors of diagnoses as well as treatment. Part of developing a mature counselling approach is mastering the skill of adapting treatment to the idiosyncracies of different clients. But the modalities of flexible and adaptive functioning are often a product of the counsellor's intuition and are not based on established psychological principles. It is for this reason that the cognitive style of the client and his locus of control orientation will be examined as potentially useful moderator variables. Therefore, this study will examine aspects of the counsellor's interviewing behavior as well as the client's characteristics. This is in the tradition of a growing number of studies investigating the organismic features of the client with particular treatment modalities.

The objective of this study then is to examine the effects of counsellor-offered structure and organismic aspects of the client's cognitive style and locus of control on certain language behaviours of the client. Two levels of structure, that is, low structure and high structure will represent the ambiguity-specificity dimension. It is hypothesized that the structure level of the counsellor's messages and the client organismic characteristics will interact

and have a direct measurable influence on the criterion variables. In this study, the criterion variables will be of the following three types: (a) client self-disclosure, (b) client linguistic and speech patterns, and (c) client perceptions of the interview experience. These variables are discussed in chapter II and defined in chapter III.

The primary hypothesis is that the self-disclosures of clients, their speech patterns, and their perceptions of the interview experience will vary as a function of the counsellor's level of structure and the client's characteristics. The general questions which the study addresses are the following:

(1) Does the client's self-disclosure differ as a function of (a) the structure level of the counsellor's messages and (b) the interaction of client cognitive style and locus of control with that structure level?

(2) Do the client's linguistic patterns differ as a result of (a) counsellor-offered structure and (b) the interaction of client cognitive style and locus of control with that structure level?

(3) Do the client's perceptions of the interview experience differ as a result of (a) counsellor-offered structure and (b) the interaction of client cognitive style and locus of control with that structure level?

Footnotes

[1]The use of the masculine pronoun is strictly for convenience and refers to the general case of counsellors and clients. The use of the feminine pronoun in other parts of this manuscript refers specifically to the sample of female students that was used for this study.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

In this chapter a review of the literature that is germane to the principal concerns of this study will be presented. The first section deals with the subject of interview-offered structure. Those studies of cognitive style and locus of control pertinent to this study will be dealt with in a second section. A third section will be devoted to a review of those criterion variables selected for this study.

Counseller-Offered Structure: The Ambiguity-Specificity Dimension

The notion of counsellor-offered structure is related to and at times synonymous with counsellor ambiguity. If we define ambiguity as referring to a situation that is vague and loosely defined, then it is obvious that ambiguity is but at one end of a structure continuum. Also, it is clear that its converse, specificity, should occupy the opposite end of that continuum. This continuum is often implicit in the counselling interview since the counsellor makes use of structure by the way he defines both the tasks and the roles of the participants in the dyad

(Blocher, 1966; Bordin, 1955; Goldstein et al., 1966) and by the way he controls the direction and content of the counselling interaction (Heller, 1972; Pope, 1979). For example, when the roles and tasks of both the counsellor and the client are well defined, the ambiguity of the counselling relationship is minimized (Goldstein et al., 1966). In addition, the use of the structure dimension is reflected in the way the counsellor supplies cues for the exploration and discussion of appropriate interpersonal and intrapersonal content. When the counsellor cues the client only with broad, open-ended,and unfocused remarks that are intended simply to maintain the communicational flow of the client, the ambiguity of the counselling relationship is maximized. Bordin (1968) illustrated differences in the use of structure in this way:

> ... we are talking about the degree to which the therapist either advertently or inadvertently gives structure to the stimulus field for the patient. The analyst who appears to be a blank screen to his patient represents one extreme of the ambiguity-structured dimension. By long periods of only listening, the analyst minimizes the amount of structure the situation presents to the patient... Information-bound counselling relationships are good

> examples of extremely structured situations where the purposes of the meeting and the goals are usually both explicitly and implicitely defined in relatively definite terms and where the topic is often restricted by a series of very limited questions which can be answered "Yes" and "No". (p. 152)

The foregoing implies that the continuum may be exemplified by the two extremes of free-association and the information-gathering interview. Also implied is the recognition that the control of the direction and content of the interview can be facilitated by the creative and thoughtful use of the ambiguity-specificity dimension.

Ambiguity in Counselling and Psychotherapy Interactions

Perhaps no school of psychotherapy has had a greater impact on the profession as a whole than psychoanalysis. In its development Freud found, like other therapists before him, that patients were capable of strong and sometimes embarrassing feelings towards the therapist. It was the development of these feelings that had the makings of a transference relationship which the analyst used in helping the patient overcome his difficulties (Blanck, 1976). In essence, the patient developed a transference neurosis which was a duplicate of attitudes and

feelings held by the patient toward parents and other authority figures. The reexposure of these earlier feelings under more favorable conditions led to a cure. Therefore, in order to maximize the rich curative power of the transference phenomenon, it was essential to minimize all reality cues from the therapeutic situation (Fenichel, 1945). The emphasis on free association as the basic rule of psychoanalysis, the use of the couch, and the out-of-view therapist were all intended to create an open-ended, ambiguous situation thereby allowing the patient to reach deep into his own memory and imagination for meaningful unconscious material (Blanck, 1976; Greenson, 1967).

In psychoanalytic terms the ideal situation is one that enhances and facilitates the projective aspects of the therapeutic contact (Bordin, 1955). In this way, the attitudes and reactions of the patient are seen as subjective responses rather than responses to objective situations. This notion is borrowed from projective psychological testing in that the vague stimulus structures of the test materials elicit relevant unconscious data. So too, the ambiguous and open-ended therapeutic interview is intended to elicit personally relevant client information which would lead to more accurate inferences about the actual nature and source of the client's anxieties, conflicts, and concerns (Korchin, 1976; Lindzey, 1961; Stein, 1978).

The view that ambiguous therapeutic situations are prerequisites for the production of fantasy and other unconscious personality material works well within a system that emphasizes intrapersonal and intrapsychic processes. A broader explanation for the use of ambiguity might be to view its function within a context of response variability. Response variability is best illustrated by using projective testing as an example. It is widely accepted that ambiguous stimulus cards allow greater freedom of interpretation and are capable of eliciting a wide variety of themes. Those cards that elicit stereotyped, typical response patterns are considered unambiguous (Kenny, 1954, 1961; Klopfer & Taulbee, 1976; Lindzey, 1961 Murstein, 1963, 1966). Applying this same dynamic to counselling and psychotherapy, we find that the ambiguity inherent in many therapeutic contacts affords the client greater latitude in what he chooses to focus on, discuss, or pursue. Hence, the counsellor's use of ambiguity may be for its capacity to elicit fantasy and unconscious material. But more often than not, and among counsellors of a non-analytic orientation, ambiguity is often maintained because it allows the client more "response variability" - a term used to describe the client's freedom to develop themes and concerns of special interest to him.

Response Variability in Counselling and Psychotherapy

The concept of response variability as it applies to the mental health interview was developed by Lennard and Bernstein (1960). These authors maintained that the flow of communication in psychotherapy was a two-way street on which both client and therapist travelled. They therefore used the concept of communication as a system of informational exchange to characterize the process of the therapeutic dyad. More importantly, they pin-pointed the structure dimension of this exchange as a central component of the counsellor's informational input. They illustrated this notion thus:

> Any idea (proposition) expressed by a therapist may be regarded as a message sent to the patient by the therapist. Such propositions differ in the degree to which the information they supply provides a basis for limiting the range or array of possible responses. For example, the therapist statement, "Just start by saying anything that occurs to you," has a low specific informational stimulus value because it does not limit the patient's response to any specific subject matter or proposition. It may therefore be said to be non-

> directive or unstructured. On the other hand, the question, "How old are your sisters?", has a high specific informational stimulus value because it provides information that can be used to set limits on the range of possible alternatives from which the patient may select his reply. It therefore may be said to be highly directive or structured. (p. 42)

As part of a larger research of the dynamics of psychotherapy, Lennard and Bernstein (1960) devised an a priori scale to measure the degree of ambiguity-specificity of the content of the clinical interaction. Eight categories intended to estimate the amount of structure inherent in a therapist's message were used to assess the effect of varying levels of structure on the verbal output of clients. Their finding indicated that high verbal output of the client was a function of the low specificity of the therapist. Interestingly enough, a systems dynamic was noted, that is, when the verbal output of the client fell, the specificity of the counsellor rose. Lennard and Bernstein (1960) concluded " the maintenance of optimum levels of output exhibit their own dynamic which is relatively autonomous and which to some extent transcends the specific adaptational goals of the therapy system, the diagnosis of the patient and the theoretical orientation of the therapists "

(p.149).

The concept of the informational exchange qualities of the dyadic system and the designation of message specificity as a key variable provided a more parsimonious framework to understanding how ambiguity-specificity works within the interview. Consequently, it became possible to extricate the uses of message ambiguity from the narrower system of psychoanalysis and to apply it to the more general case of dyadic communication.

Accepting the basic model proposed by Lennard and Bernstein (1960), Siegman and Pope (1962, 1965) focused on the effects of interviewer ambiguity-specificity on a number of verbal and paraverbal dimensions. Earlier, Howe and Pope (1961; 1962) had designed a scale to measure a therapist's verbal activity level when conducting naturalistic initial interviews. Activity level was characterized by the attributes of ambiguity, "lead", and inference. Thus, when a therapist's activity level is low, his verbal messages are relatively ambiguous, nonleading, and supply few inferences. Howe and Pope (1961) assumed that the three attributes were highly intercorrelated and that the global dimension of therapist activity level was constituted by ambiguity, lead, and inference. Howe and Pope (1962) later found that the activity dimension was not a unitary factor and that only the ambiguity factor of their scale had any clinical

usefulness. Activity level was contrasted with Lennard and Bernstein's (1960) informational specificity, a construct bearing much resemblance to Howe and Pope's (1962) ambiguity attribute. They found therapist activity level to be unrelated to the patient's speech output and paralinguistic disturbances whereas a significant relationship between ambiguity-specificity and these dependent variables was found. It was perhaps for this reason that activity level was abandoned in favor of ambiguity-specificity as a significant dimension of interviewer behavior.

Following the conceptual schema of Lennard and Bernstein (1960) and encouraged by the Howe and Pope (1962) findings, Siegman and Pope (1962) developed an empirical scale for measuring interviewer ambiguity-specificity. This scale became useful in subsequent empirical research where ambiguity-specificity was used in analyzing client-therapist interactions.

The basic operational definition of ambiguity as informational uncertainty led Siegman and Pope (1965, 1972) to test several hypotheses about how ambiguity-specificity influenced interviwee verbal behavior. Their primary dependent variables were interviewee productivity scores (measured by the number of words per client response) and several paralinguistic features such as silent pauses, hesitation and,verbal fluency. In one study, 50 nursing students (all female) were interviewed

using a two-four-two schedule that consisted of two ambiguous questions followed by four specific questions and concluded by two more ambiguous questions. The predicted relationship of longer client responses following ambiguous questions was confirmed (Siegman & Pope, 1965). This finding was replicated in subsequent research using both analogue and naturalistic situations. Some additional support came from the research of Matarazzo and his colleagues who found that the silence behavior of the interviewer increased the rate of client-initiated talk-time (Matarazzo, Wiens, Matarazzo, & Saslow, 1968).

As stated previously, the effects of ambiguity and specificity on paralinguistic cues was also examined. Interest in paralinguistic phenomena is based on the psychodynamic notion that these cues are indicators of defenses and especially of anxiety (Horowitz, Sampson, Siegalman, Wolfson, & Weiss, 1975; Kasl & Mahl, 1965). Paralinguistic variables such as rate of speech or filled pauses are familiar to clinical interviewers and are often seen as the vehicle of the client's affective expressions (Siegman 1978, 1979b).

Siegman and Pope (1972) reported that ambiguous interviewer remarks were associated with a greater pausing and slower articulation on the part of the client. However, this study did not find the predicted relationship between ambiguity

and other speech characteristics such as client reaction time and silent pausing during a response. Earlier, in a similar analogue study, ambiguous interviewer remarks had been associated with longer latencies and duration of silent pauses (Siegman & Pope, 1965), a discrepancy that Siegman and Pope (1972) attributed to the procedural differences between the two studies. The results from these studies were predated in a non-interview study using projective tests. TAT cards of varying levels of ambiguity were administered to students. Responses to cards of greater ambiguity were associated with hesitant and disrupted speech (Siegman & Pope, 1966b).

The findings regarding interviewee verbal productivity and speech hesitations were replicated with a clinical sample by Pope et al. (1971). Psychiatric in-patients were interviewed by the same person on three different occasions. The interviewers used a counterbalanced schedule of high and low specificity as well as a mixed format in talking to patients about hospital activities. Consistent with previous findings the low specificity schedule evoked greater verbal productivity than the high specificity one. The mixed format was mid-point between the two. The low specificity format was associated with more speech hesitation and disruption.

While verbal productivity is one indicator of the

interviewer's skill, its usefulness as a source of psychological information is quite low. Self-disclosure, on the other hand, is high in information of greater potential value. Siegman and Pope (1972) devised a Superficiality Ratio as an index of the psychological meaningfulness of an interviewee's responses. Interviewee responses were divided into speech clauses and then rated as to whether they were factually descriptive and trivial or psychologically evaluative and referring to affective experiences. This superficiality index was obtained by dividing the number of trivial responses by the total number - the larger number indicating lower self-disclosure. Siegman and Pope (1972) found that ambiguous interviewer remarks were associated with a higher superficiality ratio and hence indicative of less disclosure. However, their results did indicate that ambiguity elicited more meaningful clauses than specific conditions but that the ratio of meaningful to superficial clauses was lower for ambiguity. The Superficiality Ratio was also used in the previously cited Pope et al. (1971) study. Their results indicated that ambiguous probes were associated with more self-disclosure as measured by the same index.

The relationship between ambiguity and self-disclosure was examined by Heller and his colleagues. In their studies, self-disclosure was measured by both the number of self-referencing and problem-referencing statements made by the

client. In an unpublished, study Heller, Silver, Bailey, and Dudgeon (reported by Heller, 1972) examined the effects of ambiguity-specificity on samples of students and patients. Their results indicated that the more structured interviewer conditions were more effective in eliciting self-referenced statements for both the patient and the student group but unstructured conditions were marginally better at eliciting problem-referenced statements.

Heller, Davis, and Myers (1966) examined the effects of active and passive interviewers on a number of dependent variables. The passive interviewer role was characterized by a great deal of ambiguity. He allowed the client to lead and (a) communicated some affect but (b) spoke infrequently. The active interviewer led the interview by encouraging verbalizations. The results indicated that under active conditions subjects talked more during available time. In a similar study, Heller, Marlatt, Bailey, and Silver (cited by Heller 1968) reported that only client self-references (and not problem statements) were greater in situations where interviewer feedback was ambiguous rather than clear.

Ambiguity Inherent in the Relationship

Ambiguity is not limited strictly to the content of what the counsellor says, but as Bordin (1955) implied, it may be a by-product of the counsellor's neutrality. By refraining from sharing his own ideas and reactions to the client's "story" and by safe guarding against possible non-verbal leakage, the counsellor is able to maintain relationship ambiguity. This relationship ambiguity (Heller, 1968) is achieved when the interviewer refrains from verbal feedback as well as from the numerous smiles, head nodding, and postural movement that are potent sources of reinforcement for the client. Psychoanalysts are well known for their neutral and reserved stance (the rule of abstinence). The supine client and out-of-sight therapist were designed to facilitate the therapist's control of his own non-verbal reactions. This is no longer considered a good way to maximize neutrality since, as many psychoanalysts are recognizing, it tends to accentuate non-visual cues that have reinforcing qualities (Reid, 1980). However, neutrality and non-intrusiveness are still considered de rigueur for certain therapies. Relationship ambiguity has therefore been the subject of a number of investigations.

Siegman and Pope (1972) conducted two experiments to assess what impact reducing non-verbal cues would have on the

verbal fluency and productivity of student clients. Cue reduction was created by placing an opaque screen between the two participants. This manipulation assured that the interviewer's non-verbal messages would not interfere with the respondent. The results indicated that reducing non-verbal cues in this manner significantly lowered the verbal productivity of clients. Also, like message ambiguity, relationship ambiguity was associated with cautious and hesitant speech.

In a second study, the interpersonal ambiguity noted above was achieved by manipulating seating positions rather than by using a screen. This was done to rule out the possibility that facing a screen was not true to life, probably distracting, and therefore possibly accounting for the results. In the treatment condition interviewees faced away from the interviewer whereas the control group was interviewed in a face-to-face manner. As in the previous study, verbal productivity was lower and hesitation higher in the treatment condition.

In the previously cited Heller et al. (1966) study the researchers decided to manipulate the interpersonal cues of the interview rather than eliminate them. Student clients were interviewed by active or passive counsellors who also controlled the interpersonal qualities of friendliness and hostility. Friendly counsellors were supportive and considerate; hostile

counsellors were disapproving and unappreciative of the interviewees. No clear-cut patterns emerged. For example, more sex and problem words were emitted under passive friendly conditions and more family words were emitted by clients interviewed by the active, friendly counsellors and passive, hostile counsellors. Overall however, it appeared that subjects felt more pressure to discuss some embarrassing and threatening content with hostile interviewers. The only clear-cut evidence is the strong preference of clients for friendly interviewers, but friendliness per se had little impact on talk-time and the content variables.

In another study, Heller, Marlatt, Bailey,and Silver (cited by Heller, 1972) trained interviewers to give feedback that was positive, negative,or ambiguous. Participants in this experiment sat in two rooms separated by a one-way mirror. The lighting was controlled so that the interviewer could be seen only when he spoke. The interviewer's messages were delivered clearly so that the client could hear exactly what was said, or they were distorted by a throat microphone so that only parts of the message were coherent. Positive feedback (both clear and distorted) was rated as more friendly and comforting by the clients. Talk time was greater for the clear condition but more self-referenced statements occurred with distorted messages. However, when subjects were divided into high and low

problem-admitters using a check-list, a significant personality-by-treatment interaction was observed. High problem-admitters were more self-disclosing under ambiguous messages both clear and distorted. In a similar study Heller, Marlatt, and Bailey (cited by Heller, 1972) manipulated the conditions of activity level and interviewer evaluation of client message through positive, negative, or ambiguous feedback. Furthermore, participants sat across from each other but were separated by a screen. The impact of the treatments was measured by (a) a post-interview evaluation of the particular condition, (b) request for feedback, and (c) switching of topics. Results indicated that positive interviewers (both passive and active) were best liked and that negative-passive interviewers were the least liked. The results of the ambiguous feedback condition fell approximately mid-way between the positive and negative evaluations in terms of feedback requests and topic switching. Heller (1972) mentioned the difficulty involved in interpreting the results concerning ambiguous feedback and admitted that complete neutrality is impossible even with a screen blocking out visual cues.

The whole question of whether interpersonal ambiguity as the embodiment of a neutral and reserved counsellor stance has the tendency to inhibit interviewee communication was examined by other researchers. Pope and Siegman (1968) found that reserved counsellors inhibit the client's communication of content but

they admitted that methodological flaws made their results questionable. In a later refinement of the same study, Pope and Siegman (1972) found that unlike their previous study, cordial male interviewers did not elicit more talk time from their clients and hence results indicated a non-significant difference between warm and reserved interviewers for male clients. Female clients were more talkative with neutral counsellors, a finding that the authors attributed to the sex of the interviewers, that is, females may have felt more comfortable with a reserved male interviewer and may have felt uneasy with a warm, expressive male. In another study, using only female clients and interviewers, Siegman (1979a) found that warm interviewers were rated more positively, higher in interpersonal attraction, and more competent than reserved interviewers. Differences between interviewee scores under the two conditions in relation to non-content indices such as pauses, speech rate, reaction time were significant. However, there were no significant differences in verbal productivity between the warm and reserved conditions. Finally, interviewer warmth had only a moderate and non-significant effect on the client's willingness to self-disclose. Similarly, Heller and Jacobson (reported by Heller,1972) found that friendly interviewers inhibited the speaking time and self-disclosure of dependent males as assessed by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule but had the opposite effect on independent males. The female group did not elicit this

interaction for talk-time and self-statements but did so for problem-statements.

Ambiguity and Anxiety

It is generally accepted that ambiguity and lack of structure, especially in novel situations, increase an individual's level of anxiety (Bednar & Kaul, 1978; Bordin, 1974; Budner, 1962). This has been demonstrated in a number of studies and the overall relationship between the two variables seems clear: unpleasant arousal increases in ambiguous situations whether these be small group settings, psychological experiments designed to assess the impact of ambiguity levels on task performance, or in the interview setting (Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Keenan, 1978; Smith, 1957).

Arousal has long been recognized as a central factor in counselling and psychotherapy, and techniques designed to mobilize a client's anxiety are often seen as a necessary gambit on the part of the counsellor (Davanloo, 1978; Hill, Charles, & Reed, 1981). This is based in part on the principle that moderate levels of anxiety have beneficial effects on the performance of a number of complex tasks, of which speaking is one (Dollard & Miller, 1950; Kanfer, 1958a; Manaugh, Wiens, & Matarazzo, 1970). For example, Kanfer (1958a, 1958b) found that verbal rates

increased in response to both electric shock-induced anxiety and anxiety-arousing topics in an interview. Earlier, Davids and Erickson (1955) found a positive relationship between the verbal productivity of a word association task and a measure of anxiety.

There is also some indication that initial anxiety is necessary for the therapeutic undertaking and that this may be predictive of successful outcome (Parloff, Waskow, & Wolfe, 1978). Heller (1972) suggested that the client's attempts to reduce the stressful effects of interview-induced anxiety may have a facilitative effect on self-disclosure. It is perhaps for this reason that ambiguity is often used as one way of inducing and controlling anxiety in the clinical interview.

A number of studies indicated that the state-anxiety of a client can be manipulated, that is, controlled through the amount of counsellor-offered structure in the interview. Dibner (1958) conducted a study to assess the impact of ambiguity-specificity on patients in a hospital setting. Four psychologists each interviewed ten subjects, half with an ambiguous (open-ended) message style and half with a more specific and concrete style. The treatment conditions were checked by both observers and by the subjects' responses to a post-interview assessment of their perceptions of the structure level of the interviews. Five measures of anxiety assessed the arousal states

of the subjects during and after the interviews. Four of the measures correlated significantly with observers' ratings of the ambiguity dimensions, while only two of these were correlated with the subjects' ratings. Similar results were obtained earlier by Smith (1957) in an analysis of the influence of ambiguous role expectations on group behavior. He found that the ambiguity created by manipulating the roles of accomplices increased the level of defensiveness and decreased the level of satisfaction with the group experience. Pope and Siegman (1962b) found that low therapist specificity was also associated with anxiety. In this study, the subjects' speech disturbances were used as a measure of anxiety.

Kaplan (1966) noted a person-by-treatment interaction in a study of ambiguity and anxiety. Subjects were given instructions that varied in their level of ambiguity. Half were given a free association instruction while the other half were given more specific guidelines about what to say. Kaplan's high anxious group responded more spontaneously and with greater feeling in the less ambiguous condition. This could be taken as an indication that individuals with a low tolerance for anxiety would prefer more structured interview situations.

In another study, Clemes and d'Andrea (1965) found that when patients' expectations about the clinical interview were

incompatible with what they experienced there was greater anxiety. Patients were instructed to expect a structured or an unstructured interview and their assignments to these interviews were compatible or incompatible with their expectations. Results indicated a higher level of anxiety occurred for incompatibles regardless of the type of interview. It would seem that in this case the type of expectations concerning the therapist's activities was a more potent factor than the actual structure of the interview.

Although not unequivocal the research evidence does seem to indicate that ambiguity has an effect on anxiety. Perhaps less equivocal is the usefulness of anxiety as an activator of human behavior. This relationship is usually seen as curvilinear and the activating influences of high and low anxiety states are dysfunctional while moderate ones are not. In addition, the clinical evidence indicated that reduced levels of anxiety made certain clients feel less threatened. In fact, some recent approaches in counselling and psychotherapy especially with certain types of clients try to reduce the ambiguity inherent in the whole psychotherapeutic relationship (Goldstein & Stein, 1976).

Summary of Research on the Ambiguity-Specificity Dimension

Initial interest in the ambiguity-specificity dimension

of counselling and psychotherapy grew out of the observation that a reserved and ambiguous counsellor stance increased client self-reliance and fostered a communicational flow that had necessary and beneficial effects on the therapeutic relationship. Thus, the projective quality of open-ended, ambiguous remarks stimulates the therapeutic process by allowing clients to vary their responses, as a function of their own perceptions, needs, and goals. In the end, the clients' responses to ambiguous probes facilitate communication by allowing greater latitude in what they wish to introduce as a particular area of concern. This prompts them to explore a wider range of personally relevant experiences.

The empirical study of ambiguity in interpersonal situations was prompted by its widespread use in mental health interviews. The clinical intuition of many practitioners led to the belief that broad, unfocused, and ambiguous interviewer messages facilitated verbal expression in dyadic communication. The results of several studies suggested this. Ambiguous counsellor remarks elicit more talk-time from clients than do specific ones. Also, there were some strong suggestions that ambiguity facilitates the discussion of personally relevant information about the self. Heller (1972) alluded to the tension-inducing quality of ambiguity in interpersonal dyads and concluded that "mild and moderate stress and challenge, and

the opportunity to overcome that stress are important ingredients in helping subjects perform a task involving the admission of personal concerns and worries " (p. 25). This is extremely pertinent in the light of the fact that progress in psychotherapy is made by those clients who (a) talk more, (b) talk for longer periods of time and,(c) are able to discuss personally meaningful experiences (Sloane et al.,1975).

Another body of research evidence indicates that ambiguous counsellor remarks have an impact on a number of paraverbal measures. It seems that clients react with greater speech hesitation and disfluency to ambiguous than to specific remarks. Speech disfluency has often been seen as an indicator of anxiety but this point is questionable and needs further examination.

Data on the effects of ambiguity are useful in helping establish its value to the therapeutic process, but its true impact, especially outside of certain variables, is hardly clear-cut. Researchers interested in this and other variables may need to consider the more recent emphasis on person-situation transactions (Blass, 1976; Cronbach, 1975; Ekehammer, 1974). For example, the more recent evidence in the counselling and psychotherapy literature appears promising in its demonstration of the differential reactions of clients to certain interview

variables. Indeed, the more current trend has been the matching of particular types of clients with selected forms of counselling approaches in order to maximize the benefits that may be derived by these clients. The effects of counsellor-offered ambiguity-specificity on the interviewer's behavior will need further examination to account for potential variations in interviewee behavior that are a function of the interviewee's own personality make-up as well as the message style of the counsellor. It is for this reason that the cognitive style variable of field-dependence/independence and internal-external locus of control are selected as plausible candidates for moderating the effects of ambiguity and specificity.

Cognitive Style: Field-dependence/independence

Cognitive style grew out of a number of older perceptual studies conducted to determine how individuals perceive the verticality of objects. More important were the questions relevant to the salience of those cues provided by the visual field versus those provided by the perceivers themselves. A number of ingenious experiments were conducted whereby the visual field of objects could be manipulated in order to test assumptions concerning an individual's use of external or internal referents in judging the upright. Experimental findings have been summarized in two major texts, reporting the work from

its earliest roots to more recent times (Witkin et al., 1962; Witkin & Berry, 1975; Witkin & Goodenough, 1980). Though it is recognized that individuals rely both on their own bodily cues as well as cues from their environment, they differ significantly on the importance of these different cues in making judgements. Also, there is much consistency in each individual's performance across different situations and on his response to different methods used to assess this perceptual style (Witkin & Berry, 1975; Witkin et al., 1979). It was perhaps these particular trends that helped shift the focus of study from interest in the actual stimulus quality of the phenomenon being perceived to those characteristics of the individual that contributed to the particular manner of perceiving the stimulus.

In recent years the study of field-dependence/ independence has become extremely widespread, and literature is available on its relevance to personality, psychopathology, interpersonal behavior, cross-cultural factors, learning, memory, and the like (Goodenough, 1976; Witkin, 1965; Witkin & Goodenough, 1980). Since this literature is of considerable breadth, only those studies relevant to the present research will be discussed. These will consist of research data linking the field-dependence/ independence dimension to interpersonal influence attempts, ambiguity conditions of certain situations, and of more pertinence, the usefulness of considering the impact

of this dimension to questions of counselling and psychotherapy.

Use of Social Referents

One of the earliest applications of the field-dependence/independence construct was to those questions of a social psychological nature. More specifically, the construct was used to predict an individual's decision-making strategy in social influence experiments. Linton's (1955) pioneering work in the area of conformity and field-dependence pointed out that a subject's responses on measures of field-dependence/independence were highly related to a confederate's influence in making judgements of movement in an autokinetic situation. Other researchers extended Linton's original work and although results are not unequivocal, the general conclusions seem to indicate that field-dependents are more susceptible to being influenced by a number of conditions. These conditions include pressure from a peer group to conform to the group's decision, suggestions from instructional sets about the presence of a certain phenomenon, and exposure to an authoritative statement prior to adopting or endorsing a particular view (Linton & Graham, 1959; Mausner & Graham, 1970; McCarrey, Dayhaw, & Chagnon, 1971).

Linton and Graham (1959) employed two measures of field-dependence/independence in predicting susceptibility to

social influence in an autokinetic movement experiment. Subjects were paired with experimental confederates whose estimates of light movement were preprogrammed by the experimenter. Linton and Graham (1959) reported a significant positive relationship between susceptibility to social influence (as measured by the judgement shifts of subjects in the direction of experimental confederates) and field-dependence. Similarly, Rosner (1957) found that field-dependence as measured by the Embedded Figures Test was related to conforming to judgements made by the experimental confederate. Using a modified Asch-type group pressure situation to identify high and low yielders, his results indicated that yielding to group pressure is associated with field-dependence.

Witkin et al. (1962) reported a study by Mednick and Schaffer in which subjects in a modified autokinetic situation were told that light would move so as to write messages. Field-dependents reported significantly more words than field-independent subjects. Segal and Barr (1969) compared the perception of light movement under different instructional sets. Subjects were first exposed to stimulus conditions and then told that they were in fact perceiving an illusion. In a second phase of the study a modified illusion was shown but subjects were instructed that the movement was real. Field-dependent subjects more readily believed this suggestion.

Murphy (1966) studied the effects of strong, moderate, and weak suggestions on a group of field-dependent and independent subjects prior to entering a two-hour sensory deprivation experiment. Results indicated that both field-dependents and field-independents were affected by the suggestion that they would experience schizophrenic-like hallucinations (a strong suggestion) and unaffected by a weak instruction (no suggestion). However, field-dependents were significantly affected by the moderate suggestion which was phrased in more neutral and ambiguous terms whereas field-independents were not.

The pattern reported in this study seems to cast some light on other instructional set experiments that produced dissimilar or equivocal results. It would seem that when instructional sets are either both strong and believable or both relatively weak and implausible differences between the two groups are rare. This might explain the lack of correlation between performance on perceptual tests of field-dependence/independence and susceptibility to suggestive instructional sets that are relatively weak (Brothers & Gaines, 1973; Cancro & Voth, 1969; Marino, Fitzgibbon, & Mirabile, 1970). For example, Brothers and Gaines (1973) instructed their subjects that the autokinetic effect was a subjective phenomenon and that they might or might not see the light move. This, in effect, made for

a relatively weak suggestion.

Linton's (1955) original study also examined the relationship between field-dependence/independence and the opinion change induced by authoritative statements. Both Linton (1955) and Graham (1959) reported that field-dependents changed their opinions on a number of social issues in the direction of a persuasive written message after being exposed to it. In later studies, however, the influence of authoritative positions on changes in opinion was not as clear-cut.

Doktor and Hamilton (1973) found that field-dependent students in a business administration program were more likely than their field-independent colleagues to accept the conclusions of a consultant's report. Likewise, McCarrey, Dayhaw, and Chagnon (1971) found that the field-dependence measured by the Rod-and-Frame Test was related to shifts in attitude following exposure to opinion sources. But, a number of other experiments failed to replicate these findings (Glass, Lavin, Henchy, Gordon, Mayhew, & Donahoe, 1969; Kumpf & Gotz-Marchand, 1973; Laird & Berglas, 1975).

A number of related experiments that examined the relationship between field-dependence and conformity to group pressures also found mixed results. Solar, Davenport, and Bruehl

(1975) paired field-dependent and independent subjects and asked them to co-operate in making judgements during the administration of the Rod-and-Frame Test. Results show that in every subject pair, estimates of verticality were closer to the field-independent's estimate. This suggests that field-dependents are more susceptible to the opinions of others. This would be consistent with Rosner's (1957) results using Asch-like experimental procedures.

The effect of experimentally induced conflict on field-dependence/independence was examined by Oltman, Goodenough, Witkin, Freedman, and Friedman (1975). In their study, three groups were formed by matching subjects according to field-dependence/independence or by mismatching them (i.e., field-dependents with independents). Pairs were instructed to reach a decision on a set of choice-dilemma situations. The field independent pairs were the least likely to reach a choice consensus whereas the field-dependent pair quickly arrived at a choice compromise. In the mismatched groups consensus was most often reached by a shift in the direction of the field-independent's choice. However, not all conformity experiments offered such clear-cut results (Busch & De Ridder, 1973; Berry & Annis, 1974; Dawson, Young, & Choi, 1974).

The Effects of Ambiguity on Cognitive Style

The greater tendency of field-dependents to be unaffected by the behavior of others is consistent with differentiation theory, that is, the theory that field-independents tend to rely more on themselves and are thus quite autonomous of external referents. This dynamic seems accentuated in situations where instructions or expectations are not clear-cut as, for example, under conditions of ambiguity (Witkin & Goodenough, 1977). This conclusion is based on a number of studies (both published and unpublished) of interpersonal situations in which the information provided by other people was considered to be the significant variable. Thus, Culver et al., (1964) conducted an experiment in sensory deprivation whereby one group of subjects was given specific instructions about what to expect during the deprivation. To a second group instructions were ambiguous and little feedback was provided by the experimenter during the study. Field-dependents were more stressed under the ambiguous condition as demonstrated by the differences in heart rates between field-dependent and field-independent subjects. The fact that field-dependents did not react with increased heart rates during specific instructions is suggestive of less discomfort in structured situations.

Two studies used a modified version of the Gottschalk and Gleser (1969) monologue procedure to assess differences between

field-dependents and independents. The monologue is an open-ended, ambiguous situation during which time subjects are required to talk uninterruptedly and without feedback for 5 minutes about an aspect of their lives. Freedman et al. (1972) observed the gesture behaviors of 24 subjects. Twelve field-dependent and 12 field-independent females were interviewed briefly about their current lives. This was followed by participation in the Gottschalk and Gleser free-association monologue. Their results indicated that field-dependent subjects demonstrated significantly more body movement not related to speaking, hand-stroking, touching of the clothes, etc., during the interactive exchange with the interviewer. The results suggested that field-dependents had greater difficulty with the lack of feedback and structure inherent in the monologue. Steingart et al. (1975) compared the verbal styles of field-dependents and independents in situations of structured interview and of open-ended monologue. Their results indicated that field-dependents talked less during the 5-minute monologue condition and that their sentence structures were grammatically different in the two situations. Field-independents talked more than dependents during the monologue and demonstrated less change in their speech patterns in the two conditions. Their speech patterns were consistent in that they continued to talk in monologue with sentence patterns similar to their dialogue with the interviewer.

Consistent with the findings that field-dependents are more likely to use other people as sources of information to reduce uncertainty, a number of studies focused on an individual's attention to different social information. In particular, a number of studies have examined gaze behaviors during interpersonal interaction. Since the face is a major source of information about the thoughts of the other person, it often becomes the target of a person's information-seeking behavior especially for the more field-dependent individual.

Ruble and Nakamura (1972) conducted three studies with children in which they examined the effects of experimenter-supplied cues for performance of two different tasks. They chose field-dependence/independence and sex as their independent variables. Results indicated no sex differences in performance on a number of puzzle and selection tasks. However, significant differences occurred for field-dependence/independence. Field-dependents were observed to glance more frequently at the experimenter who was performing the same task while field-independents did not use this strategy to complete tasks. One of the tasks required that subjects attend to the facial cues of the experimenter to detect those cues necessary for making correct responses. Field-dependents performed better than the independents on this task.

Konstadt and Forman (1965) compared the performance of field-dependent and field-independent fourth graders on a letter cancellation task. The tasks were administered in counterbalanced order to one-half of the sample by an approving and supportive examiner and by a critical and disapproving one to the other half. The results indicated that while there were no differences in performance between dependents and independents under the two conditions, a significant interaction effect occurred between the classification variable and examiner "style". Field-dependents performed more poorly under "disapproval" conditions even though disapproval lowered the performance scores of all subjects. Also, the researchers noted that field-dependents gazed at the examiner more frequently than field-independents during the disapproval condition. These results are consistent with the findings that field-dependents show greater sensitivity to the human environment. They are better at recalling faces than field-independents and attend more to verbal information that is of a social and interpersonal nature. This is explained in terms of their greater attention to social stimuli and is independent of other possible explanations such as recall abilities, visual learning skills, attentional skills, etc. (Messick & Damarin, 1964).

A number of studies in the area of counselling and psychotherapy have also presented some interesting findings. These studies demonstrated that field-dependents, whether selected with the Group Embedded Figures Test or with a Rod-and-Frame apparatus, showed greater reliance on the interviewer in deciding how to interact in a dyad. For example, Witkin et al. (1962) reported the comments of ten-year-old boys during the administration of TAT cards. They found a significant difference between field-dependents and field-independents in the amount of questions asked of the tester. These questions were related to their performance on the task. Similarly, Gates (cited by Russakoff et al., 1976) reported that field-dependents requested more guidance and structure from the interviewer, that is, they asked the interviewer what to talk about and asked for reassurance that what they were discussing was appropriate.

In actual counselling situations, people less autonomous in interpersonal situations (e.g., field-dependents) show greater recourse to the counsellor's instructions and to messages that provide structure for the interview. Russakoff et al. (1976) found field-dependence/independence to be significantly related to each client's differing need for structure. A positive correlation was found between the client's level of cognitive style and their level of satisfaction with the amount of structure offered by different types of interviewers.

These results parallel those of an unpublished study conducted by Koff of clients' expectations prior to counselling (cited by Karp, 1977). Field-dependent clients demonstrated greater expectations to receive advice and guidance.

Dowds et al. (1977) examined the impact of field-dependence/independence on the therapist's perception of clients' needs for structure. Males referred to the out-patient clinic of a VA hospital were interviewed by one of six therapist trainees. Following their initial interview, trainees were asked to recommend the therapeutic approach suitable to each patient. The results indicated that interviewers attributed need for structure and guidance to the more field-dependent patients. This observation is consistent with those therapy analogue studies using both a structured interview situation and the open-ended Gottschalk and Gleser monologue procedure (Steingart et al., 1975; Freedman et al., 1972).

The differential structure needs of field-dependents and independents is noticeable to sensitive and skilled therapists. Witkin, Lewis, and Weil (1968) found that therapists delayed longer before responding to a field-independent client. This tendency was in response to the greater tolerance for silence of field-independents. Also, therapists were more active and directive with field-dependents. They concluded that therapists

must meet different demands in facilitating the communication of field-dependent and field-independent clients. In a reanalysis of the transcripts of the above study, Witkin, Moore, Goodenough, and Cox (1977) commented that the therapists intervened less frequently with field-independent clients. Also, more specific and close-ended questions were asked of field-dependents and more ambiguous and open-ended questions of the field-independents. Witkin et al. (1977) stated that the therapists in their study were able to identify the structure needs of their clients within the first session and adapted their styles accordingly.

The recognition that field-dependent and independent clients are better served by differential treatments comes from those studies already cited as well as from a study by Karp, Kissin, and Hustmeyer (1970). Their research examined the selection of alcoholic patients for either a highly structured (drug therapy) or a highly unstructured (insight therapy) treatment. Selection of patients was conducted by a social worker and a psychiatrist who were unaware that a research project was being conducted. Results indicated that the most field-independent subjects were assigned to insight-oriented psychotherapy and the rest to drug therapy. Interestingly enough, those field-dependent clients selected for insight therapy dropped out of treatment - an indication of their difficulty in

dealing with the open-ended, unstructured characteristics of the therapeutic approach.

Summary of the Literature on Field-Dependents/Independents

Taken together the varieties of evidence indicate that field-dependence/independence is a salient and useful individual-differences variable and as such is therefore pertinent to a number of behavioral phenomena. Individuals who tend to manifest a field-dependent orientation have been shown to rely to a greater extent on external referents and as such they may be more susceptible to those influences and cues that are outside of themselves. As a result, they are more attuned to the information provided by those with whom they interact. Consistent with these tendencies is the evidence from counselling and psychotherapy studies which indicates that field-dependent clients have a greater preference and need for direct structure, for guidance, and for concreteness from the counsellor. In contrast, field-independents are more self-reliant, less influenced by external social referents, and therefore more autonomous in their interpersonal relations. This dynamic operates in counselling situations where it was observed that field-independents are quite successful in dealing with counsellors who use ambiguous, open-ended questions and responses in conducting their interviews.

Internal-External Locus of Control

Internal-external locus of control emerged from Rotter's (1954) social learning theory. Social learning theory combined aspects of the expectation and reinforcement quality of a situation in understanding the dynamics of behavior. The inclusion of the expectancy variable, which consisted of the anticipation or belief that a reinforcement would occur, led to some interesting experimentation and to the eventual development of a generalized expectancy for internal or external locus of control (Rotter, 1966).

Early studies examined the behavior of subjects in experimental conditions which had been described by the experimenter either as a chance or luck situation or as one involving skill on the part of the individual. Results indicated that the behavior of subjects differed under the two conditions, that is, the expectation that performance was under personal control (e.g., skill) or that it was a random, uncontrolled event (e.g., luck) dramatically affected their behavior (James & Rotter, 1958; Rotter, Chance, & Phares, 1972). This observation led to an examination of the extent to which individuals differ in their belief in their own internal or external locus of control. This concept was defined thus:

When reinforcement is perceived by the

> subject as following some action of his own but not entirely contingent upon his action, then in our culture, it is typically perceived as a result of luck, chance, fate or under the control of powerful others... When the event is interpreted in this way by the individual we have labelled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent on his own behavior or is a relatively permanent characteristic we have termed this belief as internal control. (Rotter,1966, p. 1)

Since the introduction of the more convenient paper and pencil scales designed to tap an individual's control dimension, an enormous amount of research has been published (Joe, 1971; Lefcourt, 1982; MacDonald, 1973; Throop & MacDonald; 1971). This interest continues and the control concept is being expanded and applied to many areas (Berzins & Ross, 1973; Crandall & Lacey, 1972; Coan, 1973; Graybill & Sergeant, 1983; Hiroto, 1974; Kirscht, 1974). It had been identified in 1976 as "the single most popular topic in current personality research" (Carlson, 1976, p. 396) and several extensive reviews attest to this fact (Joe, 1971; Lefcourt, 1982; Phares, 1976).

Empirical evidence indicates that individuals may manifest quite divergent expressions of their expectations for either internal or external control, and the research literature often differentiates between these two groups (i.e., as being internal or external). The differences between the two groups have been demonstrated in both correlational and experimental studies. A more comprehensive picture may be drawn by referring to the previously cited literature reviews. More pertinent to the present study is the extent to which locus of control is predictive of behavior in interpersonal situations similar to those already discussed in the section under the field-dependent and independent cognitive styles.

Conformity and Social Influence

Like field-dependence/independence, locus of control has been related to a number of examples of social influence and conformity to pressure. The earliest data of the relationship between external locus of control and social influence came from a study by Gore (reported by Rotter, 1966). She administered TAT cards under different sets of experimental conditions. Her results indicated that when the experimenter tried to influence subjects to produce longer stories through non-verbal cues, internals shortened their stories while externals did not. This

pattern was interpreted as an indication that externals are more easily manipulated or controlled. In another study, Crowne and Liverant (1963) found no differences between internals and externals in the amount of incorrect yielding to stooges in an Asch-type experiment. However, when subjects were given money and asked to bet on their judgements, yielding by internals was significantly lower than externals. Also, during periods of independent betting (i.e., without knowledge of the decision of the majority) externals were less confident of their decisions and bet less money than during group betting. Similarly, Jones and Schrauger (1968) found that externals reciprocated more than internals. They tended to agree with those who agreed with them and tended to disagree with those who disagreed.

A number of studies have used verbal conditioning paradigms as an example of social compliance to demonstrate differences between internals and externals. Alegre and Murray (1974) trichotomized a sample of college students into internals, externals, and a middle-range group. Their results showed that conditioning was easiest for externals and most difficult for internals. The middle group fell mid-way in their susceptibility to being conditioned. Also, Doctor (1971) found significant differences between internals and externals on their performance in a verbal conditioning situation. But Strickland (1970) found no difference between the two groups during the acquisition phase

of the conditioning procedure. However, it was noted that when internals were aware of the manipulation, they showed greater resistance to conditioning than both externals and unaware internals. Getter (1966) described internals as "latent conditioners" a phenomenon referring to the emission of correct responses during the extinction phase of the experiment. Getter and others (e.g., Strickland, 1977) interpret this as a reaction against subtle manipulation, that is, that internals were willing to give correct responses (as per the demands of the situations) but only when not cued to do so.

Other types of social influence paradigms have been able to replicate the findings using verbal conditioning methods. For example, in a study of communicator status and attitude change Ritchie and Phares (1969) found that both groups of internals and externals were likely to shift opinion in the direction of a persuasive message. However, externals shifted as a result of the source of the message (e.g., a high status individual) whereas internals were influenced by the content of that message. These results are consistent with a number of similar experiments and the general conclusion seems to indicate that externals are more compliant and susceptible to social influence (Biondo & MacDonald, 1971; Ryckman, Rodda, & Sherman, 1972; Sherman, 1973).

Locus of Control and Ambiguity

Consistent with the theoretical underpinnings of the locus of control variable is the prediction that under ambiguous conditions internals seem to display more effective coping skills. Thus, in situations of low structure, internals have been known to impose their own structure through self-reliance, information-seeking, and attention to useful interpersonal cues (Phares, 1976). Davis and Phares (1967) tested the assumption that an ambiguous experimental situation would motivate internals to seek information. Subjects were asked to influence another person's attitude but instructions about their likelihood of success were stated either ambiguously or specifically. No differences occurred between internals and externals with clear-cut expectations but under ambiguous conditions, internals demonstrated greater information-seeking behavior relative to their assigned task. Similarly, Wolk and Ducette (1974) found that internals performed better than externals in perceptual identification tasks and recall of incidental material when given instructions that were either vague or specific. However, in a second study these authors found that a significant improvement in recall and recognition occurred for external subjects following specific instructions. These authors concluded that

externals failed to use their perceptual-attentive system as efficiently as internals under conditions of ambiguity. Related to this, Lefcourt and Wine (1969) found that when placed in experiments with confederates behaving in a novel and uncertain manner, internals displayed greater frequency of visual mobility and eye contact, a strategy useful in gathering information relative to that situation. Lefcourt (1967) found that as the concreteness and specificity of an experimental task increased the performance levels of externals improved. However, internals showed no variation as a function of specificity. It appears that internals need less task explication to perform adequately (James & Rotter, 1958; Lefcourt, Lewis, & Silverman, 1968) and are quicker to adapt to a series of unpredictable and ambiguous situations (Lefcourt, Sordoni, & Sordoni, 1974; Lefcourt, Antrobus, & Hogg, 1974). These findings have been explained in terms of the greater alertness of internals who are "more ready to grasp for information that can contribute to the interpretation of and coping with various tasks and situations" (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 146).

Two studies by Phares and his colleagues examined the impact of a person's control orientation on the attribution of responsibility to situations described either ambiguously or in more specific detail (Phares & Wilson, 1972; Phares & Lamiell, 1975). These studies were guided by the assumption that when

data are ambiguous and unclear, the locus of control dimension should be a powerful intervening variable in the attribution process. In one study, (Phares & Wilson, 1972) subjects were asked to make quasi-legal judgements about a driver's culpability after reading clear descriptions of automobile accidents. Internals attributed more responsibility to the driver and were more severe in ascribing punishment. However, the expectation that internals would respond similarly to ambiguous descriptions was not reported. Likewise, Phares and Lamiell (1975) found that internals were less understanding and less willing to accord financial assistance to individuals after reading details of their case histories. The individual in each history was described as either a victim of circumstance or as responsible for his own plight. The expectation that internals would respond in this manner to an ambiguous case history where details concerning responsibility were unclear was not obtained. It would seem that while locus of control operates more consistently with theoretical expectations in ambiguous situations involving task performance, it does not seem to do so in judgements about situations that are described ambiguously.

Locus of Control and Counselling Studies

Additional evidence of behavioral style differences between internals and externals is available from studies in the

area of counselling and psychotherapy. Counsellors and therapists from diverse backgrounds have long recognized that the adoption and maintenance of internal expectancies were concomitants of competent and effective behavior (Lefcourt, 1966). Thus, a number of studies has been conducted to examine the effects of different forms of psychological interventions on a person's control orientation. For example, Smith (1970) found that the resolution of an acute life crisis through psychotherapy was marked by a significant drop in the external control of clients. Similarly, Gillis and Jessor (1970) reported that the completion of successful therapy was associated with increases in the client's internal control orientation, and Dua (1970) found that a behavioral program of cognitive rehearsals and the examination of concrete actions was more effective in increasing levels of internality than a re-educative program involving the discussion of affect and attitudes about interpersonal problems. Results such as these have been replicated in a number of studies using different therapeutic approaches and client samples (Diamond & Shapiro, 1973; Foulds, 1973; Majumber, Greever, Hold, & Friedland, 1973; Masters, 1970; Nowicki & Barnes, 1973; O'Leary, Donovan, Hague, & Shea, 1975; O'Leary, Donavan, & O'Leary, 1976; Pierce, Schauble, & Farkas, 1970).

The major trend among the above studies is in the use of

interventions derived from learning principles. The reason for this is unclear. Perhaps the more concrete and specific approaches of behaviorally oriented counsellors are better suited to clients who feel that the external world is a more potent source of reward and who therefore see reinforcement for personal actions as being outside their own control. Thus, in spite of Phares' (1976) statements that either Rogerian acceptance or the highly specific prescriptions of behavior modification might be effective in changing a client's perception about his control orientation, the more externally oriented client might derive greater benefits from counsellors who are concrete, specific, and highly structured and who link behavioral responses to particular reinforcement contingencies. On the other hand, since the evidence indicates that internals are more self-reliant and less susceptible to external pressure, they would be more reactive to counselling approaches that tend to limit their control or freedom.

That people might be better suited to the differential approaches of counsellors and therapists as a function of the "control" variable has been examined in a number of studies. Nowicki, Bonner, and Feather (1972) assigned subjects to one of two treatments: an interview condition or systematic desensitization. In the former, subjects interacted with an open-ended and relatively ambiguous interviewer and were free to

pursue areas of personal concern. Subjects assigned to desensitization followed a strict and specific procedure established by the same interviewer. An assessment of clients' perceptions of the therapist indicated that internals attributed more dominance to the therapist conducting relaxation techniques whereas externals perceived the therapist as more loving. The authors suggested that these differences are of a cognitive-perceptual nature and may relate to how co-operative a client may be in a particular therapeutic situation. Similarly, Freedman and Dies (1974) assigned internals and externals randomly to one of three conditions: counselling, in vivo systematic desensitization, or video-taped systematic desensitization. The three conditions varied in their specificity in that counselling was the most ambiguous and open to the client's input whereas the video-taped condition was the least ambiguous. Results indicated that internals showed greater preferences for the counselling condition where client control and direction was maximized. Internals appeared to resist the direction and specificity provided by desensitization procedures.

Two unpublished studies reported by Phares (1976) cast some additional light on how internals and externals view the counselling process. Helweg (reported by Phares, 1976) showed films of Rogers and Ellis conducting initial interviews with the same client to samples of college students and psychiatric

in-patients. Among this sample, the external subjects preferred the more specific and directive interview style of Albert Ellis. Similarly, Jacobson (reported by Phares, 1976) asked subjects to imagine having psychological problems and to state a preference for a therapist based on descriptions of their therapeutic approach. The results indicated that internals showed a preference for the ambiguous and open-ended style of a psychoanalyst whereas the externals preferred the more concrete and specific characteristics of behavioral therapists.

Abramowitz et al. (1974) examined the influence of control differences on the effectiveness of group counselling. Mildly distressed college students were assigned to either of two conditions. One group leader used specific and directive techniques in that he was highly structured and steered discussions into particular areas. In contrast, the other group was less directive and involved a leader who was open-ended and provisional. An analysis of a number of outcome measures indicated that internals derived greater benefit in the open-ended, non-directive group whereas externals made greater gains in the directive group. Similarly, Kilmann, Albert, and Sotile (1975) found that internals reported greater personal gains when exposed to unstructured, open-ended leader roles. Externals demonstrated the same trend with the more structured group leader. Consistent with these findings is a study by

Kilmann and Sotile (1971). Participants in structured and unstructured group counselling were rated in terms of their control dimension and were then asked to rate the group leader. The results indicated that internals rated the unstructured style more positively but externals perceived a structured style as more desirable.

Summary of the Literature on Internal-External Locus of Control

A survey of the locus of control literature pertinent to the present study indicates some marked behavioral differences of individuals with internal or external control orientations. The research seems to support the notion that externals are more compliant to social and interpersonal pressures. On the other hand, internals are more self-reliant and have been known to resist interpersonal influence especially if it is subtle or covert. Related to this dynamic is the fact that internals appear to rely on themselves and their own abilities in dealing with situations that are ambiguous and open-ended. This may be the result of attentional-perceptual capabilities which make internals more effective at recognizing information that may be useful in a social situation.

The field of counselling and psychotherapy also offers some interesting differences of the behavioral styles and

preferences of internals and externals. Taken together, externals seem better served by behaviorally oriented programs that are specific, concrete, and structured. Internals seem to function best in climates where the counsellor interviews the client in an open-ended and unstructured manner and thus leaves the content and direction of the interview in the hands of the client. This pattern is also apparent in clients' ratings of, and preferences for, structured and unstructured counsellors.

Criterion Variables

As noted earlier, the first task of the counsellor is to facilitate the expression of personally relevant information in the dyadic encounter. The exchange between counsellor and client establishes the basis for a number of factors critical to the working relationship. Hence the selection of criterion variables is made on the basis that these are appropriate and suitable measures of the ongoing interaction. Thus, the criterion measures chosen for this study were: (1) the non-content speech behaviors of the interviewee to wit, (a) talk-time, (b) reaction time latencies, (c) number of words spoken, (d) average pause time (e) mean words per response, and (f) rate of speech; (2) positive and negative self-referencing statements; and (3) the post-interview reports of state anxiety and counsellor attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness.

Non-Content Speech Behaviors

Non-content speech behaviors have been used extensively in the study of counsellor-client interactions. Most notably, Matarazzo and his colleagues have thoroughly investigated various aspects of the structural (i.e., non-content) properties of the interview (Matarazzo, Wiens, Matarazzo, & Saslow, 1968; Matarazzo & Wiens, 1972). They established early on in their research studies that non-content measures were highly reliable for each individual in spite of large differences from one interviewer to another. Further, they discovered that (a) "without any interpolated activity by a therapist or other interviewer, the speech behavior of any individual patient would be similar from test to retest and (b) with some interpolated activity (e.g. head nodding ...) we had a reasonably good chance of producing change in the variables we had chosen and also measuring such changes" (Matarazzo et al. 1968, p. 347). Thus, they established non-content measures as potentially useful indicators of the impact of the interviewer's behavior on the interviewee.

Non-content measures have also been widely used in studies of counsellor-offered structure. Siegman and Pope (1965) reported longer client responses (i.e., talk time) following the unstructured responses of counsellors. These results were substantiated in other studies (Siegman & Pope, 1972). In

general, it appears that ambiguous counsellor remarks evoked more verbal productivity and less fluent and more hesitant interviewee responses.

The usefulness of non-content speech measures, other than their capacity to differentiate interviewer behaviors, is their ability to predict successful outcome in psychotherapy. Sloane et al. (1975) used non-content speech measures among their multiple measures of therapist-patient interaction. They discovered that:

> Patients who spoke more in therapy, that is, those who showed greater total speech time, did better in psychotherapy than those who spoke less. Such patients did not speak more often but rather spoke in longer blocks when they did speak. There was also a tendency for successful patients to react more quickly to the therapist's comments, as the difference between high and low reaction time approached statistical significance. (p. 193)

These results are obviously consistent with the stereotype of the "good" therapy candidate as one who is verbal,

speaks in full thought units, reacts quickly to the interviewer, and thus makes profitable use of the interview time by allowing little time to be wasted in the therapy hour.

Self-Disclosure

The theoretical and empirical literature on self-disclosure is indeed voluminous and even a synoptic review of this topic is far beyond the scope of this paper. Excellent reviews are presented by Cozby (1973), Goodstein and Reinecker (1974), and Chelune (1975, 1979). A brief overview is presented in order to establish the self-disclosure factor as a useful variable of the dyadic interaction.

Within the therapeutic arena, the importance of self-disclosure seems well established. As Truax and Carkhuff (1965) have stated: "Most descriptions of the psychotherapeutic process have focused upon ... self-disclosure ... as one of the central happenings" (p. 3). Others have commented on the psychological value of self-disclosure especially because of its relationship to the client's ability to engage in meaningful therapeutic work (Truax, 1961; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Rogers, 1961; Yalom, 1980). For example, Chelune (1979) has stated: "The ability to disclose is an important indicator of a client's 'therapy readiness' and is related to the realism and accuracy with which he or she

perceives the client role and responsibilities in therapy" (p. 257).

The foregoing implies that self-disclosure is central to the dyadic interaction that takes place in the interview process. The counsellor's progressive attempts at encouraging the client's self-disclosure and self-exploration are often seen as synonymous with the counselling process. It is perhaps for this reason that self-disclosure measures have been included in studies of counsellor-offered structure.

Siegman and Pope (1972) found no disclosure differences between low-structure and high structure interview styles. An earlier study by Pope et al. (1971) found that low-structure (i.e., ambiguous) counsellor responses to be associated with more self-disclosure. Heller (1972) reports several studies of interview structure and self-disclosure where results were equivocal. Hence, a clear relationship between interview-offered structure and self-disclosure remains to be established.

Client Perception of the Counsellor

The client's perception of various aspects of the counselling process continues to be regarded as an important variable (Goldstein et al., 1966; Gurman, 1977; LaCrosse, 1977). Rogers (1957), for example, maintained that unless the client

perceives that the therapist possesses and communicates certain core conditions, then these conditions do not exist. Empirical tests of this assumption focused on perceptions of the "therapeutic relationship" as the embodiment of the counsellor's attributes of warmth, genuineness, and empathy (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Truax & Mitchell, 1971). Outside the client-centered arena, the value of the client's perceptions of the therapist's attributes, relationship, or therapeutic skill continues as a major source of interest (Bent, Putnam, & Kiesler, 1976; Lorr, 1965; Saltzman, Luetgert, Roth, Creaser, & Howard, 1976; Sloane et al., 1975; Truax & Mitchell, 1971).

Strong's formulation of counselling as an interpersonal influence process (Strong, 1968; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Matross, 1973) led to numerous investigations of client perceptions of counsellor attributes (Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Gelso & Karl, 1974; Strong, Hendel, & Bratton, 1971; Tinsley & Harris, 1976). What has emerged is the notion that the counsellor's ability to influence the client resides in the client's perceptions of the counsellor as possessing resources that are useful to the client. This has led to further refinements and the general consensus seems to be that counsellors can maximize their influence potential when they are perceived as embodying the attributes of attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness (Barak & La Crosse, 1975; Dell, 1973; Dell & Schmidt, 1976;

Strong, 1978). Thus, there is evidence to indicate that the attributes of the counsellor are important aspects of the dyadic encounter.

Client's Reported Anxiety

Social situations, especially those that are unfamiliar to the individual, are frequently perceived as threatening, and induce negative emotional sequelae. It is not unusual therefore that dyadic interactions like counselling and psychotherapy have as a behavioral consequence some expression of emotional arousal. The level of anxiety (usually the client's but not infrequently also the counsellor's) has a prepotent influence on the psychological climate of the interview. It is for this reason that the anxiety inherent in the therapeutic interview has been the topic of numerous investigations (Boomer, 1963; Boomer & Goodrich, 1961; Russel & Snyder, 1963; Siegman, 1978).

Among the more interesting findings is the fact that verbal behavior is partially a function of emotional arousal (Boomer & Dittman,1964; Kanfer, 1958a; Manaugh, Wiens, & Mattarazzo, 1970; Siegman & Pope, 1965). More specifically, verbal fluency and velocity are heightened, within certain limits, as a function of increasing anxiety. Related to this, is the strong suggestion from a number of investigations that the

level of anxiety manifested by a client can be influenced by the degree of ambiguity or structure that is present in the interview (Dibner, 1958; Siegman & Pope, 1972). This relationship has already been discussed in a previous section and is only here mentioned because anxiety, verbal fluency, and velocity (i.e., rate of speech) have been selected as dependent variables for this study.

An additional note on anxiety may be useful. The current view of anxiety is that it is not a unitary phenomenon and may be expressed as a sensori-motor, physiological, or experiential dimension (Lang, 1971). Spielberger (1972) noted an important distinction by describing anxiety as either of state or trait type. This author refers to trait anxiety as a relatively stable personality characteristic that is manifested in the tendency to interpret a wide range of situations as threatening or dangerous. State anxiety, on the other hand, refers to the reactions evoked in individuals who interpret specific situations as threatening or dangerous (Spielberger, 1983). It is this second type of anxiety that is of interest to this study.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This section deals with the experimental facets of the study. It outlines the design of the study, the description of the independent and criterion variables, and the procedural aspects necessary for its implementation. Also, it lists the statistical hypotheses that were investigated.

Design and Factors

This study was undertaken to determine the effects of counsellor-offered level of structure and selected personality variables on certain interview behaviors of female college students. The personality constructs of field-dependent and field-independent cognitive styles and locus of control were examined to determine their interaction effects with the experimental factor. Consequently, the questions of interest to the study bear on: (1) the effects of counsellor-offered structure on the interviewee behaviors, (2) the effects of the personality variables and, (3) the interaction of counsellor - offered structure and the selected personality variables of the interviewee.

The general linear model was used to set up the appropriate analyses. Field-dependence/independence and locus of control were used as continuous variables; counsellor-offered structure was a categorical variable (coded 1,2); and the interaction of counsellor offered-structure and the personality variables was derived from the product of the two.

The factor under study was counsellor-offered structure. The covariates consisted of the personality variables, that is, the cognitive style dimension of field-dependence/independence and the expectancy for internal or external locus of control. The interaction of these two dimensions was also studied.

Criterion Variables

Three classes of criterion variables were used to assess the effects of the independent variables on the interviewee's behavior. These were classified as content, non-content, and self-report categories.

Content categories

The content of the interviewee's verbal responses was examined by using the self-reference as a unit of self-

disclosure. Self-disclosure is here defined as those verbal responses made by the interviewee that "describe(s) something about him, tell(s) something about him, or refer(s) to some affect he experiences" (Rogers 1960, p. 248). Self-references were categorized as positive, negative, or neutral depending on whether they refer to favorable, unfavorable, or ambiguous aspects of the person. For this study only positive and negative statements were recorded.

In order to measure the interviewee's self-references, a sample of the interview content was assessed on the basis of descriptions of aspects or qualities of the interviewee. Two raters listened to and coded the self-referencing statements for each subject. Both were instructed on the nature of the task and on the procedure for rating first-person pronoun statements. In brief, any direct self-reference (whether it was affective, cognitive, or behavioral) was recorded, and a final rating for both the positive references and negative references was made as the sum of these ratings. Interrater reliabilities calculated as correlation statistics for 12 randomly selected samples were .96 for positive self-references and .97 for negative self-statements.

Non-content categories

A second set of criterion variables consisted of the interviewee speech behaviors collected during the interview. These are non-content categories and were used to assess the speaking patterns of each interviewee. The following five variables are included: (a) talk-time , that is, the amount of time in seconds spoken by the interviewee during the interview segment, (b) the mean number of words per response, that is, the total words spoken divided by the number of responses, (c) the average rate of speech measured as the number of words divided by talk-time, (d) reaction time latency which is the length of silence (in seconds) separating the end of the interviewer's message and the interviewee's response to it and, (e) the mean pause time which consisted of the sum of all silences of more than a two-second duration divided by the number of pauses and exclusive of reaction time, that is, variable (d).

In order to partial out the effects of the interviewer's talk-time, a regression analysis was performed in order to obtain the residuals for the talk-time of both interviewer and interviewee. It was these residuals that were used in the multivariate analysis.

Self-report categories

Two self-report measures following the interview provided indices of the interviewee's anxiety and the perception of the interviewer's attributes. These measures were the (a) A-State Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, 1983) and the Counselor Rating Form - Short Version (CRF-S; Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983). These scales are discussed below under "Instrumentation."

Sample

The sample for the study was composed of 60 junior college students from one of the public CEGEPS in Montreal. Of this number, 12 were males and were eliminated from the data analysis. All subjects were enrolled in a course entitled "Interactions in the Professional World". This group was chosen because of its relatively high percentage of females and because all of these were in their final semester of course work. The final sample used for the data analysis consisted of 48 females. Ages ranged from 18 to 22.

Instrumentation

Field-dependence/Independence

Field-dependence/independence was assessed with the Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT; Witkin, Oltman, Raskin, & Karp, 1971). This is a group form of the Embedded Figures Test (EFT) which was constructed earlier by the authors of the GEFT. The test consists of pairs of figures - one simple, the other complex. Individuals are shown a simple figure and are required to locate and trace it within the complex design. The complex design is arranged so that the simple figure is part of the pattern yet effectively concealed by it.

The test consists of three parts and there are seven, nine, and nine items in each part respectively. The 7-item subpart is not scored but serves as a simple check for instructional comprehension. Thus, the number of correctly traced figures of the remaining 18 items constitutes the score. The range is therefore from zero to 18.

Locus of control

Locus of control was assessed by means of the Internal (I), Powerful Others (P), and Chance (C) Locus of Control Scale

(Levenson, 1973,1975). The I, P, and C Scales consist of three 8-statement subscales in Likert format. The scale is presented as a unified instrument of 24 items (see Appendix B).

This scale is an extension of Rotter's (1966) I-E scale and consists of items from that original scale as well as new items specific to this instrument. Three dimensions of control are tapped - belief in personal control (I Scale), awareness of powerful others (P Scale), and the belief in chance or fate (C Scale). The scales do not dichotomize individuals as internals or externals but measure the degree to which a person believes in a particular aspect of personal control. Thus, scores on each subscale tap the extent to which (a) an individual expects to have control over his life, (b) the extent to which an individual expects powerful others to have control over his life and, (c) the extent to which an individual expects luck and chance to have an influence over his life.

Scoring is conducted by summing response values and then adding a constant of 24 to this total to eliminate negative numbers. The range of possible scores is zero to 48. Based on Kuder-Richardson coefficients, Levenson (1974) reported reliabilities of .64 for the I Scale, .77 for the P Scale, and .78 for the C Scale. Other researchers found similar estimates (Wallston, Wallston, & De Vellis, 1978; Levenson, 1973).

State anxiety

The interviewee's experienced anxiety during the interview was determined by the Spielberger (1983) A-State Anxiety Inventory. This self-report instrument is a 20-item Likert-type scale which measures an individual's feelings of experienced tension, apprehension, or arousal. Assessments of state anxiety were conducted immediately following the interview session. Subjects were asked to rate the extent to which each statement of the scale describes them "right now, at this moment." Appendix C contains a sample of the scale used for this study.

Spielberger (1983) reports test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from .16 to .62 for several samples of college students. This range appears expected in light of the fact that the transitory nature of anxiety reflects the influence of various situational factors at the time of assessment.

Client perception of the interviewer

Another aspect of the interviewee's perceptions was assessed with the Counsellor Rating Form-Short Version (Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983). This scale consists of 12 adjectives in 7-point Likert format. The items tap three counsellor attributes -

attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; Barak & Dell, 1977). Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the interviewer demonstrated the characteristics of the adjective. (See Appendix D).

Corrigan and Schmidt (1983) reported inter-item reliabilities of .82 to .94 for the CRF-S. These were comparable to those for the longer scale (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975). Additional reliability data for the CRF-S are provided by Epperson and Pecnik (1985).

Procedures

Testing

Prior to the interview, the sample of students was administered the GEFT and the I, P, and C, Locus of Control Scale by the experimenter and the course instructor. Students were told that the two measures had been used to predict career orientation and satisfaction with academic program selection. This statement was true but deliberately incomplete in order to ensure that students not suspect the actual nature of the study. Additionally, they were told that their responses would probably corroborate their responses in the interview. Scores derived from these instruments served as the covariates.

Interviewers

The interviewers were three female counsellors who had recently completed a Master's level training program and internship and who were judged by their professors as functioning at average and above average levels in counselling skills. In addition, videotaped samples of their work with the same clients were judged by raters. The results indicated that the three interviewers were functioning at above average levels in abilities to establish appropriate client rapport, verbal tracking, and responding (Bernardelli, 1986).

The use of female counsellor-client pairs was intended to control effects based on sex which has been shown to be a potentially contaminating factor in interview studies (Siegman, 1979a). Also, the use of more than one interviewer was intended to minimize any experimental artifact that might be a function of each individual's personality characteristics.

Training

Prior to the experimental interviews, interviewers were told of the general nature of the study. Specific assumptions, expectations, or hypotheses were not discussed. The notion of counsellor-offered structure was introduced and demonstrated by

two half-hour audio interview samples. Audio tapes were actual interviews of the investigator with two female university students. A member of the doctoral committee and an advanced doctoral student listened to both tapes to see whether they conformed to the two roles as presented in Appendix A..

Interviewers also received the two copies of specific interviewer roles which describe the two levels of structure that they were to carry out (Appendix A).

The interviewers met with the experimenter for two additional sessions. They participated in two-hour training sessions which simulated the experimental situation. Each interviewer was initially observed and coached by the investigator. The second training session involved an actual interview while being observed by the investigator and a doctoral level colleague behind a one-way mirror.

Treatments

Since the interest of this study was on the effects of different levels of counsellor-offered structure within the dyadic interview, two standardized interviewer roles were delineated, that is, two levels along the ambiguity-specificity continuum were selected to serve as examples for the treatment

conditions. These two experimental conditions consisted of behavioral opposites in that (a) one role portrayed a low-structure interviewer who encouraged and allowed clients to choose the content and direction of the interview through broad, open-ended responses whereas, (b) a second role depicted a high-structure interviewer who determined the direction of the interview content through the use of highly specific responses and both open-ended and closed-ended questions. The interviewers were instructed to talk to each student about their collegial experiences. However, it was understood that interviewers could discuss any subject or concern that the student presented. See Appendix A.

Both the low-structure and high-structure conditions were carried out by each interviewer. The two roles called for a warm, understanding, and interested listener that differed in no respect other than in their level of structure. Therefore, regardless of the structure condition, interviewers conducted each role in a manner consistent with their style and used non-verbal cues such as smiling and head-nodding when appropriate.

The experimental task required students to engage in a 20-minute interview with a trained interviewer. Students had been previously instructed that the topic of the interview would be

their recent educational experiences. The interviewers were instructed to begin the interview by asking the interviewee about her expectations regarding collegial studies and it was made clear to the students that they were free to discuss any topic of personal interest.

Students were randomly assigned to one of the three interviewers. Each student was then randomly assigned to one of the two conditions by means of a coin toss. All interviews were conducted in a counsellor's office. A cassette tape recorder and tapes were on the table in plain view of the interviewees.

Following the interview, each student was asked to complete the self-report questionnaires with the assurance that the interviewer would not be aware of their responses. Also, the investigator answered any question or concern that the interviewee might have had concerning the study.

Treatment Check

A master tape of 20 randomly selected interview segments was compiled consisting of 10 high-structure and 10 low-structure samples. The tapes were edited to exclude verbalizations made by the interviewees. This was intended to facilitate the tasks of the raters.

In order to test the validity of the two interview conditions, two judges (a doctoral level social worker and a master's level school counsellor) independently rated the tape excerpts according to instructions provided by the experimenter. Raters were asked to assess the degree of structure of each statement on a 7-point scale. Interrater agreement calculated as a correlation coefficient was .89 for the 20 segments.

Differences between the two conditions were assessed by means of a t-test. The results indicated a significant difference between the judgements made of the samples of the two conditions, $t = (1, 18)\ 6.21$, $p < .01$.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested.

1. Counsellor-offered level of structure will have no influence on the following criterion variables:

(a) interviewee self-referencing statements,

(b) interviewee talk-time,

(c) mean number of words per interviewee response,

(d) interviewee rate of speech,

(e) average amount of interviewee silent pausing,

(f) average reaction time latency of the interviewee,

(g) reported state anxiety of the interviewee,

(h) interviewee perception of the interviewer.

2. The personality variables, cognitive style and locus of control, will have no influence on the following criterion variables:

(a) interviewee self-referencing statements,
(b) interviewee talk-time,
(c) mean number of words per interviewee response,
(d) interviewee rate of speech,
(e) average amount of interviewee silent pausing,
(f) average reaction time latency of the interviewee,
(g) reported state anxiety of the interviewee,
(h) interviewee perception of the interviewer.

3. The interaction of counsellor-offered structure and cognitive style and locus of control will have no influence on the following criterion variables:

(a) interviewee self-referencing statements,
(b) interviewee talk-time,
(c) mean number of words per interviewee response,
(d) interviewee rate of speech,
(e) average amount of interviewee silent pausing,
(f) average reaction time latency of the interviewee,
(g) reported state anxiety of the interviewee,
(h) interviewee perception of the interviewer.

CHAPTER IV

Results

A two-factor multivariate analysis of variance was used to examine the main and interactive effects of the independent variables on the verbal behaviours and the post-interview reactions. One of the factors is counsellor-offered structure and a second factor is a composite of the personality variables which is used in a manner analogous to a covariate. This made it possible to obtain the interaction of structure and personality. The results are presented in a series of tables (Tables 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, and 11) and deal with the following criterion variables: self-referencing statements, talk-time, total number of words spoken, reaction time latencies, average amount of silent pausing, mean number of words per response, rate of speech, and the post-interview judgements of interviewer attractiveness, trustworthiness, expertness, and the interviewee's state anxiety.

Multivariate statistics are warranted with related multiple criterion variables in order to minimize Type I Error rates. It is for this reason that several criterion variables were grouped into clusters and analyzed simultaneously (Leary & Altmeir,1980).

The criterion variables were organized into the following clusters: (1) talk-time, total words spoken, and reaction time latencies represented the productivity cluster; (2) mean words per response, mean amount of unfilled pausing, and rate of speech made up the verbal fluency cluster; (3) and the post-interview reaction was made up of the attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness ratings and the state anxiety scores. In addition, the criterion variables, positive and negative self-referencing statements were analyzed as separate univariate measures.

The organization of variables into these specific clusters was supported by the relatively strong intercorrelations among the measures. These are presented in Appendix E. Table 1 presents the descriptive data for the independent variables. Table 2 presents the same statistics for the criterion variables.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Independent Variables

Variables		Low structure (n = 23)	High structure (n = 25)	Combined structure
Group Embedded Figures Test	M	8.30	8.28	8.29
	SD	4.36	3.73	4.00
		$t(1,46) = .07$ $p > .05$		
Locus of Control (Internal Scale)	M	30.09	34.68	33.18
	SD	9.54	5.73	6.80
		$t(1,46) = 1.9$ $p > .05$		
Locus of Control (Powerful Others Scale)	M	19.87	23.24	21.96
	SD	7.37	5.46	6.13
		$t(1,46) = 1.7$ $p > .05$		
Locus of Control (Control Scale)	M	19.30	21.64	20.10
	SD	5.87	6.92	7.06
		$t(1,46) = 1.2$ $p > .05$		

Although subjects were assigned randomly to either low or high structure groups, differences between the two groups were nevertheless assessed by means of t-tests. As indicated in Table 1, no significant differences occurred between the two groups for the four personality measures.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for the Criterion Variables

Variables		High structure	Low structure	Combined structure
Self-referencing statements (negative)	M	5.96	6.64	6.25
	SD	7.58	3.29	5.75
Self-referencing statements (positive)	M	5.30	6.64	5.47
	SD	3.22	2.87	3.04
Talk-time	M	219.78	204.48	212.13
	SD	17.04	18.03	17.56
Total number of words	M	598.78	616.48	608.00
	SD	151.77	131.58	140.37
Reaction time latency	M	.84	.57	.70
	SD	.31	.26	.31
Mean words per response	M	38.25	45.25	41.90
	SD	21.77	19.78	20.52
Mean amount of unfilled pausing	M	.04	.10	.07
	SD	.05	.10	.08
Rate of speech	M	2.71	3.00	2.85
	SD	.61	.55	.58
Attractiveness	M	21.83	22.04	21.94
	SD	2.37	1.7	1.41
Expertness	M	17.57	17.88	17.33
	SD	3.20	2.37	2.77
Trustworthiness	M	20.52	20.68	20.60
	SD	3.57	2.73	3.12
State anxiety	M	36.43	37.12	36.79
	SD	8.42	7.68	7.97

Cluster 1: Productivity

The null hypothesis that is related to the set of variables which consists of talk-time, total number of words, and reaction time may be stated as follows: there will be no main or interactive effects of interview structure and personality with respect to the productivity cluster. An inspection of the results presented in Table 3 reveals that the null hypothesis may be rejected for the main effect of interview structure. The main effect of personality and the interactive effect of personality with the structure condition were non-significant.

Table 3

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Productivity Cluster

Source	df	F	p
Structure condition	3,36	6.74	.001
Personality type	12,95	1.27	.248
Structure x personality	12,95	.59	.845

Since the multivariate F was significant, it was appropriate to proceed to univariate analyses for the main effect of structure. These results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Univariate Analyses of Variance for the Main Effect of Structure

Source	df	MS	F	p
Talk time	1	1738.36	5.27	.03
Error	38	329.63		
Total number of words	1	3391.26	.17	.68
Error	38	20038.31		
Reaction time	1	.77	9.23	.004
Error	38	.08		

While the multivariate analysis indicates that the cluster of variables that constitutes interviewee productivity is significant, the univariate analyses help pin-point the variable(s) responsible for multivariate group differences. Subjects in the high structure group spoke for longer periods of time, spoke a smaller number of words, and reacted more slowly to the interviewer's responses, but words total was not significant.

Cluster 2: Verbal Fluency

The null hypothesis related to the set of variables, mean amount of unfilled pausing, mean words per response, and rate of speech may be stated as follows: there will be no main or interactive effects of interview structure and personality with respect to the verbal fluency cluster.

An inspection of the results presented in Table 5 reveals that the null hypothesis may be rejected only for the main effect of structure. Multivariate statistics for the main effect of personality type and for the interaction of personality and structure were not significant.

Table 5

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Verbal Fluency Cluster

Source	df	F	p
Structure condition	3,36	4.24	.01
Personality type	12,95	1.42	.17
Structure x personality	12,95	1.10	.36

Since the multivariate F was significant for the

main effect of structure, the univariate analyses were examined to determine the contribution of each variable in the cluster to the multivariate group differences. This is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Univariate Analyses of Variance for the Main Effect of Structure

Source	df	MS	F	p
Mean number of words per response	1	852.39	2.02	.16
Error	38	421.43		
Mean amount of unfilled pausing	1	.025	5.15	.03
Error	38	.005		
Rate of speech	1	.75	2.21	.15
Error	38	.37		

While the verbal fluency set is significant and must be considered collectively, average amount of pausing contributed the most to multivariate group differences. Subjects in the low structure condition spoke more words for each response, spoke at quicker rates than their counterparts in the high structure condition, and had longer average pauses, but only this last

variable was significant.

Cluster 3: Post-Interview Reactions

The null hypothesis related to the set of variables that make up the interviewee's post-interview reaction may be stated as follows: there will be no main or interactive effects of interview structure and personality with respect to the post-interview cluster.

Inspection of the results presented in Table 7 reveals that the null hypothesis for the post-interview reaction may be retained. Multivariate statistics for both main effects and for interaction effects were non-significant.

Table 7

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Post-Interview Reaction

Source	df	MS	F	p
Structure condition	3,36	4.35	.098	.98
Personality type	12,95	16.11	.702	.79
Structure x personality	12,95	16.10	.690	.79

Given the lack of significance of the multivariate analysis, univariate analyses were unwarranted.

Criterion Variable 4: Positive Self-referencing Statements

The null hypothesis relating to the criterion variable, positive self-referencing statements, may be stated as follows: the total sum of positive self-references uttered by an interviewee during the interview segment will not differ significantly as the result of the main or interactive effects of interview structure and personality type.

The results of an analysis of variance of positive self-referencing statements are presented in Table 8. An examination of the table indicates that there were no significant differences in positive self-statements as a function of the main effects of structure and personality. The same was also true for the interaction of structure with personality.

Table 8

Analysis of Variance of Interviewees' Positive Self-referencing Statements

Source	df	MS	F	p
Personality type	4	14.19	1.44	.24
Structure condition	1	5.05	.51	.48
Structure x personality	4	2.72	.28	.89
Error	38	9.88		

Criterion Variable 5: Negative Self-referencing Statements

The null hypothesis relating to the criterion variable, negative self-referencing statements, may be stated as follows: the total sum of negative self-references uttered by an interviewee during the interview segment will not differ significantly as the result of the main or interactive effect of interview structure and personality type.

The results of an analysis of variance of negative self-referencing statements are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance of the Interviewee's Negative Self-referencing Statements

Source	df	MS	F	p
Personality type	4	98.18	4.45	.005
Structure condition	1	71.00	3.22	.08
Structure x personality	4	56.80	2.58	.05
Error	38	22.04		

An examination of Table 9 indicates that the null hypothesis may be rejected for the main effect of personality and for the interaction of structure with personality. The interaction may be attributed to the large negative correlations between the I Scale and negative self-referencing (r=-.65) and the P Scale and negative self-referencing statements (r=-.37) for the high structure group. These correlations were essentially zero for the low structure group. The results of the intercorrelations are presented in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10

Intercorrelations between Self-referencing Statements and Personality Variables: High Structure Format

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Self-referencing (positive)	1.00	.00	.06	.38*	.38*	.09
2. Self-referencing (negative)		1.00	.02	-.65*	-.37*	.10
3. Group Embedded Figures Test			1.00	.40*	.17	-.17
4. Locus of Control (I Scale)				1.00	.50*	-.06
5. Locus of Control (P Scale)					1.00	.47*
6. Locus of Control (C Scale)						1.00

*p< .01

TABLE 11

Intercorrelations between Self-referencing Statements and Personality Variables: Low Structure Format

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Self-referencing (positive)	1.00	.00	.02	.14	-.08	.02
2. Self-referencing (negative)		1.00	.30*	-.02	-.05	-.12
3. Group Embedded Figures Test			1.00	-.15	-.04	-.35*
4. Locus of Control (I Scale)				1.00	.31*	-.13
5. Locus of Control (P Scale)					1.00	.27
6. Locus of Control (C Scale)						1.00

*$p < .05$

CHAPTER V

Discussion

The present study focused on the interaction of the structure condition with the personality measures. In general terms, it was reasoned that the level of structure of the interview is a salient feature of a dyadic clinical session and as such would have a differential impact on the process and outcome of counselling of clients with different personality characteristics. In the measure that this is confirmed, it would support the notion that certain types of interview approaches (e.g., those that differ as a function of structure) are more appropriate for certain types of clients. The second question that was addressed was whether the interview structure and the personality measures had an influence on the criterion variables under study. With regard to interview structure, the question of interest is whether structure has an effect on selected interviewee verbal behaviors that are thought to be important to the process and outcome of counselling. And, with regard to the personality variables, a focus of this study was to investigate whether the constructs of cognitive style and locus of control had an impact on the exchange between the interviewer and interviewee that occurred within the interpersonal arena of the interview.

This chapter contains a discussion of the influence that the independent variables under study had on the specific measures of interview behavior.

Criterion Variables

Productivity cluster

The multivariate analysis of variance for the productivity cluster (e.g., a composite of talk-time, total number of words, and reaction time) is presented in Table 3. An examination of each individual criterion variable from that cluster will be discussed below.

Talk-time.

The present study indicates that interviewee talk-time is a function of the independent variable, counsellor-offered structure, F (1,38) = 5.27, $p < .03$ (see Table 3). As the analysis in Table 3 indicates, talk-time does not appear to be a function of the personality variables or of the interaction of personality with structure. Interviewees in the high structure condition talked for a greater amount of time than those in the low structure condition. Thus, it appears that specific interviewer responses attempting to elicit factual information may be more

successful than open-ended probes in encouraging the interviewee to maximize her talk-time. This relationship seems to be independent of the interviewee's anxiety, that is, anxiety does not appear to influence talk-time. The rationale for this is the following: if both the state anxiety scale and the interviewee's rate of speech are considered as two potential indicators of the presence of anxiety, then, an examination of the results for these two variables reveals no significant differences between the two structure conditions (see Table 6 and 7).

These results are somewhat surprising and at odds with results of some previous studies (Siegman & Pope, 1972). These authors argued that the uncertainty inherent in the ambiguous interviewer message enhances verbal productivity. They reasoned that the client who must respond to a specific counsellor remark quickly exhausts various response alternatives and this results in a decrease of talk-time. However, in the present study the opposite trend seems to have occurred. The less ambiguous interviewer accentuated talk-time by eliminating the usual hesitation and pausing that occurs when an individual contemplates response alternatives. Uncertainty on the part of the interviewer may increase uncertainty on the part of the interviewee and thereby reduce talk-time.

The lack of consistency between these results and those of

Siegman & Pope (1972) might be attributable to the obvious methodological differences that exist between the two studies. Siegman and Pope (1965,1972) interviewed students on specific topics by using a two-four-two sequence of two specific questions followed by four ambiguous questions and ending with two specific questions. This format has obvious dissimilarities with the present study.

What may be of greater importance is not whether structure is associated with talk-time but whether this relationship can be sustained in subsequent interviews. With the obvious exception of the job interview, counselling and psychotherapy interviews are endeavors that occur over time. It is not known whether the consistent application of one particular approach or technique will consistently have benefits in the long term.

A second important consideration is the relative value of a process variable like talk-time to the outcome of counselling. Most traditional counselling methods are obviously concerned with talk-time or one of its derivatives. This fact is attested to by the plethora of studies that have used talk-time as a major dependent variable (Harper et al., 1976). However, in spite of suggestive evidence supplied by Sloane et al.(1976) that talk-time is related to a positive outcome, it remains to be

established whether the amount of time a client talks covaries with quality of work in a counselling dyad. It is true that the absence of the client's verbal involvement is bound to upset the interactive exchange between the counsellor and the client. In this respect, talk-time must be viewed as a facilitative condition and necesary for maintaining appropriate therapeutic contact. But while talk-time may be enhanced by moderate amounts of interview structure, focusing strictly on the more obvious samples of verbal behavior must fit into the larger therapeutic strategy of the counsellor. It is for this reason that the skillful counsellor will need to make moment-by-moment decisions about how much structure is beneficial or harmful to each client. Obviously the counsellor's assumptions about what is useful and appropriate for each client, what the purposes and goals of counselling are, and how to best achieve all of these must override the purely technical aspects of professional practice. In this respect, Gilmore's (1973) caveat that counsellors distinguish between talk as a means to an end and talk as an end in itself seems particularly useful.

It was hypothesized that a relationship between structure and talk-time could not be predicted without considering the possible moderating effects of the two personality dimensions. However, the present results indicate that the interaction of the personality variables with the

structure condition did not occur. Similarly, no main effects for the personality measures were found. Since this pattern occurs for all the criterion variables except one, to wit, negative self-referencing statements, a discussion of this appears following the criterion variables. This is intended to eliminate obvious redundancies in the discussion.

Total number of words.

Logically, total number of words is closely related to talk-time, that is, everything else being equal, the longer a person talks, the more words will be uttered. However, in spite of the strong positive correlation between the two variables, total number of words spoken does not show a pattern similar to the one reported for talk-time.

The null hypothesis that stated that the total sum of words uttered would not differ significantly as the result of the main and interactive effects was retained, F (1,38) = .17, p< .68 (see Table 4). For this criterion variable, there were no significant main effects of structure and personality nor any significant interaction effects.

Given the previous results for talk-time, the absence of a main effect for personality and for the interaction of

personality with structure was expected. However, the lack of a main effect for structure is a surprising finding in light of the strong positive correlation between talk-time and number of words, r=.51 (see appendix E). In view of the significant main effects for talk-time, it would appear logical to expect that the total number of words should also differentiate the two conditions. In fact, what appears to emerge is an inverse relationship between talk-time and total number of words for the structure conditions. Whereas high structure accentuates talk-time it seems to depress the number of words spoken (see Table 2). However, differences between means for total number of words were not significant and the fact that greater number of words was recorded for the low structure format has little meaning.

Reaction time.

This study indicates that the reaction time of the interviewee was differentially affected by the experimental variable of counsellor-offered structure, $F(1,38) = 9.23, p < .004$. Reaction time was unaffected by the personality variables or the interaction of personality with structure (see Table 5). Thus, the null hypothesis that stated that the reaction time would be unaffected by the independent variables or their interaction was rejected only for the main effect of structure.

It was thought that the uncertainty implicit in the open-ended feature of low-structured interviewer responses would have increased the reaction time of interviewees. This would be consistent with the notion that counsellor messages that present a wider range of response alternatives as well as ambiguity increase cautiousness and hesitation. But, the very opposite trend seems to have occurred. Interviewees responded to the uncertainty of low-structure messages with quicker response times. The reason for this result might be that when the focus is not specific (as in the low structure condition) interviewees may respond with random expressions and thoughts similar to the kinds of responses that occur in free association tasks. But, when interviewees are required to discuss specific content, the necessary information retrieval process causes a delay in response and hence an increase in reaction time. This would be consistent with findings from non-interview research that hesitant speech is associated with information processing taking place at the time of the hesitation (Goldman-Eisler, 1968; Siegman,1978). For example, speaking tasks that required interpretation of TAT cards, in contrast to those requiring a simple description of the cards, were clearly associated with response time increases. Thus, when speaking is not automatic, the kinds of delays that occur may be the result of cognitive decision-making processes that function to organize the speech content taking place. This rationale could account for the

longer response times of individuals in the high structured interview condition.

Verbal fluency cluster

The multivariate analysis of variance for the verbal fluency cluster (e.g., a composite of mean number of words per response, mean amount of unfilled pausing, and rate of speech) is presented in Table 5. An examination of each variable in that cluster is presented below.

Mean amount of pauses.

It is generally thought that disrupted and disfluent speech is indicative of tension and anxiety. Experienced interviewers are especially attuned to the information value of these types of paralinguistic cues. Moreover, the presence of paralanguage (e.g., the unfilled pause) may avert the interviewer to his impact on the interviewee. It is not unexpected then, that the silent pause could be a highly sensitive criterion variable. In this study, the unfilled pause proved to be sensitive to the variable of counsellor-offered structure, $F(1,38) = 5.15, p < .03$. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected for the main effect of structure but was retained for the main effect of personality and for the

interaction of structure with personality (see Table 6).

It appears that silent pausing was clearly a function of the structure level of the interview. Interviewees in the low structure dyad had significantly longer proportions of their "floor time" that went to silent pausing. Thus, we may conclude that interviewer messages that elicit specific, concrete information also elicit less hesitant and disfluent speech. This is consistent with the general notion that ambiguous interviewer remarks plunge the client into a situation of informational uncertainty where the guidelines for what is expected content is extremely loose and tenuous. Faced with this situation the individual may exercise greater amounts of cognitive monitoring as she attempts to maintain fluent thoughts and ideas. It is this cognitive monitoring that took shape in the unfilled pause and is possible evidence of cognitive information processing or decision-making functions that are occurring. These results are consistent with the general notion that uncertainty per se increases silent pausing (Goldman-Eisler, 1968; Siegman,1979b).

Related to the self-monitoring feature of the silent pause, there is the likelihood that the presence or the relative frequency of silent pausing is indicative of resistance on the part of the interviewee. Thus, the more guarded and cautious client is likely to manifest much silent pausing. Within this

framework, it would be logical to assume that interviewees were less resistant when interviewer remarks were relatively more structured. This would indicate that low structured, ambiguous probes increase defensiveness and should be avoided if the interviewer is striving for a more fluent interaction.

The actual significance of the unfilled pause is equivocal and obviously needs closer examination. For example, Duncan (1969) reported a positive relationship between hesitation and pausing and the "poor" therapy hour. On a contradictory note, Fischer and Apostal (1975) reported that judgements concerning high self-disclosure occurred for interviews that had greater amounts of unfilled pauses. They concluded that the unfilled pause indicates to the interviewer that the interviewee's message is revealing greater amounts of information and that the interviewee is ready to share this material. In reality, unfilled pauses can be caused by a large number of dynamics. What is indicated here is that they emerge in a significant way in a low structure interview.

Mean words per response.

Since the variable mean number of words is derived from total number of words, it is logical that the two should be highly interrelated. This will inevitably be the case unless the

number of responses for each segment alters this relationship. The general expectation would be that high structured segments would demand that the interviewer speak more often since responses to requests for specific information have a shorter life span in that when the information is exhausted, speech ends. In fact, this was the case, that is, interviewers made more responses in the high structure condition. But, in spite of the differences in the number of responses for each condition, this did not significantly affect the mean number of words per response.

The null hypothesis that stated that the mean number of words per response would not differ as a result of the main or interactive effects of the independent variables was retained (see Table 5). In spite of the differences between the two groups, results were not large enough to contribute to a significant effect.

This pattern is not surprising since it parallels closely that for total number of words. Like that particular criterion variable, greater words per response were associated with the low structured interview. But also like that variable, differences between conditions were non-significant. Thus, the assumption that low structured, ambiguous interviewer remarks would have created a "free association" set where the interviewee

talks uninterruptedly and with only occasional prodding from the interviewer was clearly not supported. Similarly, the rationale that this set would be associated with the personality variables under study and their interaction with the interview condition was also not supported.

Rate of speech.

This study indicates that the rate of speech, that is, the speed with which participants spoke was not differentially affected by the experimental variables under study. Thus, the null hypothesis which stated that the rate of speech would not be influenced by the main effects of structure and personality or by the interaction of the two was retained (see Table 5).

The lack of significant effects is surprising especially for the main effects of structure, $F(1,38) = 2.21$, $p<.15$ (see Table 6). It has been shown that anxiety and verbal productivity are interrelated and that anxiety has an activating effect on speech (Murray, 1971). It follows, therefore, that since verbal productivity and speech rate are positively related, quicker speaking rates should be obvious sequelae of anxiety. This would be logical if it could be demonstrated that in this particular study a low-structure interviewer was indeed more stressful and anxiety-provoking. However, although it has been

suggested that anxiety is associated with ambiguity, the evidence from this study is equivocal. Participants in the low structure interview spoke more quickly but differences were too small to contribute to a significant effect.

Post-Interview Cluster

The multivariate analysis of variance for the post-interview cluster (e.g., a composite of state anxiety, perceptions of counsellor attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness) is presented in Table 7. A discussion of each criterion variable from that cluster follows.

Counselor Rating Form.

For the sake of convenience the three scales of the Counselor Rating Form (CRF-S) will be discussed together. The null hypothesis stated that interviewee judgements of attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness would not differ significantly as the result of the main and interactive effects of structure and personality or as a function of the interaction of the two. Results indicate that the null hypothesis can be retained for both main and interactive effects, that is, interviewee perceptions of the three attributes were not significantly influenced by the independent variables or their

interaction (see Table 7). A comparison of the descriptive data for both conditions reveals very similar results for the three attributes.

It was thought that naive interviewees would rate the more structured interviewers more positively. This would be consistent with the finding that counsellors are rated more positively when they structure the interview and suggest specific topics to discuss (Schmidt & Strong,1970). This notion is further substantiated by the finding that college students rated Albert Ellis as more "expert" than Carl Rogers - a result that can be explained by the highly concrete and specific approach of the founder of Rational-Emotive Therapy (Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983). This finding is important since it is thought that the perception of a counsellor's expertness may override other counsellor attributes (Strong, 1978). But in spite of the foregoing, interviewers using a more structured approach were not rated as more expert, attractive, or trustworthy.

The lack of significant differences between the structure conditions on the Counselor Rating Form suggests that this scale provides little information about the perceptions of interviewees' reactions to counsellors using different levels of structure. In this sense, the two counsellor roles may not reflect the dimensions tapped by the CRF-S. The general tendency

of interviewees was to rate the three interviewers positively regardless of the structure condition or their personality orientation. In addition, the three attributes were positively correlated to a high degree. This may be evidence of what Bergin (1971) called a "good guy" effect, that is, the tendency to see counsellors and helpers as essentially good. Interviewees may have reacted to a global impression or expectation of counsellors as supportive and understanding. Also, interviewers and counsellors are generally perceived as having some authority or status (Corrigan, 1978). It is therefore not unusual that interviewers in this study should be rated accordingly.

State anxiety

As it was explained earlier, anxiety is considered to be a common sequela of interviewer ambiguity. In the present study, it was thought that anxiety would be mediated by the influence of the personality variables and thereby creating an interaction effect. However, the self-reported state anxiety of interviewees did not prove to be a sensitive variable for either the main effects of structure and personality or their interaction. Thus, the null hypothesis for the main and interaction effects was retained. We would have to conclude that there were no differences in interviewees' reports of their state anxiety.

Neither the structure condition nor the personality characteristics of the interviewees significantly affected the reports of anxiety. This is particularly surprising in the case of interviewer-offered structure. If low structure does indeed increase anxiety (and this is obviously open to question for this study) it would seem that there would have been some evidence of this in the anxiety measure. There was, in fact, no cogent evidence of this. The means for the high strukture and low structure conditions respectively are 36.4 and 37.1. Both results appear essentially similar to the mean of 38.7 reported by Spielberger (1983) for a sample of female college students.

Self-referencing statements

Much of what occurs as paralanguage is outside of conscious awareness and is to a large extent automatic (Goldman-Eisler, 1968). It is for this reason that the non-content variables are not usually vulnerable to the conscious, deliberate influences of the individual. Self-disclosures, on the other hand, are the actual contents of speech and are influenced by a broader range of factors (Chelune, 1979). The factors of interest in this study are counsellor-offered structure and certain personality variables. These questions were asked: are self-referencing statements influenced by a moderately low or a moderately high interview

structure? Are these statements affected by the personality variables of the discloser? Do structure and personality interact thereby influencing the self-referencing statements of each interviewee?

Positive self-referencing statements.

The null hypothesis which states that the number of positive self-referencing statements would be unaffected by the independent variables or their interaction was retained (see Table 8). Although low structured interviewers elicited a greater number of self-referencing statements, differences between the two means were not significant. Similarly, in spite of the moderate positive correlation between positive self-references and two of the locus of control scales, positive self-statements were not statistically affected by the personality variables. Therefore, regardless of the particular structure condition that an individual was assigned to, those who expected to have control over their lives (I Scale) tended to talk about themselves more positively.

The positive correlations between the I Scale and positive self-references are not surprising. Levenson (1981) reports unpublished data showing that the I Scale is positively correlated with measures of sociability. In addition, Paulhas

and Christie (1981) demonstrated that interpersonal control is a feature of internal locus of control and as such, it is positively correlated with assertiveness. It is not unusual then, that the I scores of interviewees from this study should be associated with positive self-statements. This relationship seems particularly accentuated for the high structured interview $r = .38$ (see Table 10). Statements of positive self-reference may reflect a number of personality functions in interpersonal situations. It is possible that positive self-disclosure simply reflects an independent, confident outlook that covaries with an attitude of personal control. Even more likely is the fact that talking about oneself, especially in a non-boastful but positive light is one way of influencing another's impression and thereby eliciting approval. This would fit a social exchange model (Thibaut & Kelley,1959) where interpersonal relationships are cast within a reward/cost framework and where disclosures are necessary gambits in the acquaintance process. Given this particular notion, it is obvious that an internal orientation and positive self-references should be correlated.

Negative self-referencing statements.

The null hypothesis stated that negative self-referencing statements would not be affected by the main effects of structure, personality, and the interaction of the two. This

was retained for the main effect of structure only. Both the main effects of the personality measures and the interaction of structure with personality were found to be significant (see Table 9).

In this study, it appears that negative self-statements are negatively correlated with an individual's expectation of personal control. This seems to be mainly accounted for by the large, significant correlation between the I Scale and negative self-references, $r = -.47$, $p < .001$ (see Table 10). Therefore, much of what has been said concerning the relationship between internal control and positive self-references applies for negative self-statements. This relationship, however, is the inverse of that for positive self-statements in that persons who expect to have control over their lives make fewer statements about themselves that are negative. This would fit the general expectation that individuals with a sense of personal control are better adjusted and less likely to make self-deprecating comments.

The result of a personality-by-structure interaction appears unexpected in light of the absence of interaction for other criterion variables. Some clarification is provided by an examination of the correlation matrix for each structure condition (see Appendix E). Negative self-referencing

statements are highly correlated with the I Scale and moderately negatively correlated with the P Scale for the high structured condition. A pattern of negative correlation also occurred for the low structured format but the values are too small to suggest that they furnish any useful information. It appears that individuals who believe in their ability to control their own lives will make fewer negative statements than those who expect to have little control over their lives when interviewed by someone who is specific and asks for concrete details. Conversely, under the same interview format, the person who does not believe in personal control will make more negative self-statements than his counterpart who expects to have control. This would indicate that a more structured approach might not be the appropriate alternative for inhibiting negative statements.

A negative correlation ($r = -.37$, $p < .01$) of smaller magnitude exists between negative self-statements and the P-Scale, a measure of the belief that one's life is controlled by powerful people. This is truly surprising and difficult to explain. Perhaps this relationship might be interpreted in the following way: individuals who believe that powerful others have influence over their lives might be particularly vigilant about the kinds of negative information they disclose about themselves. The rationale is that the interviewer who controls the flow of information by the use of specific probes might be perceived as

a "powerful other" and thereby likely to elicit cautiousness and suspicion on the part of the interviewee. On the other hand, the individual who does not believe this might be freer to talk about herself in a negative fashion. The fact that this particular pattern did not occur for the low structure format indicates that a more ambiguous and more reflective interview approach is neutral in the way it impacts on negative self-statements.

Implications

Interview Structure

The focus on interviewer-offered structure was motivated by concerns with the communication process. Since the interpersonal process of communication is the primary vehicle for help-giving in our society, the question of how to conduct the interview to facilitate this process becomes of primary interest. It is for this reason that this study focused on the structure dimension of the interviewer's message. It found, among other things, that talk-time is lessened by a low-structured, ambiguous interview format.

As the findings seem to indicate, it would be advisable to take precaution against excessive ambiguity in initial dyadic interviews. This would be particularly true of interviews with

clients of counselling and psychotherapy. Most such persons have some interpersonal deficits so that contact with others, especially unfamiliar others, causes them anxiety and expressive difficulties. Even when individuals are well-adjusted, face-to-face interaction with a person designated as "counsellor" or "interviewer" is bound to create some apprehension and anxiety for them. In view of this, it might seem reasonable for the counsellor to increase structure, at least initially. There would be less danger in inhibiting the facile flow of communication and the development of rapport so necessary to the therapeutic encounter. Not only would this benefit the communication taking place but it would also reassure the client that the counsellor is not intent on being a passive helper who can only be effective if the client is highly motivated and verbally expressive. The counsellor or therapist could thereafter reduce or increase structure as he saw fit.

A second finding of this study is that verbal fluency was compromised by an ambiguous, low structured interviewer. If we accept that the presence of unfilled, silent pausing interrupts the normal flow of communication, then it can be seen that ambiguity stimulates this process. The danger of relatively frequent and lengthy pausing is that its disruptive impact on speech can have a number of potentially negative sequelae. In our culture, silence following a statement is usually interpreted

as a turn-yielding signal. Speakers who prolong their within response pauses run the risk of "losing the floor" to their speaking partner. The consequence of this particular dynamic is that speakers may consciously or unconsciously deal with this situation by increasing their filled pauses or by slowing down the rate of their speech. Speakers who are adept at manipulating "floor-keeping" cues (e.g., filled pauses, controlling speech rate) needn't worry about the possibility of losing the floor. But, speakers not so inclined may have to deal with the tension and uncertainty inherent in such a situation. This tension may be further increased by the fact that speech disfluency tends to create a poor impression on listeners. Therefore, where a speaker's credibility is an important factor in the interaction, it may be useful for the speaker to attempt to decrease his speech disfluencies.

By implication we may caution counsellors and psychotherapists from making hasty judgements about anxiety and defensiveness based on the relative presence of silent pauses. The results of this study seem to indicate that this particular form of hesitation may be a feature of the ongoing interactive exchange between participants and not necessarily a manifestation of intrapsychic conflict, anxiety, or resistance. Actual clinical judgements of these events should take into consideration not only the occurrence of silent pausing (and other hesitations) but

also their location, that is, when they occurred in a particular speech sequence, the topic under discussion, and the particular manner with which these topics are introduced and pursued by the counsellor. Interviewers may need to ask themselves whether their own particular interviewing preferences are not responsible for the kinds of disrupted and disfluent verbalizations that are so often interpreted as evidence of a "bad therapy hour".

Thirdly, this study found that reaction time was shortened by a low structured, ambiguous interview approach. If short delays are indicative of impulsivity and a lack of reflectiveness, then, a less structured interview format seems to encourage this. Very short response times may be a sign that the interviewee has not thought out his response and is therefore verbalizing spontaneous and quasi-random content. Counsellors like to feel that what they say to their clients is significant and sufficiently pertinent to stimulate thought processes. It appears that this likelihood is increased when interviewers avoid vague and ambiguous probes in favor of more specific and concrete communication.

While short response latencies may be associated with impulsivity (and even anxiety) long reaction times may signal cautiousness and suspicion of the interviewer especially if these occur very early in the relationship. Perhaps a useful caveat is

that length of latencies (like other hesitation phenomena) cannot be interpreted without considering a number of other factors. There seems to be a danger in making judgements of client emotional states or motives without regard for the particular circumstances of the counselling situation. The topic under discussion, the task of the counsellor, the particular stage in the "life" of the relationship are among the many aspects that will define the context of counselling. For example, while a very long delay may be inappropriate during a first interview, the very same delay may be both appropriate and necessary during a later interview. Clearly, the exact circumstance when paralinguistic cues are positive and desirable features of the counselling process requires further clarification.

Finally, as for self-disclosure, this study failed to show that either form of structure was better at eliciting self-references. Nonetheless, certain patterns occurred that are pertinent to this discussion. It appears that a low-structured, ambiguous format is the better strategy if eliciting both positive and negative self-statements is considered useful. If we consider that the quantity of self-references, both positive and negative, may be thought of as an index of interpersonal openness, then, low structure appears to increase this type of disclosure. This is a useful implication especially for the counsellor or psychotherapist who adheres to a model of therapy

that gives priority to an open relationship and to the expression of feeling. But whereas ambiguous probes seem to encourage self-references, this relationship changes when the interviewee's locus of control orientation is considered.

Personality-by-structure

In spite of some previous suggestions that both the cognitive style and the internal-external locus of control of an individual should interact with levels of structure or ambiguity in interpersonal situations, the present study found a personality-by-structure interaction for only one criterion variable. Thus, despite their intuitive appeal, interaction hypotheses, especially in the area of counselling and psychotherapy are deceptive in their complexity. This has been attested to by several authors (Kilmann, Scovern, & Moreault, 1979; Nisbett, 1978; Stiles, Shapiro, & Elliott, 1986) and the difficulty of adequately testing interactive hypotheses is underscored by the results of this study.

This study found a personality-by-structure interaction for negative self-referencing statements. It appears that during a moderately high structured interview, fewer negative self-statements were associated with an interviewee's belief in personal control. This is interesting since it might indicate

that counsellors who are more specific and structured (e.g., behavior therapists) need to pay closer attention to the kinds of personality characteristics that mediate disclosing behaviors in an interview dyad. Fortunately, pragmatic counsellors and therapists (e.g., brief, systemic, and strategic therapists) usually do not place a high premium on the expression of feelings and other emotions. Rather they tend to be highly structured and concrete since they are often searching for the kinds of detailed information needed to formulate precise behavior prescriptions (Haley, 1976; Bergman, 1985). But when the client's needs dictate that the exploration of feelings about self and others is necessary, counsellors may need to switch to a more reflective style of interviewing.

The significant interactive results for negative self-statements might provide some interesting possibilities for future research. Given that both positive and negative self-references seemed to show some promise for a structure-by-personality interaction, it suggests that content variables (like self-disclosure) might be extremely useful in testing the suspected personality-by-treatment interactions.

Conclusions

Based on the empirical results of the present study and

their implications, several conclusions present themselves.

1. Interactive paradigms often imply that one type of counsellor or counselling approach is better suited for certain clients. This is the basic underlying assumption of matching hypotheses (Stein & Stone,1976). However, in spite of the inherent attractiveness of matching hypotheses, the intent of this study is not to bolster the data regarding the matching of counsellors and clients. Rather, it calls upon counsellors, therapists, and interviewers in general to exercise sensitivity and flexibility in the conduct of their professional activity and to adapt their styles to the particular needs of the client and the situation. Since even moderately experienced counsellors can learn to use both structured and unstructured interview approaches independent of their theoretical biases and personal styles, it follows that this and other important interviewer dimensions can become part of the larger repertoire of the counselling professional. This might be particularly apropos in those settings where the number of mental heath professionals is small and where the matching of client and counsellor is hardly feasible. An aspect of professional development of the counsellor might be to master those interviewing skills that are shown to be effective and to loosen rigid theoretical positions that have little bearing on what is helpful to the client.

2. The structure dimension is an important aspect of the interview process of all schools of counselling. The implications for the practicing counsellor are therefore quite broad. The results of this study suggest that initially in counselling, a more structured style might have certain advantages for the new client. But whether these advantages are maintained from session to session is questionable and remains to be established. In fact, counsellors need to be particularly attentive to the numerous covert as well as overt factors that influence clients. It is suggested that they need not only to be aware of how they influence their clients but to assess whether these influences are (a) intentional and (b) occur in similar fashion from session to session. Behavioral flexibility in the conduct of the interview might be a more useful quality of the skilled interviewer than orthodox techniques that follow from theoretical constructs of dubious worth.

3. The foregoing suggests that interviewers need occasionally to override their preferences for certain types of structure in favor of an approach that is consistent with the client's needs and goals. Interviewers have individual preferences for certain interviewee behavior and there are bound to be differences in what each interviewer is capable of tolerating. For example, some interviewers may be quite tolerant of interviewee hesitations and silences. By implication, since interviewers are

usually aware of their own limits and preferences, it is expected that those who are not so tolerant would avoid ambiguous probes. Interviewers should be aware of the fact that different levels of structure have obvious consequences. Based on the present results, the the relationship between structure and hesitation is monotonic. As levels of ambiguity increase to the point where hesitation becomes a major obstacle in the communication process, the counsellor will need to ask whether maintaining ambiguity is necessary or useful.

4. Based on the ease with which the three interviewers were able to learn to use messages of differing levels of structure, it follows that these skills can be mastered by most interviewers. However, much more complex are the sensitivity and intuition necessary to judge when it is appropriate to increase or decrease structure. This question will have to consider not only how different structure levels affect communication, but it will have to examine factors such as the goals of counselling, the nature of the problem, and the particular point in the life of the counselling relationship.

Limitations of the Study

Strong arguments for the use of the experimental analogue as a means of controlling confounding variables have been presented by numerous researchers. Their advantages are obvious: that is, increasing internal validity by highly rigorous paradigms that allow for the systematic manipulation of one or more variables at a time while keeping several other variables constant. But while this is desirable, the resultant decrease in external validity and the difficulty in being able to generalize more broadly is a limitation.

This study was an analogue experiment and the criticisms that are mounted against analogues apply to this study as well. It was not a naturalistic counselling interview and as such it is difficult to extrapolate beyond the realm of the analogue situation. In spite of the effort to give analogues the appearance and flavor of the actual counselling situation, they differ from counselling interviews in important ways. One obvious difference is that analogue interviews are contrived: interviewers are asked to behave in ways that may be untypical of their actual day-to-day styles.

A very important factor in counselling and psychotherapy is the level of motivation of both counsellor and client. "Real

clients' seeking counselling are motivated by any of a number of factors not the least of which is the desire to seek relief from their anxieties and conflicts. Therefore, it cannot be disputed that the amount of investment with which clients approach the counselling situation is bound to influence the extent and manner of their conduct. In this sense, the nature of the interview content for this study (e.g., expectations regarding collegial studies) may have been a low profile topic and attenuated any potential effects.

Related to the limits of the experimental analogue is the issue of obtrusiveness. Since this study was experimental in nature it was by necessity obtrusive in its measurements. Although subjects could not possibly have known exactly which behaviors were being measured, the entire experimental situation, by its very nature, was obtrusive. Subjects realized that they were participating in an interview study and that their participation was necessary to generate data for analysis. They were also obviously aware that their entire performance was being recorded and would eventually be listened to. It is therefore not illogical to believe that these factors had consequences that would not have appeared in a study where subjects were not consciously aware of their participation. Indeed, the whole issue of obtrusiveness has been the subject of constant debate by philosophers of science.

The interviews used to generate data for analysis were relatively brief. A 20 to 25-minute encounter with a stranger (even a warm, non-threatening one) may have been insufficient time for an individual to feel comfortable enough to display behaviors more typical of their personalities. That is, regardless of a person's self-reliance, confidence, or personal control, a first, brief contact with a stranger might elicit some cautiousness or even suspicion. In the event that this initial response is not a positive one, it would certainly have an impact on the interviewee's subsequent performance. For example, Siegman (1979a) suggests that what occurs at the beginning of an interview creates a "set" that endures the life of that interview. This would indicate that the interview experience as a whole may be a much more salient factor than an individual's personality traits. It is not unlikely that participation in a study of this type may have created expectations powerful enough to dilute an interviewee's behavioral responses. For example, Milgram (1965) has demonstrated how the impact of the experimental situation can cause ordinary people to behave in totally unexpected and surprising ways.

The participants in this study were all females most of whom were in their final year of collegial studies. Also, the three interviewers were female. Both these demographic

parameters were established a priori as a way of controlling possible effects due to sex. However, this does not permit us to generalize beyond the female population or beyond female-female pairs of counselling dyads. It is highly likely that had male participants or counsellors been used for this study, the results might have been quite different.

This study contrasted a moderately structured interview with a moderately unstructured interview, that is, it compared two interview formats that are mid-point on the structure dimension. Structure is obviously not a dichotomous variable. It is a continuous variable and more divergent (even extreme) levels of the continuun could have been studied. This was not done in order to give counsellors some degree of credibility that might not have occurred with a counsellor who used many closed-ended questions or one who used long periods of silence as a way of communicating to the client that it was her task to provide the verbal content of the interview. Thus, it is not known how more pronounced levels of structure would have affected the individuals in this study.

Suggestions for Further Research

The results of this study indicate that several useful data can be derived from an examination of dimensions of

the interview (e.g., structure) as well as the client's characteristics. But, continued research is obviously warranted if we wish to unravel questions related to how the structure dimension and other features of the interview process (see Pope, 1977) influence different types of clients. It is also obvious that research of this type needs further extension and several improvements need to be brought to bear on a "replication" of this study.

Additional future research will need to address the question of how sex covaries with other variables chosen for investigation. This will obviously involve a paradigm with a broader mix of counsellors and clients (e.g., male and female counsellors with both male and female clients). In this way we might begin to answer the question of whether counsellor-offered structure interacts with sex and other variables to produce measurable differences in the behaviors of both males and females.

Analogue studies provide the testing ground for theoretical notions and general psychological principles (Stone,1984), but they need cross-validation in clinical settings with clinical samples. This would help clarify the issue of clinical validity and generalizibility which are the factors of prime interest to the consumers of psychotherapy research

(Morrow-Bradley & Elliot, 1986). Studies of interview structure that lack the rigor of the laboratory situation but that place greater stress on external validity and clinical verisimilitude are necessary. One line of research might be to match the client's stated preference or expectation for structure with the counsellor's particular approach in view of determining those factors that are the most useful in helping to establish a viable working relationship from the very onset of counselling. Since establishing such a relationship underpins the whole therapeutic process, those factors (e.g., ambiguity) that may vitiate this process will inevitably retard progress. A research question related to this might be: can we predict satisfactory benefits to the client on the basis of his assumptions and expectations concerning both the counselling and interview process?

Finally, with respect to personality-by-treatment paradigms, it is obvious that numerous methodological constraints and disappointing results have done little to dampen professional enthusiasm for this particular model. But, the question is not whether the model has logical or theoretical appeal. Rather, the question is one that addresses the manner in which the model can be adequately tested. In this respect, additional attempts at identifying those variables (both content and non-content) that best reflect the complexities of the dyadic therapeutic exchange are necessary. However, clinical studies may have to

abandon significance testing as a metric of interview impact in favor of measures that are more clinically relevant (e.g., see Mahrer & Nadler, 1986; Russel & Trull, 1986). It is obvious that since the age-old worry concerning counselling effectiveness seems to have abated, researchers will no doubt feel less pressure to demonstrate empirically that something of worth transpires in the consultation room. This trend will certainly encourage researchers to experiment with less traditional stategies and this may eventually offer some additional answers to the question of which counsellors, using which methods, are most effective with which clients.

References

Abramowitz, C.W., Abramowitz, S.I., Roback, H.B., & Jackson, C. (1974). Differential effectiveness of directive and non-directive group therapies as a function of client internal-external control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 849-853.

Alegre, C., & Murray, E.J. (1974). Locus of control, behavioral intention, and verbal conditioning. Journal of Personality, 42, 668-681.

Balch, P., & Ross, A. W. (1975). Predicting success in weight reduction as a function of locus of control: A unidimensional and multi-dimensional approach. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 119.

Ball-Rokeach, S.J. (1973). From pervasive ambiguity to a definition of the situation. Sociometry, 36, 378-389.

Barak, A., & Dell, D.M. (1977). Differential perception of counselor behavior: Replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 288-292.

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

Barak, A., & LaCrosse, M.B. (1977). Comparative perception of practicum counselor behavior: A process and methodological investigation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 16, 202-208.

Barrett-Lennard, G.T. (1962). Dimensions of therapists' response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 76, (43, whole no. 562).

Bednar, R. L., & Kaul, T. J. (1978). Experiential group research: Current perspectives. In S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (pp.769-815).New York: Wiley.

Bent, R.J., Putnam, D.G., & Kiesler, D.J. (1976). Correlates of successful and unsuccessful psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 149.

Bergman, J.S. (1985). Fishing for barracuda: Pragmatics of brief systemic therapy. New York: Norton.

Bernardelli, A.M. (1986). The effects of diverse communication tasks on selected counselling process variables as a function of cognitive complexity and gender. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. McGill University, Montreal.

Berry, J. W., & Annis, R. C. (1974). Ecology, culture and psychological differentiation. International Journal of Psychology, 9, 173-193.

Berzins, J. I. (1977). Therapist-patient matching. In A.S. Gurman & A. M. Razin (Eds.), Effective psychotherapy: A handbook of research (pp. 222-251). New York: Pergamon Press.

Berzins, J. I., & Ross, W. F. (1973). Locus of control among opiate addicts. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40, 84-91.

Biondo, J., & MacDonald, A. P. (1971). Internal-external locus of control and response to influence attempts. Journal of Personality, 39, 407-419.

Blanck, G. (1976). Psychoanalytic technique. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.), The Therapist's handbook: Treatment methods of mental disorders (pp. 61-86). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Blass, T. (Ed.) 1977. Personality variables in social behavior. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Blocher, D. H. (1966). Developmental counseling. New York: The Ronald Press.

Boomer, D.S. (1963). Speech disturbance and body movement in interviews. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 136, 263-266.

Boomer, D.S., & Dittman, A.T. (1964). Speech rate, filled pause, and body movement in interviews. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 139, 324-327.

Boomer, D.S., & Goodrich, D.W. (1961). Speech disturbance and judged anxiety. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25, 160-164.

Bordin, E.S. (1955). Ambiguity as a therapeutic variable. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 19, 9-15.

Bordin, E.S. (1968). Psychological counseling (2nd. ed.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bordin, E.S. (1974). Research strategies in psychotherapy. New York: Wiley.

Brothers, R., & Gaines, R. (1973). Perceptual differences

between hippies and college students. Journal of Social Psychology, 91, 325-335.

Brown, J. C., & Strickland, B. R. (1972). Belief in internal-external control of reinforcement and participation in college activities. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 38, 148.

Brunink, S. A., & Schroeder, H. E. (1979). Verbal therapeutic behavior of expert psychoanalytically oriented, gestalt, and behavior therapists. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47, 567-574.

Budner, S. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. Journal of Personality, 30, 29-50.

Busch, J. C., & De Ridder, L. M. (1973). Conformity in preschool disadvantaged children as related to field - dependence, sex, and verbal reinforcement. Psychological Reports, 32, 667-673.

Cancro, R., & Voth, H. M. (1969). Autokinesis and psychological differentiation. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 28, 99-103.

Carlson, R. (1976). Personality. Annual Review of Psychology, 26, 393-414.

Carr, J. E. (1970). Differentiation similarity of patient and therapist and the outcome of psychotherapy. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 76, 361-369.

Chelune, G.J. (1979). Self-disclosure: Origins, patterns, and implications of openness in interpersonal relationships. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chelune, G.J. (1975). Self-disclosure: An elaboration of its basic dimensions. Psychological Reports, 36, 79-85.

Clemes, S. R., & D'Andrea, V. J. (1965). Patient's anxiety as a function of expectation and degree of initial interview ambiguity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 397-404.

Coan, R.W. (1973). Personality variables associated with cigarette smoking. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 86-104.

Corrigan, J.D. (1978). Salient attributes of two types of helpers: Friends and mental health professionals. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 588-590.

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

Cozby, P. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 73-91.

Crandall, V. C., & Lacey, B. W. (1972). Children's perceptions of IE control in intellectual-academic situations and their Embedded Figures Test performance. Child Development, 43, 1123-1134.

Cronbach, L. J. (1957). The two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 12, 671-684.

Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 30, 116-127.

Crowne, D. P., & Liverant, S. (1963). Conformity under varying

conditions of personal committment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 545-547.

Culver, C. M., Cohen, S. I., Silverman, A. J., & Shmavonian, B. M. (1964), Cognitive structuring, field dependence-independence, and the psychophysiological response to a perceptual isolation. In J. Wortis (Ed.), Recent Advances in Biological Psychiatry (Vol. 6) (pp. 119-128). New York: Plenum Press.

Davanloo, H. (Ed.). (1978). Basic principles and techniques of short-term dynamic psychotherapy. New York: SP Medical and Scientific Books.

Davids, A. H., & Erickson, C. W. (1955). The relationship of manifest anxiety to association productivity and intellectual attainment. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 19, 219-222.

Davis, W. L., & Phares, E. J. (1967). Internal-external control as a determinant of information-seeking in a social influence situation. Journal of Personality, 35, 547-561.

Dawson, J.L.M., Young, B. M., & Choi, P. P. C. (1974). Developmental influences in pictorial depth perception among Hong Kong Chinese children. Journal of Cross-Cutural Psychology, 5, 3-22.

Dell, D.M. (1973). Counselor power base, influence attempt, and behavior change in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 395-405.

Dell, D.M., & Schmidt, L.D. (1976). Behavioral cues to counselor

expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 197-201.

Diamond, M.J., & Shapiro, J. L., (1973). Changes in locus of control as a function of encounter group experiences: A study and replication. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 82, 514-518.

Dibner, A. S. (1958). Ambiguity and anxiety. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, 165-174.

Doctor, R. M. (1971). Locus of control of reinforcement and responsiveness to social influence. Journal of Personality, 39, 542-551.

Doktor, R. H., & Hamilton, W. F. (1973). Cognitive style and acceptance of management science recommendations. Management Science, 19, 884-894.

Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. (1950). Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill

Dowds, B. N., Fontana, A. F., Russakoff, L. M., & Harris, M. (1977). Cognitive mediators between patients' social class and therapists' evaluations. Archives of General Psychiatry, 34, 917-920.

Dua, P. S. (1970). Comparison of the effects of behaviorally oriented action and psychotherapy reeducation on introversion-extroversion, emotionality, and internal-external control. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 567-572.

Duncan, S.D. (1969). Nonverbal communication. Psychological Bulletin, 72, 118-137.

Ekehammer, B. (1974). Interactionism in personality from a

historical perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 1026-1048.

Epperson, D.L., & Pecnik, J.A. (1985). Counselor Rating Form - Short Version: Further validation and comparison with the long form. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 143-146.

Fenichel, O. (1945) The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: Norton.

Finn, J. D. (1974). A general model for multivariate analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Fischer, M.J., & Apostal, R.O. (1975). Selected vocal cues and counselors' perceptions of genuineness, self-disclosure, and anxiety. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 92-96.

Foulds, M. L. (1971). Changes in internal-external control: A growth experience. Comparative Group Studies, 2, 293-300.

Freedman, N., O'Hanlon, J., Oltman, P., & Witkin, H. A. (1972). The imprint of psychological differentiation on kinetic behavior in varying communicative contexts. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 79, 239-258.

Friedman, M. L., & Dies, R. R. (1974). Reactions of internal and external test-anxious students in counseling and behavior therapies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 921.

Fry, P. S., & Charron, P. A. (1980). Effects of cognitive style and counselor-client compatibility on client growth. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 529-533.

Gelso, C. J. (1979). Research in counseling: Methodological and

professional issues. The Counseling Psychologist, 8, 7-35.

Gelso, C.J., & Karl, N.J. (1974). Perceptions of "counselors" and other help-givers: What's in a label? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21, 243-247.

Getter, H. A. (1966). A personality determinant of verbal conditioning. Journal of Personality, 34, 397-405.

Gillis, J. S., & Jessor, R. (1973). Effects of brief psychotherapy on belief in internal control: An exploratory study. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 7, 135-137.

Gilmore, S.K. (1973). The counselor-in-training. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Glass, D. C., Lavin, D. E., Henchy, T., Gordon, A., Mayhew, P., & Donahoe, P. (1969). Obesity and persuasibility. Journal of Personality, 37, 407-414.

Goldfried, M.R. (Ed.). (1982). Converging themes in psychotherapy. New York: Springer.

Goldman-Eisler, F. (1968). Psycholinguistics: Experiments in spontaneous speech. New York: Academic Press.

Goldstein, A.P. (1971). Psychotherapeutic attraction. New York: Pergamon Press.

Goldstein, A.P., & Stein, N. (1976). Prescriptive psychotherapies. New York: Pergamon Press.

Goldstein, A. P., Heller, K., & Sechrest, L. B. (1966). Psychotherapy and the psychology of behavior change. New York: Wiley.

Goodenough, D. R. (1976). The role of individual differences in field dependence as a factor in learning and memory. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 675-694.

Goodstein, L.D., & Reinecker, V.M. (1974). Factors affecting self-disclosure: A review of the literature. In B.A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research, Vol. 7 (pp. 49-77). New York: Academic Press.

Gottman, J. M., & Markham, H.J. (1978). Experimental designs in psychotherapy research. In S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (2nd. ed.) (pp. 23-62). New York: Wiley.

Gottschalk, L.A., & Gleser, G.C. (1969). The measurement of psychological states through the context analysis of verbal behavior. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Graybill, D., & Sergeant, P. (1983). Locus of control: Perceived contingency or perceived competence. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 56, 47-54.

Greenson, R.R. (1967). The technique and practice of psychotherapy. New York: International Universities Press.

Greenacre, P. (1954). The role of transference. Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 2, 671-678.

Gregory, W.L. (1978). Locus of control for positive and negative outcomes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 840-849.

Gurman, A.S. (1977). The patient's perception of the therapeutic

relationship. In A.S. Gurman and A.M. Razin (Eds.), Effective psychotherapy: A handbook of research (pp. 503-543). New York: Pergamon Press.

Haley, J. (1976). Problem-solving therapy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harper, R.G., Wiens, A.N., & Matarazzo, J.D. (1978). Nonverbal communication: The state of the art. New York: Wiley.

Heller, K. (1968). Ambiguity in the interview interaction. In J.M. Shlien (Ed.), Research in psychotherapy: Vol. 3 (pp.242-249). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Heller, K. (1972). Interview structure and interview style in the initial interview. In A.W. Siegman and B. Pope (Eds.), Studies in dyadic communication (pp. 9-28). New York: Pergamon Press.

Heller, K., Davis, J.D., & Myers,R.A. (1966). The effects of interviewer style in a standardized interview. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 30, 501-508.

Hersch, P.D., & Scheibe, K.E. (1967). Reliability and validity of internal-external control as a personality dimensions. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 31, 609-613.

Hill, C.E. (1982). Counseling process research: Philosophical and methodological issues. The Counseling Psychologist, 10, 7-26.

Hill, C.E., Charles, D., & Reed, K.G. (1981). A longitudinal analysis of change in counseling skills during doctoral training in counseling psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 428-436.

Hill, C.E., Thames, T.B., & Rardin, D.K. (1979). Comparison of Rogers, Perls, and Ellis on the Hill Counselor Verbal Response Category System. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 198-203.

Hiroto, D.S. (1974). Learned helplessness and locus of control. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 102, 187-193.

Horowitz, L.M., Sampson, H., Siegalman, E.Y., Wolfson, A.W. & Weiss,J. (1975). On the identification of warded-off mental contents. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 84, 545-558.

Howe, E.S., & Pope, B. (1961). The dimensionality of ratings of therapist verbal responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25, 296-303.

Howe, E.S., & Pope, B. (1962). Therapist verbal activity level and diagnostic utility of patient verbal responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26, 149-155.

James, W.H., & Rotter, J.B. (1958). Partial and 100 percent reinforcement under chance and skill conditions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 55, 397-403.

Joe, V.C. (1971). Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable. Psychological Reports, 28, 619-640.

Jones, S.C., & Schrauger, J.S. (1968). Locus of control and interpersonal evaluations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 664-668.

Kanfer, F.H. (1958a). Effect of a warning signal preceding a noxious stimulus on verbal rate and heart rate. Journal of

Experimental Psychology, 55, 73-80.

Kanfer, F.H. (1958b). Supplementary report: Stability of a verbal rate change in experimental anxiety. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 56, 182.

Kaplan, F. (1966). Effects of anxiety and defense in a therapy-like situation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 71, 449-458.

Karp, S.A. (1977). Psychological differentiation. In T. Blass (Ed.), Personality variables in social behavior (pp. 135-178). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Karp, S.A., Kissin, B., & Hustmeyer, F.E. (1970). Field-dependence as a predictor of alcoholic therapy dropouts. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 150, 77-83.

Kasl, S.V., & Mahl, G.F. (1965). The relationship of disturbances and hesitations in spontaneous speech to anxiety. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 425-433.

Keenan, A. (1978). Selection interview performance and intolerance of ambiguity. Psychological Reports, 42, 353-354.

Kelly, K.R., & Stone, G.L. (1982). Effects of time limits on the interview behavior of type A and type B persons within a brief counseling analog. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 454-459.

Kenny, D.T. (1961). A theoretical and research appraisal of stimulus factors in the TAT. In J. Kagan and G.S. Lesser (Eds.), Contemporary issues in thematic apperceptive methods

(pp.288-308). Springfield: Thomas.

Kenny, D.T. (1954). Transference indices, extent of personality factors in fantasy responses, and the ambiguity of TAT cards. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 345-348.

Kerlinger, F.N., & Pedhazur, E.J. (1973). Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Kiesler, D.J. (1966). Some myths of psychotherapy research and the search for a paradigm. Psychological Bulletin, 65, 110-136.

Kiesler, D.J. (1971). Experimental designs in psychotherapy research. In A.E. Bergin & S.L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (pp. 36-74). New York: Wiley.

Kilmann, P.R., & Howell, R.J. (1974). Effects of structure of marathon group therapy and locus of control on therapeutic outcome. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 912.

Kilmann, P.R., & Sotile, W.M. (1976). The effects of structured and unstructured leader roles on internal and external group participants. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 32, 848-863.

Kilmann, P.R., Albert, B.M., & Sotile, W.M. (1975). The relationship between locus of control, structure of therapy, and outcome. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 912.

Kilmann, P.R., Scovern, A.W., & Moreault, D. (1979). Factors in the patient-therapist interaction and outcome: A review of the

literature. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 20, 132-146.

Kirscht, J.P. (1974). Perceptions of control and health beliefs. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 4, 225-237.

Klopfer, W.G., & Taulbee, E.S. (1976). Projective tests. Annual Review of Psychology, 27, 543-567.

Konstadt, V., & Forman, E. (1965). Field-dependence and external directedness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 490-493.

Korchin, S.J. (1976). Modern clinical psychology. New York: Basic Books.

Krumboltz, J.D. (Ed.) (1966). Revolution in counseling: Implications of behavioral science. Boston, Mass.: Houghton, Mifflin.

Kumpf, M., & Gotz-Marchand, B. (1973). Reduction of cognitive dissonance as a function of magnitude of dissonance, differentiation, and self-esteem. European Journal of Social Psychology, 3, 255-270.

LaCrosse, M.B. (1977). Comparative perceptions of counselor behavior: A replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 464-471.

Laird, J.D., & Berglas, S. (1975). Individual differences in the effects of engaging in counter-attitudinal behavior. Journal of Personality, 43, 286-304.

Lang, P.J. (1971). The application of psychophysiological methods to the study of psychotherapy and behavior change. In A.E.

Bergin and S.L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (pp. 75-125). New York: Wiley.

Leary, M., & Altmaier, E. (1980). Type I error in counseling research: A plea for multivariate analyses. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 611-615.

Lefcourt, H.M. (1966). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 65, 206-220.

Lefcourt, H.M. (1967). Effects of cue explication upon persons maintaining external control expectancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 372-378.

Lefcourt, H.M. (1976). Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lefcourt, H.M. (Ed.) (1981). Research with the locus of control construct: Vol 1. Assessment methods. New York: Academic Press.

Lefcourt, H.M. (1982). Locus of control; Current trends in theory and research (2nd. ed.). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lefcourt, H.M., & Wine, J. (1969). Internal versus external control of reinforcement and the development of attention in experimental situations. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1, 167-181.

Lefcourt, H.M., Antrobus, P., & Hogg, E. (1974). Humor response and humor production as a function of locus of control, field dependence, and type of reinforcement. Journal of Personality, 42, 632-651.

Lefcourt, H.M., Lewis, L., & Silverman, I.W. (1968). Internal versus external control of reinforcement and alteration in a decision-making task. Journal of Personality, 36, 663-682.

Lefcourt,. H.M., Sordoni, C., & Sordoni, C. (1974). Locus of control and the expression of humor. Journal of Personality, 42, 130-143.

Lennard, H.L. & Bernstein, A. (1960). The anatomy of psychotherapy. New York: Columbia University Press.

Levenson, H. (1975). Additional dimensions of internal-external control. Journal of Social Psychology, 97, 303-304.

Levenson, H. (1974). Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. Journal of Personality Assessment, 38, 377-383.

Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 397-404.

Linton, H.B. (1955). Dependence on external influence: correlates in perception, attitudes, and judgement. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 502-507.

Linton, H., & Graham, E. (1959). Personality correlates of persuasibility. In C.I. Hovland & I.Janis (Eds.), Personality and persuasibility (pp. 69-101). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lindzey, G. (1961). Projective techniques and cross-cultural research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lorr, M. (1965). Client perceptions of therapists: A study of the therapeutic relation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 146-149.

MacDonald, A.P. (1973). Internal-external locus of control. In J.P. Robinson & P.R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes (pp. 169-242). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Mahrer, A.R., & Nadler, W.P. (1986). Good moments in psychotherapy: A preliminary review, a list, and some promising research avenues. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 10-15.

MaJumber, R.K., Greever, K.B., Holt, P.R., & Friedland, B.V. (1973). Counseling techniques tested: Field study shows effective internal-external counseling. Journal of Rehabilitation, 39, 19-22.

Malkiewich, L.E., & Merluzzi, T.V. (1980). Rational restructuring versus desensitization with clients of diverse conceptual levels: A test of a client-treatment matching model. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 453-461.

Manuck, S.B., Henrihsen, J.J., & Ross, E.O. (1975). Life stress, locus of control, and state and trait anxiety. Psychological Reports, 36, 413.

Manaugh, T.S., Wiens, A.N., & Matarazzo, J.D. (1970). Content saliency and interviewee speech behavior. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 26, 17-24.

Marino, D.R., Fitzgibbons, D.J., & Mirabile, C.S. (1970). Attention deployment in field dependence and autokinetic movement. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 31, 155-158.

Masters, J.C. (1970). Treatment of "adolescent rebellion" by the reconstrual of stimuli. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 35, 213-216.

Matarazzo, J.D., & Wiens, A.N. (1972). The Interview: Research on its anatomy and structure. Chicago: Aldine.

Matarazzo, J.D., Wiens, A.N., Matarazzo, R.G., & Saslow, G. (1968). Speech and silence behavior in clinical psychotherapy and its laboratory correlates. In J.M. Shlien (Ed.), Research in psychotherapy (pp. 347-394). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Mausner, B. & Graham, J. (1970). Field dependence and prior reinforcement as determinants of social interaction in judgement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 486-493.

McCarrey, M.W., Dayhaw, L.T., & Chagnon, G.P. (1971). Attitude shift, approval need, and extent of psychological differentiation. Journal of Social Psychology, 84, 141-149.

Messick, S. & Damarin, F. (1964). Cognitive styles and memory for faces. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 69, 313-318.

Milgram, S. Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. Human Relations, 18, 57-76.

Morrow-Bradley, C., & Elliott, R. (1986). Utilization of psychotherapy research by practicing psychotherapists. American Psychologist, 41, 188-197.

Murphy, D.F. (1966). Sensory deprivation suggestion, field dependence, and perceptual regression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 289-294.

Murray, D.C. (1971). Talk, silence, and anxiety. Psychological Bulletin, 75, 244-260.

Murstein, B.I. (1966). Sex differences in TAT ambiguity, hostility, and projection. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 103, 71-80.

Murstein, B.I. (1963). Theory and research in projective techniques: emphasizing the TAT. New York: Wiley.

Nisbett, R.E. Interaction versus main effects as goals of personality research. In D. Magnusson and N.S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology (pp. 235-241). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Nowicki, S., & Barnes, J. (1973). Effects of a structured camp experience on locus of control orientation. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 122, 247-252.

Nowicki, S., Bonner, J., & Feather, B. (1972). Effects of locus of control and differential analogue interview procedures on the perceived therapeutic relationship. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 38, 434-438.

O'Leary, M.R., Donovan, D.M., & O'Leary, D.E. (1976). Changes in perceived and experienced control among inpatient alcoholics. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 32, 500-504.

O'Leary, M.R., Donovan, D.M., Hague, W.H., & Shea, R.A. (1975). Shifts in component factors of locus of control as a function of treatment in male alcoholics. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31, 359-361.

Oltman, P.K., Goodenough, D.R., Witkin, H.A., Freedman, N., & Friedman, F. (1975). Psychological differentiation as a factor in conflict resolution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 730-736.

Paulhus, D., & Christie, R. (1981). Spheres of control: An interactionist approach to assessment of perceived control. In H.M. Lefcourt (Ed.), Research with the locus of control construct. Vol. 1. Assessment methods (pp. 161-189). New York: Academic Press.

Pardes, H., Papernik, D.S., & Winston, A. (1974). Field differentiation in inpatient psychotherapy. Archives of General Psychiatry, 31, 311-315.

Parloff, M.B., Waskow, I.E., & Wolfe, B.E. (1978). Research on therapist variables in relation to process and outcome. In S.L. Garfield and A.E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (2nd. ed.) (pp. 233-282). New York: Wiley.

Paul, G.L. (1967). Strategy of outcome research in psychotherapy.

Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, 104-118.

Phares, E.J. (1976). Locus of control in personality. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Phares, E.J., & Lamiell, J.T. (1974). Relationship of internal-external control to defensive preferences. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 23-38.

Phares, E.J., & Wilson, K.G. (1972). Responsibility attribution: role of outcome severity, situational ambiguity, and internal-external control. Journal of Personality, 40, 392-406.

Pierce, R.M., Schauble, P.G., & Farkas, A. (1970). Teaching internalization behavior to clients. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 7, 217-220.

Pope, B. (1979). The mental health interview: research and application. New York: Pergamon Press.

Pope, B., & Siegman, A.W. (1962) The effect of therapist verbal activity level and specificity on patient productivity and speech disturbance in the initial interview. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26, 489.

Pope, B., & Siegman, A.W. (1965). Interviewer specificity and topical focus in relation to interviewee productivity. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 4, 188-192.

Pope, B., & Siegman, A.W. (1968). Interviewer warmth in relation to interviewee verbal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 588-595.

Pope, B., & Siegman, A.W. (1972). Relationship and verbal

behavior in the initial interview. In A.W. Siegman and B. Pope (Eds.), Studies in dyadic communication (pp. 69-89). New York: Pergamon Press.

Pope, B., Blass, T., Cheek, J., Siegman, A.W., & Bradford, N.H. (1971). Interviewer specificity in seminaturalistic interviews. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36, 152.

Posthuma, A.B., & Carr, J.E. (1975). Differentiation matching in psychotherapy. Canadian Psychological Review, 16, 35-43.

Reid, W.H. (1980). Basic intensive psychotherapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Ritchie, E., & Phares, E.J. (1969). Attitude change as a function of internal-external locus of control and communicator status. Journal of Personality, 37, 429-443.

Rogers, C.R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 95-103.

Rogers, C.R. (1961). On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Rogers, J.M. (1960). Operant conditioning in a quasi-therapy setting. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60, 247-252.

Rosner, S. (1957). Consistency in response to group pressures. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 55, 145-146.

Rotter, J.B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement, Psychological Monographs, 80, (1, whole no. 609).

Rotter, J.B. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 56-67.

Rotter, J.B., Chance, J.E., & Phares, E.J. (1972). Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Ruble, D.N., & Nakamura, C.Y. (1972). Task orientation versus social orientation in young children and their attention to relevant social cues. Child Development, 43, 471-480.

Russakoff, L.M., Fontana, A.F., Dowds, B.N., & Harris, M. (1976). Psychological differentiation and psychotherapy. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 163, 329-333.

Russel, P.D., & Snyder, W.U. (1963). Counselor anxiety in relation to amount of clinical experience and quality of affect demonstrated by clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 358-363.

Russell, R.L., & Trull, T.J. (1986). Sequential analysis of language variables in psychotherapy process research. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 16-21.

Ryckman, R.M., Rodda, W.C., & Sherman, M.F. (1972). Locus of control and expertise relevance as determinants of changes in

opinion about student activism. Journal of Social Psychology, 88, 107-114.

Saltzman, C., Luetgert, M.J., Roth, C.H., Creaser, J., & Howard, L. (1976). Formation of a therapeutic relationship: Experiences during the initial phase of psychotherapy as predictors of treatment duration and outcome. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 546-555.

Schmidt, L.D., & Strong, S.R. (1970). "Expert" and "inexpert" counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 115-118.

Segal, S.J., & Barr, H.L. (1969). Effect of instructions on phi phenomenon, criterion task of "tolerance for unrealistic experiences". Perceptual and Motor Skills, 29, 483-486.

Sherman, S.J. (1973). Internal-external control and its relationship to attitude change under different social influence techniques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 23-29.

Sloane, R.B., Staples, F.R., Cristol, A.H., Yorkston, N.J., & Whipple, K.C. (1975). Psychotherapy versus behavior therapy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Siegman, A.W. (1972). Do interviewer mm-hmm's reinforce interviewee verbal productivity? Proceedings of the 80th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, 8, 559-560.

Siegman, A.W. (1978). The meaning of silent pauses in the initial interview. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 166, 642-

654.

Siegman, A.W. (1979a). Review of interview research. In G.V. Balls (Ed.), Psychiatric foundations of medecine (pp. 481-530). Woburn, Mass.: Butterworth.

Siegman, A.W. (1979b). On cognition and hesitation in speech. In A.W. Siegman & S. Feldstein (Eds.), Of speech and time: Temporal speech patterns in interpersonal contexts (pp. 151-178). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Siegman, A.W., & Pope, B. (1962). An empirical scale for the measurement of therapist specificity in the initial interview. Psychological Reports, 11, 515-520.

Siegman, A.W., & Pope, B. (1965). Effects of question specificity and anxiety arousing messages on verbal fluency in the initial interview. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 522-530.

Siegman, A. W., & Pope, B. (1966a). The effect of interviewee ambiguity-specificity and topical focus on interviewee vocabulary diversity. Language and Speech, 9, 242-249.

Siegman, A. W., & Pope, B. (1966b). Ambiguity and verbal fluency in the TAT. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 30, 239-245.

Siegman, A.W., & Pope, B. (1972). The effects of ambiguity and anxiety on interviewee verbal behavior. In A.W. Siegman & B. Pope (Eds.), Studies in dyadic communication (pp. 29-65). New York: Pergamon Press.

Smith. E.E. (1957). The effects of clear and unclear role

expectations on group productivity and defensiveness. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 213-217.

Smith, R.E. (1970). Changes in locus of control as a function of life crisis resolution. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 75, 329-332.

Solar, D., Davenport, G., & Bruehl, D. (1969). Social compliance as a function of field dependence. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 29, 299-306.

Spielberger, C.D. (Ed.). (1974). Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research. Vol.1. New York: Academic.

Spielberger, C.D. (1983). Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Stein, M.I. (1978). Thematic apperception test and related methods. In B.B. Wolman (Ed.), Clinical diagnosis of mental disorders. New York: Plenum Press.

Stein, M.L., & Stone, G.L. (1978). Effects of conceptual level and structure on initial interview behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 96-102.

Steingart, I., Freedman, N., Grande, S., & Buchwald, C. (1975). Personality organization and language behavior: The imprint of psychological differentiation on language behavior in varying communication conditions. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 4, 241-255.

Stiles, W. B., Shapiro, D. A., & Elliott, R. (1986). "Are all psychotherapies equivalent?" American Psychologist, 41, 165-

180.

Stone, G.L. (1984). Reaction: In defense of the "artificial". Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, 108-110.

Straham, R., & Huth, H. (1975). Relations between Embedded Figures Test performance and dimensions of the I-E scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 39, 5.

Strickland, B.R. (1979). Individual differences in verbal conditioning, extinction, and awareness. Journal of Personality, 38, 364-378.

Strickland, B.R. (1977). Internal-external control of reinforcement. In T. Blass (Ed.), Personality variables in social behavior (pp. 219-278). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

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

Strong, S.R. (1978). Social psychological approach to psychotherapy research. In S.L. Garfield and A.E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (2nd. ed.) (pp. 101-135). New York: Wiley.

Strong, S.R., & Dixon, D.N. (1971). Expertness, attractiveness, and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 25-37.

Strong, S.R., & Matross, R.P. (1973). Change process in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 25-37.

Strong, S.R., Hendel, D.D., & Bratton, J.C. (1971). College

students' views of campus helper-givers: Counselors, advisers, and psychiatrists. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 234-238.

Strupp, H.H. (1978). Psychotherapy research and practice: An overview. In S.L. Garfield & A.E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (2nd. ed.) (pp.3-23). New York: Wiley.

Strupp, H.H. (1977). A reformulation of the dynamics of the therapists's contribution. In A.S. Gurman & A.M. Razin (Eds.), Effective psychotherapy: A handbook of research (pp.3-22). New York: Pergamon Press.

Strupp, H.H., & Bergin, A.E. (1969).Some empirical and conceptual bases for a coordinated research in psychotherapy: A critical review of issues, trends, and evidence. International Journal of Psychiatry, 7, 18-20.

Thibaut, J.W., & Kelley, H.H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley.

Throop, W.F., & MacDonald, A.P. (1971). Internal-external locus of control: A bibliography. Psychological Reports, 28, 175-190.

Tinsley, H. E., & Harris, D.J. (1976). Client expectations for counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 197-201.

Truax, C.B., & Mitchell, K.M. (1971). Research on certain therapist interpersonal skills in relation to process and outcome. In A.E. Bergin and S.L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change (pp. 299-344). New York:

Wiley.

Truax, C.B., & Carkhuff, R.R. (1965). Client and therapist transparency in the psychotherapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12, 3-9.

Truax, C.B. & Carkhuff, R.R. (1965). Client and therapist transparency in the therapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12, 3-9.

Tseng, M.S. (1970). Locus of control as a determinant of job proficiency, employability, and training satisfaction of vocational rehabilitation clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 487-491.

Wachman, R.N. (1964). The study of social influence: A methodological evaluation. Bard Psychology Journal, 3, 3-25.

Wallston, K.A., Wallston, B.S., & De Vellis, R. (1978). Development of the multidimensional health locus of control (MHLC) scales. Health Education Monographs, 6, 160-170.

Witkin, H.A. (1965). Psychological differentiation and forms of pathology. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 70, 317-336.

Witkin, H.A., & Berry, J.W. (1975). Psychological differentiation in cross-cutural perspective. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 6, 4-87.

Witkin, H.A., & Goodenough, D.R. (1977). Field dependence and interpersonal behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 661-689.

Witkin, H.A., & Goodenough, D.R. (1980). Cognitve styles, essence and origins: Field dependence and field independence. New

York :International Universities Press.

Witkin, H.A., Goodenough, D.R., & Oltman, P.K. (1979). Psychological differentiation: Current status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1127-1145.

Witkin, H.A., Lewis, H.B., & Weil, E. (1968). Affective reactions and patient-therapist interactions among more differentiated and less differentiated patients early in therapy. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 146, 193-208.

Witkin, H.A., Dyk, R.B., Faterson, H.F., Goodenough, D.R., & Karp, S.A. (1962). Psychological differentiation. New York: Wiley.

Witkin, H.A., Moore, C.A., Goodenough, D.R., & Cox, P.W. (1977). Field-dependent and field-independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. Review of Educational Research, 47, 1-64.

Witkin, H.A., Oltman, P.K., Raskin, E., & Karp, S.A. (1971). Manual for the Group Embedded Figures Test. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Wolk, S., & DuCette, J. (1974). Intentional performance and incidental learning as a function of personality and task dimensions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 90-101.

Yalom, J.D. (1980). Existential Psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for training interviewers.

ROLE 1: HIGH STRUCTURE FORMAT

The main feature of a structured format is that the interviewer helps the interviewee decide the direction and content of the interview. This means that specific probes, leads, and questions are necessary. The interviewer structures the interview from the very beginning by determining specific areas that the client may talk about.

The interviewer's role is that of providing specific, concrete cues and suggestions relative to the direction and content of the interview. The interviewer facilitates the client's speech with specific questions, probes, comments, and leads. He may choose from the following examples:

1) "Tell me more about (specific subject)."
2) Could you elaborate (explain, give some details about) _____."
3) "Why don't you expand (elaborate, etc.) on how you felt (behaved, reacted, decided to) when (at the time of) _____."
4) "I'd like to hear a little more about _____."
5) Clarification of content: the interviewer submits a synthesis of what the client intended.
   "Are you saying that _____?"
   "It sounds to me like you _____."
6) Reflection of feelings:
   "You felt _____ because _____."
7) The interviewer makes and states inferences from what he heard.
   "It sounds to me like you _____."

8) The interviewer asks for specific factual information through questions that are both open-ended as well as close-ended.

"Do you like your teachers?"

"What were some of your best courses?"

"Do you have some ideas of what to do with your education?"

The following are some typical interactional sequences of a high structure interview.

(a) At the beginning:

Ier: "As you probably know, the purpose of this interview is to get an idea of your experiences and feelings about cegep. Almost anything you say to me about them will be relevant and useful. Perhaps we could start by talking about your expectations before you came to Dawson. Later on we may want to focus on some present feelings and past experiences."

Iee: (Implies consent)

Ier: "OK. What were some of your expectations prior to coming here to college?"

If the client does not imply consent (re: expectations) the interviewer asks the client what it is that he might want to start with.

Ier: "It sounds as if you have some other things you'd prefer to start with. What might these be?"

Iee: (responds)

Ier: "OK. That's fine with me. Why don't you start with your ideas on _____."

(b) After the interview gets off on this note, the interviewee can explore a number of issues relative to his "expectations".

(c) During the interview:

The interviewer is attentive, relaxed and puts the client at ease. He conveys understanding and appreciation for what is being said. He responds appropriately and does not interrupt in a disruptive way. He tries to be smooth and flowing thereby going from mood to mood or topic to topic in a natural way that parallels what is happening in the interview (i.e. He does not have a particular script).

(d) If or when the client comes to the end of a particular sequence and appears to have run out of things to say, the interviewer can redirect the focus on to something that the client touched on already or can direct the client into a new area.

Iee: (silence indicating end of a sequence)

Ier: "(Client's name), you mentioned earlier that you (_____) I wonder if you could elaborate a little more on that?"

OR

Ier: "(Client's name), now that you talked somewhat about (_____) maybe you could tell me a little about (_____)."

(e) It is important that if the client should ask for structure in the form of:

Iee: "What is it that I'm supposed to be doing?" or "I'm not really sure what this is all about."

that the interviewer be ready to provide guidelines such as:

Ier: "Your task is to talk about yourself in a way that I can get to know you a little better."

OR

Ier: "We're gathering information on the experiences of recent cegep students. As part of that project we will be interviewing a number of them to find out what cegep students are really like."

ROLE 2: LOW STRUCTURE FORMAT

The main feature of the low structure format is that the client must decide for himself the direction and content of the interview. This means that the interviewer avoids specific probes, direct questioning, or suggestions. The interviewer's only form of structuring is to communicate at the very beginning and throughout the interview that the client is free to bring up whatever topic or material he wishes.

The interviewer uses familiar techniques such as restatement, paraphrasing, etc... but these are phrased in such a way that they reflect only what the client has said. The interviewer is therefore to avoid giving cues or direction about what the client may introduce or explore. When a client is having difficulty maintaining a verbal flow, the interviewer cues the client only in extremely broad and general terms.

This role presents the interviewer as a warm, accepting listener. He encourages the client to take responsibility for what to talk about and may do so using some of the following:

1) "I see ... "
2) " Go on."
3) "... and then ... "
4) "Yes ..."
5) "Keep going."
6) Silence with appropriate non-verbal cues like smiling or head-nodding

to communicate readiness to listen.

7) Restatement such as:

Iee: "I was really pleased to receive that letter."

Ier: "You were pleased ."

OR

Iee: "After I hung up a funny feeling came over me."

Ier: "... a funny feeling ..."

OR

Restating the whole statement with changes in pronouns.

8) Pointing to a feeling without further comment.

"You sound a little (confused, angry, happy, etc...)

OR

"I'm hearing a lot of (anger, fear, satisfaction, etc...) in that statement."

The following are some typical sequences of a low structure format.

At the beginning:

(a) Ier: "As you probably know the purpose of this interview is to get an idea of your experiences at cegep. Almost anything you tell me will be relevant and useful. Talk about yourself in any way you like. Tell me whatever you think is interesting about your experiences."

Some individuals will have difficulty getting started and will ask for more guidance. The interviewer repeats his intructions perhaps by including a little encouragement.

Ier: "Of course it's always difficult getting started. Simply tell me anything you think is important in my getting more understanding of your situation."

If the client continues to have difficulty getting started, the interviewer may make some general comments:

Ier: "Begin with what you think is important."

OR

Ier: "Maybe you could begin by describing your reactions to cegep."

(This one is reserved when all else fails)

(b) Whenever the client seeks further guidance during the interview, the interviewer makes suggestions in general, open-ended ways.

Ier: "A while ago you mentioned _____ " followed by silence and an expectant look.

If the client cannot connect with so vague a statement he may elaborate such as:

Ier: "Well a while ago you mentioned _____".

Iee: Silence or "What do you mean?"

Ier: "I'm just wondering what significance _____.has for you?"

(c) During the interview:

The interviewer is attentive, relaxed and puts the client at ease. He communicates verbally and non-verbally a readiness to listen. He conveys the message: "What you have to say is important. My task is to facilitate your talking to me." Thus periods of comfortable silence are to be broken by the client. When silences are lengthy and are a barrier to communication, the interviewer breaks the silence with general comments or probes such as:

Ier: "It's sometimes difficult to talk at length about oneself."

OR

"Sometimes it's important to have some time to organize one's thinking ... just tell me things as they occur to you."

OR

"I'm wondering what you may be thinking about?"

If these are too general for the client, the interviewer may focus only on a previously discussed subject.

Ier: "I'm just thinking back on what you said about _____."

This is followed by some silence. If the interviewee is not quick to respond, the interviewer follows with:

"Maybe you would like to talk a little about that."

OR

"Perhaps you could elaborate on some aspects that you've mentioned earlier.

(d) Throughout the interview the interviewer conveys appreciation and understanding for what is being said. The interviewer attempt to have a smooth, flowing style that parallels both the content and the mood of the interview. He uses reflective statements frequently and avoids direct questioning.

APPENDIX B

I, P, and C, Locus of Control Scale.

OPINIONNAIRE

NAME: _____

DATE OF BIRTH: _____

TODAY'S DATE: _____

This questionnaire presents a number of statements. Each statement represents a commonly held opinion and therefore there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably agree with some items and disagree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully, then show the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by circling the number that corresponds to your level of agreement. The numbers listed below represent these different levels.

1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE
2 = SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
3 = SLIGHTLY DISAGREE
4 = SLIGHTLY AGREE
5 = SOMEWHAT AGREE
6 = STRONGLY AGREE

1.	Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2.	To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3.	I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4.	Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good a driver I am.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5.	When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6.	Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interest from bad luck happenings.	1 2 3 4 5 6

7.	When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8.	Although I might have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9.	How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10.	I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11.	My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12.	Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13.	People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14.	It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15.	Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16.	Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17.	If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18.	I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.	1 2 3 4 5 6
19.	I am usually able to protect my personal interests.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20.	Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on the other driver.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21.	When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22.	In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.	1 2 3 4 5 6

23. My life is determined by my own actions. 1 2 3 4 5 6

24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Check you answer sheet to make sure you have not skipped any numbers.

APPENDIX C

The A-State Anxiety Inventory.

INTERVIEW REACTION REPORT

Think of the interview you have just completed. Read each of the following statements and then circle the appropriate number to the right that best indicates how you felt during the session.

Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe your reaction best.

		NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAT	MODERATELY	VERY MUCH
1.	I felt calm	1	2	3	4
2.	I felt secure	1	2	3	4
3.	I was tense	1	2	3	4
4.	I was regretful	1	2	3	4
5.	I felt at ease	1	2	3	4
6.	I felt upset	1	2	3	4
7.	I was presently worrying over possible misfortunes	1	2	3	4
8.	I felt rested	1	2	3	4
9.	I felt anxious	1	2	3	4
10.	I felt comfortable	1	2	3	4
11.	I felt self-confident	1	2	3	4
12.	I felt nervous	1	2	3	4
13.	I was jittery	1	2	3	4
14.	I felt "high strung"	1	2	3	4
15.	I was relaxed	1	2	3	4
16.	I felt content	1	2	3	4
17.	I was worried	1	2	3	4
18.	I felt over-excited and "rattled"	1	2	3	4
19.	I felt joyful	1	2	3	4
20.	I felt pleasant	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX D

Counselor Rating Form - Short Version.

Interview Reaction Form

NAME: _____

DATE OF BIRTH: _____

TODAY'S DATE: _____

On the following page are listed a number of characteristics. Each characteristic is followed by a seven-point scale that ranges from "not very" to "very". Please mark an "X" at the point on the scale that best represents how you viewed the interviewer. For example:

FUNNY

not very X : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : very

WELL DRESSED

not very _ : __ : __ : __ : X : __ : __ : very

These ratings might show that the interviewer did not joke around much, but was dressed well.

Though all of the following characteristics are desirable of an interviewer, we feel that interviewers often differ in the extent to which they demonstrate these characteristics. We are interested in knowing how you see these differences.

Remember to base your response on how you saw the person who interviewed you and not on how the interviewer should have been.

1. FRIENDLY

not very __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : very

2. LIKEABLE

not very __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : very

3. SOCIABLE

not very __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : very

4. WARM

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

5. EXPERIENCED

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

6. EXPERT

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

7. PREPARED

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

8. SKILLFUL

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

9. HONEST

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

10. RELIABLE

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

11. SINCERE

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

12. TRUSTWORTHY

not very ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : very

APPENDIX E

Intercorrelation matrices for high structure, low structure, and combined groups.

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDEPENDENT AND CRITERION VARIABLES (LOW STRUCTURE GROUP)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13	14.	15.	16.
1. GROUP EMBEDDED FIGURES TEST	1.00	-.15	-.04	-.35	-.05	-.20	.12	.06	-.27	.09	.37	.01	.36	-.03	.02	.30
2. LOCUS OF CONTROL (I SCALE)		1.00	.30	-.13	-.30	-.24	-.05	-.22	-.29	.42	-.11	-.33	-.14	.09	.14	-.02
3. LOCUS OF CONTROL (P SCALE)			1.00	.27	-.23	-.05	.34	-.36	.01	.17	-.24	-.18	-.13	.00	.01	-.08
4. LOCUS OF CONTROL (C SCALE)				1.00	.07	.09	-.15	-.28	-.00	.01	-.22	.03	-.06	.15	-.08	-.12
5. TALK-TIME					1.00	.55	-.51	.39	.52	-.87	.03	.30	-.03	-.54	.09	-.06
6. TOTAL NUMBER OF WORDS						1.00	-.60	.71	.85	-.69	-.07	.26	.05	-.50	-.01	.45
7. REACTION TIME							1.00	-.27	-.57	.47	.01	-.54	-.14	.15	-.01	-.25
8. MEAN WORDS PER RESPONSE								1.00	.50	-.61	.08	-.02	.09	-.38	-.08	.51
9. RATE OF SPEECH									1.00	-.59	-.10	.31	.11	-.65	-.14	.17
10. AVERAGE PAUSE TIME										1.00	-.02	-.21	.01	.46	-.03	-.06
11. ATTRACTIVENESS											1.00	.24	.48	.18	.17	.08
12. EXPERTNESS												1.00	.27	-.19	.28	-.03
13. TRUSTWORTHINESS													1.00	-.24	-.28	.06
14. STATE ANXIETY														1.00	.16	-.04
15. SELF-REFERENCING (POSITIVE)															1.00	-.02
16. SELF-REFERENCING (NEGATIVE)																1.00

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDEPENDENT AND CRITERION VARIABLES (HIGH STRUCTURE GROUP)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13	14.	15.	16.
1. GROUP EMBEDDED FIGURES TEST	1.00	.40	.17	-.17	-.24	.06	.01	.34	-.08	.22	.05	.12	-.08	.10	.06	.02
2. LOCUS OF CONTROL (I SCALE)		1.00	.50	-.06	-.26	-.07	.02	.01	-.12	.15	.16	.26	.01	.16	.38	-.65
3. LOCUS OF CONTROL (P SCALE)			1.00	.47	-.01	.37	-.24	.15	.19	-.05	-.15	.08	-.17	-.26	-.37	-.21
4. LOCUS OF CONTROL (C SCALE)				1.00	.04	.15	-.22	.07	.13	.06	-.37	-.08	.07	-.36	.09	-.06
5. TALK-TIME					1.00	.50	-.25	.42	.49	-.79	.13	.18	.02	-.19	.19	.35
6. TOTAL NUMBER OF WORDS						1.00	-.38	.76	.86	-.67	-.12	-.02	.03	-.10	.33	.16
7. REACTION TIME							1.00	-.09	-.53	.21	-.11	-.12	.03	-.21	.07	-.10
8. MEAN WORDS PER RESPONSE								1.00	.45	-.36	.01	-.00	.17	.01	.18	.13
9. RATE OF SPEECH									1.00	-.71	-.08	.02	.07	.25	.25	.17
10. AVERAGE PAUSE TIME										1.00	-.13	-.16	-.21	.18	-.33	-.29
11. ATTRACTIVENESS											1.00	.73	.61	.15	.03	.05
12. EXPERTNESS												1.00	.48	.10	.21	-.13
13. TRUSTWORTHINESS													1.00	-.08	.14	.02
14. STATE ANXIETY														1.00	-.17	-.28
15. SELF-REFERENCING (POSITIVE)															1.00	-.30
16. SELF-REFERENCING (NEGATIVE)																1.00

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDEPENDENT AND CRITERION VARIABLES (COMBINED GROUPS)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13	14.	15.	16.
1. GROUP EMBEDDED FIGURES TEST	1.00	.19	.08	-.26	-.24	-.06	.05	.21	-.16	.11	.17	.08	.10	. 4	.04	.09
2. LOCUS OF CONTROL (I SCALE)		1.00	.48	-.03	-.26	-.10	-.00	-.33	-.54	.26	.08	-.07	-.03	.14	.33	-.47
3. LOCUS OF CONTROL (P SCALE)			1.00	.39	.13	.19	-.10	.00	.09	.17	-.17	-.00	-.15	-.13	.26	-.26
4. LOCUS OF CONTROL (C SCALE)				1.00	.07	.12	-.24	-.08	-.24	.09	-.26	-.03	.07	-.07	-.19	.00
5. TALK-TIME					1.00	.52	-.37	.41	.50	-.81	.09	.23	-.02	-.37	.14	.19
6. TOTAL NUMBER OF WORDS						1.00	-.46	.73	.85	-.55	-.09	.09	.08	-.28	.18	.23
7. REACTION TIME							1.00	-.22	-.50	.13	-.08	-.29	-.04	-.06	-.07	-.15
8. MEAN WORDS PER RESPONSE								1.00	.46	-.38	.04	-.00	.13	-.16	-.09	.24
9. RATE OF SPEECH									1.00	-.53	-.09	.14	.08	-.31	.08	.22
10. AVERAGE PAUSE TIME										1.00	-.03	-.14	-.05	.33	-.03	-.10
11. ATTRACTIVENESS											1.00	.55	.56	.16	.09	.06
12. EXPERTNESS												1.00	.39	-.02	.25	-.10
13. TRUSTWORTHINESS													1.00	-.15	-.03	.03
14. STATE ANXIETY														1.00	-.00	-.13
15. SELF-REFERENCING (POSITIVE)															1.00	-.02
16. SELF-REFERENCING (NEGATIVE)																1.00