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Applied sport psychology consultation is a relatively new phenomenon with limited empirical underpinnings. The purpose of the study was to evaluate three applied sport psychology consultant personal and professional characteristics within Strong's social influence model that have been suggested to impact consultants' effectiveness in working directly with athletes and their performance problems. The three consultant characteristics were academic training, past athletic experience, and interpersonal skill. Division I female athletes (*N* = 187) read written preconsultation information and watched a 10-minute vignette between a consultant and an athlete. Participants completed the Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S), the Sport Psychology Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF), and questions concerning willingness to work with the consultant. The data from the dependent measures were analyzed by a 2 (level of consultant academic training) X 2 (level of consultant past athletic experience) X 2 (level of consultant interpersonal skill) MANOVA. Results indicated...
that applied sport psychology consultants' academic training and past athletic experience had only limited influence on the participants' perceptions about the consultants. The Division I female athletes unambiguously rated consultants with positive interpersonal skills more favorably on all dependent measures regardless of the consultants' level of academic training or past athletic experience. Directions for future research and implication of the findings on training and certification in applied sport psychology are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The field of sport psychology is comprised of individuals from the disciplines of exercise/sport sciences and psychology. Reflecting this blend, the current membership in the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology lists 43% from the exercise/sport sciences and 49% from psychology (Burke, 1993). Professional disciplines rarely have equal proportions of individuals from two different academic areas contributing to the field, as well as vying to provide a service. This unique aspect also contributes to an ongoing discussion, sometimes adversarial, regarding who is most qualified to work as an "applied sport psychology consultant." Although the purpose of this literature review is not to extensively survey the history and progress of applied sport psychology, a brief discussion seems necessary as contextual background to the present investigation.

History of Sport Psychology and Current Professional Practice

It is doubtful that Coleman Griffith in 1925 could have predicted that his article on psychology and its relation to athletic competition would be cited as the seminal work
ushering in the discipline of sport psychology (Gould, 1990). Nor could have Griffith predicted that sport psychology would spend its first 70 years as a relatively quiet academic subdiscipline in physical education departments (Silva, 1989). It is only within the last 15 years that the applied version of sport psychology, hinted at in Griffith's work, has exponentially grown to its present state.

Currently, applied sport psychology consultants work with numerous athletes and coaches ranging from elite Olympic and professional performers to entry level youth participants. Silva (1989) suggested that increased media exposure especially at the Olympics was one explanation for sport psychology's growth. Vealey (1988) noted a significant increase in the number of self-help sport psychology texts allowing more sport participants access to performance enhancement information. The formation of the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology, Division 47 of the American Psychological Association, and related scholarly journals (e.g., The Sport Psychologist, Journal of Exercise and Sport Psychology, Journal of Applied Sport Psychology) reflect both a cause and an effect of increased sport psychology awareness.

It is somewhat surprising given sport psychology's sudden rise that some professionals question whether or not the field of sport psychology has even been defined (Rejeski
& Brawley, 1988). As an example of this relaxed approach, Silva (1989) reported that one of his esteemed colleagues answered the question of "What is sport psychology?" by stating that "Sport psychology is what sport psychologists do." Silva and Weinberg (1984) defined sport psychology broadly as either a concern for the effect of psychological factors on behavior in sport or the psychological effect of sport participation or physical activity on an individual. As the boundaries of sport psychology continue to be delineated, the actual practice of applied sport psychology rushes forward unchecked much to the dismay of many professionals. Prior to the formation of the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology in 1986, there were was limited or no professional guidance concerning who practiced applied sport psychology (Silva, 1987). To a certain extent, this problem still plagues the field. Numerous examples exist of questionable promises and guarantees made about sport psychology by individuals whose training may be insufficient.

Currently, however, the training and certification of applied sport psychologists is being actively discussed, delineated, and implemented. In recognition that sport psychology is developing into a distinct integrated discipline with connections to both psychology and the sport sciences, training and certification standards are being formulated to reflect that relationship. There are
currently a variety of individuals who practice applied sport psychology, however, some do so under the auspices of forthcoming certification standards and some without regard for these criteria. Presently, there is no clear model for training sport psychologists, although most authors suggest an interdisciplinary approach as being vital (Lutz, 1990; Murphy, 1995). Interested students typically pursue training in either a psychology or kinesiology graduate program and attempt to complete additional course work in the program with which they are not affiliated. Applied internship and practicum experiences are haphazard, and unfortunately, often must be student initiated. In assessing the views of clinical psychology chairpersons (LeUnes & Hayward, 1990), no consensus was found as to the proper place of sport psychology within the academic community. Mahoney and Suinn (1986) suggested that issues of professionalism and power are at the center of who defines what sport psychology is and who defines the necessary requirements for training and licensure in the area.

Although the training and certification of applied sport psychologists continues to move forward, some professionals in the field still question the role of application in the field of sport psychology. Sport psychology is similar to the general discipline of psychology in that individuals typically emphasize either
research or practice, though this split does not discount many who perform both roles. Some have suggested that before applied sport psychology methods and techniques are justifiably implemented that a more solid theoretical foundation supported by empirical research is necessary (Dishman, 1983). Others take a less conservative approach, though these professionals are still cognizant of the limitations of implementing applied sport psychology interventions. Smith (1989) noted that evidence exists that some sport psychology intervention programs benefit athletes and coaches, but there needs to be increased accountability before "giving sport psychology away."

LaRose (1988) reviewed a diverse list of roles that psychologically oriented sport practitioners currently perform and grouped these roles into two main categories, clinical and educational. Clinical sport psychologists are capable of helping athlete-clients with severe emotional problems through various forms of psychotherapy and are typically licensed as psychologists by the state in which they practice. Conversely, educational sport psychologists help athletes develop psychological skills optimizing their sport participation and enjoyment. Licensing is not currently a requirement, though a certification process is available to those choosing to participate.

As can clearly be seen, many factors related to sport psychology, and applied sport psychology in particular,
contribute to a complicated and still evolving picture of the field. Issues regarding discipline definition, application versus basic research, training and certification, educational versus clinical roles, and other concerns reflect the ongoing development existing in the field of sport psychology.

**Evaluations of Applied Sport Psychology Consultants' Effectiveness**

Despite the dramatic increase in the number of individuals providing sport psychological services and increased number of contacts with athletes, relatively scant attention has been given to applied sport psychology consultant effectiveness as rated by athletes, coaches, or consultants themselves. Similarly, preferences and perceptions of the consumers of applied sport psychological services have not been thoroughly examined. Two recent studies (Orlick & Partington, 1987; Partington & Orlick, 1987a) were the first to investigate the characteristics that differentiate effective and less effective consultants. These researchers utilized a semi-structured interview with 75 Canadian Olympic athletes who represented 19 different 1984 Summer and Winter Olympic sports. A content analysis revealed that the best consultants were likeable, perceived to have applied and concrete interventions to offer, flexible, willing to work individually with athletes, able to establish a rapport and care about the athletes, and
willing to establish long-term, ongoing programs with follow-up sessions. Ineffective consultants were described as having poor interpersonal skills, poor application of psychology to sport, limited one-on-one contact with athletes, minimal sensitivity or flexibility to individual needs, inappropriate application of consulting skills at on site competitions, and limited consultant feedback or consultant input (Orlick & Partington, 1987). Effective consultants had the personal qualities and relationship skills, as well as the mental training knowledge to effect changes in the athletes. Orlick and Partington (1987) further stressed the importance of the first meeting with the athlete and the necessity of ample one-on-one contact. Orlick and Partington (1987) concluded that the shortage of good sport psychology consultants is a direct result of a failure to emphasize personal qualities and interpersonal skills in the selection of students into applied sport psychology programs.

In assessing what Olympic coaches believed were important applied sport psychology consultant characteristics, Partington and Orlick (1987a) interviewed 17 Canadian national coaches of athletes preparing for the 1984 Olympics. The most valued consultants were found to be good listeners, able to relate quickly and easily to athletes and staff, energetic, hardworking, flexible, open, creative, well-trained with useful and relevant skills, and
willing to accept low fees. Coaches reacted negatively to consultants who were overbearing, dogmatic, undisciplined, unpredictable, and not punctual. These findings support Orlick and Partington's (1987) contentions that both expertise in mental skill development techniques and interpersonal skills to communicate that information is necessary to be an effective applied sport psychology consultant to athletes and their coaches.

Partington and Orlick (1987) extended their previous findings (Orlick & Partington, 1987; Partington & Orlick, 1987a) while surveying a larger sample of Olympic athletes in the development of an evaluation inventory to assess applied sport psychology consultants. The data paralleled the consultant descriptors generated in the intensive interviews of the earlier two studies. Again, athletes consistently reported that consultants must have good interpersonal skills to be effective. The Sport Psychology Consultant Form (CEF) reflects these necessary conditions, as seven of the 10 items of the CEF directly or indirectly assess interpersonal skills or personal qualities (e.g., "seemed open, flexible, and ready to collaborate with me," "had a positive, constructive attitude," "was easy for me to relate to," "fitted in with others," "connected with the team").

Gould, Murphy, Tammen, and May (1991) evaluated United States Olympic sport psychology consultant effectiveness in
an effort to replicate and extend Orlick and Partington's previous work. One hundred and sixty-two consultants, sport administrators, athletes, and coaches working at the Olympic level of their professions were subjects. Overall, consultants were rated very favorably by themselves, sport administrators, coaches, and athletes as assessed by the CEF. All 10 consultant characteristics described in the CEF were found to be positively related to consultant effectiveness as rated by the athletes and coaches who were most often in the best position to observe and evaluate the applied sport psychology consultants. The highest correlations between consultant characteristics and athlete ratings of effectiveness were found for positive-constructive consultant attitudes, consultant ability to draw on athletes' strengths, and consultant proficiency in providing clear strategies. The importance of consultant interpersonal skills and personal qualities is evident again from these results. This also could be seen in responses to a follow-up, open-ended question asking athletes, coaches, and sport administrators how sport psychological programs could satisfy them more fully. Two perceived needs were clearly indicated by most respondents across the four groups, a desire for more individualized interventions (more one-on-one contact) and a wish for the consultants to spend more time with the athletes.
Findings of Orlick and Partington's earlier work were shared with the 19 sport psychology consultants funded by Sport Canada to work with Canadian Olympic athletes in preparation for the 1988 Olympic Games (Partington & Orlick, 1991). This workshop allowed the researchers to collect responses to several questions including descriptions of their best-ever consulting situations, factors contributing to that best-ever experience, accounts of less effective consulting situations, and elements within that negative situation that made it difficult to have a beneficial influence. The results paralleled what previous Olympic athletes and coaches have stated about consultant effectiveness. Best-ever consulting experiences, as reported by the applied sport psychology consultants, began with an individualized, athlete-centered approach to identify the athletes' needs and special demands of the sport, employed a common core of skills and services (e.g., goal setting, imagery, good communication), and were implemented in an atmosphere where athlete and coach receptivity and contact time were high during both training and competition. Consultant recommendations during the workshop also noted that the most important personal assets for consultants to develop were good communication and interpersonal skills, especially skilled listening. Finally, the authors expressed their firm belief that openness, respect, and support on the part of the applied
sport psychology consultant with athletes and coaches were prerequisites to effective and rewarding experiences for both parties (Partington & Orlick, 1991).

**Applied Sport Psychology Consultation in the Professional Practice Literature**

With the advent of *The Sport Psychologist* and the *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, a forum has become available for a professional practice literature. In this scholarly journal, leading consultant professionals in the field of sport psychology discuss methods, techniques, and modes of operation they have utilized when working in applied settings. Although some may question the relevance of these personal, nonscientific descriptions, the professional practice literature does provide a subjective view of what is thought to be important when working in an athletic setting. Two issues in particular are consistently addressed in discussions of applied sport psychology consultation, consultant interpersonal skills and sport knowledge and/or athletic experience.

Ravizza (1988) postulated the existence of three significant barriers when attempting to gain entry to working with athletic teams: 1) negative connotations, 2) consultant lacking sport-specific knowledge, and 3) inadequate experience and knowledge about the politics of different sport environments. In reference to the first and third perceived barriers, Ravizza (1988) focused on the
importance of good communication and interpersonal skills to overcome these barriers through establishing respect, credibility, and trust. The second barrier also must be addressed in order to interact effectively with athletes and coaches. Ravizza (1990) suggested several ways to gain sport-specific knowledge including personal experience, advanced training in physical education, talking with people who play the sport, and viewing the game in action. The consultant must demonstrate an understanding of the sport, its vocabulary and terminology, strategies, performance skills, and specific demands confronting the athletes. If there is an absence of athletic playing experience, especially at the elite or professional level, then the applied sport psychology consultant must be able to demonstrate a full understanding of the sport specific demands to players and coaches. If this is not done, then the consultation relationship will generally not last long.

Orlick (1989) was much stronger in his view concerning what should be required of applied sport psychology consultants. Orlick stated that consultant training and registration should be heavily based on direct client evaluation of the consultant, and that "one should have experience in sport as an athlete, a coach, or as one who knows firsthand what it is to pursue excellence in a demanding, physically oriented domain" (p. 360). In addition, Orlick stated that academic training must be made
more relevant to excellence in the applied sport psychology domain.

Dorfman (1990) suggested four essential requirements to be effective as an applied sport psychology consultant: professionalism, credibility, personality of the consultant, and trust. The first two requirements address the necessity for appropriate training and qualifications for dealing with the athlete and the necessity of knowing the specific elements of the athlete’s game. The second two requirements reflect Dorfman’s belief in the importance of possessing good communication and interpersonal skills. Personality of the consultant refers to the ability of the healer (consultant) to connect with the athlete-client in a way that makes him/her feel personally cared about. The athlete must not only believe that the consultant is capable of helping, but also that the consultant is honest and can be trusted. Dorfman stated "it is my strongly held view that, particularly in professional sports, if the sport psychologist has the athlete’s confidence and trust, he (sic) will reveal the deeper problems interfering with performance" (p. 342).

Rotella (1990) echoed these sentiments. Rotella stated that athletes must be helped by the consultant to feel talented, capable, healthy, and in possession of the strengths necessary to make it. The consultant’s approach
must be one where the athlete feels completely at ease and free of fear that they are being evaluated or judged.

Henschen (1991) identified two principles that govern effective applied sport psychology consultation. First, the consultant must have sufficient knowledge of the sport. The most critical characteristic for effectiveness is the consultant's ability to talk the language of the athlete. Second, the consultant has to gain the trust and confidence of the athlete by establishing and maintaining a professional relationship.

In a case study, Gould and Finch (1990) interviewed a female professional bowler. One section of the interview focused on the effectiveness of sport psychology and applied sport psychology consultants. The bowler emphasized several important elements in effective consultation including the athlete's comfortable identification with the consultant's personality, individualized strategies conveyed in a knowledgeable and understandable manner, good listening skills, flexibility, and a general concern for the athlete. The bowler emphasized the importance of relationship skills when she stated, "I think there must be an art to being a good consultant and not just a science. There is a definite art to it" (pp. 425-426).

The professional practice literature is consistent in emphasizing the need for knowledge and expertise, as well as the interpersonal and communication skills necessary to
convey knowledge and a genuine concern for the athlete. Smith (1989), in his 1987 Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology presidential address, suggested that consultant effectiveness may be associated more strongly with consultant characteristics rather than particular psychological techniques. Although the effective delivery of applied sport psychological services is consistently discussed in the context of personal consultant characteristics and skills, an empirical basis for these assertions may be lacking.

Perceptions of Sport Psychologists and Athletes Who Consult Sport Psychologists

Recently, Linder and colleagues (Linder, Pillow, & Reno, 1989; Van Raalte, Brewer, Linder, & DeLange, 1990; Linder, Brewer, Van Raalte, & DeLange, 1991; Van Raalte, Brewer, Brewer, & Linder, 1992) have explored the perceptions of athletes who consult a sport psychologist. Linder et al. (1989) examined whether the draft recommendations for a quarterback, a central figure in the team’s performance, would differ depending on who the player consulted, a sport psychologist or a coach. Although the multivariate analysis did not indicate a significant main effect for coach versus sport psychologist, two univariate analyses indicated that the player working with the sport psychologist was rated less emotionally stable and less likely to fit in well with team management. There also was
not a significant main effect for type of problem (increasing concentration to improve consistency, learning to cope with stress to improve consistency, improving consistency) for which the player was receiving help.

A second experiment in the Linder et al. (1989) study was conducted to assess whether this negative halo effect was generalizable across two more sports (basketball and baseball), as well as peripheral positions. Peripheral positions were defined as those less centrally important to the team's performance such as a baseball outfielder or a basketball guard. The results indicated that there existed a negative halo effect for all athletes who consulted a sport psychologist. Linder et al. (1989) concluded that consulting a sport psychologist creates a perception of deviance, a nonspecific derogation not associated with stigmatization as a mental patient. The researchers deliberately chose not to give the credentials of the sport psychologist believing that this information would ensure the labeling of the athlete as a mental patient. One limitation of this investigation was the use of undergraduate psychology students who were not required to have knowledge of the different organized sports to participate as subjects.

The second study in the series was designed to further examine perceptions of sport psychologists and a variety of other sport-associated professionals (Van Raalte et al.,
A multivariate scaling analysis was selected for investigating how sport psychologists are perceived relative to other sport and mental health professionals. The researchers chose a broad sampling of sport practitioners representing both physical and psychological realms. The list included sport psychologist, psychotherapist, coach, psychiatrist, counselor, performance consultant, nutritionist, sports medicine specialist, strength coach, hypnotist, and technical equipment adviser. Subjects judged the similarity between all pairwise combinations of the practitioners on 9-point Likert scales. Results indicated a two-dimensional solution as the best fit for the data. One dimension concerned the mental or physical aspects of sport and the practitioner, while the second dimension indicated practitioners ordered as a function of whether they focused on sport specific problems or general life concerns. Sport psychologists were perceived as being in the nonsport/mental quadrant and very similar to mental health practitioners as a whole, and clinical psychologists and psychotherapists in particular. The researchers suggested that the term "psychologist" might be the primary determinant of public perception. Positively, sport psychologists being seen as related to mental health professionals indicates professional respect. This same connection, however, might hinder sport psychologists if athletes are stigmatized or seen as deviant because of the association with mental
health professionals. It is interesting to note that the researchers again did not provide a general description of any of the sport and mental health professionals.

Misconceptions and incorrect beliefs are common in the public’s knowledge of mental health professionals. Wood, Jones, and Benjamin (1986) reported that 30% of the public did not perceive psychologists as evaluating mental disorders or providing counseling services. Tallent and Reiss (1959) found that among evening college students only 70% thought that a psychiatrist had a medical degree. In a more recent study (Murstein & Fontaine, 1993), the general public’s knowledge was found to be most accurate for physicians, clergy, and psychiatrists compared to other mental health professionals. Knowledge of psychologists was poor with a general confusion about the differences between psychologists and psychiatrists. The lowest accuracy score was found for psychotherapists. This same study found that respondents rated the physician as the mental health professional they were most comfortable in seeking out for help. Respondents, however, did not feel significantly less comfortable seeing a psychologist as opposed to a psychiatrist. Linder et al. (1989) and Van Raalte et al. (1990) chose not to describe the sport-associated professionals beyond the labeling identification. Given the general public’s misconception concerning mental health professionals, it is likely that similar misconceptions
and/or ignorance exist for the sport-associated professionals. Because the sport-associated professionals were not described and the subjects' general knowledge of these practitioners unknown, it is impossible to know what the subjects' perceptions were based upon. For example, if subjects do not understand the difference between a psychologist and psychiatrist, then how can they make an accurate comparison and form subsequent perceptions? The use of a university-aged population as subjects again limits the generalizability of the results.

Linder et al. (1991) sought to replicate and extend their previous findings (Linder et al., 1989; Van Raalte et al., 1990) by attempting to reveal whether derogation resulted from a perception of the athlete who consulted a sport psychologist as being deviant or from a stigmatization of the athlete due to consultation with any psychologist (similar to the general stigmatization occurring toward individuals who consult mental health professionals). In replicating their multidimensional scaling analysis, Linder et al. (1991) found a similar two-dimensional solution for the data, a sport/nonsport dimension and a mental/physical dimension. The results of the multidimensional scaling also did not suggest a gender effect as the relative positions of the coach, sport psychologist, and psychotherapist were very similar for both genders. Male subjects showed a clear derogation of the athlete when the consultant was described
as either a sport psychologist or psychotherapist. Females did not respond differentially to the consultant described as coach, sport psychologist, or psychotherapist. The researchers' interpretation was that males have well-defined role expectations of athletes and consultation with a sport psychologist or psychotherapist was not consistent with these expectations. As a result, the behavior of consulting a sport psychologist or psychotherapist for help was labeled deviant. In experiment 2 of this same study, the researchers sought to test expectations of subjects who were older, noncollegiate males. Results supported previous findings as this population also had a strong derogation of athletes who consulted either a sport psychologist or psychotherapist. Responses did not differ with respect to consultant title which suggests that athletes are derogated as a result of being labeled deviate (different) rather than specifically stigmatized as an individual with mental problems or illness. Again, the researchers chose not to list the credentials, training, or other descriptions of the sport psychologist or psychotherapist. Therefore, it was not clear whether subjects were either accurate or consistent in their knowledge of sport psychologists or psychotherapists as professions. This lack of profession description would appear to cloud subsequent results and interpretations.
In their most recent study, Van Raalte et al. (1992) explored athletes' perceptions of an athlete who consulted a sport psychologist and athletes' perceptions of various sport and mental health professionals. In study 1, subjects (Division II football players) perceived an athlete differently depending on whether the individual was working with a coach, sport psychologist, or psychotherapist for a problem identified as consistency in performance. The participants gave similar draft ratings to athletes who consulted a sport psychologist or a coach. An athlete seeing a psychotherapist, however, was derogated in comparison to an athlete who was working with a coach for that same problem. Study 2 examined college football players who had had previous contact with athletic counseling or sport psychology services. These subjects were asked to make similarity judgements comparing the sport and mental health practitioner terms used by Van Raalte et al. (1990). Sport psychologists were viewed as an important resource for sport-related issues, as well as possessing considerable expertise about physical issues. Psychotherapists were rated very low on sport expertise and on physical issues but first on mental expertise. Based on these findings, the researchers suggested that the athlete seeking out a psychotherapist might be stigmatized as a mental patient. Athletes having had previous contact with athletic counseling or sport psychological services did not
differ in their ratings of sport and mental health practitioners compared to athletes with no previous personal experience with athletic counseling or sport psychological services.

Linder and colleagues (Linder et al., 1989; Van Raalte et al., 1990; Linder et al., 1991; Van Raalte et al., 1992) have begun to investigate perceptions about athletes who consult sport and mental health professionals to improve athletic performance. It would appear that the general public (especially males) derogates athletes consulting these professionals due to perceptions that this behavior is deviant. Athletes' own perceptions were different regarding consultation. Athletes' derogation was more selective, as only consultation with a psychotherapist being negatively labeled. Assessing perceptions of athletes who consult sport psychologists is important because stigma attached to that collaboration can negatively affect athletes. An apparent limitation of this line of research has been the investigators' decision to not define or describe the different titles of the sport and mental health professionals. Without these definitions or descriptions, it is unclear whether subjects' perceptions were accurately or consistently based. Similarly, the researchers have not addressed perceptions of sport psychologists with different training backgrounds. The generic label "sport psychologist" does not indicate equivalent training and
background. Quite possibly, the general public's and athletes' perceptions of sport psychologists could differ depending on differences in type or level of training (e.g., sport sciences versus psychology, Ph.D. versus B.A.) and background (e.g., former athlete versus nonsport participant).

Social Influence in Counseling

Fretz (1982) defined the goal of counseling as helping people to change through assistance in solving problems and coping with life's difficulties. The goal of applied sport psychology consultation might be similarly expressed, that is, applied sport psychology consultation helps athletes solve problems and cope with athletic difficulties, or in other words, to help athletes change. Social influence theory would seem to be an appropriate starting point in exploring the change process in the applied sport psychology consultant-athlete relationship. Athletes come to sport psychologists (or sport psychologists to the athlete) to be influenced. It behooves the applied arm of sport psychology to answer the questions, what factors and under what conditions promote influence in consultation?

Strong (1968) proposed a two-phase model for attitude and behavior change based on the conceptualization of counseling as a social influence process. In the first phase, counselors must establish themselves as capable of influencing change in the client. Increasing positive
perceptions of the counselor's ability to facilitate change is done through enhancing the counselor's credibility (expertness and trustworthiness) and attractiveness. Perceived expertness is the client's belief that his or her problem can be handled effectively and conclusions obtained through the therapist's possession and interpretation of available information (Strong & Dixon, 1971). Trustworthiness is a function of the counselor's reputation for honesty, social role, sincerity, and perceived lack of motivation for personal gain (Strong, 1968). Attractiveness is defined as the client's positive feelings about the counselor which include liking and admiration, desire to gain approval, and desire to become more similar (Schmidt & Strong, 1971). It is evident that these characteristics are similarly related to behaviors denoting unconditional positive regard and accurate empathy.

Once these perceptions are established, the counselor is theoretically positioned to influence or involve clients in a therapeutic manner. Strong's theory of the counseling process has generated a plethora of research in the past 25 years. Wampold and White (1985) cited social influence as one of the major themes in the counseling psychology literature. This corpus has been the subject of three extensive reviews (Corrigan, Dell, Lewis, & Schmidt, 1980; Heppner & Dixon, 1981; Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). Heppner and Claiborn (1989) noted that the majority of the social
influence research has focused on the first stage of influence or initial phase of counseling (identification of events which lead to perceptions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness). There has been significantly less emphasis on the second stage of influence, the actual influence process where the counselor uses the influence power built in the first stage to implement attitude and behavior changes in the client. It has also been suggested that there exists an over reliance on analogue research which simulates actual counseling conditions by using brief counseling vignettes in audio or video-taped form (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). Since the present investigation is unique to the applied sport psychology literature, it is appropriate to begin with an analogue design and later pursue more naturalistic field research. Similarly, first stage influence variables need to be examined and understood in applied sport psychology consultation interactions before the more complex second stage influence process is explored.

The most obvious research question evolving from the view of counseling as a social influence process has been: What events actually affect perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989)? It follows that social influence research has focused on many variables affecting perceptions of counselors including specific counselor behaviors, objective
evidence of training, counselor reputation, counselor-client similarity, personal characteristics, and prestige cues. Of most interest in the present investigation are those variables that might be indicators of the applied sport psychology consultant’s professional or social role. These cues can be accessed through introductions, reputation, prior accomplishments, philosophical orientation, or inferred from information made available about the applied sport psychology consultant’s background (Corrigan et al., 1980).

Perceptions of counselor expertness have been the most prevalently studied of the three counselor variables theorized to facilitate change. Across analogue studies, Heppner and Claiborn (1989) concluded that perceived expertness of counselors has consistently been found to be positively affected by objective evidence of training and prestige cues. Angle and Goodyear (1984) found that counselors described in an expert condition (Ph.D. in counseling psychology, extensive training and experience, published research) were perceived to be more expert than counselors described in a nonexpert condition (B.A. in English, no experience as a counselor, recently completed an introductory course in communication) or without an introduction after viewing the same 15 minute counseling vignette. Using audiotaped vignettes with manipulated counselor introductions, McCarthy (1982) found similar
results. Subjects reported greater perceptions of expertness for a professional counselor with a Ph.D. and seven years experience in private practice compared to an experienced paraprofessional with a B.A. degree in English and seven years supervised work in a community mental health center. Littrel, Caffrey, and Hopper (1987) found that high school students rated counselors lower in expertness and had decreased preference for counselors described with negative reputational cues from their peers. Eighth graders perceived counselors presented with a high credibility introduction (caring, confidential, understanding) to be more expert than counselors with a low credibility introduction (fashionable hair, stylish clothes, listens to rock music) when an audiotaped counseling session was held constant (Bernstein & Figioli, 1983). Finally, Paradise, Conway, and Zweig (1986) reported that counselors described with an expert introduction (experienced, familiar with current research) compared with those described with referent introductions (relates well, similar personal experiences as the client) received higher ratings of professional attributes. In contrast to these results, one study found that five minute videotapes of a counseling vignette with different counselor titles captioned at the bottom of the tape (Dr., Mrs., Ms., Miss, therapist first and last name, no caption) did not elicit compelling evidence that title alone has a significant effect on
subjects' perceptions of expertness (Holmes & Kixmiller, 1989).

A large number of counselor personal characteristics and their effect on perceptions of expertness have been studied. Overall, the results of these studies are equivocal (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). For example, both black and white subjects rated black counselors as more expert than white counselors (Green, Cunningham, & Yanico, 1986). Atkinson and Alpert (1981) reported that college women viewed counselors holding egalitarian attitudes toward dating versus traditional attitudes as more expert regardless of the subjects' own attitudes. Mallinckrodt and Helms (1986) found that counselors with obvious physical disabilities were perceived to be more expert than counselors with hidden physical disabilities or no physical disability. Finally, Atkinson, Brady, and Casas (1981) reported that gay men perceived gay counselors to be more expert than heterosexual counselors who refrained from stating a sexual preference.

Other counselor personal characteristics have not been found to affect perceptions of counselor expertness. No significant effects have been found for the variables counselor weight (McKee & Smouse, 1983), gender (Angle & Goodyear, 1984), age (Schneider & Hayslip, 1986), physical disability (Strohmer & Biggs, 1983), and note-taking (Miller, 1992). Moran (1992) reported no significant
differences in gay subjects' ratings of expertness for therapists labeled homosexual which is in contrast to the Atkinson et al., (1981) study. The use of a lengthier videotape (compared to the short audiotape in the Atkinson et al. study) might have allowed subjects to evaluate counselor skill more critically without a focus on counselor sexual orientation.

Many of the studies which have examined factors influencing perceived expertness of counselors also have assessed perceptions of counselor attractiveness and trustworthiness (personal attributes) at the same time. Objective evidence of training and prestigious cues have been found to positively affect ratings of perceived attractiveness in studies investigating expertly and nonexpertly described counselors (Angle & Goodyear, 1984), professional versus experienced paraprofessional counselors (McCarthy, 1982), positive versus negative reputational cues (Littrell et al., 1987), and high and low credibility therapist introductions (Bernstein & Figioli, 1983). Paradise et al. (1986) did find that counselors introduced referently were rated by subjects to be higher in perceived attractiveness than counselors introduced with professional attributes creating an expert power base.

The effect of different counselor personal characteristics on perceptions of attractiveness mirrored the results found with perceptions of counselor expertness.
Higher ratings for counselor attractiveness were found for black counselors (Green et al., 1986), obvious physically disabled counselors (Mallinckrodt & Helms, 1986), gay therapists (Atkinson et al., 1981), egalitarian counselors (Atkinson & Alpert, 1981), and physically attractive counselors (Green et al., 1986; Paradise et al., 1986). No significant relationships were found for subject perceptions of counselor attractiveness and counselor weight (McKee & Smouse, 1983), gender (Angle & Goodyear, 1984), age (Schneider & Mayslip, 1986), sexual orientation (Moran, 1992), note-taking (Miller, 1992), and physical disability (Strohmer & Biggs, 1983).

Perceived counselor trustworthiness has been found to be positively affected by objective evidence of training and prestige cues in at least four studies. McCarthy (1982) found higher ratings of trustworthiness for counselors described as professional compared to experienced paraprofessionals. Littrell et al. (1987) reported positive reputational cues significantly increased perceptions of counselor trustworthiness as opposed to negative reputational cues. High credible versus low credible introductions have been shown to elicit higher ratings of counselor trustworthiness (Berstein & Figioli, 1983). Finally, McKee and Smouse (1983) found that doctoral-level counselors were perceived to be more trustworthy than counselors-in-training.
Equivocal findings again were found when examining personal characteristics of counselors and perception of the counselor variable trustworthiness (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). Higher ratings of counselor trustworthiness were found with the following counselor personal characteristics: black ethnicity (Green et al., 1986), obvious physical disability (Mallinckrodt & Helms, 1986), gay sexual orientation (Atkinson et al., 1981), and egalitarian attitude (Atkinson & Alpert, 1981). Counselor weight (McKee & Smouse, 1983), age (Schneider & Hayslip, 1986), gender (Angle & Goodyear, 1984), sex role orientation (Moran, 1992), note-taking (Miller, 1992), and American Indian ethnicity (LaFromboise & Dixon, 1981) were not found to affect perceptions of counselor trustworthiness.

The value of being perceived as similar to the individual or group one is attempting to influence has been intuitively recognized for some time. In that same line of thinking, client and counselor similarity has been touted as a potentially effective combination in a therapeutic, helping relationship. That is, clients from special populations will perceive counselors from a similar population as more credible (expert and trustworthy) and attractive due to group membership similarity.

Extensive literature reviews of the counselor-client similarity hypothesis have come to contradictory conclusions. Corrigan et al. (1980) and Heppner and Dixon
(1981) reported that inconsistent results were produced prior to 1981 for a group-membership effect. Atkinson and Schein (1986) concluded that little evidence existed to support a group-membership effect, but found fairly consistent support for an attitude similarity effect. The Atkinson and Schein (1986) review covered the variables gender, race, age, physical ability, attitude and value similarity, socioeconomic status, prior treatment, personality, and cognition style. In comparison, Heppner and Claiborn (1989) stated that the research since 1981 has generally supported a similarity hypothesis and indicated that similarity between counselor and client increase counselor credibility and attractiveness. Of the studies finding a group-membership effect resulting in higher ratings of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, the areas included sexual preference (Atkinson et al., 1981), sexual attitude (Holland, Atkinson, & Johnson, 1987), cultural sensitivity (Pomales, Claiborn, & LaFromboise, 1986), and hearing impairment (Freeman & Conoley, 1986).

The applied sport psychology literature has not experimently addressed issues of consultants' objective evidence of training, prestige cues, or personal characteristics, and subsequent effects on athlete-client perceptions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The professional practice literature,
however, suggests that such perceptions are important in determining the effectiveness of applied sport psychology consultants. Group-membership similarity (counselor-client similarity hypothesis) also has not been studied in the applied sport psychology literature, in particular, similarity between consultant’s past and athlete’s current level of sport experience or expertise. The professional practice literature and anecdotal reports made by athletes and coaches suggest that lack of similarity in athletic experience or expertise might be problematic (i.e., if the consultant has not played at an elite level, then will the consultant be viewed as potentially effective by the elite athlete?).

Far fewer studies have been done in field settings examining the effects of perceived counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. In real-life, as opposed to analogue counseling situations, clients seem to more quickly and consistently view counselors as very expert, attractive, and trustworthy (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). Counselors’ socially prescribed role as professional helpers may dominate initial perceptions and override any particular counselor characteristics (Heppner & Heesacker, 1982). Another notable finding from the field research is that clients’ perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness appear to change as the counseling progresses (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). Two
studies have indicated a slight increase in clients’ positive perceptions of counselors as the number of therapy sessions increased (Heppner & Heesacker, 1982; LaCrosse, 1980). A limited focus on perceptions based on initial contact probably over simplifies the relationship.

Pretherapy Information

Counseling psychology has recognized the influence that a counselor’s values can have on the therapeutic process and subsequent outcome of counseling (e.g., Bergin, 1980; Smith, 1981). It has been argued that clients should have information about counselor’s values, as well as other information such as training background and experience, in order to make more informed and competent decisions before entering into a counseling relationship. The Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (American Psychological Association, 1992) has several standards that address informed consent. In structuring the relationship, psychologists are required to describe the nature and anticipated course of therapy, fees, and confidentiality as soon as is feasible in the therapeutic relationship. Psychologists are required to obtain appropriate informed consent from the client to enter a therapeutic relationship using language that is easily understood by the client. Although the content of the informed consent may vary, it should include the provision that the client has been given any significant information concerning the therapeutic
process or procedure. The language of the code is not specific in what the psychologist must divulge to the client, but the implication seems to be that the client should have access to any information that might bear on the relationship.

Recently, a small body of studies has begun to investigate the effect of providing more explicit pretherapy information on clients' perceptions of counselors (Lewis, Davis, & Lesmeister, 1983; Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Epperson, & Foley, 1989). These initial investigations have all utilized a feminist approach to therapy as the counselor value potentially influencing the therapeutic process. This manipulation embodied the notion of a specific value orientation present in the therapist. Lewis et al. (1983) provided subjects with three different scenarios by varying pretherapy information about the therapist. The counselor was either described in a traditional telephone book advertisement, an identical advertisement with the additional label of "feminist therapist," or a detailed statement specifying the therapist as a feminist counselor and delineating her values and approach to therapy. Results indicated that subjects perceived the feminist counselor who explicitly delineated her values and approach to therapy as negative compared to the perceptions of the other two differently described therapists. A limitation of this study was the failure to control the amount of information
in each of the three scenarios. The researchers, in interpreting these results, suggested that although pretherapy information about procedures, goals, and effects of therapy might be more ethical, the effect could be a decrease in the client's confidence about the therapist's capacity to help. Schneider (1985) added a more traditional description of a counselor to counterbalance the more extreme "feminist therapist" description of the Lewis et al. (1983) study. This partial replication of Lewis et al. (1983), however, still found a similar negative reaction to the feminist therapist.

Epperson and Lewis (1987) sought to replicate the Lewis et al. (1983) study while strengthening the investigation with several methodological improvements. The most important change was the addition of a counselor description that was neutral and different from the feminist therapist description while parallel to it in form and quantity. Additionally, the feminist therapist description was changed to be more representative of that genre and done in narrative form. Eleven significant interaction effects (counselor's orientation X explicitness of information) on the dependent measure (Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire) suggested that explicit pretherapy information enabled the subjects to construct a fuller picture of the counselor and her orientation than did the label alone. Explicitness of pretherapy information also
affected subjects' willingness to see the feminist or traditional counselor. In general, explicit information slightly increased willingness to see the traditionally described counselor and decreased willingness to see the counselor in the feminist condition. Subjects in this study strongly agreed that counselors should make every effort to keep their values from influencing their clients. Combined, the results imply that clients expect therapists to be value neutral in the therapeutic process, and that the simple expression of controversial values may cause clients to perceive those same values as being introduced in their work together in an influential manner. The researchers noted that general information about consensus values and goals seem to enhance perceptions of the therapist, but that controversial values may precipitate hesitancy or refusal to engage the therapist. Hence, the client's need for information to make an informed choice must be weighed with the possibility that clients will be alienated by that same information.

The first two studies in this series had used a college-based subject population. Lewis et al. (1989) replicated their previous investigations but incorporated a client population from a university hospital clinic. Results were consistent with those obtained in their previous investigations. Again, increased explicitness of pretherapy information allowed clients to form more accurate
and complete pictures of the therapist as compared to a
counselor label alone. Explicit feminist information
decreased clients' willingness to see the counselor, while
the description of the traditional therapist either
increased or had no effect on client willingness to engage
in work together. Presentation of controversial values
seemed to violate client expectations that therapists should
remain neutral in the therapeutic relationship according to
the researchers.

Applied sport psychology consultation is still in its
infancy, yet many individuals currently are consulting with
athletes and coaches on a wide variety of sport
psychological services. Some researchers, however, have
begun to identify what consultant characteristics are
related to effectiveness (e.g., Gould et al., 1991; Orlick &
Partington, 1987; Partington & Orlick, 1987a). The
professional practice literature has allowed leaders in the
applied sport psychology field to contribute their opinions
and experiences regarding effective methods, techniques, and
approaches when consulting in an athletic setting (Gould &
Finch, 1990; Orlick, 1989; Ravizza, 1988). Both the survey
research and professional practice literature have
emphasized the importance of applied sport psychology
consultants possessing excellent communication and
interpersonal relationship skills which convey honesty,
caring, and genuineness. Without those skills, a
consultant's ability to teach athletes and coaches effective performance enhancement techniques is likely to be limited. Unfortunately, no empirical research has directly studied perceptions of applied sport psychology consultants (of various educational or training backgrounds and athletic experience) in relation to the characteristics associated with consultant effectiveness.

Researchers, however, have examined perceptions held about athletes who consult others (e.g., sport psychologists, coaches, psychotherapists) for problems related to athletic performance (Linder et al., 1989; Linder et al., 1991; Van Raalte et al., 1990; Van Raalte et al., 1992). There appears to be relatively consistent derogation toward athletes who seek help. These investigators have chosen not to describe the professionals beyond their titles or labels. Therefore, it is unclear what the subjects' perceptions are based upon, or whether all subjects are defining the professional accurately. This limitation would seem to confound any conclusions made by the researchers. In addition, perceptions of the various professionals' ability to perform effectively were not assessed.

Strong's social influence model of counseling has been a guiding theory in the field of counseling psychology for many years, and the factors expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness have been related to counselor effectiveness (e.g., Corrigan et al., 1980; Heppner & Dixon, 1981; Heppner
& Claiborn, 1989). These three concepts have not been directly studied before in the applied sport psychology literature, though similar characteristics (e.g., consultant training background, previous athletic experience, relationship skills) have been linked to successful outcomes in applied sport psychology consultation. Given the lack of empirical grounding for assertions made about factors influencing consultant effectiveness, it would seem that counseling psychology’s social influence model could be effectively used within an applied sport psychology setting. Similar variables as those deemed important in applied sport psychology consultation have been studied to varying degrees in the counseling psychology literature within the social influence model.

Understandably, applied sport psychology consultants might be sensitive to athletes’ and coaches’ questions about training, education, and past athletic experience that might imply they are somehow not the most desirable or competent consultant. Consumers of applied sport psychological services, however, deserve information in order to make informed choices. The current study’s purpose is to begin an initial exploration into athletic performers’ perceptions of applied sport psychology consultants’ effectiveness based on various personal characteristics. Two characteristics, previously identified as important for effective sport psychology consultation, are the consultant’s formal
educational or academic training background and their level of previous sport participation or athletic experience. A third personal characteristic hypothesized as crucial in the consultation relationship is the consultant's interpersonal or relationship skills. Unfortunately, studies examining these variables in the sport psychology literature generally have been atheoretical and based on survey methodologies. What appears to be missing is a theoretically based, empirical investigation to determine what factors truly influence applied sport psychology consultants' effectiveness. Thus, using Strong's social influence model, the present investigation examined the effect of applied sport psychology consultants' level of educational or academic training background (i.e., B.A. or Ph.D.), level of past athletic experience (i.e., elite-former collegiate athlete or minimal-recreational sport experience), and interpersonal skills (i.e., skilled-positive or unskilled-negative) on athletes' perceptions of the consultants' effectiveness. Consultant effectiveness was determined based upon the athletes' perceptions of the consultant as (a) expert (e.g., prepared, skillful), attractive (friendly, likeable), and trustworthy (e.g., honest, sincere), (b) possessing important skills or knowledge, and (c) willingness to work with the applied sport psychology consultant if the athlete had a performance problem.
Based on previous research, the following hypotheses were offered:

1) It was hypothesized that the combination of high level of past athletic experience, high level of education or academic training (Ph.D.), and interpersonally skilled (positive) condition would result in the highest ratings of perceived expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, consultant effectiveness, and athlete willingness to work with the consultant.

2) It was expected that the applied sport psychology consultant described in the high level of education or academic training condition (Ph.D.) would be perceived to be more expert than the consultant described in the low level of education or academic training condition (B.A.).

3) Similarly, it was expected that the applied sport psychology consultant described in the high previous athletic experience condition (elite, former collegiate athlete) would be perceived to be more expert and attractive than the consultant described as having minimal (recreational, mostly high school) previous athletic experience.

4) It was anticipated that the applied sport psychology consultant in the high interpersonal (positive) skill level would be perceived to be more expert, attractive, and trustworthy than the consultant in the low interpersonal
(negative) skill level condition, and viewed as a more effective consultant.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Pilot Testing of Written Applied Sport Psychology Consultant Descriptors

Participants: Written Consultant Descriptors

The participants consisted of 55 undergraduate students (33 female and 22 male) enrolled in introductory psychology classes. The pilot testing of the written consultant descriptors was conducted at the end of regular class time, and students were given the opportunity to refuse involvement if they wished. Extra credit was given for participation.

Stimulus Materials: Written Consultant Descriptors

The written descriptions of the applied sport psychology consultant's academic or educational training background (i.e., Ph.D. or B.A.) and level of past athletic experience (i.e., elite/Division I, competent high school/Division III, or minimal/recreational) were developed by a sport psychology research team and doctoral level sport psychology professionals with backgrounds in either kinesiology and/or counseling psychology. The verbatim written descriptions for the consultant academic training descriptions can be found in Appendices A and B. The written descriptions for consultant's past athletic
experience are located in Appendices C through E. Although there appeared to be solid face validity in the varying levels of academic training and previous athletic experience in the written descriptions, it was deemed necessary to run a manipulation check on the written descriptions with an outside, unbiased group of participants.

A seven-item questionnaire was developed to verify the manipulation of the applied sport psychology consultant’s academic training and past athletic experience. Four of the items focused on the consultant’s academic training (perceived sport psychology expertness, experience in assisting athletes, academic preparedness, and ability to help). Three of the items assessed perceptions about the consultant’s past athletic experience (athletic involvement, athletic skillfulness, and similarity to a Division I athlete). Participants’ responses to each item were rated on a 7-point Likert scale with anchors of (1) not very and (7) very. See Appendices F and G for the complete questionnaires and instructions used to pilot test the written consultant descriptions.

Procedure and Data Analysis: Written Consultant Descriptors

Initial instructions given to the participants were that the study was designed to assess perceptions about applied sport psychology consultation. Participants were randomly assigned to read a description of the applied sport psychology consultant which contained one level of academic
training and one level of previous athletic experience. After participants read the written description of the applied sport psychology consultant, they were told to answer the seven-item questionnaire. Written instructions on the questionnaires, as well as verbal instructions from the experimenter, explained to the participants that they were to assume they were Division I college athletes in answering the seven items. After all participants completed the questionnaire, they were debriefed as to the purpose of the study.

The data were analyzed by two one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs): one for the independent variable academic training (two levels) and the four questions (dependent variables) focusing on this area and the other for the independent variable past athletic experience (three levels) and the three questions (dependent variables) focusing on this area. The one-way MANOVAs were significant for academic training, Wilks’ Lambda = 0.50, $F(1, 54) = 12.37, p < .001$ and past athletic experience, Wilks’ Lambda = 0.39, $F(2, 54) = 21.94, p < .001$. Follow-up ANOVAs indicated that the Ph.D. level applied sport psychology consultant was perceived to be significantly more expert in sport psychology, $F(1, 54) = 38.01, p < .001$, experienced in assisting athletes, $F(1, 54) = 33.35, p < .001$, academically prepared, $F(1, 54) = 39.60, p < .001$, and able to help, $F(1, 54) = 31.34, p < .001$. Means and
standard deviation for the four items can be found in Table 1.

Follow-up ANOVAs on the past athletic experience variable indicated that the groups differed on level of involvement in athletics, $F(2, 45) = 68.58, p < .001$, athletic skill, $F(2, 45) = 49.44, p < .001$, and similarity to a Division I athlete, $F(2, 45) = 5.04, p < .05$. Scheffe post hoc analyses demonstrated that the differences in mean scores were between the consultant with the elite (high level) athletic background and the consultant with the recreational (low level) athletic background; means and standard deviations for the three items assessing past athletic experience of the consultant can be found in Table 2.

The applied sport psychology consultant described as having been a competent high school and Division III athlete (the conceptualized mid-range description of the past athletic experience variable) was not statistically different than either the high or low level descriptors of past athletic experience. Therefore, the moderate level of the past athletic experience variable was eliminated in the applied sport psychology consultant written descriptions.

Pilot Testing of the Videotaped Vignettes

Participants: Videotaped Vignettes

Participants were 114 university students (54 male and 60 female) enrolled in undergraduate psychology classes.
Participants choosing to volunteer for the study viewed one of the four videotaped vignettes at the end of regular class time. Extra credit was generally given for those students who participated in the study.

**Stimulus Materials: Videotaped Vignettes**

Initially, two videotapes and subsequent transcripts were created using a licensed psychologist (who was also an AAASP certified applied sport psychology consultant) playing the role of the applied sport psychology consultant and a former collegiate soccer player playing the role of the athlete. The aim of these videotapes and transcripts was to create a realistic and credible initial consultation interaction between a sport psychologist and an athlete within a condensed time frame. These videotapes and transcripts served as the model for the confederates in preparation for their roles.

In one videotaped vignette, the licensed psychologist used a variety of basic attending skills (Ivey & Authier, 1978) to assist the athlete in discussing her concern about a problem in performance consistency (i.e., the positive interpersonally skilled condition). The second videotaped vignette showed the licensed psychologist exhibiting less effective attending skills (Cormier & Cormier, 1985) but communicating similar content concerning the intervention designed to assist the athlete (i.e., the negative interpersonally skilled condition). The decision to define
the athlete's presenting problem as performance inconsistency was based on the Linder et al. (1989) finding that an athlete's nonspecific "consistency" problem yielded the same results as more specific problems such as "concentration" and "stress." It was thought that a nonspecific presenting problem would facilitate participants' identification with the confederate playing the role of the athlete, as well as more closely reflect their own athletic experiences. See Appendix H for a complete description of the female athlete and her "consistency" problem. The content and organization of the interaction remained constant in each videotaped vignette. That is, the consultant's introduction of herself to the athlete, definition and information gathering of the athlete's problem, the consultant's performance enhancement interventions, and the summarization and closure of the session were comparable across the two conditions. What differed across the conditions was the presence or absence of basic counseling skills designed to enhance rapport.

Videotapes of the interactions (positive interpersonally skilled and negative interpersonally skilled presentations) and a matching written transcript of each consultation interaction were given to the confederates playing the roles of the applied sport psychology consultant and the athlete to study and review. To avoid having the videotapes appear artificial and the role playing awkward or
stilted, the confederates were instructed to become familiar with the material, rather than memorize the text and mannerisms verbatim. On several occasions, the confederates practiced the entire session under the direction of the principal investigator. The confederates reviewed the videotapes of these practice interactions and received feedback on their performances. Cue cards with a brief outline of the session organization and a list of verbal and nonverbal microskills were placed off-screen and in the line of sight of the confederates to help them in their roles.

The use of two confederates each playing the applied sport psychology consultant role in the positive and negative interpersonally skilled conditions created four separate scenarios: 1) conferee [A] demonstrating positive interpersonal skills when interacting with the athlete, 2) conferee [A] demonstrating negative interpersonal skills when interacting with the athlete, 3) conferee [B] demonstrating positive interpersonal skills when interacting with the athlete, and 4) conferee [B] demonstrating negative interpersonal skills when interacting with the athlete.

Two advanced (fifth year) doctoral counseling psychology graduate students were selected to play the role of the female applied sport psychology consultant. Both women had master’s degrees in counseling psychology and extensive client contact in professional therapist
positions. The confederates were similar in age, body build, and level of attractiveness. Both wore black, tailored suits during the videotaping of the vignettes. Schneider and Hayslip (1986) have noted the importance of utilizing more than one individual to play the role of the professional in videotaped vignettes, that is, employing a nested design. If only one individual is used to play the role of the professional, then results might be solely attributable to that person. The use of two confederates increases the generalizability of any significant results and lessens the chance that the findings are the result of the individual who is playing the role. A former collegiate soccer player (also an advanced doctoral graduate student in counseling psychology) played the role of the athlete in all four vignettes.

Participants were able to see only the applied sport psychology consultant on the television screen. The confederate playing the role of the athlete was off-screen and only her voice could be heard. Previous research has used counselor only on-screen and counselor-client viewed together on-screen with no apparent criteria for that decision being made. In the present investigation, the rationale for including only the applied sport psychology consultant on the screen was that participants were going to be asked to focus on the consultant. Identification with the athlete was considered important, but it was thought it
would be easier for the participants to become more personally involved with the interaction on the videotape without the additional stimulus of the athlete on the television screen.

In the end, four separate videotapes were created with the actresses [A] and [B] playing both the positive and negative interpersonally skilled roles. The specific length of time of each consultation session were as follows: 1) actress [A]-positive interpersonal skills (9:45), 2) actress [A]-negative interpersonal skills (10:14), 3) actress [B]-positive interpersonal skills (9:47), and 4) actress [B]-negative interpersonal skills (10:48).

**Instrument: Videotaped Vignettes**

A 14-question instrument was developed to assess a wide range of counseling microskills including eye contact, body language, vocal tone, and mannerisms. Also assessed were the content of the consultation interaction, the confederate athlete's perceived satisfaction with the consultant, and the willingness of participants to see the consultant for help with athletic performance problems of their own. These items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale anchored with 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). See Appendix I for the complete questionnaire and participant instructions.

**Procedure and Data Analysis: Videotaped Vignettes**

Participants viewed the videotaped vignettes in classroom settings after completing a brief informed
consent. Each participant viewed only one of the four vignettes. The television screen was placed so that all participants in the classroom could see and hear the videotaped interaction between the applied sport psychology consultant and the athlete. The instructions given to the participants were:

You are about to watch a videotape of a discussion between an athlete and an applied sport psychology consultant. The videotape is about 10 minutes in duration. As you watch the videotape, try to put yourself in the athlete's shoes as she interacts with the applied sport psychology consultant. To help you do so, the athlete will be off-screen. You will be able to hear the athlete, but you will not be able to see her. Try to identify with the athlete in her interaction with the applied sport psychology consultant as you watch the videotape.

Please watch the videotape carefully as you will be asked to answer several questions regarding what you see and hear during the interaction. When the videotape is finished, please answer the questions presented to you.

After the videotape had been seen by the participants, the 14-item questionnaire assessing the counseling microskills and the content of the consultation interaction was given to the participants. After the participants
completed the questionnaire, they were debriefed as to the purpose of the study and their questions were answered.

A one-way (consultant/actress) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to initially analyze the data from the 14-item questionnaire. The overall MANOVA was not significant, Wilks' Lambda = 0.61, F(14, 99) = 1.61, p = 0.13. The univariate ANOVAs revealed that the actresses were rated the same (no statistical difference) on 12 of the 14 items when collapsed across the interpersonal skill variable. Means and standard deviations for the two actresses collapsed across the interpersonally skilled conditions can be located in Table 3. Means and standard deviations for the different actresses in each of the interpersonally skilled conditions (positive and negative) are also given in Tables 4 and 5. These tables are provided to show how similar the actresses were rated in each of the interpersonally skilled conditions. Therefore, the two actress conditions were collapsed into the single interpersonally skilled (positive) and interpersonally unskilled (negative) conditions.

Next, another multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run to analyze the interpersonal skill variable with the actress conditions collapsed. An overall significant difference was found between the positive interpersonally skilled vignette and the negative interpersonally skilled vignette, Wilks' Lambda
Univariate F-tests indicated that there was statistical significance on 13 of the 14 items. The sole exception was on item 10 regarding the applied sport psychology consultant’s ability to provide a clear, practical strategy for the athlete to try out in an attempt to improve performance, $F(1, 112) = 0.38, p = 0.54$. This non-significance served as evidence that while the interpersonal skill variable was being successfully manipulated in the videotaped vignette, the content of the consultant-athlete interaction remained constant as perceived by the participants. In other words, what the applied sport psychology consultant told the athlete stayed the same regardless of the interpersonal presentation. What changed was how the applied sport psychology consultant presented the information and assistance to the athlete in each of the videotaped vignettes. Means and standard deviations for the 14 items on the videotaped vignette questionnaire with the actress conditions collapsed into positive and negative interpersonally skilled conditions are located in Table 6.

Primary Investigation

Participants: Primary Investigation

Participants were 187 female NCAA Division I varsity athletes drawn from seven universities. This sample constituted a broad cross-section of universities with most geographical regions of the country represented.
Academic classification of the participants showed that freshman comprised the largest percentage of athletes (36.2%) followed by sophomores (26.6%), juniors (18.6%), and seniors (17.6%). Two of the participants did not indicate their academic classification on the demographic information questionnaire (1.1%). The majority of the athletes were Caucasian (76.1%); the next largest group was African-American (13.8%). The remaining races and nationalities included Hispanic (0.5%), Asian (2.7%), and other foreign countries (4.3%). Five participants did not indicate their race on the demographic information questionnaire (2.7%).

Nine different sports were represented including: volleyball (n = 47, 25.0%), cross-country and track (n = 41, 21.8%), swimming (n = 34, 18.1%), basketball (n = 20, 10.6%), golf (n = 19, 10.1%), tennis (n = 18, 9.6%), soccer (n = 5, 2.7%), water polo (n = 1, 0.5%), and gymnastics (n = 1, 0.5%). Two of the participants (1.1%) did not indicate on the demographic questionnaire which sport they competed in at the collegiate level. The small number of participants in several of the sports was due to varying degrees of athlete availability at the universities. Finally, there was nearly an equal division in the percentage of athletes who had previously seen an applied sport psychology consultant with 47.3% of the athletes having had prior contact with a consultant and 52.7% who had not. Athletes who reported prior contact with an applied sport psychology consultant
were asked to describe the experience on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (negative-not helpful at all) to 7 (positive-extremely helpful). Descriptors anchoring the scale were 1 (negative-not at all) to 7 (positive-extremely helpful). The mean for this question was 5.24 (SD = 1.31).

**Stimulus Materials: Primary Investigation**

In addition to the applied sport psychology consultant's interpersonal skills, the other independent variables of interest were consultant's academic or educational training background and consultant's previous athletic experience. The two levels of applied sport psychology consultant academic training background (Ph.D. and B.A.) and two levels of previous athletic experience (elite and recreational) combined to create four possible written descriptions of the applied sport psychology consultant, one of which participants would read prior to viewing the videotape of the consultation interaction. Applied sport psychology consultant academic training background was described as either having earned a Ph.D. or B.A. in psychology with 4 years experience at their current employment positions. The Ph.D. level consultant was described as being employed at a university counseling center with a close liaison with the athletic department. The B.A. level consultant was described as a peer counselor for the university counseling center where she conducted workshops and organized the center's outreach services.
Applied sport psychology consultant's past level of athletic experience was described in one of two ways: the consultant competed in her sport (volleyball) at an elite level (two-time All-American and post collegiate international competition) or played at a recreational (mostly high school) level of competition. The written descriptions of the consultant's academic training background were based primarily on input from several professionals with sport psychology backgrounds and a graduate sport psychology research team. For verbatim descriptions of the final four written descriptions used in the main investigation, see Appendices A, B, C, and E.

Instruments: Primary Investigation

A demographic questionnaire was developed for the study to obtain the following information: age, academic classification, race, athletic background, previous contact with an applied sport psychology consultant, and helpfulness of that previous contact with the consultant. In addition, participants were asked to identify a previous athletic performance problem they had had and assess their willingness to see an applied sport psychology consultant for that problem. This same question (assessment of the athlete's willingness to see an applied sport psychology consultant for their performance problem) was asked again after the participants viewed the videotaped vignettes and was specific to the consultant in the videotape they viewed.
These questions were patterned after those used by Dowd and Boroto (1982). See Appendix J for the demographic and preference data questionnaire.

**Applied sport psychology consultant characteristics.** The 12-item Counseling Rating Form-Short (CRF-S; Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983), a shortened version of the original Counseling Rating Form (CRF; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), was used to measure the participants' perceptions of the portrayed applied sport psychology consultant role on the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Four items are associated with each of the three dimensions, and can be answered on a continuum of not very (1) to very (7); total scores can range from 4 to 28 for each of the three dimensions. Higher scores reflect higher levels of perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. A global CRF-S score (ranging from 12 to 84) for an individual can be obtained by adding the scores of each of the three dimensions.

Corrigan and Schmidt (1983) created the CRF-S to improve the utility of the existing CRF and demonstrated that the CRF-S attained or exceeded the reliabilities and validities for the CRF. For example, Corrigan and Schmidt reported reliability coefficients (Spearman-Brown method) of .90, .91, and .86 for the Expertness, Attractiveness, and Trustworthiness scales, respectively. The CRF also has been shown to differentiate attribution dimensions within and
between counselors (Barak & Dell, 1977; LaCrosse, 1980). Finally, the CRF has been shown to predict counseling outcome, as measured by the Goal Attainment Scale (LaCrosse, 1980). A copy of the modified CRF-S with the participants' instructions can be found in Appendix K.

Another measure of applied sport psychology consultant effectiveness is the Sport Psychology Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF; Partington & Orlick, 1987). This 10-item measure was developed to provide feedback to applied sport psychology consultants on their interpersonal and mental training skills. The 10 items (consultant characteristics) are answered on 10-point Likert scales ranging from 0 (not at all) to 10 (yes, definitely). Total scores are obtained by summing across all items with higher scores reflecting greater applied sport psychology consultant effectiveness. Partington and Orlick (1987) demonstrated that the consultant characteristics were discriminating, reliable, valid, and useful for understanding athletes' judgments of consultant effectiveness. For example, the test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be an acceptable .81 for the index sample. Validity was inferred from significant correlation coefficients obtained between total scale scores and two criterion ratings (consultant effect on the athlete, \( r = .68 \); consultant effect on team, \( r = .57 \); \( p \)'s < .001). See Appendix L for a complete copy of the CEF with the participants' instructions.
A 4-item post-videotaped vignette questionnaire was also created (see Appendix M). These items were answered on 7-point Likert scales, ranging from not at all (1) to extremely (7). The first two items asked the participants to rate the applied sport psychology consultant's helpfulness to the athlete in the videotaped vignette and the athlete's level of satisfaction with the consultant. Item 3 asked the participant to assume they were the athlete in the videotaped vignette and rate their willingness to see the consultant. The fourth and final item instructed the participants to refer back to their own previously stated athletic performance problem (item 6 on the demographic questionnaire) and rate the likelihood that the consultant in the videotaped vignette could help them with that problem.

Procedure: Primary Investigation

Coaches and athletic directors were initially contacted at each university and given an explanation of the proposed investigation. Athletes whose coaches indicated openness to the study were then approached and given the opportunity to participate. Initial contact with the athletes generally occurred during team meetings or practices. Although initial agreement with the coaches was necessary to approach their team members, all athletes were made aware of the voluntary nature of their involvement in the investigation. The athletes also understood that their coaches' willingness
to allow the investigators access to team members did not construe a demand on the coaches' part to participate in the study.

Participants were tested individually or in small groups by the principal investigator or a research assistant carefully trained to follow the experimental protocol. Due to the number of different geographical locations where the data were collected, research assistants were given specific verbal and written instructions regarding the experimental protocol. Participants completed an informed consent (see Appendix N) which included a brief explanation stating that the study was designed to assess athletes' impressions about applied sport psychology consultants during the consultation process. In situations where the participants were tested in small groups, the athletes were spaced apart from one another and instructed to remain quiet for the duration of the research. The instruction to remain quiet was repeated at different intervals during the testing by the principal investigator or research assistant and helped prevent any noise distractions that might have disturbed the participants.

After the informed consent was signed, participants were directed to turn the page of their research packet to the next page and complete the demographic information. The research packet consisted of the informed consent, demographic information questionnaire, written description
of the applied sport psychology consultant, written
description of the female athlete and her performance
problem, instructions about watching the videotaped
vignette, the CEF, the CRF-S, a 4-item post-questionnaire
concerning the videotaped vignette, and debriefing
information. There were written instructions on the bottom
of each page directing the participants when to stop or
continue in the research packet. These instructions were
also given verbally by the principal investigator or
research assistant throughout the testing.

The basic design of the investigation was a 2 (applied
sport psychology consultant level of academic or formal
educational training) X 2 (applied sport psychology
consultant level of past athletic experience) X 2 (applied
sport psychology consultant level of interpersonal skill).
Random assignment of individual participants, although
possible, was not attempted for the videotaped vignette
condition (positive consultant interpersonal skills or
negative consultant interpersonal skills) given the field
setting of the project and the athletic participant
population. Time demands upon the athletes and the coaches
were an important consideration, and every effort was made
to keep their time commitment to a minimum. Random
assignment of each athlete to watch one of the four
videotaped vignettes would have made their participation too
tedious and time-consuming. Each of the research assistants
at the various geographical locations was given copies of the four different videotaped vignettes (actress [A]-positive interpersonal skills, actress [A]-negative interpersonal skills, actress [B]-positive interpersonal skills, and actress [B]-negative interpersonal skills). The research assistants were instructed to attempt to show each of the videotapes to an equal number of different athletes in order to generate an approximately equal number of participants in the eight experimental conditions. In general, an entire athletic team would watch just one of the four videotaped vignettes. A relatively equal distribution of athletes in different sports across conditions was accomplished by staggering the time in which the study was conducted at different geographical locations.

After completing the demographic questionnaire, participants were asked to read the next two pages of the research packet which were the written descriptions of the applied sport psychology consultant and the female athlete and her performance consistency problem. The four different written descriptions of the applied sport psychology consultant were randomly distributed within the total complement of research packets. Participants read one of four written descriptions: a) Ph.D. level of academic training and elite athletic experience background, b) Ph.D. level of academic training and recreational athletic experience background, c) B.A. level of academic training
and elite athletic experience background, or d) B.A. level of academic training and recreational athletic experience background. The number of participants in each of the eight experimental cells (interpersonal skill-academic training-past athletic experience) were as follows: 1) Positive-Ph.D.-Elite (N = 25), 2) Positive-B.A.-Recreational (N = 23), 3) Positive-B.A.-Elite (N = 23), 4) Positive-Ph.D.-Recreational (N = 23), 5) Negative-B.A.-Elite (N = 23), 6) Negative-Ph.D.-Recreational (N = 23), 7) Negative-Ph.D.-Elite (N = 24), and 8) Negative-B.A.-Recreational (N = 21).

Next, participants were directed to read along with the principal investigator or research assistant the instructions about the videotape they were about to watch. Participants were then asked to stop and put down the research packet prior to viewing the videotape. The television screen and VCR were situated so that all participants could see and hear the interaction on the videotape. The instructions for watching the videotape were:

You are about to watch a videotape of a discussion between an athlete and an applied sport psychology consultant. The videotape is about 10 minutes in duration. As you watch the videotape, try to put yourself in the athlete’s shoes as she interacts with the applied sport psychology consultant. To help you do so, the athlete will be off-screen. You will be
able to hear the athlete, but you will not be able to see her. Try to identify with the athlete in her interaction with the applied sport psychology consultant as you watch the videotape. Please watch the videotape carefully as you will be asked to answer several questions regarding what you see and hear during the interaction. When the videotape is finished, please answer the questions presented to you.

After viewing the videotaped vignette, the participants were instructed to answer the questions on the three pages that followed: the CEF, the CRF-S, and the 4-item post-videotaped vignette questionnaire. Finally, participants were instructed to read along with the principal investigator or a research assistant the debriefing statement (see Appendix 0). Any questions participants had pertaining to their involvement in the research investigation were answered. The participants were also requested not to talk to other athletes on their respective campuses about the nature of the research. During the course of the study, no participants indicated that they had previously talked with other athletes regarding the research prior to their participation.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS: PRIMARY INVESTIGATION

The data from the dependent measures of the modified Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S) total score, the three individual dimensions of the CRF-S (expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness), the Sport Psychology Consultant Effectiveness Form (CEF) total score, and the 4-item post-videotaped vignette questionnaire were analyzed with a 2 (level of consultant academic training) X 2 (level of consultant past athletic experience) X 2 (level of consultant interpersonal skill) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). No three-way or two-way interaction effects reached significance. Results indicated significant main effects for all three independent variables: academic training, Wilks' Lambda = 0.80, F(9, 169) = 4.70, p < .001, past athletic experience, Wilks' Lambda = 0.87, F(9, 169) = 2.75, p < .005, and interpersonal skill, Wilks' Lambda = 0.43, F(9, 169) = 24.55, p < .0001.

Although the main effect was significant for academic training (Ph.D. or B.A.), the univariate ANOVAs revealed that only one of the dependent measures reached significance, F(1, 177) = 4.26, p < .05. For the post-videotaped vignette questionnaire item "how well did the applied sport psychology consultant help the athlete with
her problem?", the applied sport psychology consultant with a B.A. (M = 4.6, SD = 1.4) was perceived to be more helpful to the athlete than the consultant with a Ph.D. (M = 4.1, SD = 1.7); a finding inconsistent with the hypothesized results. No other differences emerged between the two levels of academic training on the remaining dependent measures. See Table 7 for the specific means and standard deviations on each of the dependent variables.

The next main effect was found for the independent variable previous athletic experience of the applied sport psychology consultant. Again, the univariate ANOVAs indicated that only one of the specific dependent measures was significantly different across the two levels, F(1, 177) = 5.59, p < .01. On the total score of the CRF-S, the consultant in the high level past athletic experience condition (M = 66.8, SD = 22.2) was perceived more favorably across all dimensions of the CRF-S (expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness) than the consultant in the low level of past athletic experience (M = 60.6, SD = 27.4). The means and standard deviations for the various dependent measures relevant to past athletic experience can be found in Table 8.

The final main effect was found for the variable interpersonal skill (positive or negative) of the applied sport psychology consultant. Univariate ANOVAs were significant for all of the dependent measures: total CRF-S,
$F(1, 177) = 129.80, \ p < .0001$, CRF-Expertness, $F(1, 177) = 105.79, \ p < .0001$, CRF-Attractiveness, $F(1, 177) = 183.06, \ p < .0001$, CRF-Trustworthiness, $F(1, 177) = 141.37, \ p < .0001$, CEF, $F(1, 177) = 181.46, \ p < .0001$, Consultant Helpfulness, $F(1, 177) = 84.71, \ p < .0001$, Athlete Satisfaction, $F(1, 177) = 85.24, \ p < .0001$, Athlete Willingness, $F(1, 177) = 131.84, \ p < .0001$, and Participant Helpfulness, $F(1, 177) = 108.21, \ p < .0001$. The applied sport psychology consultant with positive interpersonal skills was overwhelmingly rated more favorably than the consultant displaying negative interpersonal skills. Table 9 presents the means and standard deviations for all dependent measures.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore athletes' perceptions of applied sport psychology consultants' effectiveness based on different personal and professional characteristics. The applied sport psychology professional practice literature and anecdotal reports by athletes, coaches, and applied sport psychology consultants themselves have suggested that academic training, past athletic experience, and interpersonal skills are three important variables in the consultation relationship (e.g., Burke, 1993; Gould & Finch, 1990; Orlick, 1989; Partington & Orlick, 1991; Ravizza, 1990). The present investigation sought to explore these variables within Strong's (1968) social influence model in a theoretically-based, empirical manner.

Several hypotheses were formulated at the beginning of the study concerning the relative importance of the applied sport psychology consultant's educational level, past athletic experience, and interpersonal skill level. The results indicated a mixture of support and rejection of these hypotheses. The first hypothesis, which suggested that the applied sport psychology consultants with positive
interpersonal skills, high level of academic training (Ph.D.), and high level past athletic experience (elite) would receive the highest ratings of perceived expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, effectiveness, and athlete willingness to work with the consultant, was not supported. Although main effects were found for each of these variables (educational training, past athletic experience, and interpersonal skill), the effect of interpersonal skill was the most prominent. Applied sport psychology consultants with these personal and professional characteristics (Ph.D., elite athletic background, and positive interpersonal skills) were rated favorably, but not differently than other consultants with positive interpersonal skills and combinations of educational training (Ph.D. or B.A.) and past athletic experience (elite or recreational). In other words, Division I female athletes rated all positive interpersonally skilled applied sport psychology consultants favorably regardless of the consultants’ level of academic training or past athletic experience.

The second hypothesis predicted that the applied sport psychology consultant described in the high (Ph.D.) level of academic training would be perceived to be more expert (as measured by the CRF-S Expert scale) than the consultant in the low (B.A) level of academic training. This hypothesis also was not supported. Although there was a significant main effect for the variable academic training, the
univariate ANOVA for the Expertness scale of the CRF-S was not statistically significant. Subjects perceived the applied sport psychology consultants with a Ph.D. or a B.A. degree to be equally expert in their ability to help the athlete in a prepared and skillful manner based on the CRF-S. With regard to the applied sport psychology consultants' educational training, participants' perceptions statistically differed on only one item. The B.A. level consultant ($M = 4.6, \text{SD} = 1.4$) was rated higher than the Ph.D. level consultant ($M = 4.1, \text{SD} = 1.7$) on how well they were perceived to have helped the athlete in the vignette with her problem; a finding inconsistent with pre-investigation expectations. Interestingly, when asked to rate how likely the applied sport psychology consultant could help the participants with their own previously stated athletic performance problem, there was no difference between the Ph.D. ($M = 3.5, \text{SD} = 1.9$) and B.A. ($M = 3.6, \text{SD} = 1.9$) level consultants.

The third hypothesis focused on the past athletic experience variable and predicted that applied sport psychology consultants with high (elite) past athletic experience would be perceived to be more expert and attractive than consultants with low (recreational) past level of athletic experience. This hypothesis was partially supported. Although the applied sport psychology consultants' past level of athletic experience did not
significantly affect participants' perceptions about the consultants' expertness (e.g., skill, preparedness, confidence) or attractiveness (e.g., likability, compatibility, similarity) on the specific Expertness and Attractiveness scales of the CRF-S, there was a significant difference on the total CRF-S score. The significant main effect for past athletic experience suggests that consultants with high and low previous athletic experience are perceived differently, but apparently the applied sport psychology consultants' athletic background is only important to athlete-clients in a global, more general way. It would appear that athletes' perceptions about the consultant's ability to help with a performance problem based on the consultants' past athletic experience may not be as important as has previously been suggested.

The counseling psychology research literature prior to 1988 has come to contradictory conclusions regarding the importance of counselor-client similarity. Most recently, Heppner and Claiborn's (1988) literature review has generally supported a similarity hypothesis suggesting that similarity between counselor and client increased counselor credibility and attractiveness. In that same vein, intuitively, it would make sense that competitive athletes would perceive applied sport psychology consultants with competitive athletic backgrounds in a more positive light.
literature consistently reports that for consultants to be effective they must demonstrate sport-specific knowledge and have firsthand experience in the pursuit of excellence in athletics. Clearly, the written description of the consultant with a low, recreational level of previous athletic experience did not meet the requirement suggested by professionals in the applied sport psychology field as being important. The Division I female athletes did not find the consultant with an elite athletic background to be any more expert, attractive, trustworthy, or effective than the consultant with only recreational athletic experience. Similarly, the athletes did not differ in their expressed willingness to work with the consultant in the videotaped vignette based on the past athletic experience information.

The final hypothesis which suggested that applied sport psychology consultants in the high (positive) interpersonally skilled condition would be perceived to be more expert, attractive, trustworthy, and effective than the consultant in the low (negative) interpersonally skilled condition was supported. Applied sport psychology consultants with positive interpersonal skills were rated higher in expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, and effectiveness than consultants displaying negative interpersonal skills. In addition, the participants rated the positive interpersonally skilled consultants higher in their ability to help the athlete, the athlete more
satisfied with the positive interpersonally skilled consultant, the athlete more willing to continue working with the positive interpersonally skilled consultant, and the positive interpersonally consultant more likely to help the participants with their own previously reported performance problems.

The present investigation supports the survey research on applied sport psychology consultant effectiveness (Gould et al., 1991; Orlick & Partington, 1987; Partington & Orlick 1987a; Partington & Orlick, 1987; Partington & Orlick, 1991), the applied sport psychology professional practice literature (Dorfman, 1990; Gould & Finch, 1990; Henschen, 1991; Orlick, 1990; Ravizza, 1988; Ravizza, 1990), and anecdotal reports which have consistently contended that positive interpersonal or relationship skills are necessary to function effectively as a consultant and communicate information to athletes. Division I female athletes in this study rated applied sport psychology consultants with positive interpersonal skills more favorably than consultants with negative interpersonal skills on all the dependent measures when the content and intervention strategies within the interaction were held constant. Clearly, how the applied sport psychology consultants' knowledge was conveyed to the athlete and the manner in which the performance enhancement interventions were implemented greatly affected the participants' perceptions.
of the consultants' effectiveness and the participants' own willingness to work with that consultant.

Somewhat surprisingly, the applied sport psychology consultants' academic training and past athletic experience (the written information given to the participants prior to viewing the videotaped interaction) had only limited influence on the participants' perceptions about the consultant. Previous research in the counseling psychology literature has found considerable evidence that objective evidence of training and prestige cues did affect perceptions of counselor expertness (Angle & Goodyear, 1984; Berstein & Figioli, 1983; Holmes & Kixmiller, 1989; Littrell et al., 1987; McCarthy, 1982; Paradise et al., 1986), attractiveness (Angle & Goodyear, 1984; Berstein & Figioli, 1983; Littrell et al., 1987; McCarthy, 1982; Paradise et al., 1986), and trustworthiness (Berstein & Figioli, 1983; Littrell et al., 1987; McCarthy, 1982; McKee & Smouse, 1983). Written descriptions of the applied sport psychology consultant in the high level of academic training condition (Ph.D., licensed psychologist, 4 years experience in counseling center and athletic department, published journal articles, successful book) and low level of academic training condition (B.A., 4 years experience as a peer counselor, organization of counseling center workshops, coordinator of counseling center outreach services) did not elicit any significant differences in perceptions of
expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness from Division I female athletes. This finding is in direct contrast to the counseling psychology research literature. Pilot testing of the written descriptions with nonathletes serving as participants indicated that the manipulation of the academic training variable was successful. The participants in the pilot testing did perceive differences in expertness, experience, academic preparedness, and ability to help based on the consultants' level of academic training. The presentation of the actresses with the label "applied sport psychology consultant" in the viewing instructions for the videotaped vignettes may have been enough to negate any perceptions of the consultants' qualifications based on academic training. Although the label "applied sport psychology consultant" does not indicate equivalent academic training background, athletes (even at Division I universities) may be unaware of the different levels of educational training that are possible within the field, and thus not have predetermined expectations based on educational level. This held true in the study even though nearly 50% of the participants had indicated having had at least one previous contact with an applied sport psychology consultant before. It may be that the label of "applied sport psychology consultant" was prestigious and suggested enough credibility that the additional information provided
in the written description regarding the specifics of her academic training had minimal influence.

Another possible explanation for the lack of specific differences found after the manipulation of applied sport psychology consultants' academic training and past athletic experience was the amount of discrepancy in the positive and negative interpersonal skill levels of the consultants in the videotaped vignettes. The actresses in the less effective interpersonally skilled condition exhibited poor counseling microskills and basic attending behaviors throughout the entire 10 minute interaction. A perusal of the videotaped vignette pilot testing results in Table 6 reveals that the actresses in the negative interpersonally skilled role were rated very low on the specific, attending behavior items more objectively judged, more easily observed, and less subject to participant interpretation (items 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). The negative interpersonally skilled actresses were rated 2.3 (maintained eye contact, item 1), 1.5 (body language indicating interest, item 2), 5.8 (appeared distracted, item 5), 2.8 (warm and sincere vocal tone, item 6), and 6.5 (interfering mannerisms, item 7) on the 7-point Likert scales anchored (1) not at all and (7) extremely. In comparison, actresses in the positive interpersonally skilled condition were rated 6.7 (maintained eye contact, item 1), 5.3 (body language indicating interest, item 2), 1.8 (appeared distracted, item 5), 5.7
(warm and sincere vocal tone, item 6), and 3.3 (interfering mannerisms, item 7) on the 7-point Likert scales anchored (1) not at all and (7) extremely. This large discrepancy in the applied sport psychology consultants' interpersonal skill level may have overshadowed the other two variables of interest, academic training and past athletic experience. The addition of a moderate level of consultant interpersonal skill may have allowed a better view of the importance of consultant academic training and past athletic experience.

Given that the manipulations for the variables consultant academic training and past athletic experience were successfully verified in the pilot testing of the written pre-consultation information, the actual behavior displayed by the consultant in the videotaped vignette may have significantly outweighed the influence of the pre-consultation written information on those variables. The participants in the present study had ample opportunity to observe and listen to the respective consultants. It is likely that the participants based their ratings on the applied sport psychology consultants' actual skill rather than on the consultants' academic training or past athletic experience. Therefore, any influence of the written pre-consultation information was negated. Dell and Schmidt (1976) have suggested that although prior knowledge of counselors' training and experience influence client
evaluations, these variables lessen greatly in importance to
the counselors themselves in determining these judgements.

The results of the present investigation bear on the
current discussion concerning the training and certification
of applied sport psychology consultants. Division I female
athletes unambiguously rated consultants with positive
interpersonal skills more favorably on variables
(expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, effectiveness)
associated with the ability to facilitate change. Orlick
and Partington (1987) have bluntly stated that the shortage
of good applied sport psychology consultants is a direct
result of a failure to emphasize personal qualities and
interpersonal skills in the selection of students into
applied sport psychology programs. The current criteria for
AAASP certification as an applied sport psychology
consultant includes the requirement for training in
counseling. In general, this is meant to be the course work
and practicum experience where psychologists-in-training
learn the microskills and attending behavior necessary to
interact with clients in an effective manner. The present
results suggest that individuals desiring to work
effectively in applied sport psychology settings must be
able to demonstrate positive interpersonal skills. Anshel
(1993) correctly stated that the applied sport psychology
field includes many individuals with various personality and
communication styles, and that "an arrogant, patronizing
certified sport psychology consultant will not be more
effective than a noncertified consultant who has more
personable and humanistic tendencies" (p. 350). The present
study addressed Anshel's (1993) call for research on the
effectiveness of certification standards. For Division I
female athletes, a "competent" certified applied sport
psychology consultant must be able to demonstrate positive
interpersonal skills to be effective. These participants
could not hear the consultants' message when it was
presented in an interpersonally unskilled manner.

This study also addressed Anshel's (1995) call to move
beyond description of what sport psychologists do and
identify what they should do. The pronouncement has often
been made for applied sport psychology consultants to gain
expertise in counseling skills. Frequently, this is
advanced with the caveat that the consultant can then be in
the position to meet the athletes' needs and expectations as
both a sport and mental health provider (Van Raalte, Brewer,
Brewer, & Linder, 1993). The field of sport psychology and
individual consultants may not be comfortable with filling
the role and responsibilities of being a mental health
provider for athletes, however, the results still underscore
the need to have structured training in basic counseling
skills. Gaining entry to conduct sport psychology field
research (Eklund, 1993) and increasing the willingness of
athletes to participate in formal assessment of their needs
(Taylor, 1995) are other areas of applied sport psychology which have been identified as requiring consultants with effective interpersonal skills. It would seem that the AAASP criteria element requiring course work in counseling skills is not only a good idea, but a necessity regardless of an individual’s decision to pursue clinical, educational, or research careers in sport psychology. Ability to demonstrate positive interpersonal skills (including successful practicum experiences) may be needed in addition to the course work requirement.

Several limitations were present within this investigation that warrant discussion. Kazdin (1986) and Heppner and Claiborn (1988) have previously detailed the weaknesses that exist when implementing an analogue design. Participants viewed only a 10 minute videotaped interaction of a condensed session between an applied sport psychology consultant and an athlete. Despite the care taken in creating a realistic interaction, participant perceptions were based on relatively limited information and initial impressions. Videotaped vignettes most closely resemble real-life counseling because it includes both verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Participants in the current study, however, were simply observers instructed to identify with the athlete and not client-athletes themselves. The participants may have responded differently had they been involved in the counseling themselves. The videotaped
vignettes were less emotionally immediate and the participants likely gave most of their attention to the consultant (especially since this was the only actress visually present on the screen). In comparison, athlete-clients would be expected to attend to their own cognitions and emotions, as well as the consultants' behavior in a real-life consultation session. This task was made somewhat easier in the present investigation since the participants (female Division I athletes) resembled the athlete in the videotape in several important ways. Given these disadvantages, the results' generalizability to actual consultation in applied sport psychology settings must be considered with caution.

A second limitation of the study may have been the decision to provide the academic training and past athletic experience information in written form. There does not appear to be any research which directly assesses the relative importance of videotape and written information when both are presented at the same time. Hardin and Yanico (1981) have compared simultaneously recorded videotape and audiotape counseling analogues and written transcripts made from the tapes. Male subjects rated counselors less expert, attractive, and trustworthy after reading the written transcripts of an initial counseling interview in comparison to the same counseling interview in audio or videotaped format. There was also a main effect found for gender with
females rating counselors higher in expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness than male subjects. In the present investigation, it would appear that the actual behavior of the consultant in the videotape significantly outweighed the influence of the pre-consultation written information regarding academic training and past athletic experience. Perhaps, if the written information had been presented within the videotaped vignette, then the consultant academic training and past athletic experience variables may have become more salient.

This investigation provides several different directions for future research. As has been earlier discussed, some of the results are in direct contrast to those found in the counseling psychology literature. This suggests that counseling psychology research findings based on the social influence model cannot be assumed to directly carry over to applied sport psychology consultants' work with athletes. As a first step, it will be important to replicate the present study and extend it to male participants and male actors in the roles of the consultant and athlete. Although most comprehensive reviews of the counseling psychology literature have concluded that there is not a consistent finding based on gender of the counselor or client-counselor gender matching on treatment outcome (Beutler, Crago, & Arizmendi, 1986), this will need to be verified for athletes where gender plays an important role.
in how sport and exercise are experienced. As an example, in the Linder et al. (1991) study, male subjects were found to derogate an athlete who consulted a sport psychologist or a psychotherapist, but female subjects did not. Also, Krane (1994) has pointed out that many gender differences in sport psychological variables are acknowledged to exist, although few studies have addressed the complexities of the issue or examined why these differences occur.

Of possibly greater interest, would be an investigation in which the applied sport psychology consultant and the athlete-client are opposite in gender. Henschen (1991) in the applied sport psychology professional literature has already discussed some critical issues to consider when male consultants work with female athletes. A more formal, experimental approach to this issue would be a valuable addition to the literature.

More analogue studies are needed to investigate other consultant personal characteristics, and their effect on athletes' perceptions of expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, and effectiveness. These might include consultant race, consultant gender, consultant academic field, consultant fitness level and body size, as well as other consultant-athlete group membership similarities. It is too early to make the recommendation to move on to Strong's (1968) second stage of influence (the actual influence process) before other components of perceived
expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, and effectiveness are identified and compared to the currently available counseling psychology research. Counselor or consultant personal and professional characteristics represent antecedents in the counseling or consultation process rather than an end point. It will eventually be important to go beyond focusing solely on the antecedents of athlete-client influence and examine the functioning of these consultant characteristics in the change process itself. Analogue studies provide the advantage of looking at basic factors and their contributions to outcome in a well-controlled environment and is often desirable during the beginning investigation of a research area. This needs to be done before advancing to the more complex and multidimensional process of actual client (athlete) change.

Applied sport psychology continues to move forward at a rapid pace, and often, the research has seemed to lag behind as an after-the-fact attempt to catch-up or evaluate the work and interventions that have already been implemented. This study evaluated three applied sport psychology consultant personal and professional characteristics that have previously been suggested to impact consultants' effectiveness in working directly with athletes; and this was done utilizing Division I female athletes as participants, a population with whom consultants often desire to work and collaborate. The strongest finding of
the investigation was that positive interpersonal skills were perceived by the participants to favorably affect the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, and effectiveness. These dimensions have been shown to be important in facilitating change with clients in a therapeutic manner. Limitations of the study existed which exclude direct generalizability to real-world work between applied sport psychology consultants and athletes, however, the strong finding for the influence of consultant positive interpersonal skills supports previously called for training standards in basic counseling skills. Individuals in the field of applied sport psychology who desire to work directly or indirectly with athletes and coaches are challenged to examine their own qualifications to provide effective services to their athlete and coaching clientele. The field of applied sport psychology covers a broad and complicated mixture of professionals, academic fields, training issues, and most importantly, athletes and coaches as consumers. Ongoing evaluation and clarification of what is effective in helping athletes and coaches pursue their personal and team goals are necessary if the field is to advance in an ethical and purposeful way.
APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF CONSULTANT WITH A Ph.D. OR HIGH LEVEL OF
ACADEMIC OR EDUCATIONAL TRAINING
Description of Consultant with a Ph.D. or High Level of Academic or Educational Training

Dr. Sarah West is a 30-year-old female licensed psychologist. Dr. West has been working as a sport psychologist for the past 4 years consulting with athletes on a variety of problems related to athletic performance. Her current position is within a university counseling center where she divides her time between the center and the athletic department. Dr. West has published several athletic performance articles in scholarly journals and has presented papers at professional conferences. Dr. West presently has a successful book on the market titled Being Your Athletic Best: A Guide to Peak Performance which elite athletes report to be helpful.
APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTION OF CONSULTANT WITH A B.A. OR LOW LEVEL OF ACADEMIC OR EDUCATIONAL TRAINING
Description of Consultant with a B.A. or Low Level of Academic or Educational Training

Sarah West is a 30-year-old female with an undergraduate degree (Bachelor of Arts) in Psychology. After graduation from college, Ms. West began working as a peer counselor within the university counseling center where she has been for the past 4 years. Her job responsibilities include organizing and leading workshops for students on a variety of topics, including communication skills and stress management. Through these workshops, Ms. West has had the opportunity to work with several athletes individually. Ms. West recently attended a one-day workshop on assisting athletes in performing their best. Ms. West also works with the counseling center director in organizing the center's outreach services.
APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF CONSULTANT WITH A HIGH LEVEL OF PAST
ATHLETIC EXPERIENCE
Description of Consultant with a High Level of Past Athletic Experience

In high school, Sarah West lettered in basketball and volleyball all 4 years she participated. During her senior year in high school, she was extensively recruited as an All-State player, and eventually decided to accept a volleyball scholarship to a Division I university on the West Coast. She was a two-time All-American and led her team to a NCAA championship her senior year. After graduation, Sarah West successfully continued her volleyball career playing for the U.S. national team before retiring from international competition. Currently, she is on a local volleyball team which competes in United States Volleyball Association (USVBA) tournaments.
APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF CONSULTANT WITH A MODERATE LEVEL OF
PAST ATHLETIC EXPERIENCE
Description of Consultant with a Moderate Level of Past Athletic Experience

In high school, Sarah West participated in basketball and volleyball for 4 years and lettered in both sports her senior year. During her senior year in high school, she also was selected to the second team all-city volleyball team. Several Division III colleges were interested in her athletic skills, and she finally decided to enroll at a school in the Midwest where she competed for the volleyball and basketball teams with moderate levels of success. Since graduation from college, Sarah West has continued to play volleyball in various city leagues.
APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTION OF CONSULTANT WITH A LOW LEVEL OF

PAST ATHLETIC EXPERIENCE
Description of Consultant with a Low Level of Past Athletic Experience

In high school, Sarah West recreationally participated in basketball and volleyball in a local recreational league. During her senior year in high school, she received a league award for having the best attitude. As a university student, she devoted most of her time to academics and other campus activities, though occasionally played on intramural volleyball teams with friends. Immediately after graduation from the university, Sarah West's sport participation was limited. Since Sarah West has been at her current employment, she has played for the center's co-rec basketball team in the faculty/staff league.
APPENDIX F

PILOT TESTING QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WRITTEN DESCRIPTION
OF APPLIED SPORT PSYCHOLOGY CONSULTANT'S
LEVEL OF ACADEMIC TRAINING
Pilot Testing Questionnaire for Written Description
of Applied Sport Psychology Consultant's
Level of Academic Training

INSTRUCTIONS: As a point of comparison, assume you are a
college athlete competing at a Division I university. Based
upon the written description, please answer the following
questions by circling the appropriate number.

1. How expert is this individual in the area of sport
psychology?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not very  very

2. How experienced is this individual in assisting athletes
with performance problems?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not very  very

3. How prepared (educationally trained) is this individual
to help athletes with performance problems?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not very  very

4. How well would this individual be able to help athletes
with performance problems?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not very  very
APPENDIX G
PILOT TESTING QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WRITTEN DESCRIPTION
OF APPLIED SPORT PSYCHOLOGY CONSULTANT'S
LEVEL OF PAST ATHLETIC EXPERIENCE
Pilot Testing Questionnaire for Written Description of Applied Sport Psychology Consultant's Level of Past Athletic Experience

INSTRUCTIONS: As a point of comparison, assume you are a college athlete competing at a Division I university. Based upon the written description, please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number.

1. How involved in athletics has this individual been?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not very very

2. How skilled as an athlete is this individual?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not very very

3. How similar to you as an athlete is this individual?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not very very
APPENDIX H

DESCRIPTION OF THE FEMALE ATHLETE AND HER PERFORMANCE "CONSISTENCY" PROBLEM
Description of the Female Athlete and Her Performance "Consistency" Problem

Courtney is a 20-year-old junior on the women's varsity soccer team. She plays forward and according to her coach had made significant contributions to the team's success during her freshman and sophomore years. This year Courtney played quite well during the first third of the season, but recently has been playing progressively worse. After a medical evaluation by the team physician, possible physical problems were eliminated as an explanation for her poor athletic performance.

Courtney and her coach report that there is a lack of consistency in her performance which has allowed other teams to take advantage of her errors. In fact, the team has lost important games due to her mistakes. Courtney and her coach agree that Courtney's performance problems appear to be psychological, and that a sport counselor would be the professional most appropriate to help her. Courtney's coach is aware of a counselor at the university counseling center who is available for the university's athletic teams. In her work with athletes, this sport counselor typically focuses on helping athletes develop skills to achieve their best, play more consistently, reduce performance anxiety, set goals, and create a mental focus. Courtney is afraid of losing her starting position due to the "consistency" problem and has come to the university counseling center for help.
APPENDIX I

PILOT TEST QUESTIONNAIRE FOR VIDEOTAPED VIGNETTES
Pilot Test Questionnaire for Videotaped Vignettes

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon the videotape that you viewed, please respond to the statements by circling the appropriate number.

1. The applied sport psychology consultant maintained good eye contact.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not at all extremely

2. The applied sport psychology consultant's body language indicated interest in the athlete.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not at all extremely

3. The applied sport psychology consultant accurately understood the athlete's problem.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not at all extremely

4. The applied sport psychology consultant listened to the athlete with concern.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not at all extremely

5. The applied sport psychology consultant appeared distracted.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   not at all extremely
6. The applied sport psychology consultant’s vocal tone was warm and sincere.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all extremely

7. The applied sport psychology consultant’s mannerisms and gestures were distracting and interfering.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all extremely

8. The applied sport psychology consultant was open and flexible with the athlete and her problem.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all extremely

9. The applied sport psychology consultant was ready to collaborate with the athlete about her problem.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all extremely

10. The applied sport psychology consultant provided a clear, practical strategy for the athlete to try out in an attempt to improve her performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all extremely

11. The athlete related well with the applied sport psychology consultant.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all extremely
12. How satisfied do you believe the athlete was with the applied sport psychology consultant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How well did the applied sport psychology consultant help the athlete with her problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. If you had an athletic performance problem, how willing would you be to see this applied sport psychology consultant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Demographic Information

1. Age:
2. Academic Classification:
3. Race:
4. What sport(s) do you compete in at the collegiate level?
5. Have you ever consulted or worked with an applied sport psychology consultant before? (Circle) Yes No
   If yes, how would you describe the experience?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   negative positive
   not helpful at all extremely helpful
6. Think about a previous athletic performance problem you have had. Briefly write in the space provided what the problem was.______________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. How willing would you be to see an applied sport psychology consultant about that problem?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   extremely unwilling
   extremely willing
APPENDIX K

MODIFIED COUNSELOR RATING FORM-SHORT (CRF-S)
Modified Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S)

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon the videotaped interaction and written description of the applied sport psychology consultant, please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number. Some questions may be difficult to answer based upon the information provided, however, please respond to all questions.

1. How friendly is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
2. How experienced is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
3. How honest is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
4. How likeable is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
5. How expert is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
6. How reliable is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
7. How sociable is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
8. How prepared is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
9. How sincere is this sport psychology consultant?
   Not Very 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
10. How warm is this sport psychology consultant?
Not Very 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very

11. How skillful is this sport psychology consultant?
Not Very 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very

12. How trustworthy is this sport psychology consultant?
Not Very 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very
APPENDIX L

SPORT PSYCHOLOGY CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM (CEF)
SPORT PSYCHOLOGY CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM (CEF)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please rate the applied sport psychology consultant on each of the following characteristics by circling a number from 0 to 10 as seen below.

1. Had useful knowledge about mental training that seemed to apply directly to the athlete's sport.
   
   Not At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Yes, Definitely

2. Seemed willing to provide an individual mental training program based on the athlete's input and needs.
   
   Not At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Yes, Definitely

3. Seemed open, flexible, and ready to collaborate/cooperate.
   
   Not At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Yes, Definitely

4. Had a positive, constructive attitude.
   
   Not At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Yes, Definitely

5. Proved to be trustworthy.
   
   Not At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Yes, Definitely
6. Was easy for the athlete to relate to (e.g., the athlete felt comfortable and the consultant understood her).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Yes, Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Would fit in with others connected with the team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Yes, Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Tried to help the athlete draw upon her strengths (e.g., the things that already worked for the athlete) in order to make the athlete’s best performance more consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Yes, Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Tried to help the athlete overcome possible problems, or weaknesses, in order to make the athlete’s best performance even better and more consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Yes, Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Provided clear, practical, concrete strategies for the athlete to try out in an attempt to solve problems, or improve the level and consistency of the athlete’s performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Yes, Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

VIDEOTAPED VIGNETTE QUESTIONNAIRE:

PRIMARY INVESTIGATION
Post-Videotaped Vignette Questionnaire:

Primary Investigation

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon what you saw in the videotaped interaction and read about in the written description of the applied sport psychology consultant, please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number.

1. How well did the applied sport psychology consultant help the athlete with her problem?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   Not At All  Extremely

2. How satisfied do you believe the athlete was with the applied sport psychology consultant?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   Not At All  Extremely

3. Assume you were the athlete with the problem. How willing would you be to see this applied sport psychology consultant?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   Not At All  Extremely

4. Think about the athletic performance problem you previously wrote down about yourself. How likely would this applied sport psychology consultant be able to help you with your problem?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   Not At All  Extremely
APPENDIX N

INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent

I, ____________________________, (print name) agree to participate in a study concerning applied sport psychology consultation. As a participant in this study, I agree to complete a series of questionnaires after watching a videotaped vignette of an interaction between an applied sport psychology consultant and an athlete. I understand that following completion of the questionnaires no additional time will be requested or required by the investigator. The purpose of this study is to better understand perceptions about applied sport psychology consultation.

I understand that all information I provide will be confidential and will not be recorded in any way that could identify me personally. I understand that my participation in this study is completely voluntary, and I am free to discontinue participation without prejudice at any time.

If I have any questions or problems that arise in connection with my participation in this study, then I should contact Douglas M. Hankes, 900 Volunteer Blvd., Student Counseling Services Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37796-9250, or call (615/974-2196). Or contact Dr. Trent Petrie, Department of Psychology, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76202, or call (817/565-2671).
I have read and understand the explanation of this study and agree to participate.

Participant’s Signature:______________________________
Name (printed):______________________________
Date:____________
APPENDIX O

DEBRIEFING INFORMATION
Debriefing Information

The videotaped vignette that you viewed was a staged interaction between two actresses. In some instances, the actresses purposely made mistakes or behaved in inappropriate ways. An actual consultation between an athlete and an applied sport psychology consultant (in most cases) would look and sound very different than what you viewed. If you have any questions regarding the videotape, written descriptions, or questionnaires, feel free to contact the primary investigator, Douglas M. Hankes, Student Counseling Services Center, 900 Volunteer Blvd., University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37796-9250, or call (615/974-2196). Or contact Dr. Trent Petrie, Department of Psychology, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76202, or call (817/565-2671).
APPENDIX P

TABLES
Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for the Written Description of Consultant Level of Academic Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Psychology Expertness</td>
<td>5.7*</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Assisting Athletes</td>
<td>5.4*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Preparedness</td>
<td>6.0*</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Help Athletes</td>
<td>5.5*</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .001.
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for the Written Description of Consultant Level of Past Athletic Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Elite M</th>
<th>Elite SD</th>
<th>Mod M</th>
<th>Mod SD</th>
<th>Rec M</th>
<th>Rec SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Involvement</td>
<td>6.9*</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8*</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Skillfulness</td>
<td>6.7*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Division I Athlete</td>
<td>4.8**</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001  
** p < .05
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for the Videotaped Vignette Pilot Questionnaire of the Two Actresses Collapsed Across Interpersonally Skilled Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Actress [A]</th>
<th></th>
<th>Actress [B]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Language</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately Understood</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Listening</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Tone</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannerisms</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Related</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Willingness</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for the Videotaped Vignette Pilot Questionnaire of the Two Actresses in the Positive Interpersonally Skilled Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Actress [A]</th>
<th>Actress [B]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Language</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately Understood</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Listening</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Tone</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannerisms</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Related</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Willingness</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the Videotaped Vignette Pilot Questionnaire of the Two Actresses in the Negative Interpersonally Skilled Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Actress [A]</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Actress [B]</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Language</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately Understood</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Listening</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Tone</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannerisms</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Related</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Willingness</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations for the Videotaped Vignette Questionnaire with the Actress Conditions Collapsed into Positive and Negative Interpersonally Skilled Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Language</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately Understood</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Listening</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Tone</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannerisms</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>5.0*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.9*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Related</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Willingness</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Only item 10 (strategy) not statistically different. All other items significant at $p < .001$. 
Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures by Level of Academic Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
<th></th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CRF</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Attractiveness</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Trustworthiness</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Expertness</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Helpfulness</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Willingness</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Helpfulness</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures by Level of Previous Athletic Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Elite</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Elite</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CRF</td>
<td>66.8*</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>60.6*</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Attractiveness</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Trustworthiness</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Expertness</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Helpfulness</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Willingness</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Helpfulness</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures by Level of Interpersonal Skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CRF</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Attractiveness</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Trustworthiness</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-Expertness</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Helpfulness</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Willingness</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Helpfulness</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All dependent measures significant at p < .0001.
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