

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Alison Mascolo entitled "Effects of Legitimate and Coercive Power on Supervisor's Influence of Counselors' Acceptance of Negative Feedback." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Education.

Naomi M. Meara
Naomi M. Meara, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Lawrence A. Little

Kenneth R. White

Priscilla White

Accepted for the Council:

Lawminkel
The Graduate School

EFFECTS OF LEGITIMATE AND COERCIVE POWER ON SUPERVISOR'S
INFLUENCE OF COUNSELORS' ACCEPTANCE
OF NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Alison Mascalo

March 1984

DEDICATION

To my parents, for all they have done and for all they
have given.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the many individuals who helped make possible the completion of this project. To Dr. Naomi M. Meara, my committee chairwoman, I extend heartfelt thanks and appreciation for her excellent guidance with respect to the development and presentation of this research. I selected Naomi as my major professor because of the high regard I hold for her exemplary professional and academic standards. Although meeting those standards was frustrating sometimes, hindsight enables me to appreciate all that I have learned from the task. To my other committee members, Dr. Lawrence M. DeRidder, Kenneth R. Newton, and Priscilla N. White, I also express gratitude for their suggestions, knowledge, and support. To Priscilla, I offer additional thanks for her unflagging encouragement and praise which helped to keep me going during the roughest times. Although not a member of my committee, Dr. Mark Hector also deserves special thanks and appreciation for his assistance with the design of this research. His comments proved to be invaluable in the construction of the methodology for this study.

I would like to recognize several other individuals who assisted me in this research endeavor. Dr. P. Gary Klukken and Scott Anderson worked hard to perfect their respective roles as supervisor and trainee. The many hours they contributed, as well as their friendship, are appreciated deeply. J. J. Johnson of the

Educational Media Center provided technical expertise in the editing and duplication of the supervision videotape. Paul Wright, my computer consultant, contributed excellent assistance with my data analysis. Drs. Bob McBrien and John Zweig, my good friends and former colleagues, deserve special thanks for their recruitment of subjects for both the pilot procedures and final study. I also extend my gratitude to the many men and women who served as judges or subjects for this research.

The friendship of many people meant a great deal to me as I worked on this project. I wish to thank the UT counseling center staff for the use of the center's rooms and equipment, as well as for giving me "a place to hang my hat." I also thank Carrie Jo Johnson, Betty Noble, Dr. Carolyn Patton, Dr. Liz Wyman, and Damarius Young for their continual support, humor, and encouragement, and for always making me feel welcome each time I returned to Knoxville.

I also express my appreciation to my parents and family for their love, confidence, and understanding during the many delays in the completion of this project. To my husband, Gary, I can offer no formal expression of thanks which seems adequate. So, Gary, to you I simply say . . . "Thank You!"

A. M.

ABSTRACT

A counseling supervisor's reputation and verbal behavior were manipulated to form different conditions of legitimate and coercive power in order to determine the effects of these types of power on social influence. Ninety graduate students in counseling served as subjects, and were assigned randomly to one of six conditions:

(a) high legitimacy-high coercion, Condition I; (b) high legitimacy-low coercion, Condition II; (c) low legitimacy-high coercion, Condition III; (d) low legitimacy-low coercion, Condition IV; (e) no endorsement-high coercion, Condition V; and (f) no endorsement-low coercion, Condition VI. Subjects in each condition viewed a 20-

minute videotaped supervision session, followed by an evaluative summary by the supervisor of the trainee's skills. After viewing the tape, subjects rated their perceptions of the trainee on the Counselor Rating Form-Short Version (CRF-S; Corrigan, 1981). It was hypothesized that subjects' ratings would be influenced more by:

(a) a supervisor with high legitimate power than by a supervisor with low legitimate power; (b) a supervisor displaying low levels of coercive power than by a supervisor displaying high levels of coercive power; and (c) a coercive supervisor with high legitimacy than by one with low legitimacy. None of the hypothesized effects was supported by the data. Implications for social power theory are discussed, particularly with regard to legitimate power, and suggestions for future research are offered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of Purpose.	1
Review of Literature.	3
Social power theory	4
Social power in managerial supervision.	7
Social power in counselor supervision	11
Rationale for current research.	18
II. METHOD.	21
Sample Size	21
Subjects.	22
Experimental Treatments and Design.	22
Supervision analogue.	22
Design and independent variables.	23
Legitimate power manipulation	24
Coercive power manipulation	25
Influence message	26
Pilot Studies	26
Measurement of the Dependent Variable	26
Instrument.	26
Dependent variable.	28
Procedure	29
III. RESULTS	31
Data Analysis	31
Results	31
IV. DISCUSSION.	34
General Conclusions	34
General Limitations	34
Implications.	35
Future Research	38
Summary of Suggestions for Future Research.	40
LIST OF REFERENCES.	41
APPENDICES.	53
A. TRANSCRIPT OF SUPERVISION INTERVIEW	54

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDICES (continued)	
B. TRANSCRIPT OF SUPERVISOR'S SUMMARY AND INFLUENCE MESSAGE. .	68
C. PILOT STUDY FINDINGS.	70
D. COUNSELOR RATING FORM--SHORT VERSION.	75
E. SAMPLE OF INSTRUCTION PACKET GIVEN TO SUBJECTS.	78
F. SUPERVISION QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN PROCEDURAL CHECKS	87
G. SUMMARY TABLE FOR RAW CRF-S SCORES ON PERCEIVED TRAINEE EXPERTNESS (E), ATTRACTIVENESS (A), AND TRUSTWORTHI- NESS (T).	90
H. RAW SCORES AND MEANS, PILOT STUDY #3.	94
I. STATEMENT OF CONSENT.	96
VITA.	98

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose

This study examines counselor supervision within the framework of French and Raven's (1959) theory of social power. For some time, social psychologists have expressed interest in the phenomena of power and influence in interpersonal relationships. Numerous theorists (Blau, 1967; French & Raven, 1959; Kelman, 1961; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) have offered different conceptualizations of the dynamics involved in the ability of one person to influence cognitive, behavioral, or attitudinal changes in another. One view which has generated substantial empirical study is French and Raven's (1959) theory of social power, which explains power and influence in terms of a power recipient's (P) perceptions of an influencing agent's (O) resources. According to French and Raven, one or more of five common power bases operate in a relationship as a result of P's perception of O: (a) reward power, (b) coercive power, (c) referent power, (d) expert power, and (e) legitimate power. French and Raven theorize that each source of power potentially yields different kinds of influence on P. Results of empirical research (Galinsky, Rosen, & Thomas, 1973) support the distinctiveness of these sources of power in social relationships.

Counselor supervision is one relationship in which social power is used to influence change. Counselor supervision is a teaching situation in which supervisors influence trainees to change their behavior in order to become more effective therapists (Arnold, 1962; Patterson, 1964). Counseling supervisors have several sources of power available to them due to the nature of their role and responsibilities (Kadushin, 1968). One way in which supervisors typically attempt to influence student counselors is to provide feedback regarding skills to help trainees develop awareness of their strengths and limitations (Berger & Freebury, 1973; Clark, 1965; Gysbers & Ronnestad, 1974). The present study investigates the differential effects of legitimate and coercive power on a supervisor's ability to influence beginning counselors to accept negative feedback.

The majority of previous research on counselor supervision has examined the effectiveness of didactic and experiential approaches to supervision, as well as the effects of different supervisory techniques on the trainee's integration of facilitative communication skills (Hansen, Pound, & Petro, 1976; Leddick & Bernard, 1980). However, recently some researchers (Dodenhoff, 1981; Heppner & Handley, 1981; 1982) have viewed the process of counselor supervision as a social influence situation. The unique aspect of the present research is its focus on supervisor influence resulting specifically from legitimate and coercive bases of social power. Information about trainee's reactions to different bases of

supervisory power may facilitate understanding of behaviors which affect supervisors' effectiveness as change agents.

Review of Literature

Social influence occurs in virtually all relationships in which people interact in order to accomplish a common objective (Adams, 1975; Secord & Backman, 1964). Such relationships involve the influence or control of one person's behavior or attitudes by another (Cartwright, 1959). The modes of influence used by persons in social relationships have been referred to as social power (Blau, 1967; Cartwright, 1959; French & Raven, 1959; Martin, 1971). Raven (1974) more clearly distinguished the concepts of power and influence by stating that social power refers to the potential influence an individual or group can exert on a person, while social influence refers to actual cognitive, attitudinal, or behavioral changes which originate in another person or group due to the exercise of power.

Several theorists (Cartwright, 1959; Dahl, 1957; Harsanyi, 1962; March, 1955) have offered various conceptualizations of the dynamics of social power. Those theories which stem from Lewinian field theory provide the theoretical framework for the present study. Field theorists (Cartwright, 1959; French, 1956; French & Raven, 1959; Kelman, 1961) stress the importance of various psychological forces operating within a social dyad. According to this view, resisting and complying forces interact in a relationship to

determine the degree of influence one person has over another (Cartwright, 1959). Power is defined as the maximum resultant force of all forces operating at the time of influence (French, 1956; French & Raven, 1959), and the balance of these opposing and conforming forces is unique to each social situation (French & Raven, 1959).

Social Power Theory

The hypotheses posed in the present study are based on French and Raven's (1959) theory of social power. French and Raven described the phenomenon of social power in terms of a dyadic relationship. According to their theory, power is measured by any change in behaviors, opinions, attitudes, goals, needs, values or other aspects of a person's psychological field. Such change occurs as a result of various forces which operate within a relationship or situation, and which determine both the behavior of the powerholder, O, and the reactions of the power recipient, P. When O intends to influence P in a given direction, and P changes in that direction, positive influence occurs; negative influence occurs when P changes in a direction opposite to that intended by O (French & Raven, 1959). The direction and degree of power are determined by the dependencies or needs of P, as well as by P's perception of O's resources to meet these needs. According to French and Raven, the different relationships between P's needs and P's perceptions of O's resources result in five common bases of social power: (a) reward power, (b) coercive power, (c) referent power, (d) expert power, and (e) legitimate power.

The first type, reward power, stems from an individual's perceptions of another's ability to offer and control rewards for behavior which complies with an influence attempt (French & Raven, 1959). Coercive power is similar to reward power, but is based on a person's perceptions of another's ability to punish or threaten punishment for noncompliance (French & Raven, 1959).

Referent power constitutes a third influence base which develops from an individual's (P) identification with a powerholder (O). This identification may result from a feeling of oneness or similarity with the powerholder, or may be due to a desire for such similarity (French & Raven, 1959). In some manner, the powerholder serves as a frame of reference for P's self-evaluation. Referent power operates when P considers some attribute of O to be desirable, attractive, or similar to P, and believes that compliance with O's influence attempts will allow P to gain or enhance this appealing quality (French & Raven, 1959).

The fourth classification of power defined by French and Raven (1959) is expert power. The basis for this type of power is P's belief that O possesses special knowledge or abilities in a specific area of value to P. Power recipients believe that compliance with O's influence attempts will benefit them by enhancing their own knowledge or abilities in this area.

Legitimacy is the fifth and most complex social power base identified by French and Raven (1959). Legitimate power develops from the internalization of societal norms and values regarding

behaviors we believe we ought to expect from or exhibit toward persons of certain authority or roles in society; because of these values, P attributes to O a legitimate right to direct behavior and feels obligated to accept O's influence (French & Raven, 1959).

Legitimate power may stem from learned cultural values, from the social structure of a particular organization or society at large, or from the granting of power by a legitimizing agent recognized by P (French & Raven, 1959).

According to French and Raven (1959), the use of each source of power described above results in different kinds of changes in P as a result of O's influence. French and Raven differentiated between public dependent change and private acceptance of influence. Public dependent change refers to observable, and often less stable, behavioral changes in P as a result of O's influence, whereas private acceptance of influence results in more self-initiated, long-lasting cognitive or attitudinal changes in P (French & Raven, 1959). French and Raven postulated that expert power generates primarily private acceptance, while coercive power results most often in public dependent change. Legitimate, referent, and reward power bases initially influence public dependent change, but over time changes in P under these conditions become independent of O's observation and stem more from P's private acceptance of the powerholder's influence (French & Raven, 1959). Raven (1965) identified several factors that determine which sources of power operate in a given influence situation. The nature of the situation, the risks of each source of

influence, and personal and cultural factors are all elements which affect the effectiveness and use of each source of influence (Raven, 1965).

Galinsky, Rosen, and Thomas (1973) tested the empirical distinctiveness of French and Raven's (1959) bases of social power in a factor analytic study. They assessed public assistance workers' perceptions of peer and supervisor behaviors and characteristics which corresponded to French and Raven's definitions of the five power bases. Only referent power did not emerge as a separate source of influence. Galinsky et al. (1973) attributed this outcome to French and Raven's vague definition of referent power, and also to measurement limitations in their own study. Despite the lack of statistical evidence for a referent base of power, the data generally supported French and Raven's theory of different bases of social power.

Social Power in Managerial Supervision

Social power in supervisory relationships has been examined primarily with respect to organizational leadership and management. Student (1968) applied French and Raven's (1959) typology of power to the work setting by relating group member performance to measures of supervisory social power. He found that employees ranked legitimate power as the most common reason for compliance with their supervisors' directives. However, referent and expert sources of power related more strongly to actual changes in work performance than did

legitimate power. Based on these results, Student concluded that the personally controlled resources of expert and referent power may enhance influence attributable to the supervisory role itself, i.e., legitimate power, and therefore should be used more frequently. Other research (Burke & Wilcox, 1971; Slocum, 1970) supports Student's conclusion.

Generally, investigations of supervisory power have yielded mixed results regarding the differential effectiveness of the five sources of power. Expert power has been found to correlate positively with employee job satisfaction (Burke & Wilcox, 1971; Slocum, 1970) and performance (Slocum, 1970). However, expert supervisory power also has been found to result in subordinates' low expectancies of compliance and self-satisfaction following compliance (Fontaine & Beerman, 1977). Studies of referent power show that it relates positively with supervisee job satisfaction (Burke & Wilcox, 1971; Fontaine & Beerman, 1977; Slocum, 1970) and compliance with the supervisor (Fontaine & Beerman, 1977). These same findings generally apply to reward power, although Burke and Wilcox did report that subordinates identified reward power as a source of low job satisfaction in relation to other sources of power. Greene and Podsakoff (1981) studied the effect of reducing a supervisor's reward power on workers' perceptions of the supervisor's other sources of power, and found that experimental subjects judged the supervisor to possess less reward, referent, and legitimate power, and more coercive power, than did control subjects.

Coercive power in supervision results in less positive influence than do expert, referent, and reward power. In a study by Slocum (1970), steel mill employees reported that coercive power was least likely to result in compliance with employment supervisors. Coercive supervisory power also correlated negatively with these subjects' work performance and job satisfaction. Studies by Burke and Wilcox (1971) and Fontaine and Beerman (1977) support these findings. In general, coercive power has been shown to lead to greater subordinate resistance to supervisor influence (Litman-Adizes, Raven, & Fontaine, 1978; Zipf, 1960), less liking for the supervisor (Zipf, 1960), and diminished task productivity of subordinates (Sheley & Shaw, 1979) than other forms of power.

Few investigations have isolated the effects of legitimate power. In a landmark study, Raven and French (1958a) manipulated supervisor legitimacy in two group work situations by varying the amount of group support for the leader. The results indicated that: (a) the more leaders or supervisors are supported by others, the more these supervisors are perceived to have a legitimate right to their positions; (b) the more legitimacy supervisors are perceived to have, the more accepted is their influence; and (c) subordinates' attraction to a supervisor is positively correlated with their perceptions of the supervisor's legitimacy. Raven and French also noted that the mere occupation of an important role or position results in the attribution of some legitimate power to an individual.

Read (1974) investigated the effects of different sources of legitimacy on leader influence in small groups, and found that self-appointment led to negative perceptions of leader legitimacy, task competence, attractiveness, and leadership ability by group members. Furthermore, both self- and inexpert-appointment resulted in low levels of influence. Election and expert sources of appointment generated high levels of influence.

A second study by Raven and French (1958b) compared the effects of both legitimate and coercive power on supervisor influence. Findings indicated that greater group support resulted in greater acceptance of a supervisor's legitimacy, and that legitimate power increased subjects' attraction toward a supervisor; coercive power decreased attraction. Legitimate power also led to significantly greater private acceptance of supervisor influence than did coercive power. Raven and French concluded that nonlegitimate, coercive power results in a discrepancy between an individual's private acceptance of, and public conformity with, influence.

French, Morrison, and Levinger (1960) also examined the effects of legitimate and coercive power on conformity, but added to their investigation the assessment of the effects of punishment and resisting forces. They speculated that these forces may have been responsible for the discrepancy between private and public acceptance of coercive influence reported earlier by Raven and French (1958b). As expected, the greater the punishment forces induced by a supervisor's coercive behavior, the greater was the subjects' conformity

immediately following the threat. However, upon termination of the punishment, the strength of the punishment forces was not positively associated with conformity. Results also indicated that the strength of resisting forces aroused by coercive power was inversely related to the degree of conformity and to subjects' attraction to the power agent. Finally, resisting forces were found to decrease under legitimate conditions.

Social Power in Counselor Supervision

Although social power and influence have been investigated rather extensively with respect to organizational leadership and supervision, these phenomena only recently have been studied within the context of counselor supervision (Heppner & Handley, 1981; 1982). Supervision research typically has focused on (a) training methods and evaluation, (b) the nature of the supervisor's role, (c) counselor-supervisor similarity, and (d) training outcomes related to the development of core facilitative skills (Hansen, Pound, & Petro, 1976; Hansen, Robin, & Grimes, 1982; Hansen & Warner, 1971; Kaplan, 1983; Schlessinger, 1966). Discussions of this research can be found in several extensive literature reviews (Ford, 1979; Garfield, 1977; Lambert, 1980; Matarazzo, 1971).

Although some early studies provide evidence to support the proposition that supervision is an influencing process (Bibbo, 1975; Carkhuff, 1969; Davidson & Emmer, 1966; Delaney, Long, Masucci, & Moses, 1969; Demos & Zuwaylif, 1962; Doehrman, 1972; James, 1974;

Karr & Geist, 1977; Martin & Carkhuff, 1968; Pierce, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967; Pierce & Schauble, 1970, 1971; Roark, 1969; Schoch, 1966; Wedeking & Scott, 1976), the direct application of social influence theory to the relationship between a counselor-trainee and supervisor stems from Strong's (1968) two-stage theory of counseling as a social influence process. Based on Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance, Strong proposed that the dissonance experienced by a client in a counseling relationship can be diminished by first enhancing cues which relate to the client's perception of the counselor as attractive, expert, and trustworthy, and then utilizing the power established by such perceptions to create positive cognitive or behavioral changes in the client. Attractiveness pertains to a person's likeability or familiarity, expertness usually is inferred from an individual's education, training, skill, or experience, and trustworthiness refers to a person's sincerity or honesty (Corrigan, Dell, Lewis, & Schmidt, 1980).

Strong's (1968) theory of counseling as a social influence process has spurred an abundance of research, which has been reviewed extensively by Corrigan et al. (1980). The development of the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) by Barak and LaCrosse in 1975 expedited the systematic study of variables affecting perceptions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Barak & Dell, 1977; Cash & Kehr, 1978; Cash, Kehr, & Salzbach, 1978; Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Corrigan, 1978; Heppner & Dixon, 1978; Kerr & Dell, 1976; Kleinke & Tully, 1979; LaCrosse, 1977; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976; McCarthy & Betz,

1978). Corrigan et al. (1980) have organized the many findings of social influence in counseling into two categories: (a) evidential, behavioral, and reputational cues which affect perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness; and (b) differential effects of these characteristics on counselor influence. Results from studies in the first category suggest that counselor expertness is enhanced by attire and setting (Bloom, Weigel, & Trautt, 1977; Heppner & Pew, 1977; Kerr & Dell, 1976; Siegel & Sell, 1978), counselor sex and race (Atkinson, Maruyama, & Matsui, 1978; Brooks, 1974), counselor experience and status (Brooks, 1974; Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Greenberg, 1969; Guttman & Haase, 1972; Hartley, 1969; Price & Iverson, 1969; Scheid, 1976; Spiegel, 1976), and variations in counselor verbal and nonverbal behavior (Atkinson & Carsdadden, 1975; Atkinson et al., 1978; Scheid, 1976; Siegel & Sell, 1978; Sprafkin, 1970; Strong & Schmidt, 1970). Perceptions of therapist attractiveness have been influenced by a counselor's physical attractiveness (Carter, 1978; Cash, Begley, McGown, & Weise, 1975; Cash & Kehr, 1978; Cash & Salzbach, 1978; Lewis & Walsh, 1978), pre-interview information about the counselor's similarity to the client or personality characteristics (Goldstein, 1971; Savitsky, Zarle, & Keedy, 1976), the self-disclosing behavior of the therapist in the interview (Giannandrea & Murphy, 1973; Hoffman-Graff, 1977; Mann & Murphy, 1975; Murphy & Strong, 1972), and the nonverbal behavior of the counselor (Haase & Tepper, 1972; Kleinke, Staneski, & Berger, 1975; Kleinke & Tully, 1979; LaCrosse, 1975; Schmidt &

Strong, 1971; Smith-Hanen, 1977). Finally, perceptions of counselor trustworthiness appear to be affected by a counselor's nonverbal behavior (Kaul & Schmidt, 1971), and by self-disclosure and acceptance of another's self-disclosure (Johnson & Noonan, 1972). Also, some evidence suggests that the role of therapist inherently may imply trustworthiness (Rotter & Stein, 1971).

The second cluster of studies reported by Corrigan et al. (1980) include those designed to test Strong's (1968) hypothesis that the more counselors are perceived to be expert, attractive, or trustworthy, the more influential they will be with clients. Although some evidence suggests that a counselor perceived as more expert may be more influential (Binderman, Fretz, Scott, & Abrams, 1972; Heppner & Dixon, 1978), generally the second stage of Strong's theory is not supported with regard to perceived expertness (Beutler, Johnson, Neville, Ellis, & Jobe, 1975; Greenberg, 1969; Sprafkin, 1970; Strong & Schmidt, 1970), at least in the initial stages of the counseling relationship (Corrigan et al., 1980). The differential effects of attractiveness on influence appear to be more involved. Although several researchers have failed to find a significant relationship between counselor physical attractiveness and influence ability (Patton, 1969; Schmidt & Strong, 1971; Sell, 1974), some evidence suggests that therapist attractiveness stemming from perceived similarity with the client may affect influence ability (Hoffman-Graff, 1977).

Of particular relevance to the present research are those studies in which counselor expertness and attractiveness were considered sources of power, as proposed by Strong and Matross (1973) in their expansion of Strong's (1968) original theory. Based upon French and Raven's (1959) typology of social power, Strong and Matross identified processes by which client change occurs in counseling. They proposed that particular client needs, together with client perceptions of counselor resources, create various sources of counselor power instrumental in achieving client change. According to Strong and Matross, the most common sources used by a therapist are expert, referent, and legitimate power bases.

Dell (1973) tested Strong and Matross' (1973) theory by studying the differential effects of expert and referent power on counselor ability to influence behavior changes in clients. Counselor introductory role and interview behavior were manipulated to portray referent or expert bases of power. Although subjects in the different power conditions did not differ significantly with regard to acceptance of the counselor's influence, results did suggest that subjects exposed to counselors whose role and influence manner were congruent were more likely to change than subjects exposed to incongruent displays of power. Dell concluded that subjects in incongruent conditions may have been more resistant to counselor influence because they perceived the counselor to lack the legitimacy to use an unestablished source of power.

Merluzzi, Merluzzi, and Kaul (1977) examined the effects of expert and referent power bases, as well as counselor race, on changes in client attitudes and behaviors. Power base alone was not found to differentially affect influence, but a significant race-power interaction was obtained with respect to counselor influence. Black-expert and white-referent counselors had the greatest amount of influence on client behavior.

In an effort to identify individual counselor characteristics affecting the choice of power, Robyak (1981) examined the effects of both counselor and client gender on counselors' preferences for legitimate, expert, and referent power-based counseling responses. Robyak found that counselor gender accounted for significant differences in a counselor's preference for both legitimate and expert power-based responses. Female counselors preferred to use the legitimate power base significantly more often than male counselors. Client gender also affected counselors' power preferences. Counselors of both sexes preferred an expert method of influence to a greater degree with same-sexed clients than with those of the opposite sex.

Since the appearance of the review by Corrigan et al. (1980), interest in the investigation of social influence variables in counseling has continued (Kerr, Olson, Claiborn, Bauers-Gruenler, & Paolo, 1983; McKee & Smouse, 1983; Merluzzi & Brischetto, 1983; Strohmer & Biggs, 1983). Based on the belief that the nature of supervision parallels that of the counseling relationship (Ekstein & Wallerstein, 1959; Kell & Mueller, 1966; Lambert, 1974), researchers have begun

to investigate social influence phenomena in counselor supervision as well. In her dissertation research, Yellin (1978) studied the impact of positive and negative supervisory feedback on counselor-trainees' persuasibility and attitude change. Although no significant differences between the two feedback conditions were found, Yellin noted that the data suggest that negative feedback may decrease the supervisor's influence on the trainee. Yellin also concluded that male supervisors appear to have greater influence on female students than on male students.

Dodenhoff (1981) measured the effects of counselor-trainee attraction toward supervisors and supervisor style of influence on various ratings of trainee effectiveness. Dodenhoff found that trainees highly attracted to their supervisors were rated as more effective by their supervisors on counseling performance and outcome than were trainees with low attraction to their supervisors. Also, a direct style of supervisor influence was found to be associated with greater trainee effectiveness than an indirect style, as indicated by high supervisor ratings of counseling outcome.

Heppner and Handley (1981) also examined counselor supervision as an interpersonal influence process. They studied the relationship between trainees' perceptions of supervisor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness and (a) supervisors' and trainees' evaluation of changes in trainee behaviors and attitudes, and (b) both supervisors' and students' perceptions of the supervisory relationship. Results indicated that the more trainees perceived supervisors

to be expert, attractive, and trustworthy, the more they believed the supervisors responded with empathy, regard, and congruence, and the more satisfied they were with supervision.

Finally, in a 1982 correlational study, Heppner and Handley explored the relationship between 17 supervisory behaviors, as measured by Worthington and Roehlke's (1979) Supervision Questionnaire (SQ), and trainees' perceptions of supervisor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, as measured by the CRF (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975). Calculated Pearson Product Moment correlations indicated that perceptions of supervisor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness correlated significantly more highly with supervisory evaluative behaviors than with supportive behaviors. Results also indicated that perceived trustworthiness correlated significantly with more supervisor behaviors than did perceived attractiveness or expertness.

Rationale for Current Research

Counselor supervision "is a relationship where one or more persons' skills in conducting psychotherapy of mental health services are intentionally and potentially enhanced by the interaction with another person" (Hess, 1980b, p. 528). It is a learning process (Arbuckle, 1963, 1965; Arnold, 1962; Ekstein, 1964; Hansen, 1965; Matarazzo, 1971; Patterson, 1964) in which change in the trainee's behavior as a counselor is the primary goal (Altucher, 1967; Hess, 1980a). Supervision is an influencing relationship (Patterson, 1964)

in which the supervisor may be viewed as a change agent who attempts to influence the trainee to learn those behaviors considered vital to effective counseling (Arnold, 1962). The literature just discussed offers evidence of such influence, and supports the reasonableness of studying the process of counselor supervision within the context of social power theory.

As mentioned earlier, French and Raven (1959) theorize that legitimate power activates a person's beliefs about a powerholder's right to direct behavior due to a prescribed role or position in society. These beliefs lead the person to accept the powerholder's influence. If French and Raven are correct, we can expect that beginning counseling students will be influenced more by a supervisor with high legitimate power than by a supervisor with low legitimate power.

The use of coercive power in supervision may have different effects on a counselor-trainee. Social power theory (French et al., 1960; French & Raven, 1959) states that coercive power leads to greater resistance to influence than other, noncoercive sources of power. Research findings support this position (Litman-Adizes et al., 1978; Slocum, 1970; Zipf, 1960). If the theory and supportive findings are correct, we can expect that beginning counselors will be influenced more by a supervisor displaying low coercive power than by a supervisor displaying high coercive power.

Social power theory also states that the strength of an individual's resistance to a powerholder's coercive influence attempt

varies inversely with the legitimacy of the coercion (French et al., 1960). The use of coercive power by a legitimate agent is less likely to meet resistance than is the use of such power by an agent lacking the legitimacy to use such coercion (French et al., 1960; French & Raven, 1959). Assuming this to be true, we can predict that the influence of a coercive supervisor will be greater when the supervisor possesses high legitimacy than when he or she possesses low legitimacy.

Based on French and Raven's (1959) theory of social power and the research supporting it, the following hypotheses are posed:

1. Beginning counseling students will be influenced more by a supervisor with high legitimate power than by a supervisor with low legitimate power.

2. Beginning counseling students will be influenced more by a supervisor displaying low coercive power than by a supervisor displaying high coercive power.

3. Beginning counseling students will be influenced more by a coercive supervisor who has high legitimacy than by a coercive supervisor who has low legitimacy.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Sample Size

Power analysis (Cohen, 1977) was employed to determine a suitable sample size for the study. Power refers to the probability of detecting a treatment effect. According to Cohen, three factors affect power: (a) sample size; (b) the significance criterion, or alpha level; and (c) effect size (ES), or the magnitude of the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. A priori consideration of these features is crucial to the enhancement of the statistical power of research results (Cohen, 1977).

In order to enable researchers to make rational decisions regarding appropriate sample sizes, Cohen (1977) has proposed conventional levels for effect size and for power. Cohen recommends a value of .10 for a small ES, and values of .25 and .40 for medium and large effect sizes, respectively. A convention of .80 is recommended for power. Research which incorporates an experimental design and good control over extraneous variables permits investigation of a larger effect size (Cohen, 1977). Therefore, the convention for a large effect size, .40, was considered appropriate for use in this study. Practical reasons also contributed to this researcher's interest in testing for large effects of supervisor power on influence. The detection of very small effects of power on influence might have

little utility with regard to drawing conclusions about effective uses of power in supervision. Using Cohen's (1977) sample size tables for the analysis of variance, and the recommended conventions for power, .80, and Type I error, $\alpha = .05$, it was determined that 15 subjects in each of the six cells would comprise an appropriate sample.

Subjects

Ninety graduate students, 69 females and 21 males, who were enrolled in master's degree programs in counseling, volunteered as subjects in response to an announcement made in their classes. The sample consisted of students from several mid-Atlantic state colleges, as well as from The University of Tennessee. Most of the participants were at the pre-practicum level of training, and a small proportion was enrolled in or recently had completed a first practicum. Approximately two-thirds of the subjects indicated that they previously had received some type of supervision. Eighty-two subjects were Caucasian, and 5 were Black. One subject identified herself as Bahamian, and two others did not indicate their race. The majority of subjects, 68.5%, were older students, 30 or more years of age; the remaining 31.5% were between 20 and 29 years of age.

Experimental Treatments and Design

Supervision Analogue

A supervision session was enacted by a counseling psychology advanced doctoral student, who portrayed the counselor-trainee, and

a counseling center staff psychologist, who played the supervisor. The psychologist was experienced in both the practice and supervision of counseling. Both individuals were from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

The supervisory session discussed a beginning-level counselor's performance in a counseling interview in which a female client presented problems related to depression and poor self-esteem. In planning sessions, the experimenter, confederate trainee, and confederate supervisor collaborated to identify positive and negative aspects of the trainee's counseling performance which were to be reviewed in the supervision session. The trainee was instructed to respond in a natural manner to the feedback he received, keeping in mind his role as a beginning-level counseling student. The supervisor was told to alternate feedback about the trainee's predetermined strengths and weaknesses throughout the session. After approximately four hours of practice, a 20-minute videotape was made. The camera was set to focus on the supervisor; only a rear view of the trainee was visible. A transcript of the session is provided in Appendix A.

Design and Independent Variables

A 3 x 2 factorial design was used to study the effects of the independent variables of legitimate and coercive power on supervisor influence. The legitimate power of the supervisor was operationalized by information about students' endorsement of the supervisor.

This information was given to subjects prior to viewing the tape of the supervision session. Coercive power was manipulated by the verbal behavior of the supervisor in the supervisory interaction. These two types of power were varied to form four experimental conditions: (a) high legitimacy-high coercion, Condition I; (b) high legitimacy-low coercion, Condition II; (c) low legitimacy-high coercion, Condition III; and (d) low legitimacy-low coercion, Condition IV. In order to isolate the effects of legitimate power stemming simply from the supervisory role (French & Raven, 1959), the legitimacy information was eliminated in two control conditions: (a) no endorsement-high coercion, Condition V; and (b) no endorsement-low coercion, Condition VI.

Legitimate Power Manipulation

Based upon the findings of Raven and French (1958) and Read (1974), legitimate power was operationalized by evidence of peer endorsement of the supervisor. In the high legitimacy conditions, subjects received the following written introduction to the supervision session:

As you watch the tape, imagine that you are the practicum student being supervised. You are a counselor-trainee. You have been assigned to this particular supervisor. You know that more than 90% of the students in your program have recommended this person as a supervisor.

In the low legitimacy conditions, this introduction was revised to indicate that ". . . less than 10% of the students" had recommended the supervisor.

Coercive Power Manipulation

The high coercion conditions were operationalized by four statements made by the supervisor at approximate five minute intervals throughout the session. Consistent with French and Raven's (1959) definition of coercive power, each statement reflected some threat of punishment or other negative consequence. The four statements were:

1. "If you don't become aware of your difficulty with this, you're probably never going to be effective with this kind of client."
2. "You had better really improve on some of those skills that we're talking about now, or your evaluation for the quarter is going to be pretty low!"
3. "I guess I don't see how you'll be ready for an advanced practicum unless you work on your ability to somehow integrate what we're doing here with what goes on in the session."
4. "You know, in the future, you're going to need some recommendations from me for the assistantship you're hoping to get. Before I write one, you're going to need to change some of the things we've talked about."

In the low coercion conditions, these four statements were edited mechanically from the tape, resulting in two supervision tapes which were identical except for the four statements.

Influence Message

Both videotapes ended with a brief influence segment in which the supervisor reappeared alone to address the subjects. During this summary, the supervisor negatively evaluated the trainee's overall skillfulness, thus creating a message designed to influence subjects' ratings of the trainee's expertness. A transcript of the supervisor's summary statement appears in Appendix B.

Pilot Studies

Several pilot studies were conducted in order to: (a) insure the sameness of the supervisor's overall behavior in both the low coercion and high coercion conditions; (b) determine the validity of the independent variable manipulations; and (c) identify any general procedural problems which may have interfered with the clarity and effectiveness of the experimental manipulations. Two groups of counseling professionals judged the supervision tape and power manipulations. The experimental procedure was piloted with three samples of college students. See Appendix C for information about the findings of these pilot studies.

Measurement of the Dependent Variable

Instrument

The Counselor Rating Form--Short Version (CRF-S; Corrigan, 1981) was used to assess the effects of different power bases on supervisor influence. A copy of the CRF-S is provided in Appendix

D. The original version of the CRF (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) was developed to assess perceptions of a counselor's expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness--communicator characteristics considered linked to social influence (Strong, 1968). The instrument has been used extensively in counseling research related to social influence variables (Corrigan et al., 1980), and its reliability and validity have been well-documented (Barak & Dell, 1977; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; LaCrosse, 1980; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976).

In a factor analytic study, Corrigan (1981) developed the CRF-S in order to improve the measurement of the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The CRF-S consists of 12 of the original 36 adjectives from the CRF. The 12 items were selected on the basis of their ease of comprehension and previous high loadings on the three factors. No item exceeded an eighth-grade reading comprehension level, and all items ranked among the top five loadings in 50% of previous factor analyses (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; Corrigan, 1977; Zamostny, Corrigan, & Eggert, 1981). The scale structure of the CRF-S differs slightly from that of the CRF. Corrigan (1981) eliminated the negative adjective from each item, and instead structured the scale so that respondents rate a positive adjective on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not very) to 7 (very). By summing the ratings for the four items pertaining to each of the three dimensions, three scale scores ranging from 4 to 28 can be calculated. The higher the score on each scale, the more

positive the perceptions of the counselor's expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness, respectively.

Corrigan (1981) conducted two validation procedures on the CRF-S. The first method replicated the process used by Barak and LaCrosse (1975) to validate the CRF. One hundred thirty-three college students viewed 15-minute segments of interviews by Carl Rogers, Fritz Perls, and Albert Ellis from the film Three Approaches to Psychotherapy (Shostrom, 1966), and then rated each of the therapists on the CRF-S. A sample of 155 outpatient community mental health center clients provided a second set of validation data by rating their therapists on the CRF-S. For both samples, scale scores indicated that the dimensions of attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness were differentially perceived. The validity of the CRF-S was established by the results of confirmatory factor analysis with simultaneous groups, which supported the existence of a 3-factor, oblique factor structure based on previous factor analyses by Zamostny et al. (1981) ($\chi^2 = 497.93$; $\rho = .927$). Corrigan reported factor loadings greater than .75 for nearly all items on the CRF-S. Finally, using Kuder-Richardson's Formula 20, Corrigan obtained interitem reliabilities for each CRF-S scale equivalent to or greater than those of the original CRF (expertness, $r = .85$ to $.94$; attractiveness, $r = .89$ to $.93$; trustworthiness, $r = .82$ to $.91$).

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable of supervisor influence was defined in this study by subjects' agreement with the supervisor's opinion of

the trainee's skill level as expressed in the summary statement. This agreement was measured by the scale score for expertness (E), since the four items which comprise this scale relate to appraisal of the trainee's skillfulness. The lower the E score, the more influence the supervisor had.

Procedure

Fifteen subjects were assigned randomly to each of the six conditions. The experiment was conducted in available classroom or office space, in which videotape playback equipment was set up, along with chairs and tables or desks. Rooms were well-lighted and quiet. Most subjects were seen individually; however, when the randomization schedule allowed, two or three subjects were run simultaneously. In the latter case, the experimenter requested that the subjects not interact with one another so that they could make their ratings independently. All subjects cooperated with this request.

The experimenter introduced herself and informed subjects of their rights as participants. Each subject then received a four-part packet containing: (a) introductions to the study and tape, (b) a description of the supervisor corresponding to the appropriate legitimacy condition or control condition, (c) step-by-step directions for the experimental procedure, and (d) the CRF-S instructions and response sheet. A sample instruction packet is included in Appendix E. After reading Parts I and II, Introduction and Supervision

Session, of the packet, subjects viewed the appropriate supervision tape. Subjects then read Part III, Supervisor's Summary, and viewed the influence segment of the tape. Next, subjects completed Part IV, which contained the CRF-S and a brief demographic information sheet. Subjects also were asked to rate the supervisor on the CRF-S for analysis in a separate study. The experimenter collected the completed packets, and then debriefed the subjects. The entire procedure required approximately 30 minutes.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Data Analysis

Ratings on the four items comprising the expertness scale of the CRF-S were summed to obtain a total score measuring the amount of supervisor influence accepted by each subject. The lower the expertness score, the greater was the amount of supervisor influence. One subject rated all CRF-S items at the midpoint between those scale points designated by Corrigan (1981) to represent an integer between 1 and 7. For each rating made in this manner, a value of .5 was added to the number equivalent to the scale point just below the subject's rating. For example, a rating made on the scale midway between 5 and 6 was assigned a value of 5.5. Appendix G contains a table of raw data for all subjects. A 3 x 2 univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) then was conducted on subjects' expertness scores in order to test the hypotheses.

Results

Results of the ANOVA revealed no significant main effects of legitimate power ($F(2, 84) = .53, p > .05$) or coercive power ($F(1, 84) = .61, p > .05$) on supervisor influence. Thus, hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported. The data also failed to provide support for hypothesis 3, since no significant interaction effect was found ($F(2, 84) = 2.20, p > .05$).

Cell means and standard deviations for the CRF-S expertness scores are presented in Table 1. Table 2 summarizes results of the 3 x 2 ANOVA.

TABLE I
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TRAINEE
EXPERTNESS SCORE, CRF-S

Experimental Condition	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
HLHC (I)	15	10.33	3.83
HLLC (II)	15	11.53	3.87
LLHC (III)	15	10.33	5.16
LLLC (IV)	15	13.00	4.44
NEHC (V)	15	11.47	4.24
NELC (VI)	15	9.67	3.43
Total Sample	90	11.06	

NOTE: Abbreviations for each of the experimental conditions represent the following:

HLHC (I) = High Legitimacy/High Coercion
HLLC (II) = High Legitimacy/Low Coercion
LLHC (III) = Low Legitimacy/High Coercion
LLLC (IV) = Low Legitimacy/Low Coercion
NEHC (V) = No Endorsement/High Coercion
NELC (VI) = No Endorsement/Low Coercion

TABLE 2
SUMMARY TABLE FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SCORES
FOR TRAINEE EXPERTNESS UNDER DIFFERENT
POWER CONDITIONS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	<u>df</u>	Mean Square	<u>F</u>	p
Legitimate Power (A)	18.82	2	9.41	0.53	0.588
Coercive Power (B)	10.68	1	10.68	0.61	0.439
A x B	77.76	2	38.88	2.20	0.117
Error	1481.46	84	17.64		
Total	1588.71	89	17.85		

NOTE: For each F-value, $p > .05$.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

General Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study.

1. High and low levels of legitimate power do not significantly affect a supervisor's ability to influence trainees to accept negative feedback.
2. High and low levels of coercive power do not significantly affect a supervisor's ability to influence counseling students to accept negative feedback.
3. A coercive supervisor with high legitimacy is not significantly more influential than a coercive supervisor with low legitimacy.

General Limitations

Several features of this study limit the generalizability of the above results. Although all subjects were beginning-level counselors-in-training, the majority were older than 30 years of age, and thus perhaps were more sophisticated than younger students. Therefore, generalizations about counselor-trainees' reactions to supervisory power are restricted to counseling students in this age group.

Another limitation stems from the analogue nature of the present research. According to Gelso (1979), internal validity is enhanced in analogue studies at the expense of external validity. The use of an experimental analogue in this study may have generated responses different from those which may occur in an actual supervision session. Generalizations about the study's findings to trainees who directly experience supervision must be made with caution.

Social power theory states that several sources of power operate in a social interaction. The present study examined the effects of only legitimate and coercive bases of power. Any conclusions made from the results of this study about supervisor influence must be confined to these two sources of power.

Implications

The lack of significant differential effects of legitimate and coercive power on subjects' acceptance of supervisor influence may have several possible explanations. French and Raven (1959) theorized that the strength of one person's power to influence another increases with the development of their relationship; a power holder's ability to influence another is greater in long-standing relationships. Both the brevity of the experimental situation and subjects' participation as passive observers may have affected the development of an interpersonal relationship between the subjects and supervisor, thus limiting his influence.

French and Raven (1959) also stated that behavioral or attitudinal changes in a power recipient often depend upon both the degree of dependence that person has on the power holder, and the likelihood that the power holder will observe the individual's response to the influence attempt. In this study, subjects rated another trainee's skills, and did not expect the supervisor to judge their ratings. Both factors may have led subjects to perceive the supervisor as unable to impose consequences on them, thereby resulting in no differences in the influential effectiveness of each source of power.

Another explanation of the results relates to a methodological aspect of the study. The supervisor's influence message pertained to the inexperience of a counselor-trainee compared to other beginning-level counselors. Perhaps subjects expected a novice counselor to be relatively unskilled and inexperienced, based on their personal experiences of being judged as inexperienced by their own supervisors. It also could be that subjects viewed the trainee as less expert than themselves, due to their exaggeration of their own competence, a behavior common among beginning counselors (Kell & Mueller, 1966). Either of these expectations, which coincide with the opinion of the supervisor, may have led to subjects' low ratings of the trainee's expertise, thus reducing any effects related to power. Differential power effects may have been obtained if the design of the study had been balanced to include positive as well as negative feedback from the supervisor, since positive comments from the supervisor may have upended such expectations.

Corrigan et al. (1980) speculated that legitimate power stemming solely from a social role may be sufficient to effect influence and gain compliance, despite the presence or absence of other sources of power. In this study, the supervisor's legitimate power stemming from his role may have persisted despite variations in the amount of student endorsement received, or the degree of coercive power displayed. Differential influence may not have resulted because subjects simply may have accepted the supervisor's legitimate right to evaluate the trainee negatively, and therefore conformed with his opinion. The lack of statistical differences between the experimental and control groups supports this interpretation.

It also is possible that the hypothesized effects did not occur due to the operation of expert power in the study. Corrigan et al. (1980) proposed that perceived expertness may be an integral part of a counselor's recognized social role, and therefore a factor important to legitimate power as well as to expert power. In light of this theory, it may be that subjects in the present study attributed expert, as well as legitimate, power to the supervisor due to social role expectancies, and thereby were influenced equally.

A final comment on the nonsignificant results concerns the effect size selected for this study. Since identification of small effects has little practical utility in clinical or field settings (Cohen, 1977; Hays, 1973; Wampold, Furlong & Atkinson, 1983), the conventional power level of .80 (Cohen, 1977) was used to determine if a strong association existed between the independent and dependent

variables. Given the adequate power of this study, the nonsignificance of the results could provide useful information for counseling supervisors. It may be that supervisors can exercise the levels and types of power used in this study without affecting their influence on trainees. The acceptance of counseling supervisors' influence may be determined more by the degree of legitimacy and/or expertness inherent in their role, or by different forms of coercion or other sources of power not used in the present research.

Future Research

The present study is an initial attempt to identify specific sources of power available to counseling supervisors which affect their ability to influence trainees. Although the particular design of this study failed to produce significant results, continued examination of the phenomena of power and influence in counselor supervision is important. Further exploratory research which incorporates modifications in methodology or design may reveal significant findings regarding the use of power by supervisors to influence trainees.

Future research could be designed to permit better development of a relationship between subjects and supervisors. Quasi-experimental and field studies in which subjects actually receive supervision would permit more realistic reactions to supervisory power. Such studies might be designed so that subjects experience more directly the consequences of compliance or noncompliance with the supervisor's influence attempt.

Findings of this study suggest that variations in legitimate and coercive power do not significantly affect a supervisor's influence on trainees' perceptions. However, French and Raven (1959) stated that a power holder's influence may vary with respect to each system, or realm of behavior, of the power recipient. For instance, one person may not be able to influence another's overt behavior, but may be able to influence opinions or attitudes (French & Raven, 1959). Future investigations of power and influence in counselor supervision might employ dependent criteria which correspond to a different system of the trainee. Both Corrigan et al. (1980) and Heppner and Handley (1981) have recommended that research examine social influence processes related to behavioral, rather than perceptual or attitudinal, changes. Studies of social influence in counselor supervision could examine the effect of different bases of supervisor power on changes in counselor behavior, such as trainees' integration of suggested counseling strategies, or the use of empathy with clients.

A communicator's resources of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness are important variables in social influence (Corrigan et al., 1980). Heppner and Handley's (1982) study of social influence in supervision revealed that counselor-trainees' perceptions of a supervisor along these three dimensions correlated positively with supervisory evaluative behaviors, such as negative feedback. Other research has shown that information about an influencing agent's reputation affects influencees' perceptions of the agent along these

same variables (Corrigan et al., 1980). Based upon these findings, it seems reasonable to suggest that future research might investigate the effects of a supervisor's legitimate and coercive power on trainees' perceptions of the supervisor as expert, attractive, or trustworthy.

Summary of Suggestions for Future Research

1. Future research on the application of social power theory to counselor supervision could be designed to structure a more direct relationship between subjects and the supervisor. A better opportunity also could be provided for the supervisor and subjects to establish a relationship by lengthening their interaction.

2. Different dependent measures could be employed to test the influential effects of supervisor power on counselors. Such measures might include changes in trainees' counseling behavior, as well as students' perceptions of the supervisor.

3. Future investigations could employ methodology which includes positive as well as negative supervisory feedback.

4. The effects of expert, referent, and reward bases of power on supervisor influence with counselor-trainees warrant examination.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adams, R. N. Energy and structure: A theory of social power. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1975.
- Altucher, N. Constructive use of the supervisory relationship. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14(2), 165-170.
- Arbuckle, D. S. The learning of counseling: Process, not product. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10(2), 163-168.
- _____. Supervision: Learning, not counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 90-94.
- Arnold, D. L. Counselor education as responsible self development. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1962, 1(4), 185-192.
- Atkinson, D. R., & Carskadden, G. A prestigious introduction, psychological jargon, and perceived counselor credibility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 180-186.
- Atkinson, D. R., Maruyama, M., & Matsui, S. Effects of counselor race and counseling approach on Asian Americans' perceptions of counselor credibility and utility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 76-83.
- Barak, A., & Dell, D. M. Differential perception of counselor behavior: Replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 288-292.
- Barak, A., & LaCrosse, M. B. Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 471-476.
- Berger, D., & Freebury, D. R. The acquisition of psychotherapy skills: A learning model and some guidelines for instructors. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 1973, 18, 467-472.
- Beutler, L. E., Johnson, D. T., Neville, C. W. Jr., Elkins, D., & Jobe, A. M. Attitude similarity and therapist credibility as predictors of attitude change and improvement in psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 90-91.
- Bibbo, M. P. The relationship of supervisor-supervisee personality factors and supervisory relationships. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 5008-A.

- Binderman, R. M., Fretz, B. R., Scott, N. A., & Abrams, M. H. Effects of interpreter credibility and discrepancy level of results on responses to test results. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 399-403.
- Blau, P. M. Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.
- Bloom, L. J., Weigel, R. G., & Trautt, G. M. "Therapeugenic" factors in psychotherapy: Effects of office decor and subject-therapist sex pairing on the perception of credibility. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 867-873.
- Brooks, L. Interactive effects of sex and status on self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 469-474.
- Bruning, J. L., & Kintz, B. L. Computational handbook of statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1977.
- Burke, R. J., & Wilcox, D. S. Bases of supervisory power and subordinate job satisfactions. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1971, 3(2), 183-193.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Critical variables in effective counselor training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16(3), 238-245.
- Carter, J. A. Impressions of counselors as a function of counselor physical attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 28-34.
- Cartwright, D. A field theoretical conception of power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1959, 183-220.
- Cash, T. F., Begley, P. J., McGown, D. A., & Weise, B. C. When counselors are heard but not seen: Initial impact of physical attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 273-279.
- Cash, T. F., & Kehr, J. Influence of nonprofessional counselors' physical attractiveness and sex on perceptions of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 336-342.
- Cash, T. F., Kehr, J., & Salzbach, R. F. Help-seeking attitudes and perceptions of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 264-269.
- Cash, T. F., & Salzbach, R. F. The beauty of counseling: Effects of counselor physical attractiveness and self-disclosures on perceptions of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 283-291.

- Claiborn, C. D., & Schmidt, L. D. Effects of pre-session information on the perception of the counselor in an interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 259-263.
- Clark, C. M. On the process of counseling supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 64-67.
- Cohen, J. Statistical power analyses for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Corrigan, J. D. Salient attributes of two types of helpers: Friends and mental health professionals. Unpublished master's thesis. Ohio State University, 1977.
- Corrigan, J. D. Salient attributes of two types of helpers: Friends and mental health professionals. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 588-590.
- Corrigan, J. D. Development and validation of revisions in the Counselor Rating Form. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1981.
- Corrigan, J. D., Dell, D. M., Lewis, K. N., & Schmidt, L. D. Counseling as a social influence process: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1980, 27(4), 395-441.
- Dahl, R. A. The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 1957, 2, 201-215.
- Davidson, T. N., & Emmer, E. T. Immediate effect of supportive and nonsupportive behavior on counselor candidates' focus of concern. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6(1), 27-31.
- Delaney, D. J., Long, T. J., Masucci, M. J., & Moses, H. A. Skill acquisition and perception change of counselor candidates during practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 273-282.
- Dell, D. M. Counselor power base, influence attempt, and behavior change in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 399-405.
- Demos, G. D., & Zuwaylif, F. H. Counselor attitudes in relation to the theoretical positions of their supervisors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1962, 11(1), 8-13.
- Dodenhoff, J. T. Interpersonal attraction and direct-indirect supervisor influence as predictors of counselor trainee effectiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1981, 28(1), 47-52.

- Doehrman, M. J. G. Parallel processes in supervision and psychotherapy. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6642-B.
- Ekstein, R. Supervision of psychotherapy: Is it teaching? or is it administration? or is it therapy? Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1964, 1, 137-138.
- Ekstein, R., & Wallerstein, R. The teaching and learning of psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, Ill.: Row-Peterson, 1957.
- Fontaine, G., & Beerman, J. Affective consequences of social power: Powerholder and target expectancies associated with different types of power. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 771-774.
- Ford, J. D. Research on training counselors and clinicians. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49(1), 87-130.
- French, J. R. P., Jr. A formal theory of social power. Psychological Review, 1956, 63(3), 181-194.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., Morrison, H. W., & Levinger, G. Coercive power and forces affecting conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 93-101.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1959.
- Galinsky, M. J., Rosen, A., & Thomas, E. J. Distinctiveness of bases of social power. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33(3), 727-730.
- Garfield, S. L. Research on the training of professional psychotherapists. In A. S. Gurman & A. M. Razin (Eds.), Effective psychotherapy: A handbook of research. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977.
- Gelso, C. J. Research in counseling: Methodological and professional issues. Counseling Psychologist, 1979, 8, 7-35.
- Giannandrea, V., & Murphy, K. C. Similarity self-disclosure and return for a second interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 545-548.
- Goldstein, A. P. Psychotherapy research by extrapolation from social psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 38-45.

- Greenberg, R. P. Effects of presession information on perception of the therapist in a psychotherapy analogue. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 425-429.
- Greene, C. N., & Podsakoff, P. M. Effects of withdrawal of a self-contingent reward on supervisory influence and power. Academy of Management Journal, 1981, 24(3), 527-542.
- Guttman, M. A. J., & Haase, R. F. Effect of experimentally induced sets of high and low "expertness" during brief vocational counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 171-178.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Ronnestad, M. H. Practicum supervision: Learning theory. In G. F. Farwell, N. R. Gamsky, & P. Mathiew (Eds.), The counselor's handbook. New York: Intext Educational Publishers, 1974, 133-140.
- Haase, R. F., & Tepper, D. T. Nonverbal components of empathic communication. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 417-424.
- Hansen, J. C. Trainee's expectations of supervision in counseling practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4(2), 75-80.
- Hansen, J. C., Pound, R., & Petro, C. Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1976, 16, 107-116.
- Hansen, J. C., Robins, T. H., & Grimes, J. Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1982, 22(1), 15-24.
- Hansen, J. C., & Warner, R. W., Jr. Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 261-272.
- Harsanyi, J. C. Measurement of social power, opportunity costs, and the theory of specific two-person bargaining games. Behavioural Science, 1962, 7, 67-80.
- Hartley, D. L. Perceived counselor credibility as a function of counseling interactions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 63-68.
- Hays, W. L. Statistics for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973.
- Heppner, P. P., & Dixon, D. N. Effects of client perceived need and counselor role on client's behaviors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 193-199.

- Heppner, P. P., & Handley, P. G. A study of the interpersonal influence process in supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1981, 28(5), 437-444.
- Heppner, P. P., & Handley, P. The relationship between supervisory behaviors and perceived supervisor expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1982, 22(1), 37-46.
- Heppner, P. P., & Pew, S. Effects of diplomas, awards, and counselor sex on perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 514-519.
- Hess, A. K. Summing up and moving forward in psychotherapy supervision. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980, 525-530. (a)
- _____. Training models and the nature of psychotherapy supervision. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980. (b)
- Hoffman-Graff, M. A. Interviewer use of positive and negative self-disclosure and interviewer-subject sex pairing. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 184-190.
- Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G., Jr. Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- James, C. R. The socialization process of psychotherapy training: Self-disclosure, self-concept, and conformity of values orientation as mediated by trainer influence. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 3498-B.
- Johnson, D. W., & Noonan, M. P. Effects of acceptance and reciprocation of self-disclosures on the development of trust. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 430-436.
- Kadushin, A. Games people play in supervision. Social Work, 1968, 13, 23-32.
- Kaplan, D. M. Current trends in practicum supervision research. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1983, 22(3), 215-226.
- Karr, J. T., & Geist, G. O. Facilitation in supervision as related to facilitation in therapy. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1977, 16(4), 263-268.

- Kaul, T. J., & Schmidt, L. D. Dimensions of interviewer trustworthiness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 542-548.
- Kell, B. L., & Mueller, W. J. Impact and change: A study of counseling relationships. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1966.
- Kelman, H. C. Processes of opinion change. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1961, 25, 57-78.
- Kerr, B. A., & Dell, D. M. Perceived interviewer expertness and attractiveness: Effects of interviewer behavior and attire and interview setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 553-556.
- Kerr, B. A., Olson, D. H., Claiborn, C. D., Bauers-Gruenler, S. J., & Paolo, A. M. Overcoming opposition and resistance: Differential functions of expertness and attractiveness in career counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1983, 30(3), 323-331.
- Kleinke, C. L., Staneski, R. A., & Berger, D. E. Evaluation of an interviewer as a function of interviewer gaze, reinforcement of subject gaze, and interviewer attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 115-122.
- Kleinke, C. L., & Tully, T. B. Influence of talking level on perceptions of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 23-29.
- LaCrosse, M. B. Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor attractiveness and persuasiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 563-566.
- _____. Comparative perceptions of counselor behavior: A replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 464-471.
- _____. Perceived counselor social influence and counseling outcomes: Validity of the counselor rating form. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1980, 27(4), 320-327.
- LaCrosse, M. B., & Barak, A. Differential perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 170-172.
- Lambert, M. J. Supervisory and counseling process: A comparative study. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1974, 14(1), 54-60.
- _____. Research and the supervisory process. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.

- Leddick, G. R., & Bernard, J. M. The history of supervision: A critical review. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1980, 19(3), 186-196.
- Lewis, K. N., & Walsh, W. B. Physical attractiveness: Its impact on the perception of a female counselor. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 210-216.
- Litman-Adizes, T., Raven, B. H., & Fontaine, G. Consequences of social power and causal attribution for compliance as seen by powerholder and target. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1978, 4(2), 260-264.
- Mann, B., & Murphy, K. C. Timing of self-disclosure, reciprocity of self-disclosure, and reactions to an initial interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 304-308.
- March, J. G. An introduction to the theory and measurement of influence. American Political Science Review, 1955, 49, 431-451.
- Martin, J. C., & Carkhuff, R. R. Changes in personality and interpersonal functioning of counselors-in-training. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 109-110.
- Martin, R. The concept of power: A critical defence. British Journal of Sociology, 1971, 22, 240-256.
- Matarazzo, R. G. Research on the teaching and learning of psychotherapeutic skills. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.
- McCarthy, P. R., & Betz, N. E. Differential effects of self-disclosing versus self-involving counselor statements. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 251-256.
- McKee, K., & Smouse, A. D. Clients' perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness: Initial impact of counselor status and weight. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1983, 30(3), 332-338.
- Merluzzi, T. M., Merluzzi, B. H., & Kaul, T. J. Counselor race and power base: Effects on attitudes and behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 430-436.
- Merluzzi, T. V., & Brischetto, C. S. Breach of confidentiality and perceived trustworthiness of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1983, 30(2), 245-251.

- Murphy, K. C., & Strong, S. R. Some effects of similarity self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 121-124.
- Patterson, C. H. Supervising students in counseling practicum. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 47-53.
- Patton, M. J. Attraction, discrepancy, and responses to psychological treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 317-324.
- Pierce, R., Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. The differential effects of high and low functioning counselors upon counselors-in-training. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 212-215.
- Pierce, R. M., & Schauble, P. G. Graduate training of facilitative counselors: The effects of individual supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17(3), 210-215.
- _____. Follow-up study on effects of individual supervision in graduate school training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18(2), 186-187.
- Price, L. Z., & Iverson, M. A. Students' perception of counselors with varying statuses and role behaviors in the initial interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 469-475.
- Raven, B. H. Social influence and power. In I. D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965, 371-382.
- _____. The comparative analysis of power and power preference. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1974, 172-198.
- Raven, B. H., & French, J. R. P., Jr. Group support, legitimate power, and social influence. Journal of Personality, 1958, 76, 400-409. (a)
- _____. Legitimate power, coercive power, and observability in social influence. Sociometry, 1958, 21, 83-97. (b)
- Read, P. B. Source of authority and the legitimization of leadership in small groups. Sociometry, 1974, 37(2), 189-204.
- Roark, A. E. The influence of training on counselor responses in actual and role-playing interviews. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8(4), 289-295.
- Robyak, R. J. Effects of gender on the counselor's preference for methods of influence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1981, 28(1), 7-12.

- Rotter, J. B., & Stein, D. K. Public attitudes toward the trustworthiness and altruism of twenty selected occupations. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1971, 1, 334-343.
- Savitsky, J. C., Zarle, T. H., & Keedy, N. S. The effect of information about an interviewer on interviewee perceptions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 158-159.
- Scheid, A. B. Clients' perception of the counselor: The influence of counselor introduction and behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 503-508.
- Schlessinger, N. Supervision of psychotherapy: A critical review of the literature. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1966, 15, 129-134.
- Schmidt, L. D., & Strong, S. R. Attractiveness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 348-351.
- Schoch, E. W. Practicum counselor's behavioral changes. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 57-62.
- Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. Social psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.
- Sell, J. M. Effects of subject self-esteem, test performance feedback, and counselor attractiveness on influence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 342-344.
- Sheley, K., & Shaw, M. E. Social power: To use or not to use? Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1979, 13(4), 257-260.
- Shostrum, E. L. (Producer). Three approaches to psychotherapy. Santa Ana, Calif.: Psychological Films, 1966. (Film)
- Siegel, J. C., & Sell, J. M. Effects of objective evidence of expertness and nonverbal behavior on client-perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 188-192.
- Slocum, J. W., Jr. Supervisory influence and the professional employee. Personnel Journal, 1970, 49, 484-488.
- Smith-Hanen, S. S. Effects of nonverbal behaviors on judged levels of counselor warmth and empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 87-91.
- Spiegel, S. B. Expertness, similarity, and perceived counselor competence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 436-441.

- Sprafkin, R. P. Communicator expertness and changes in word meaning in psychological treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 191-196.
- Strohmer, D. C., & Biggs, D. A. Effects of counselor disability status on disabled subjects' perceptions of counselor attractiveness and expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1983, 30(2), 202-208.
- Strong, S. R. Counseling: An interpersonal influence process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 215-224.
- Strong, S. R., & Matross, R. P. Change processes in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 25-37.
- Strong, S. R., & Schmidt, L. D. Expertness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 81-87.
- Student, K. R. Supervisory influence and work-group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 188-194.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. A. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Wampold, B. E., Furlong, M. J., & Atkinson, D. R. Statistical significance, power, and effect size: A response to the reexamination of reviewer bias. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1983, 30(3), 459-463.
- Wedeking, D. F., & Scott, T. B. A study of the relationship between supervisor and trainee behaviors in counseling practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1976, 15, 259-266.
- Worthington, E. L., & Roehlke, H. J. Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors-in-training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 64-73.
- Yellin, C. S. The role of evaluative feedback in counseling supervision. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 5263-A.
- Zamostny, K. P., Corrigan, J. D., & Eggert, M. A. Replication and extension of social influence processes in counseling: A field study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1981, 28, 481-489.
- Zipf, S. G. Resistance and conformity under reward and punishment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61(1), 102-109.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPT OF SUPERVISION INTERVIEW

TRANSCRIPT OF SUPERVISION INTERVIEW

(Fade in to session.)

Supervisor (S): "Well, that was . . . I enjoyed watching that tape. It gave me a chance to see how . . . how things are going for you."

Trainee (T): "Yeah, the taping didn't go as badly as I thought it might . . . ummm . . . She didn't seem as uncomfortable with being videotaped."

S: "Uh-huh. That's . . . that's good. I guess I'm aware that sometimes people can be uncomfortable with taping. Yet, if you're comfortable with it, it's as though they really sort of forget about it."

T: "Yeah, I think I was probably more uncomfortable than she was."

S: "Uh-huh."

T: "Really, . . . really I think I kinda forgot about it after the first couple of . . ."

S: "Yeah, it was obvious just kinda looking at it that after a few minutes things just kind of . . . settled out pretty good, and One of the things that you really do well is that I think you established rapport with the client."

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: "And you know, we've looked at this . . . you've done some of this before with this client, and I . . . I think that you . . . you set that up very nicely."

T: "Yeah, I felt like . . . I felt like we have a pretty good relationship going. I think that she really trusts me, and that she, huh, she and I can really . . . really talk, and that she feels comfortable in . . . in sharing with me what's going on with her."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: ". . . I'm very pleased with that aspect of our . . . counseling."

S: "Yeah . . . I think . . . You know, and I see that as a positive for you . . . that . . . irrespective of the kinds of things she ends up talking about, that . . . I at least have a sense that there's some rapport there. That you're really making an attempt . . . at least most of the time I . . . I sense that that's going on."

T: "Yeah, I really like her! And I think that she's . . . ummm . . . I enjoyed working with her, and I think that's part of it too."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "You know . . . you know, I really do want to try to help her with her . . . her problems, and I'm concerned with what's going on with her."

S: "Uh-huh. Yeah. I guess one of the things I was aware of as we were watching the tape . . . and that is, you know, she's talking about being pretty depressed. And . . . talking about the difficulties also with her boyfriend."

T: "Um-mmm."

S: "And, I was hearing a lot of anger coming through."

T: "Umph."

S: "Ahh . . . as she's talking about that . . . her anger toward . . . toward him, her anger toward men. And I was very aware that you . . . were . . . sidestepping that. Uh . . . at least on the tape in the session, it was as though you weren't even acknowledging that was happening."

T: "Umph."

S: "And, ah, I guess I'm wondering . . . as we were watching it, did you have any . . . did you notice it at that point?"

T: "Uh, she did seem . . . ummm . . . like you said she's . . . uh . . . she's pretty depressed right now. I guess we've talked about that before. I guess she did maybe seem . . . a little mad at . . . ummm . . . at her boyfriend, about . . . about maybe She did say something about that she didn't feel like he was treating her right, and that kind of thing. So, . . . yeah, I guess . . . I guess she did seem kinda mad."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "But, uh"

- S: "Yeah, I guess I think it was even more than that. I think it was . . . I think she was pretty angry. And I think that's an issue that . . . probably you haven't gotten to yet with her. And you know, this is what? The fifth session, I guess, and she's still pretty depressed, and you know one of the . . . one of the things that can happen with depression, is that, that there can be a lot of anger that goes with it. And somehow I guess I have . . . have the feeling that you're avoiding that. That you're uncomfortable with the anger, and . . . and staying away from it."
- T: "Oh, I . . . ah, I don't know. Ummm. She . . . you know, she seemed mad. I guess I just didn't . . . feel like . . . that . . . that was that important maybe. She seems not to feel very good about herself."
- S: "Uh-huh. Hmmm."
- T: "But, um, you know, I guess I . . . yeah, I realize she is . . . is mad at her boyfriend"
- S: "Um-hmmm."
- T: ". . . But she doesn't seem to . . . she doesn't seem to talk about that very much."
- S: "Hmmm. Yeah."
- T: "She, uh, she doesn't talk about being mad at him much."
- S: "I . . . I guess I'm hearing you say, too, that at some level, you kind of are noticing it, but that she doesn't seem to be treating it very directly, that . . . you're not really pushing her on it, either, right now."
- T: "Yeah, I guess not. Uh . . . that . . . that, that probably is something. You know, you've mentioned that to me with a couple of other clients this, this issue of . . . of anger. I don't . . . I don't think I'm afraid to deal with it. Maybe I did . . . you know, maybe I'm not sure of just how to go about . . . doing that."
- S: "Um-hmmm."
- T: "Uhhh"
- S: "I think that . . . I do see that as being kind of a problem area, and, and one that you really are going to need to do something"

- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: ". . . (Pause) . . . In fact, I guess my feeling is that, if you don't become aware of your difficulty with this, you're probably never going to be effective with this kind of client."
- T: "Umph." Yeah, uh . . . well, I would like to . . . improve on that, then, because I . . . I think I . . . I see a lot of . . . I think I see a lot of this type of person, especially later on . . . if I'm working at the college center or something."
- S: "Yeah. One thing that I'm . . . that I'm taking a look at some of the other things that I also think you're doing well, though . . . of . . . your obvious concern about her is coming through. I think that's part of your rapport there. Is that you . . . give the message of being pretty concerned"
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: ". . . And being really involved with her. And I think, you know . . . I see her responding to that."
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: "Uh, and I think that's part of . . . that's part of the rapport-building. I remember back to the first session you had on the tape that you showed me, and . . . it was very shortly into the session, and I, uh, got the feeling that the rapport was going."
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: "Ah, and I think that's a great foundation to . . . to go from. You know, as we talked about, that there are some things you may need to do, . . . and I think you have that foundation part down really well. And, I think you made good rapport. I think you . . . you . . . uh . . . have a sense of how to be empathic with the person."
- T: "Hmmm."
- S: "You know, I . . . I see those as being some skills that you've . . . that you've really got! Ummm. . . ."
- T: "So you think if I, uh, if I were a little more . . . confrontive with her, or tried to make her talk about . . . being angry, that she would . . . that . . . that she would still want to come and talk to me. That she wouldn't just quit coming then?"

- S: "Yeah, I think in fact you would probably, instead of being just a good listener, you would move more in the direction that I . . . I believe both you and I want you to go, and that is that you'd become a better therapist."
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: ". . . Not just a better listener. One of the things that happens, and that's happening with her, because as she gets angry, she starts rambling"
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: ". . . and she It's as though the energy is there, and she starts moving off into other areas."
- T: "Yeah, I've noticed that!"
- S: "And you're letting her go with that!"
- T: "Yeah. She seems to A lot of times it seems like I'll ask a good question, or I'll make what I think's a pretty good accurate statement, and then, all of a sudden . . . before I know it, she doesn't always answer or respond to what I said. It seems like she, she goes into a discussion of something related to it, and before I know it, I either . . . I . . . I . . . was kinda noticing that a lot of times she didn't really seem to . . . answer or respond directly to what I was"
- S: "Right. And so she . . . yeah, she does! She starts rambling, and then one of the things that you do, you let her ramble, and then I noticed that you were asking some very specific questions . . . which were very much 'on' with what she was . . . talking about."
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: "You're . . . you're . . . content-oriented. You were"
- T: "Yeah."
- S: ". . . You were sticking with her content, but it was sorta like you just about reinforced her . . . tangents."
- T: "Hmmm. Yeah."
- S: "And . . . and I think that that's, ah, that's another area. . . . You know, the skill of . . . of staying away from those kind of direct questions."

- T: "Yeah."
- S: "As well as . . . keeping her in . . . in some kind of focus."
- T: "Yeah. (Pause.) I guess I just hate to interrupt her."
- S: "Mmmm."
- T: "You know, . . . that . . . just, uh, it seems like, um, that once I make a statement I guess, and she starts . . . seems like she's interested in talking about that, and that that's something she wants to talk about. . . . It doesn't seem right for me to"
- S: "Um-hmmm."
- T: " . . . to"
- S: "Sort of intrude"
- T: "Right."
- S: ". . . on her . . . her process, or her direction."
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: "Yeah, and I guess I feel strongly enough about . . . (pauses) . . . her rambling is her way of . . . not working."
- T: "Mmmm."
- S: "Um, and . . . and you're letting her ramble, instead of you kinda keeping her back into that focus. Uh, and the . . . and the questions that you're asking. I think . . . I don't think that those . . . are some things that you need to keep doing!"
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: "You know, I think you need to . . . to . . . focus down, and . . . not let . . . those . . . happen."
- (Pause.)
- "In fact, I guess my feeling is that . . . you had better really improve on some of those skills . . . that we're talking about now. . . . or . . . uh . . . your evaluation for the quarter is going to be pretty low!"

T: "Mmmm. Well, I That's important for me to The grade's important, but also I do want to improve on those skills. Hmmm."

(Pause.)

"How . . . how could I go about keeping her from it? Doing that?"

S: "OK. I was going to Let me just toss something in before we do that, and that is, you know I'm aware that as we're talking, that you conceptualize some of the stuff real well."

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: ". . . And so, you know, I guess that kinda ties into your question, though, now about 'how do you do this?'"

T: "Yeah."

S: ". . . Of . . . what do you do? Um . . . and I guess part of it is, you know, as we're talking about, and . . . and as we kinda conceptualize maybe some more of what her issues are, and . . . and her needing to deal with her anger, and not, every time she starts getting angry, she feels sort of the agitation . . . she feels the energy, and she immediately . . . darts off into some other direction, and starts talking about it, and kinda spinning out"

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: "Uh . . . and not doing it!"

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: "And, uh, you know, maybe for you to just really keep that in focus. Maybe keeping some notes. You know, like I took notes while we were doing the . . . the tape . . . and . . . had jotted down here so that I kinda keep track of where I want to go with you."

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: "You know, these are some of the things I want to make sure that I share with you, so that I don't come out of our talking without having said or pointed out some of the things that I think really need to be . . . done."

T: "Mmmm."

- S: "And maybe . . . you know, even if you don't walk into the session with some notes"
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: ". . . of sitting down a moment or two before you start the session, and just kind of going over, and . . . and . . . noticing, what is it I want to make sure and attend to this time?"
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: "Because, you know, you're starting out, and so it's not going to come natural to just know that . . . 'Oh yeah, this is something I've got to do,' or, 'This is something I'm going to attend to.'"
- T: "Um-hmmm."
- S: "Ah, maybe kinda focusing like that may be of some advantage to you."
- T: "Yeah, I think that might help me to really at least have a mental list, um, of things to be careful of, and to watch for"
- S: "Um-hmmm."
- T: ". . . and . . . and . . . you know, you've mentioned a couple of things that I need to . . ."
- S: "Um-hmmm."
- T: ". . . especially work on. And . . . it seems like you've said . . . you've mentioned these things a couple of times before, so . . ."
- S: "Uh-huh."
- T: ". . . um . . . I seem to have some difficulty in . . . in doing them in the session. I mean, a lot of this sounds good when we're sitting here"
- S: "Uh-huh."
- T: ". . . I guess I have trouble putting it into practice."
- S: "Yeah. Yeah, I guess . . . You know, I'm aware that . . . somehow taking and integrating the kind of feedback I'm giving you, and, uh, you know . . . even some of the comments you made as we watched the tape You've obviously . . . you've obviously grasped it."

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: "You've obviously noted some things on the tape . . . uh . . . even as we were listening to it . . . some of your comments about . . . you know . . . 'Hey, I just see this!,' or something like that. Lets me know that you're doing good conceptual work. But somehow, you're not taking . . . it, from here into there, and I'm not sure what's happening. You know . . . whether it's your own anxiety when you get in there, and you've got a real live person who's depending on you and"

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: ". . . and suddenly you get tense, and . . . and you just quit!"

T: "Yeah."

S: "Ummm, or what it is. But I guess I see that as really That's a vital point!"

T: "Yeah. I think my mind quits working sometimes when I . . . (laughs) . . . get in there with my . . ."

S: "Yeah, yeah."

T: ". . . with my clients, because . . . um . . . I seem . . . I am . . . I am . . . I do seem aware, and I think I . . . maybe I'll get . . . as I see more and more clients, maybe I'll . . . I hope to become more comfortable."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "And, so that maybe I can be a little more aware . . . of . . . some of these things."

S: "Um-hmmm. Yeah, I guess . . . you know, I guess this idea of being able to . . . to take what we're talking about, and . . . and . . . do something with it. And . . . and I'm aware you've had some difficulty."

(Pause.)

"Uh . . . I guess I don't see how you'll be ready for an advanced practicum unless you work on your ability to somehow integrate what we're doing here"

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: ". . . with what goes on in the session."

T: "Yeah, so that's pretty key . . . a pretty key skill, you think."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: ". . . to do."

S: "Um-hmmm. And yet, you know, as we're . . . as we're talking about it, and . . . and maybe we need to talk for a few moments. I'm aware that I've been focusing on some of the . . . some of the things I feel like you really need to work on. Um, let's talk about her for a moment in terms of how you see her dealing with her world."

T: "OK."

S: "Ahh, I mean she's . . . pretty depressed." (Softens voice.)

T: "Right. Um-hmmm."

S: "And . . . uh . . . you know, I guess I'm saying I see that tied to the anger. (Pauses.) What . . . what are your thoughts about it? What else might be going on?"

T: "She doesn't feel very good about herself?"

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "She seems to have a real poor . . . self-esteem. Ah . . . and things just seem . . . (sighs) . . . I guess the way I see her looking at her world is . . . is like . . . things just kinda happen to her, or people . . . treat her badly. Like this deal with her boyfriend"

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "And she doesn't seem to be . . . you know, she just kinda . . . takes it, and blames herself for a lot of that stuff. Ummm"

S: "Yeah. Um-hmmm."

T: "Ummm"

S: "Sort of . . . taking responsibility for stuff that's really not hers at all."

T: "Yeah. But I don't think she realizes that . . . that she's doing that. I think she sees . . . I think she just doesn't see herself as being a very . . . uh . . . likeable, or very . . . uh, desireable, maybe, person."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "And so I think . . . like when this boyfriend treats her like dirt, or doesn't call her, or . . . or . . . you know, maybe even . . . goes out with other girls, that she doesn't . . . she's afraid . . . maybe to . . . to bring it up, or she just kinda accepts it, and doesn't do anything about it."

S: "Do you have some ideas about how you might help her . . . become aware . . . of it?"

T: "Um. I've thought about . . . uh . . . maybe get . . . trying to get her into an assertiveness training group."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "I thought that . . . that might be . . . might be good for her, because she doesn't . . . she's not very assertive at all!"

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "And people do, not just her boyfriend, but other people. . . . She's"

S: "Sort of a lifestyle for her."

T: "Yeah. Yeah, you know, her . . . she has problems with her roommates, too."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "You know, if somebody's playing their stereo so loud she can't get to sleep, she's the type of person who will . . . ah . . . just lie there awake rather than say anything to 'em."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "Or, ah, or that. So I thought that maybe some assertiveness training might help her."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "Um. (Pause.) I think one thing I'm trying to do through just accepting her, and um, and encouraging her to talk, is to let her know that I like her, and that . . . you know, I think she's a . . . worthwhile person. And that . . . she can . . . maybe through . . . through that, that she'll come to like herself a little bit more."

S: "Um-hmmm."

T: "And see herself as being . . . more desireable. And have better self-esteem about herself."

S: "Um-hmm. Uh-hmm. OK. Yeah, both of those . . . of those things that you're mentioning do make sense. Um . . . (Pause) . . . And there might be some other, ah There's a couple of articles that talk about some therapeutic techniques with . . . with people like those, that I'll . . . go ahead and get a copy to you, so you can kind of take a look over them. Kinda give yourself a chance to . . . to expand out and . . . and, ah, look at what some other folks have done. What seems to be effective in this kind of a situation. And, ah . . . I'll let you take a look at those."

T: "Yeah! I'd like to! I think that would . . . that would help. I'm . . . I'm kind of at the point with her now where I feel like . . . we've talked a lot about her problems, but . . . I'm not real sure what to . . . (laughs) . . . what to do with it now!"

S: "Yeah. Uh-huh. OK. Yeah, uh."

(Pause.)

"You know . . . ah . . . I guess I'm just kinda, uh, thinking back over if there was anything, uh, specific that I . . . that I . . . haven't covered here that I was wanting to. I guess . . . um . . . you know, I see you as having some work to do."

T: "Um-hmm."

S: "You know, in the future, you're gonna need some recommendations from me for the assistantship that you're hoping to get."

T: "Um-hmm."

S: "And, before I write one, you're going to need to change some of the things that we've talked about."

(Pause.)

T: "Hmmm."

S: "And, uh, you know, I guess as we This is not a real easy kind of person. You're making a good . . . you know, you're making a good rapport with her. You're getting started.

And I think you're setting some . . . some good steps, and uh, getting going into it. And, uh, yet at the same time there's some steps . . . beyond merely . . . getting that going with her that you need to . . . to work on."

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: "And, uh, . . . I think up to now, you're kinda focused on those. And I'm wanting you at this point to really shift gears, and see what you can do to help her get moving."

T: "OK."

S: "It's sort of like you've made the link."

T: "Um-hmmm."

S: "And now you . . . you need to do something else."

T: "Yeah. I think you're right. I think that's really . . . the direction . . . we need to"

S: "Um-hmmm. Yeah. And, you know . . . as we . . . um . . . as we, uh, kinda look at this again, . . . and, next week I guess we can take a look at it. Maybe that's . . . one of the things that I'm gonna be really watching for, that I want you to do. Of, um, seeing how you fit these things in."

T: "Um-hmmm."

(Fade out.)

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPT OF SUPERVISOR'S SUMMARY
AND INFLUENCE MESSAGE

TRANSCRIPT OF SUPERVISOR'S SUMMARY
AND INFLUENCE MESSAGE

"Before you do your ratings, I'd like to share my impressions of this counselor-trainee with you. As I noted in the interview, the counselor conceptualizes rather well, and he builds good rapport with his client. Still, he has a tendency to miss the anger that the client exhibits. He never really confronted the client with her anger, and for someone at his level, he's really not very capable or comfortable with the skill of confrontation.

Also, I guess I look at his ability to focus the client, and he strikes me again as less competent than what he should be. By letting the client ramble on, he really lost control of the counseling session."

(Pause.)

"I see these as two very important skills, and I believe that this counselor-trainee falls behind others in this particular area. For this reason, I guess I see him as less knowledgeable and not really as well trained as most counselors."

(Pause.)

"Now take a moment and think about the supervision session. Then indicate your impressions of this trainee by completing the forms in Part IV."

(Fade out.)

APPENDIX C

PILOT STUDY FINDINGS

PILOT STUDY FINDINGS

Three procedural checks and three pilot studies were conducted to check various aspects of the experimental procedure. In the first procedural check, ten judges were asked to rate the supervisor's overall effectiveness in the taped session, and to identify the types of power they believed were displayed. Seven raters were advanced doctoral students in counseling psychology at the University of Tennessee, and 3 were staff psychologists at the counseling center there. All of the judges personally knew the individual portraying the supervisor. Five persons judged the high coercion condition, and 5 judged the low coercion condition. Half of the judges received introductions corresponding to the high legitimacy condition, and the remainder received introductions reflecting low legitimacy.

The judges were asked to rate the supervisor's behavior by responding to a modified version of Worthington and Roehlke's (1979) Supervision Questionnaire (SQ; see Appendix F). The SQ consists of 42 supervisor behaviors judged by professional supervisors to be important to good supervision. Those items which were inappropriate to a 20-minute excerpt of supervision were eliminated. All but three of the remaining 23 items previously had been rated by supervisors as desirable, important, or absolutely crucial to good supervision (Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = perfectly descriptive of the supervisor's behavior; 1 = not at all descriptive of the supervisor's behavior). Possible total scores for the 23 items ranged from 23 to 115. The higher the score, the greater was the supervisor's effectiveness.

Judges' scores on the SQ ranged from 54 to 87 in the low coercion condition, and from 40 to 88 in the high coercion condition. Differences between the two groups' perceptions of supervisor behavior were tested by the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U-test (Bruning & Kuntz, 1977). Results ($T'_1 = 33$, $T'_2 = 22$, $p = .155$) revealed no significant difference between the two groups with regard to perceived effectiveness of the supervisor's behavior. Since a p of .155 approached significance, a second procedural check was conducted by asking another sample of eight judges unfamiliar with the supervisor to rate his effectiveness in both tapes. Three of these judges held a doctorate in counseling psychology, 4 had Master's degrees in counseling, and 1 was an advanced MSW-holder; all judges worked in either a teaching or counseling capacity. Scores for these judges ranged from 68 to 81 in the low coercion condition, and from 73 to 86 in the high coercion condition. This time, results of a Mann-Whitney U-test clearly revealed no significant difference between the two conditions with regard to perceptions of the supervisor's effectiveness ($T'_1 = 16$, $T'_2 = 20$, $p = .343$).

In order to determine the effectiveness of the legitimate and coercive power manipulations, the two samples of judges described above were asked to identify the type of power they would attribute to the supervisor, based upon theoretical definitions of legitimate and coercive power. For coercive power, percent of rater agreement (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974) with the theoretical definitions provided was 90% and 87% in the first and second sample, respectively. For legitimate power, agreement percentages of 50% and 63% were reported. Several possible explanations for the lower efficacy of the legitimate power manipulation were suggested by judges' comments in post-task interviews. First, judges seemed to identify with the position of the supervisor, and attributed high degrees of legitimacy to him simply because of the nature of the role of supervisor. Secondly, many judges admitted that they ignored the theoretical definition provided, and based ratings on their personal notions of legitimate power instead. When examined, these notions seemed to be similar to the theoretical definition of expert power (French & Raven, 1959). Lastly, the task of evaluating the supervisor's behavior reportedly interfered with judges' rating of the endorsement information, a task the subjects would not be asked to perform. Several raters did state that they believed actual subjects would be more likely to attend to the endorsement information.

The efficacy of the legitimate power manipulation was tested further with a third group of judges, ten counseling psychologists, who were asked simply to read one of the two written introductions to the tape, and then identify the type of power depicted. By doing this, interference from the evaluation task was eliminated. In this final procedural check, all ten judges were able to correctly identify the level of legitimate power (percent of agreement = 100%). Later, in the first of 3 pilot studies of the true experimental procedure, counseling students serving as subjects were asked post-experimentally to identify the type of power they would assign to the supervisor. Percent of agreement for the legitimate and coercive power manipulations was 80% and 88%, respectively. These results lend support to the effectiveness of the power manipulations.

Other information generated in the above procedures was used to refine several procedural aspects of the study. Based on the comments of the judges and subjects, the introductions operationalizing legitimate power were made more concise and were revised so that the subjects were addressed directly. This was accomplished by the use of "you" language. In order to enhance recall of the legitimacy manipulation, the endorsement information was presented both before and after subjects watched the videotape.

A second pilot study then was conducted to test these methodological changes. Seventeen students, 14 females and 3 males, who were enrolled in a course in basic counseling theory and practice

volunteered to serve as subjects. All subjects were undergraduates at a small, Mid-Atlantic liberal arts college, except for three individuals who were enrolled in master's degree programs in psychology or education. Two individuals were Black, and the remainder were Caucasian. All subjects received extra course credit for their participation in the study. Subjects were told that the study related to counselor supervision and evaluation. The basic experimental procedure described in Chapter III was tested in this pilot. However, one aspect in the procedure differed from the method used in the final research study. The pilot study's design was balanced to control for the effects of the type of supervisor feedback (positive or negative). Therefore, each condition had two different influence messages. In the positive feedback message, the supervisor rated the trainee's counseling skills considerably higher than other students at the same level of experience; in the negative feedback message, the supervisor's evaluation of the trainee's skills was considerably lower than that of other students. This influence segment followed a fade-out from the supervision session, and was presented as if it were a closing comment made by the supervisor to the trainee within the context of the supervision meeting.

Subjects in the above pilot study reacted favorably to the overall supervision session. In response to various open-ended questions, subjects indicated that they were able to place themselves in the role of the trainee, and could imagine themselves being supervised. Furthermore, subjects seemed to attend to the legitimacy manipulation, as was indicated by their self-reports of perceptions of the supervisor. For example, in the high coercion conditions, the highly legitimate supervisor often was viewed as "honest," "firm," "constructive," "helpful," and so on. However, subjects who received information establishing the supervisor's low legitimacy often described him as "lacking warmth," "cold," "punitive," "lacking personality," and "less credible." Presentation of the endorsement information a second time in the CRF-S instructions seemed to aid recall of the independent variable manipulation.

Subjects in the pilot studies as well as judges who completed the procedural checks perceived the supervision session to be a realistic, believable, and natural portrayal of supervision. A few judges disagreed with some aspects of the supervisor's behavior, but attributed their objections more to differences in personal style than to the quality of supervision. The four statements in the high coercion conditions were not considered abusive or threatening, and were seen as constructive by some individuals. After some revision, directions provided in a packet given to each subject were judged to be clear and easy to follow. The technical quality of the videotape also was judged to be satisfactory.

Subjects had a less favorable reaction to the influence message. Subjects reported that they found this segment confusing,

redundant, and poorly timed, and were distracted by the fade-out because they felt that they had "missed something" in the supervision session. Also, many subjects, regardless of their assigned experimental condition, stated that the supervisor's delivery of the feedback appeared incongruent with his behavior earlier in the session.

The above factors indicated the necessity of a revision of the influence message. Since it is rarely difficult for a trainee to accept positive feedback, and since the goal of the study was to detect differential effects of power on the acceptance of feedback, it seemed reasonable to look at the supervisor's influence only with respect to subjects' acceptance of negative feedback. Therefore, the original influence segment was substituted with another in which the supervisor directly addressed the subjects, by facing the camera, and summarized his negative impressions of the trainee's overall counseling ability. This new segment followed the end of the supervision session.

A check of this revision was made in a third and final pilot study. Twelve graduate counseling students from the University of Tennessee participated. Reactions to the new influence message were much more favorable. Subjects reported that the summary statement was not confusing, and seemed to follow logically after the supervision session. Based on these results, the revised influence segment was incorporated into the design of the final study. Appendix H contains the raw scores and means from the third pilot study.

APPENDIX D

COUNSELOR RATING FORM--SHORT VERSION

COUNSELOR RATING FORM--SHORT VERSION

INSTRUCTIONS

We would like you to rate several characteristics of your therapist. For each characteristic on the following page, there is 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 view your therapist. For example:

FUNNY

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

WELL DRESSED

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

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

Though all of the following characteristics are desirable, therapists differ in their strengths. We are interested in knowing how you view these differences. Remember, your responses are totally anonymous. There is no way to associate you with the ratings you make.

FRIENDLY

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

EXPERIENCED

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

HONEST

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

LIKEABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

EXPERT

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

RELIABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SOCIABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

PREPARED

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SINCERE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

WARM

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SKILLFUL

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

TRUSTWORTHY

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE OF INSTRUCTION PACKET GIVEN TO SUBJECTS

SAMPLE OF INSTRUCTION PACKET GIVEN TO SUBJECTS

STUDY FORMAT: INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS

PART I:	Introduction
PART II:	Supervision Session
PART III:	Supervisor's Summary
PART IV:	Completion of Ratings

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND READ PART I NOW.

PART I: INTRODUCTION

You will watch a videotape of a supervision session based on a counselor-trainee's performance in a counseling interview. The supervisor and trainee already have reviewed the counseling interview, and are about to discuss the trainee's performance.

After the conclusion of the supervision session, the supervisor will reappear to comment on the interaction.

In the last phase of the study, you will be asked to rate the counselor-trainee, and perhaps the supervisor as well.

NOW TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE.

PART II: SUPERVISION SESSION

Carefully read the following.

As you watch the tape, imagine that you are the practicum student being supervised. You are a counselor-trainee. You have been assigned to this particular supervisor. You know that less than 10% of the students in your program have recommended this person as a supervisor.

Please listen and watch carefully.

AT THE END OF THE SESSION, TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE.

PART III: SUPERVISOR'S SUMMARY

The supervisor will now reappear on the videotape, and comment on the supervision session.

Please listen and watch carefully.

WHEN HE IS FINISHED, TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE.

PART IV: RATINGS

INSTRUCTIONS

We would like you to rate several characteristics of the counselor-trainee you just observed. For each characteristic on the following page, there is 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 view the trainee. For example:

FUNNY

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

WELL DRESSED

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

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

Remember, the supervision session you observed was between a counselor-trainee and his assigned supervisor, who was recommended by less than 10% of the trainee's fellow students.

Though all of the following characteristics are desirable, counselors differ in their strengths. The supervisor has indicated in his summary how he views the trainee.

Indicate your view of the counselor-trainee. Remember, your responses are totally anonymous. There is no way to associate you with the ratings you make.

Now please complete the ratings on the following page.

Rate the counselor-trainee on the following:

FRIENDLY

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

EXPERIENCED

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

HONEST

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

LIKEABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

EXPERT

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

RELIABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SOCIABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

PREPARED

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SINCERE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

WARM

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SKILLFUL

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

TRUSTWORTHY

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

Rate the supervisor on the following:

FRIENDLY

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

EXPERIENCED

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

HONEST

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

LIKEABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

EXPERT

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

RELIABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SOCIABLE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

PREPARED

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SINCERE

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

WARM

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

SKILLFUL

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

TRUSTWORTHY

not very ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ very

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

Completion of any or all of the following information is optional. The information will be used only to provide a general description of the characteristics of the study sample. Thank you. (Please circle the number to indicate your response.)

A. Age: (1) 20-24 years

(2) 25-29 years

(3) 30 or more years

B. Sex: (1) Female

(2) Male

C. Race: (1) Caucasian

(2) Black

(3) Oriental

(4) Other _____

D. Major area of study: _____

E. Have you ever received supervision on your own counseling performance?

(1) Yes

(2) No

F. Number of semester or quarter hours completed:

(1) Less than 10

(1) Less than 15

Semester: (2) 10-19

Quarter: (2) 15-30

(3) 20-29

(3) 31-44

(4) 30 or more

(4) 45 or more

APPENDIX F

SUPERVISION QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN PROCEDURAL CHECKS

SUPERVISION QUESTIONNAIRE*

Listed below are several different supervisory behaviors. Rate each behavior according to how descriptive it is of the supervisor's actual behavior during the session you just previewed.

Use the following rating scale to respond to the items:

5 = Very descriptive of the supervisor's behavior.

4 = Generally descriptive of the supervisor's behavior.

3 = Descriptive of the supervisor's behavior.

2 = Fairly descriptive of the supervisor's behavior.

1 = Not at all descriptive of the supervisor's behavior.

CAREFULLY CONSIDER EACH BEHAVIOR

Write the number corresponding to your rating on the blank provided next to each item.

- _____ 1. Gives appropriate feedback to supervisee about positive counseling behaviors.
- _____ 2. Gives appropriate feedback to supervisee about non-facilitative counseling behaviors.
- _____ 3. Helps supervisee in developing self-confidence as an emerging counselor.
- _____ 4. Helps supervisee assess own strengths.
- _____ 5. Confronts supervisee when appropriate.
- _____ 6. Helps supervisee assess own weaknesses.
- _____ 7. Establishes good rapport with supervisee.
- _____ 8. Labels counselor behavior as effective or ineffective rather than right or wrong.
- _____ 9. Gives emotional support to supervisee when appropriate.
- _____ 10. Helps supervisee to conceptualize cases. Works together with the supervisee to evolve a joint conceptualization.

- ___ 11. Helps supervisee realize that trying new skills usually seems awkward at first.
- ___ 12. Helps supervisee deal with own defensiveness when it arises in supervision.
- ___ 13. Encourages supervisee to experiment with different assessment and intervention techniques to discover their own unique styles.
- ___ 14. Provides suggestions for alternative ways of conceptualizing clients.
- ___ 15. Establishes clear goals conjointly with supervisee against which progress in supervision can be measured.
- ___ 16. Provides suggestions for alternative ways of intervening with client.
- ___ 17. Gives direct suggestions to supervisee when appropriate.
- ___ 18. Models within the supervision session good task-oriented skills.
- ___ 19. Uses the relationship between supervisor and supervisee to demonstrate principles of counseling.
- ___ 20. Uses humor in the supervision session.
- ___ 21. Focus of the supervision session is on conceptualizing the dynamics of the client's personality.
- ___ 22. Focus of the supervision session is on content of counseling session.
- ___ 23. Focus of the supervision session is on the relationship between supervisor and supervisee.

*Adapted from E. L. Worthington and H. J. Roehlke, Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors in training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26(1), 64-73.

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY TABLE FOR RAW CRF-S SCORES ON PERCEIVED TRAINEE
EXPERTNESS (E), ATTRACTIVENESS (A),
AND TRUSTWORTHINESS (T)

TABLE 3

SUMMARY TABLE FOR RAW CRF-S SCORES ON PERCEIVED TRAINEE
EXPERTNESS (E), ATTRACTIVENESS (A),
AND TRUSTWORTHINESS (T)

Subject	Experimental Condition	E-Score	A-Score	T-Score
1	LLLC	18	8	17
2	NELC	5	20	21
3	LLHC	10	24	22
4	NEHC	13	23	23
5	HLLC	18	24	21
6	LLHC	8	16	20
7	LLHC	7	10	15
8	HLHC	9	14	16
9	LLHC	11	14	18
10	HLLC	11	22	23
11	HLHC	7	20	12
12	HLLC	8	20	22
13	HLHC	7	22	25
14	LLHC	15	22	21
15	HLHC	9	22	16
16	LLHC	6	22	22
17	NELC	11	13	19
18	HLHC	7	20	17
19	NELC	12	25	23
20	LLLC	10	16	18
21	NEHC	11	25	25
22	HLHC	8	28	26
23	LLHC	9	23	20
24	HLHC	12	22	23
25	LLLC	16	20	22
26	LLHC	12	21	23
27	HLHC	12	22	21
28	LLLC	12	23	23
29	NEHC	10	23	22
30	NELC	17	24	23
31	HLLC	14	24	22
32	LLHC	6	15	24
33	NELC	10	19	20
34	LLLC	16	28	25
35	HLHC	10	17	15
36	NELC	14	24	19
37	LLLC	17	22	26
38	LLLC	10	28	22

TABLE 3 (continued)

Subject	Experimental Condition	E-Score	A-Score	T-Score
39	HLLC	6	23	21
40	LLLC	4	9	15
41	NEHC	8	16	16
42	NEHC	12	22	24
43	HLLC	10	15	23.5
44	HLHC	8	16	17
45	NEHC	18	25	24
46	NELC	12	23	21
47	LLHC	4	18	24
48	NELC	7	23	19
49	LLLC	13	25	26
50	HLLC	16	23	22
51	NELC	7	11	18
52	HLLC	6	20	21
53	LLLC	17	18	28
54	NEHC	8	24	23
55	HLHC	17	25	25
56	LLHC	18	20	26
57	NEHC	12	25	28
58	NELC	6	19	20
59	NEHC	10	25	25
60	NELC	11	21	24
61	LLHC	23	24	24
62	NEHC	18	23	23
63	HLLC	13	24	22
64	HLHC	16	24	22
65	HLLC	17	24	23
66	HLHC	18	24	24
67	LLLC	20	26	23
68	LLLC	13	22	21
69	HLLC	13	20	21
70	NEHC	10	23	22
71	HLLC	14	19	20
72	NELC	6	14	22
73	LLHC	12	26	27
74	NEHC	4	18	18
75	LLLC	7	25	18
76	HLLC	8	12	19
77	NEHC	19	20	22
78	LLHC	5	21	25
79	LLLC	9	18	19
80	LLHC	9	19	19

TABLE 3 (continued)

Subject	Experimental Condition	E-Score	A-Score	T-Score
81	NELC	7	13	21
82	HLLC	11	20	16
83	LLLC	13	22	23
84	NEHC	12	12	8
85	NELC	8	18	19
86	NELC	12	17	19
87	HLHC	8	18	17
88	HLLC	8	18	19
89	NEHC	7	18	21
90	HLHC	7	16	20

NOTE. Abbreviations for each of the experimental conditions represent the following:

- HLHC (I) = High Legitimacy/High Coercion.
- HLLC (II) = High Legitimacy/Low Coercion.
- LLHC (III) = Low Legitimacy/High Coercion.
- LLLC (IV) = Low Legitimacy/Low Coercion.
- NEHC (V) = No Endorsement/High Coercion.
- NELC (VI) = No Endorsement/Low Coercion.

APPENDIX H

RAW SCORES AND MEANS, PILOT STUDY #3

RAW SCORES AND MEANS, PILOT STUDY #3

<u>Condition</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>	<u>Mean</u>
HLHC (I)	3	8, 9, 10	9
HLLC (II)	3	11, 5, 12	9.33
LLHC (III)	3	4, 11, 8	7.67
LLLC (IV)	3	15, 17, 8	13.33

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I understand that this study relates to counselor supervision and evaluation. I have been informed that my responses to the experimental situation will be treated confidentially, and that any research report of the results of the study will protect my anonymity. I also understand that my participation in the study is voluntary, and that I have the right to withdraw as a subject at any time without penalty.

Signature

Date

VITA

Alison Mascalo was born in Hartford, Connecticut on May 12, 1950. She attended public schools in Southington, Connecticut, and graduated from Southington High School in June 1968. The following September she entered The Ohio State University, and in June 1972 she completed a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology. In the Fall of 1972, Alison began graduate study at the University of Connecticut, where she earned a Master of Arts degree in Rehabilitation Counseling in May 1974. After four years of employment in college counseling centers in Upstate New York and Maryland, Alison accepted a Hilton A. Smith Fellowship from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and entered the Graduate School there in September 1978. In August 1981 she completed a year-long clinical/counseling psychology internship at Virginia Commonwealth University's Counseling Services in Richmond, Virginia. While on internship, Alison married Gary L. Trinkle, and moved to the Washington, D. C. area. In November 1983 Alison and Gary moved to Texas, where Alison accepted a fulltime teaching position and part-time counseling position. She received the Doctor of Philosophy degree in March 1984.