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This study was undertaken to investigate the influence of a military counselor’s attire on potential clients’ expressed perceptions of and preferences for a counselor. Ninety volunteer participants were selected from a large southwestern Air Force base. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 46 years, with 68 male and 22 female volunteers. Rank was divided into 69 enlisted personnel (56 males and 13 females) and 21 officers (12 males and 9 females). Three videotapes were made depicting a counselor in three attire conditions: civilian; military officer; and military enlisted. A pilot study was completed which validated the research assumption that the videotapes differed only in the counselor’s attire conditions.

Participants were randomly assigned to three treatment groups. After each group was shown a videotape portraying the counselor in one of the three attire conditions, the participants were administered the Counselor Rating Form and the Referral Questionnaire. The Counselor Rating Form is composed of three scales which assess perceptions of a
counselors' trustworthiness, attractiveness, and expertness. The Referral Questionaire assesses subjects' preferences to see a specific counselor in the event counseling is desired.

Two main hypotheses, each having three subhypotheses, were developed for the study. The first hypothesis compared participants' reactions to a counselor in civilian and military attire conditions. The second hypothesis compared participants' reactions to a counselor in two military attire conditions representing officer and enlisted ranks. Data was analyzed by analysis of variance procedures, with Scheffe' methods used, when appropriate, for multiple comparisons of mean scores.

The results indicated that participants responded significantly more positively to the counselor in civilian attire compared to the counselor in military attire. The civilian-attired counselor was rated more highly on total CRF scores, was perceived as more expert, and was significantly preferred by potential clients in the event counseling were desired. When military counselors of officer and enlisted rank status were compared, significant differences did not exist in participants' perceptions of or preferences for either counselor.
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A client's initial impressions of the counselor may affect development of a counseling relationship, and can influence the client's decision to continue treatment (Gass, 1982). Research findings indicate that counselors perceived as low in credibility or expertise were less likely to be seen by clients in a second interview session (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975), and less persuasive in presenting results of psychological appraisals (Binderman, Fretz, Scott & Abrams, 1972), and therapeutic interpretations (Browning, 1966). Among the contextual variables which can contribute to clients' initial impressions of the counselor are the counselor's age and sex, office location and furniture arrangement, credentials, style of introduction, physical distance between counselor and client, and counselor attire. The focus of this study is the counselor's attire and its effect on client perceptions and attitudes.

Type and style of clothing worn by counselors have been shown to influence clients' attitudes towards counselors (Raia, 1972; Drummond, 1974; Hubble & Gelso, 1978; Lewis & Walsh, 1978; Littrell & Littrell, 1981;
Gass, 1982). It appears, however, that the effects on client attitudes of a counselor wearing a uniform which signifies organizational or institutional affiliation have not been widely studied. This researcher found one study of effects of a uniformed military counselor on client perceptions of the counselor (Spencer, 1982).

Further investigation of the influence of military uniforms in the counseling milieu may have implications for the counseling profession in general and for the military counselor in particular. In the United States, counseling and other psychological services are provided by the armed services for more than two million military members and their families. These services are provided predominantly by active duty military counselors, psychologists and psychiatrists who wear the uniform of their service branch.

Military counselors may be of either officer or enlisted rank, and their academic and professional preparation and experience levels vary considerably. Although a small number of civilians are employed by the military in counseling and social work positions, most counseling services are provided by uniformed military counselors. These counselors must fulfill a dual role of being members of both the military and counseling professions. This dual role results in unusual and occasionally conflicting demands upon military counselors,
yet we know very little of the effects of the uniform in the counseling environment.

In the contemporary American military, the uniform conveys special meaning and implications. Uniform insignia denote one's rank and imply immediate relative relationships among servicepeople. Dependent upon rank and position, all military members find themselves at all times in positions of superiority, subordination or equality relative to others.

Explicitly associated with one's rank is authority to issue lawful commands and an obligation to obey proper commands. Furthermore, individuals of different rank are discouraged, and in most cases forbidden by regulation, from forming close relationships and fraternizing with one another. These issues are particularly important as they concern relations among officers and enlisted personnel.

Given these living and working conditions in the military services, it seems reasonable to believe clients' perceptions of military counselors may be affected by the presence or absence of a uniform, by the counselor's rank, or by the client's own rank relative to the counselor's. Gaines (1982) has shown that the military counselor's "authoritarianism" is a factor in clients' perceptions and in counseling success. However, the counselor's uniform was not considered as a variable in that study, nor does the literature indicate systematic investigation of this area.
Statement of the Problem

This study examined effects of the wearing of military or civilian attire by counselors on participants' stated preferences for and perceptions of the counselor. Effects of counselors' rank status on participants' stated preferences for and perceptions of counselors were also investigated.

Purposes of the Study

Purposes of this investigation were to

1. Compare participants' expressed perceptions of the counselor in both military uniform and civilian attire conditions;

2. Compare participants' expressed perceptions of the uniformed military counselor who is portrayed in both officer and enlisted rank status conditions;

3. Examine participants' expressed preferences for a counselor based on the counselors' attire condition.

Hypotheses

This study tested the following hypotheses.

1. Participants will rate a counselor in civilian attire significantly higher than counselors in military attire, as measured by the Counselor Rating Form (CRF).

   a. Participants will rate a counselor in civilian attire as significantly more trustworthy than counselors
in military attire, measured by the CRF trustworthiness scale.

b. Participants will rate a counselor in civilian attire as significantly more expert than counselors in military attire, measured by the CRF expertness scale.

c. Participants will express significantly greater willingness to enter counseling with a counselor in civilian attire, compared to counselors in military attire, measured by the Referral Questionaire.

2. There will be significant positive interactions between classification variables and treatment conditions, measured by participants’ ratings of counselors on the CRF.

a. Participants will rate a counselor of their own rank status significantly more trustworthy than counselors of different rank status, measured by the CRF trustworthiness scale.

b. Participants will rate a counselor of their own rank status as significantly more expert than a counselor of different rank status, measured by the CRF expertness scale.

c. Participants will express a significantly greater willingness to enter counseling with a counselor of their own rank status, as measured by the Referral Questionaire.
Background

According to Barak and LaCrosse (1975), clients' perceptions of counselors' behavior determine to a large extent the effectiveness of counseling. Strong (1968) describes counseling as an interpersonal influence process in which the counselor attempts to influence the client to attain the goals of counseling. The counselor's task is to influence the client in helpful ways, and the client's task is to be influenced (Strong & Schmidt, 1970). Ivey and Mathews (1984) state that a key counselor function is confronting the client with discrepancies between the real world and the client's idealized world. The client's representation of problems must redefined in order for change to occur.

When a counselor presents information which differs significantly from the client's, the client's perceptions of the counselor's skills and abilities affect the extent to which the counselor can bring about change (Dell, 1973). Such a view of counseling suggests questions about the nature of counselor influence and the form or method of influence (Strong & Schmidt, 1970).

A contextual framework for investigating the factors relevant to counselor influence is provided by Festinger's (1957) cognitive dissonance theory. This concept is based on the tendency of humans towards consistency of cognitions
about oneself and about the environment. When two or more of an individual's cognitive elements are psychologically inconsistent, dissonance is created (Zimbardo, 1960). Zimbardo describes dissonance as a "...psychological tension having drive characteristics" (p. 86). Dissonance is accompanied by psychological discomfort, and when it occurs, efforts are made to reduce it.

According to Strong and Schmidt (1970), whenever a counselor reveals opinions, attitudes or interpretations which are discrepant with those held or perceived by the client, the client experiences dissonance. This dissonance can be eliminated in several ways. The client may accept the discrepant information, discredit the counselor's opinions, devalue the importance of the information, persuade the counselor to change his or her views, or seek support elsewhere (Strong & Schmidt, 1970). The clients' perceptions of counselors are powerful factors in accepting or rejecting discrepant information.

A number of factors have been identified as influencing clients' perceptions of counselors. Included among these are behaviors which reflect the counselor's expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness (Goldstein, Heller & Sechrest, 1966; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975).

Strong (1968) describes expertness as "... the
perception of a communicator as the source of valid assertions" (p. 216). He cites such concepts as counselor reputation, titles and diplomas, and confidence as factors influencing perceptions of expertness. Schmidt and Strong (1970) have identified several counselor cues, associated with appearance and behavior, which tend to suggest expertness. A number of studies (Bergin, 1962; Browning, 1966; Schmidt & Strong; Dell, 1973) have suggested that perceptions of counselor expertness significantly influence acceptance of discrepant information from the counselor by clients. According to Strong (1968), the greater the communicator's perceived expertness, the more discrepant his communications can be without generating derogation.

A counselor's perceived trustworthiness is a function of one's reputation, sincerity and openness, social role (eg, physician or psychologist), and perceived lack of motivation for personal gain (Strong, 1968). Several studies (Strong & Schmidt, 1970; Kaul & Schmidt, 1971) have investigated the effects of perceived trustworthiness on counselor influence. According to Strong (1968), perceived trustworthiness has a definite effect on opinion-change, and he suggests this concept is even more important than perceived expertness. Kaul and Schmidt (1971) concluded that an interviewer's manner has a greater impact on his
perceived trustworthiness than words used. Other factors which may influence a counselor's perceived trustworthiness are strong professional codes of ethics (Strong, 1968), confidentiality (Strong), a deep, steady interest in the client (Frank, 1963), and lack of boastfulness and ulterior motives by the interviewer (Kaul & Schmidt, 1971).

Perceived attractiveness of the counselor generally includes not only physical characteristics, but also such concepts as likeability, compatibility, and similarities of attitudes and opinions (Strong, 1968). Factors which may affect counselors' perceived attractiveness are interview behavior (Strong), unconditional positive regard and empathy (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967), and physical attractiveness (Cash, et al, 1975; Lewis & Walsh, 1978).

One may legitimately ask if all three characteristics (expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness) can be studied separately, or if they all assess some underlying counselor trait or factor. This issue was discussed by Strong (1971), and has been investigated by several researchers (Schmidt & Strong, 1970, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a, 1970b; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975).

Each counselor characteristic has been investigated as an independent factor in counselor influence (Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a, 1970b). When
developing the Counselor Rating Form, Barak and LaCrosse (1975) found factor patterns varied considerably when counselors of differing styles were assessed, and concluded that the three factors could be investigated independently.

Clearly, counselor effectiveness is directly related to the counselor’s ability to influence clients. Counselor influence, in turn, is affected by client perceptions of several counselor attributes, which include expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. Investigators have studied many factors which may affect perceptions of these attributes, including the factor of counselor attire.

Although studies of counselor attire are found in the literature, it appears little research has focused on the uniformed military counselor despite the prevalence of military counseling. Further study of this topic may assist in determining if the uniform does influence perceptions of the counselor, and may provide directions for future investigations concerning military counseling. Specifically, this study may help to determine whether individuals desiring counseling in a military environment are influenced by the uniformed or rank status of the counselor.

Several research questions are not addressed in the literature, and will be the focus of this investigation.
Does the wear of a military uniform by a counselor affect potential clients' perceptions of the counselor? Would a potential client perceive a counselor in military attire as less trustworthy than a counselor in civilian attire? Would a potential client perceive a counselor in military attire as less expert than a counselor in military attire? Will a potential client prefer to enter into therapy with a counselor in civilian or military attire? Does the military rank of a potential client, or a counselor, or both, affect perceptions of or willingness to see the counselor? These research questions were addressed by this investigation of effects of military attire on potential clients' perceptions of the counselor.

Definitions of Terms

The terms below apply to the United States Air Force and are defined for the purposes of this study as follow.

(1) Officer: an individual commissioned for service by the United States government, possessing a minimum of a bachelor's degree and having completed a commissioning program; superior in rank to an enlisted person.

(2) Enlisted person: enlisted for service by the United States government; not commissioned; possessing a minimum of a high school diploma and having completed a basic training program; subordinate in rank to officers.
(3) **Rank status**: one's military designation or rank, either an officer or an enlisted person.

**Delimitations**

Because this study utilized Air Force personnel as subjects, any generalizations beyond those applying to the United States Air Force military population would be limited.

**Limitations**

The research outcome of this study was subject to the following limitations.

(1) The use of volunteer subjects in this study may have resulted in selection bias.

(2) Outcomes of this study were based on the assumption that it is possible to obtain from subjects, through instrumentation, an accurate report of their perceptions of and willingness to enter into therapy with certain counselors.

(3) Since a primary focus of this study is the influence of military and nonmilitary attire conditions, only one level of civilian attire (formal) was utilized in this investigation.

(4) Subjects for this study were sought from one Air Force installation, rather than from the entire Air
Force population, and this process may have resulted in selection bias.

(5) The ethnic origins of participants in this study were not specifically controlled, and this factor may have resulted in selection bias.

(6) The age of participants in this study were not specifically controlled, and this factor may have resulted in selection bias.

(7) Because this investigation was conducted over a period of several days, with three separate groups of participants, it is possible individuals who had already completed the study may have discussed its nature with those who had not yet participated. Although no evidence of such collusion existed, such activity may have contaminated outcomes of the study.

Assumptions

A major assumption in this study was that subjects are representative of the United States Air Force military population in general. A further assumption is that subjects truthfully responded to test instrumentation.

Summary

This chapter has described the lack of systematic investigation concerning the effects of counselor attire
representing institutional or organizational affiliation. The nature of the military counselor’s role and the prevalence of military counselors who provide counseling services while in uniform were also discussed. The significance of the military uniform and role of military counselors were also discussed.

In Chapter II, a review of relevant literature concerning attire is presented. This chapter is divided into sections describing civilian attire, uniformed nonmilitary attire, and military attire studies found in the literature. Chapter III describes the experimental research design and procedures, and provides the results of a pilot study. A presentation and analysis of the statistical results of the study are included in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains a summary of findings, implications, and recommendations for further research.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It appears that few studies of effects of a counselor in military attire have been accomplished; therefore, a review of literature relevant to counselor attire in general is included. Counselor attire conditions will be discussed in three subsections: (1) civilian attire; (2) uniformed nonmilitary attire; and, (3) military attire.

Civilian Attire

Hubble and Gelso (1978) evaluated three modes of counselor attire worn during an intake interview, for their effect on clients' state anxiety, willingness to self-disclose, and preference for the counselor. The Anxiety Scale (A-State) and the Disclosure Scale were used to assess subjects' reported transitory anxiety and opinions of the counselor. Fifty-four volunteer female psychology students were interviewed by three male counselors attired in traditional (sport coat and tie; dark pants), casual (sport shirt, open at the collar; slacks), and highly casual (sweat shirt; blue jeans) conditions. Openness or closedness of clients' belief systems were measured by Form E of the Dogmatism Scale, and clients' own attire
preferences were assessed through an opinion questionnaire. Results provided indication that clients preferred, and were least anxious with, counselors whose attire was one step more formal than their own. That is, clients who typically dressed in a highly casual manner preferred a counselor in traditional attire. Subjects tended to be most anxious with a highly casually dressed counselor, and openness or closedness of belief systems did not appear to be significant factors. Overall conclusions of this study suggest that, in an initial interview involving a male counselor-female client dyad, counselor attire does affect clients' anxiety level, and the clients own attire has a moderating effect.

The question of whether individuals developed certain stereotypes based on a stimulus person's manner of dress was addressed by Hamid (1968). Forty-five students (21 male and 24 female) viewed color photographs of female stimulus persons who were similar in appearance but attired differently. Subjects were asked to individually arrange the photographs in the order which suited a series of ten concepts: "physical attractiveness," "conventional," "sophistication," "intelligence," "physical fitness," "religious," "shyness," "immoral," "imaginative," and "unimaginative." The photographs depicting well-dressed
individuals tended to be more highly rated by both male and female subjects in positive areas such as sophistication, intelligence and physical attractiveness. Analysis of the results provided indications that consistent stereotyped impressions based on style of dress were formed by both male and female subjects in this study.

In 1979, Amira and Abramowitz studied subjects’ perceptions of certain therapist qualities to determine the influence of therapist attire and office furnishings. Eighty-two subjects (35 male and 47 female) viewed four 5-minute interviews depicting a simulated initial interview session. The segments were identical except for the crossed factors of formality of attire (tie and jacket versus open-collar sport shirt) and office setting (diplomas and a dignified photoportrait versus a pleasant wall rug and sensitivity posters). Subjects’ opinions of therapist performance were assessed along six bipolar scales: understanding, competence, appropriateness for a close friend if seeking counseling, appropriateness for self if seeking counseling, degree to which expectations about therapy were confirmed, and favorableness of attitude towards therapist. This was followed by two checks on the effectiveness of the experimentally induced dress and office conditions.

No main effects were found for dress formality versus
informality. However, a dress formality and room formality interactive effect was found which revealed subjects' attitudes toward the therapist were more positive when he was casually dressed in the formal setting than any other condition. These findings suggest that the subjects' perceptions of the counselor's attire were mediated by the variable of office furnishings.

In a similar study, Gass (1982) investigated effects of counselor attire and seating arrangement in a counseling analog in which 206 college students viewed a slide presentation and listened to a taped interview. The researcher structured the experiment in this manner because he believed many previous attire studies failed to control for systematic behavioral effects that may occur as a function of the counselor's style of dress. To control this factor, the researcher arranged for all subjects to listen to the same audiotape presentation while observing one of four sets of slides differing only in terms of the formality of counselor attire and the presence or absence of an office desk.

The Counselor Rating Form was used to evaluate subjects' perceptions of the counselor's attractiveness, expertness and trustworthiness. Subjects also indicated their willingness to see the counselor again using a seven-
point scale (unwilling-willing) developed by the researcher. Although the casual attire/no desk setting elicited the highest attraction ratings, the counselor was perceived as maximally expert in the formal attire/behind desk context. Initial impressions were highly correlated with subjects' willingness to see the counselor.

Littrell and Littrell (1981) examined the variable of counselor attire and concluded that the formal/informal dimension of clothing may be inadequate in assessing subjects' differential preferences for counselors. These researchers objectively selected and validated six forms of male and female attire, then developed slide photographs of counselors attired in the various conditions. The conditions were: "fashionable, up-to-date"; "traditional, conservative"; "young, casual, comfortable"; "feminine for women, leisure look for men"; "western"; "conservative, out-of-date." Two separate experimental groups of 140 (67 males and 73 females) and 91 (44 males and 47 females) subjects viewed the slides and responded to a questionnaire developed by the researchers to measure subjects' preference for seeing a specific counselor concerning academic, vocational, and personal matters. Analysis of the results indicated strong statistical significance in students' preferences for counselors based on attire, and
suggested that a variety of attire conditions may be more effective in yielding meaningful outcomes than the formal/informal dichotomy.

In a subsequent study, the same researchers (Littrell & Littrell, 1982) examined the effects of two nonverbal cues, counselor dress and sex, on students' preferences for counselors. Subjects were 140 American Indians from a reservation high school and 226 students from an urban, primarily Caucasian, high school. After ascertaining and verifying the presence of the six forms of attire utilized in the previous study (Littrell & Littrell, 1981) among students and teachers, the researchers devised color slides portraying individuals in the six attire conditions and both sexes. Models similar in skin coloring and body structure were used, and the photographs excluded heads. Subjects, tested in intact classes, observed a set of counselor slides, then completed a questionnaire developed by the researchers to measure preferences for counselors. Three areas (personal problem, academic concern, vocational planning) were evaluated, with students responding to 5-point, Likert-type scales.

Results provided indication that for each type of student concern, Indian and Caucasian subjects differed in their preferences for counselors based on attire
conditions. For both groups, the "conservative, out-of-date" condition was least preferred for any type of concern. Indian subjects most preferred the "fashionable, coordinated, up-to-date" condition, while Caucasians picked the "casual, young and comfortable" dress as their first choice regardless of the type of concern. Subjects differentiated their preferences for counselors based on dress, and the order of preferences differed between races of the subjects but did not differ based on counselor sex.

The Counselor Rating Form, which consists of 36 pairs of bipolar adjectives, was used by Kerr and Dell (1976) to assess clients' perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Eighty subjects were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions defined by two modes of attire, two settings, and two interview roles. Setting and attire conditions were designed to represent "professional" or "casual" designations, and the counselor roles were represented as "expert" or "attractive." Female interviewers were utilized, and those professionally attired wore an attractive dress or tailored pants suit with hose, dress shoes, styled hair, and makeup. In the casual condition, interviewers wore clean blue jeans, casual shirts, little makeup and a naturally combed hair style.
Neither attire nor setting were shown to have significant effects on subjects' perceptions of interviewers' attractiveness. However, attire did interact significantly with the interviewer's role in determining perceived expertness of the interviewer. Conclusions suggest subjects' perceptions of counselor expertness are affected by both attire and the counselor's role.

Lewis and Walsh (1978) used attire as a factor in a study of subjects' impressions of counselors based on attractiveness. The researchers developed two videotaped presentations utilizing an actress playing the role of a clinical psychologist describing herself and her job function. One of the two-minute tapes depicted the psychologist as "attractive" while the other one portrayed her as "unattractive." In the attractive condition, the actress dressed fashionably, wore makeup, and had styled hair. In the unattractive role, she was made to appear heavier, wore a frizzled wig, and her clothing was considerably less fashionable.

The study, which replicated a previous one in which Cash, Bagley, McCown, and Weise (1975) utilized a male counselor, used two instruments developed by the earlier researchers. These instruments were dichotomous rating scales, listing descriptive terms, on which the 120
subjects (60 male and 60 female) were asked to indicate their initial impressions of the psychologist after viewing one of the two videotapes. Results provided indications that female subjects considered the attractive psychologist to be more competent, professional, interesting, relaxed and assertive than the unattractive psychologist. Female subjects also rated the attractive psychologist as potentially more helpful in personal counseling. Interestingly, no significant outcomes were found for male subjects.

The effects and relative contributions of three counselor behaviors, including attire, on perceived expertness and attractiveness were investigated by Barak, Patkin, and Dell (1982). Subjects were 120 volunteers, mostly undergraduates, who observed a videotaped interview with a counselor performing in one of eight combinations of responsive or unresponsive nonverbal behavior, professional or laymans jargon, and formal or casual attire. The 15 subjects in each condition were tested in a group, and after viewing the tape completed the Counselor Rating Form.

The findings demonstrated the potential effects of counselor-dependent variables on the way counselors are perceived by clients. Variations in the three independent variables resulted in considerably different perceptions of
Counselor nonverbal behavior had the greatest influence on perceptions of attractiveness and expertness, with jargon and attire exerting a lesser but significant influence. Effects for attire were found when the counselor engaged in responsive nonverbal behavior. Casual attire yielded significantly higher attractiveness perceptions than formal attire; on the other hand, formally dressed counselors were perceived as more expert than those in casual attire.

Raia (1972) investigated male and female therapist attire, counseling seating, and office arrangements, which were arranged into high, medium, and low structured categories and visually presented. The 176 subjects responded to these variables in terms of their facilitation of therapeutic core conditions of accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, genuineness, concreteness, and specificity of expression. Dependent variables consisted of five separate semantic scales composed of bipolar adjectives designed to differentiate the proxemic variables. The results suggested that the medium structured dress styles and the low structured seating and office arrangements were most appropriate for communicating empathy and warmth. For communicating concreteness and specificity of expression, high structured dress style,
seating and office arrangements appeared most effective. Significant results for communicating genuineness were found in the high structured dress styles and low structured seating arrangements. Drummond's (1974) study supports the conclusions of this investigation that medium or high levels of attire formality may positively influence subjects' perceptions of the counselor.

Not all studies yielded findings of counselor attire as a significant factor in influencing subjects' attitudes towards the counselor. Stillman and Resnick (1972), utilizing the Counselor Attractiveness Rating Scale and the Disclosure Scale, studied effects of counselor attire on clients' opinions of the counselor and willingness to disclose information. Fifty male volunteer subjects were interviewed by five male counselors who dressed in both formal and informal attire conditions. Results provided no indication of a relationship between the way a counselor is attired and subjects' self-disclosure and perceptions of the counselors' attractiveness.

In another study, Workman and Williams (1979) surveyed students to determine how each of several counselor characteristics was related to ratings of potential counselor effectiveness. The researchers developed and utilized an instrument, called the Counselor Effectiveness
Inventory, with which subjects rated a list of counselor characteristics as having a positive, negative, or zero effect on their expectations of benefit from the counseling relationship. The 249 subjects rated counselor attire as one of five counselor characteristics having no influence on their expectations of counseling success.

Uniformed Nonmilitary Attire

Two studies were found in which effects of religious uniforms on interviewees were investigated. Long and Long (1976) coupled the effects of attire and religious dedication on outcome of interviewing. Eighty-four subjects participated in an interview conducted by either a professed nun or a non-nun. Four treatment conditions consisted of (1) an interview by a nun, dressed as a nun, introduced as a nun, wearing a religious habit; (2) same conditions as (1), except the nun wore lay clothing; (3) an interview conducted by a female, not a nun, introduced as a non-nun, but wearing a religious habit supposedly in preparation for an experiment elsewhere; and, (4) an interview conducted by a female, wearing street clothes. Subjects were randomly assigned to conditions.

During the interview, subjects completed attitude and experience scales, and afterwards completed a questionnaire to assess expressed perceptions of the interviewer. All
three instruments were developed by the researchers. Three raters then reviewed audio tapes of the interviews, and independently rated the disclosure evidenced in each subject's responses, using Carkhuff's interpersonal process disclosure procedures.

The findings disclosed that attire but not religious status produced significant differences in interviewee's responses. Males were more open in the presence of an interviewer not in habit, while females were more open with an interviewer wearing a habit. On the basis of their measures, the researchers concluded that religious dedication appeared to be less important than the impact of attire conditions which traditionally represent religious dedication or affiliation.

Two years later, Long (1978) accomplished a similar study which included several design changes in an attempt to improve control measures. In the subsequent investigation, eight interviewers were utilized, and each one conducted half the interviews wearing a habit and half wearing lay clothing. The interviewers saw 128 subjects (64 males and 64 females; one-half of each group were Catholics and one-half were non-Catholics), with similar procedures and settings as the original study. The same instrumentation was utilized, and an additional factor of
how long subjects spent responding to questions was added. The findings provided indications of significant main effect differences in (a) length of interview - more time was spent speaking to nuns dressed in a religious habit; and (b) interviewee attitude - female interviewees responded more conservatively than males; Catholics responded more conservatively than non-Catholics; and all groups responded more conservatively to nuns than to non-nuns.

Military Attire

Spencer (1982) investigated the effects of uniformed military counselors on subjects' trust and willingness to self-disclose. Sixty volunteer subjects were randomly assigned to groups, and each group was then introduced briefly to a counselor attired in either civilian clothes or a "generic" Air Force uniform (ie, blue military trousers, blue wool military sweater without rank insignia, black shoes). The subjects then completed the Personal Topic Interview (PTI), indicating five topics they would be willing to discuss with the counselor. The topics were also rated for intimacy on the Personal Meaning Scale. A twenty-minute counseling session was then conducted with each subject by the counselor previously introduced.
The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) was used to determine subjects' perceptions of the counselor's trustworthiness. The other two scales of the instrument, expertness and attractiveness, were not utilized in this study. Analyses of data from the CRF, PTI, and Personal Meaning Scale were accomplished. No significant differences in levels of self-disclosure were found, nor were relationships identified between attire and trustworthiness or intimacy. The researcher cited the need for comparable studies in this area utilizing differing research conditions.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Research Design

This study was designed to assess the effects of three counselor attire conditions on subjects' perceptions of and preferences for counselors. In order to test the research hypotheses, a post-test only experimental design was utilized (Campbell & Stanley, 1972).

Since the rank status of the subjects and of the counselor were integral aspects of the research hypotheses, a randomized block assignment procedure was utilized (Dayton, 1970; Ferguson, 1981). Subjects were separated based on rank status (Officer or Enlisted), then were randomly assigned to the three treatment groups. Factors of participants' age and ethnic origins were not specifically controlled. The factor of subjects' sex was controlled by random and proportional assignment to treatment groups.

Each group was randomly assigned to view a videotape depicting a counselor in one of three attire conditions (A, B, or C). In each of the three tapes, the counselor made the identical presentation; the only difference in each tape was the counselor's attire.

The three videotaped segments were professionally produced by a film studio, and each segment was approximately two minutes in length. A military officer with professional
acting experience was utilized to portray the counselor in each of the three segments. The actor/counselor introduced himself and discussed his qualifications, credentials, education, specialty areas and availability for providing counseling services to the viewing group.

Presentations were carefully scripted (Appendix E) and tested to ensure all three film segments were highly similar in nature. The films differed only in the type counselor attire. The three attire conditions were:

1. Condition A - civilian traditional (sport jacket and tie; dark trousers).

2. Condition B - Air Force uniform with officer insignia (Captain's bars) worn on the shoulder of the uniform coat.

3. Condition C - Air Force uniform with enlisted insignia (Staff Sergeant's stripes) worn on the sleeves of the uniform coat.

The Air Force uniform consisted of the standard formal uniform: dark blue jacket; blue shirt and tie; blue military trousers; and black shoes. The counselor's rank, decorations, and name tag were worn on the jacket in both military attire conditions.

To ensure significant differences did not exist among the three videotapes, with the exception of the attire
conditions of the counselor, a pilot study was conducted prior to completing experimental procedures.

Pilot Study

In order to evaluate research procedures and data collection techniques, and to identify possible flaws or problem areas in the research design, a pilot study was conducted. An important objective of the pilot study was to test the assumption that no significant differences existed in the three videotapes utilized to manipulate the independent variable other than the counselor's attire conditions. This information was necessary to ensure extraneous variables, such as the counselor's demeanor or style of speaking, did not influence research outcomes significantly. The pilot study was conducted in the following manner.

1. Copies of the three original videotapes were made and edited to ensure attire conditions of the counselor were masked. Viewers of this edited set of tapes were able to view only the face of the counselor.

2. Forty-five volunteers were utilized as subjects in the pilot study. Procedures similar to those to be used in the experimental study were utilized. Individuals attending a substance abuse prevention seminar at a
large Air Force base in the southwestern United States were asked to volunteer for the pilot study. Participants consisted of 33 enlisted personnel (24 men and 9 women) and 12 officers (8 men and 4 women). Volunteers were stratified by rank and sex, and randomly assigned to three groups.

3. Each group was randomly assigned to view one of the three edited videotapes. Immediately after viewing the appropriate videotape, each volunteer completed the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) and the Referral Questionnaire (RQ).

4. Analysis of variance procedures were completed on mean scores for each scale (expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness) of the CRF, as well as for total CRF mean scores. Similar statistical treatment was also accomplished for Referral Questionnaire mean scores for the pilot study.

An evaluation of results of the pilot study indicate that subjects' perceptions of the counselor did not differ significantly for any of the three CRF scales, nor did overall CRF mean score comparisons significantly differ.

As indicated in Table I, the computed $F$ value for the CRF trustworthiness scale ($F = 4.18$) was not significant
when compared with the critical $F$ value ($F = 5.15, p < .05$). These findings indicate that pilot study participants did not perceive a counselor in any of the three attire conditions as significantly more trustworthy than the others.

**TABLE I**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PILOT STUDY - CRF TRUSTWORTHINESS SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II reflects the computed $F$ value for the expertness scale ($F = 0.62$), which is not significant as compared to the critical $F$ value ($F = 5.15, p < .05$). These findings indicate that the pilot study participants did not perceive a counselor in any of the three attire conditions as significantly more expert than the others.
**TABLE II**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PILOT STUDY - CRF EXPERTNESS SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The computed F value (F = 0.98) for the attractiveness scale, summarized in Table III, does not show significance when compared to the critical F value (F = 5.15, p < .05). These findings indicate that pilot study participants did not perceive a counselor in any of the three attire conditions as significantly more attractive than the others.

**TABLE III**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PILOT STUDY - CRF ATTRACTIVENESS SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.89</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV summarizes total CRF mean score data treatment. The computed F value ($F = 4.10$) is not significant compared to the critical F value ($F = 5.15, p < .05$). These results indicate that pilot study participants did not rate a counselor in any of the three attire conditions as significantly higher than the others.

**TABLE IV**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PILOT STUDY - TOTAL CRF SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences existed in the pilot study subjects' expressed willingness to see the counselor in any of the three videotapes. Table V summarizes the analysis of variance data which indicates the computed F value ($F = 1.14$) is not significant when compared with the critical F value ($F = 5.15, p < .05$).
These results indicate the pilot study participants' perceptions of the counselor's trustworthiness, expertness, and attractiveness were not significantly different when the counselor's attire conditions were masked. Furthermore, the subjects' willingness to enter into therapy with the counselor did not differ significantly among the three videotapes. It may therefore be assumed that any differences in experimental subjects' perceptions and preferences are due to the counselor's attire conditions.

During the pilot study, procedural aspects of data manipulation, instrumentation, and statistical analysis were completed without difficulty. No unforeseen problems were discovered; however, several minor discoveries were made which resulted in adjustments to procedures as follow:
1. It had been anticipated that the participants' viewing of the videotape and subsequent completion of the questionnaire would take no longer than ten minutes. During the pilot study, participants were informed that their part in the study would take no longer than ten minutes. However, actual time required for viewing the videotape and for completing the questionnaire ranged from six to nineteen minutes, with and average completion time for participants of slightly over fifteen minutes. Instructions to the participants in the experimental study were therefore changed, and they were informed their part would take approximately twenty minutes.

2. During the pilot study, the researcher gave instructions to participants in an extemporaneous style utilizing note cards. However, during review of pilot study results and methods, the researcher discovered that the manner and style of instructions could influence responses. Therefore, instructions to each group during the experimental study were read from a prepared script by the researcher. As a further precaution, the researcher wore identical civilian attire during each treatment session.

3. A final, and minor learning point occurred when, during instructions to pilot study participants, the
researcher discovered pencils were not available for completion of the questionnaire. Pencils were acquired, and during the experimental study the researcher ensured writing utensils were plentiful.

Subjects

Participants in the study were 90 active-duty Air Force personnel (68 men and 22 women) who were assigned to a large Air Force base in the southwestern United States. Twenty-one officers and 69 enlisted personnel participated in the study, and ranged in age from 18 to 46 years.

The volunteers were solicited from participants in substance abuse prevention seminars, which are required annually for all Air Force personnel. These seminars are conducted weekly by the base Social Actions Office, last approximately four hours, and are composed of approximately 25-30 individuals per class. Participants were sought from three seminars, and all individuals in attendance volunteered for the study.

Instrumentation

The Counselor Rating Form (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) was utilized to measure subjects' perceptions of the counselor, and to test main hypotheses 1 and 2. This instrument is composed of three scales designed to assess counselors' expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness.
The first scale (trustworthiness) was utilized to test subhypotheses 1a and 2a. The second scale (expertness) was utilized to test subhypotheses 1b and 2b.

The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) is composed of 36 seven-point items anchored by bipolar adjectives, 12 on each of the three dimensions. Scores on each dimension range from a minimum of 12 to a maximum of 84. The instrument has been shown to be effective in discriminating among counselor attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness (LaCrosse & Barak, 1976), and its reliability (Barak & Dell, 1977) and predictive validity (LaCrosse, 1980) have been demonstrated. LaCrosse and Barak (1976) report split-half reliabilities of .87, .84, and .90 for the three scales, respectively.

To assess validity, LaCrosse (1980) evaluated the CRF in a study of the relationship between initial perceptions of the counselor and postcounseling outcomes. Total CRF ratings correlated moderately high with postcounseling scores ($r = .63$, $p < .0001$), supporting the validity of the CRF as a research tool and a practical instrument.

The Referral Questionnaire was utilized to assess the likelihood that subjects would choose the counselor observed for self-referral if counseling were desired. This questionnaire contains five items designed to assess subjects' willingness to choose a specific counselor for
counseling concerning several different personal concerns. Responses are marked on seven-point, Likert-type scales which are identical to CRF response scales. This instrument is highly similar to questionnaires utilized by several other researchers (Hubble & Gelso, 1978; Gass, 1982; Littrell & Littrell, 1982) to assess willingness to see a specific counselor in the event counseling were desired. The Referral Questionnaire was used to test subhypotheses 1c and 2c.

Selection of Sample and Data Collection

Utilizing a table of random numbers, the researcher randomly assigned 30 subjects to each treatment condition. Appendix F contains demographic data (total subjects assigned, number of officers and enlisted personnel and assigned, and number of males and females assigned) for each treatment group.

The procedures indicated below were followed in accomplishing the experimental study and gathering data.

1. At the beginning of each of the substance abuse seminars, the researcher explained that the study was being conducted to improve counseling services provided to military people and their families, and would last
approximately 20 minutes. All information was read to subjects by the researcher from a previously prepared script.

2. The researcher further explained that the participants' part in the study would be to view a brief videotape, then to complete a demographic data form and a questionnaire.

3. Volunteers were then identified, and informed that the study would be conducted at the completion of the substance abuse seminar. Each volunteer was given a number to ensure anonymity and facilitate random assignment to treatment groups.

4. The researcher then left the seminar room, and the regularly scheduled substance abuse seminar was conducted by the military instructor. While the two-hour seminar was in progress, the researcher utilized a table of random numbers to assign subjects to treatment groups. The videotapes were also randomly assigned to treatment groups at this time.

5. At the conclusion of the substance abuse seminar, the substance abuse instructor turned the class over to the researcher for completion of the study.

6. Videotape equipment had previously been placed in the seminar room, and in two adjacent seminar rooms, in preparation for the experiment. The researcher again
explained the purpose of the study, and informed the participants they would view a brief videotape, then complete the instrumentation.

7. Consent forms were distributed, signed by each participant, and collected by the researcher.

8. Participants were then assigned to seminar rooms based on the group to which they had been randomly assigned.

9. To avoid possible problems associated with having research assistants or with variations in methods of presenting instructions by the researcher, a script was utilized to provide instructions to each treatment group. The researcher wore identical civilian attire during each treatment administration, and all research activities were conducted during the same time of day.

10. The appropriate videotape was shown to participants, and instrumentation was completed without problems or deviations from the research plan.

Testing of Hypotheses

Analysis of variance procedures with data organized in a 3 X 2 design were utilized to test Main Hypothesis 1 and associated subhypotheses. Main Hypothesis 1 was evaluated by analysis of variance procedures which tested main effects among treatment groups A, B, and C for total CRF mean scores. Subhypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c were tested by
accomplishing analysis of variance procedures for main effects on the trustworthiness scale and expertness scale of the CRF and on the Referral Questionnaire.

A 2 X 2 design was utilized to test Main Hypothesis 2 and associated subhypotheses. Main Hypothesis 2 was evaluated by analysis of variance procedures which tested for interaction among the classification variable factors (Officer and Enlisted) and treatment conditions (Groups B and C), as measured by total CRF mean scores. Subhypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c were tested by accomplishing analysis of variance procedures for interactive effects among classification variables and treatment conditions on the trustworthiness scale and expertness scale of the CRF and on the Referral Questionnaire.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents results of the data analysis concerning each hypothesis and subhypothesis investigated in this study. In this study, the investigator examined the effects of a counselor's attire conditions on subjects' expressed perceptions of and preferences for the counselor. Of specific interest in this investigation was the influence of military attire conditions on subjects' perceptions and preferences.

Ninety volunteer participants selected from a military installation in the southwestern United States were randomly assigned to three treatment groups. Each group viewed a videotape of a counselor in one of three attire conditions. The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) was administered to participants to assess their overall perceptions of the counselor in each attire condition. Two scales of the CRF were utilized to assess participants' perceptions of counselor trustworthiness and expertness. The Referral Questionnaire was utilized to assess participants' expressed preferences for the counselor in the three attire conditions.
Two main hypotheses, each with three associated subhypotheses, were established for this study. The first hypothesis was designed to compare participants' perceptions and preferences for counselors in civilian and military attire conditions. The second hypothesis was designed to compare participants' perceptions and preferences for counselors in military officer and military enlisted attire conditions.

Main hypothesis 1 and related subhypotheses were tested for main effects across the three treatment conditions of counselor attire. Data was treated by analysis of variance procedures utilizing a $3 \times 2$ design. Main hypothesis 2 and its related subhypotheses were tested for interactive effects among classification variables and treatment conditions. Data was treated by analysis of variance procedures with a $2 \times 2$ design utilized. Where appropriate, post hoc comparison of group mean scores were accomplished utilizing Scheffe's methods (Ferguson, 1982). A level of significance of .05 was established by the researcher as the criterion for retaining or rejecting each hypothesis.

A pilot study was completed prior to the investigation which established that significant differences other than the counselor's attire conditions did not exist in the videotapes.
Main hypothesis 1 stated participants would rate a counselor in civilian attire significantly higher than counselors in military attire, as measured by total Counselor Rating Form (CRF) scores. Table VI presents analysis of variance of mean scores for the total CRF, CRF expertness scale, CRF trustworthiness scale, and Referral Questionnaire. As indicated in Table VI, analysis of variance procedures for total CRF scores resulted in a computed F value of 6.58 (Pr > F = .0022), which is highly significant at the .05 confidence level. Comparison of group means using Scheffe' procedures revealed Group A mean scores were significantly higher than Group B or C means, as summarized in Table VII. Main hypothesis 1 was therefore retained.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: TOTAL CRF, TRUSTWORTHINESS SCALE, EXPERTNESS SCALE, AND REFERRAL QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CRF</td>
<td>11654.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness Scale</td>
<td>809.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.0511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness Scale</td>
<td>1525.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Questionaire</td>
<td>664.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subhypothesis la stated that participants would rate a counselor in civilian attire significantly higher than the counselor in military attire, as measured by the CRF trustworthiness scale. As indicated in Table VI, analysis of variance procedures accomplished on CRF trustworthiness scale mean scores resulted in a computed F value of 3.08 (Pr > F = .0511). This value is not significant at the .05 confidence level, and subhypothesis la is, therefore, rejected. It is important to note, however, that the computed F value is out of the range for rejection by a very small amount (.0011). As will be discussed in the next chapter, further investigation of the trustworthiness factor may be of interest and benefit.

Subhypothesis lb stated that participants would rate a counselor in civilian attire as significantly more expert than counselors in military attire, as measured by the CRF expertness scale. Analysis of variance procedures accomplished on the CRF expertness scale mean scores resulted in a computed F value of 6.71 (Pr > F = .002), as reflected in Table VI. This value is highly significant at the previously established .05 level of confidence. Analysis of group means using the Scheffe' method, as elaborated in Table VII, revealed that the Group A mean was significantly higher than means for Groups B and C. Subhypothesis lb is, therefore, retained.
Subhypothesis 1c stated that participants will express significantly greater willingness to enter counseling with a counselor in civilian attire, compared to counselors in military attire, as measured by the Referral Questionnaire (RQ). Analysis of variance procedures, as indicated in Table VIII, were accomplished on RQ mean scores and resulted in a computed F value of 9.03 (Pr > F = .0003). This value is highly significant at the .05 level of confidence. Analysis of group means utilizing the Scheffe' method revealed the Group A mean was significantly higher than means for Group B and C, as reflected in Table VII. Subhypothesis 1c is therefore retained.

**TABLE VII**
MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF GROUP MEAN SCORES UTILIZING THE SCHEFFE' METHOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Attire Condition (Means)</th>
<th>Minimum Sig. Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CRF</td>
<td>209.13</td>
<td>189.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness Scale</td>
<td>69.16</td>
<td>64.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness Scale</td>
<td>73.36</td>
<td>67.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTRQ</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Civilian attire condition significantly higher than military attire conditions
Main hypothesis 2 stated that significant interactions would occur between treatment conditions (B and C) and classification variables (0 and E), as measured by total CRF scores. Table VIII contains results of analysis of variance for interactive effects based on mean scores of the total CRF, the CRF trustworthiness scale, the CRF expertness scale, and the Referral Questionnaire. As indicated in Table VIII, analysis of variance procedures for total CRF mean scores resulted in a computed F value of 1.41 (PR > F = .2407). The computed F value is not significant at the previously established confidence level of .05, and subhypothesis 2 is therefore rejected.

**TABLE VIII**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTERACTIVE EFFECTS: TOTAL CRF, TRUSTWORTHINESS SCALE, EXPERTNESS SCALE, AND REFERRAL QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CRF</td>
<td>1628.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.2407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness Scale</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness Scale</td>
<td>177.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.2860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Questionaire</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.4410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subhypothesis 2a stated that participants would rate a counselor of their own rank status as significantly more trustworthy than counselors of different rank status, as measured by the CRF trustworthiness scale. Analysis of variance to assess interactive effects resulted in a computed F value of 1.41 (PR > F = .2407), as reflected in Table VIII. The computed F value is not significant at the previously established confidence level of .05, and subhypothesis 2a is therefore rejected.

Subhypothesis 2b stated that participants will rate a counselor of their own rank status as significantly more expert than a counselor of different rank status, as measured by the CRF expertness scale. Analysis of variance to assess interactive effects resulted in a computed F value of 1.16 (PR > F = .2860), as reflected in Table VIII. The computed F value is not significant at the previously established confidence level of .05, and subhypothesis 2b is therefore rejected.

Subhypothesis 2c stated that participants would express a significantly greater willingness to enter counseling with a counselor of their own rank status, as measured by the Referral Questionnaire. Analysis of variance procedures to assess interactive effects resulted in a computed F value of 0.60 (PR > F = .4410), as indicated in Table VIII. The
computed $F$ value is not significant at the previously established confidence level of .05, and subhypothesis 2c is therefore rejected.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This research study was undertaken to investigate relationships between counselors' attire conditions and subjects' expressed perceptions of and preferences for counselors. Specifically, the influence of military attire in the counseling environment was the focus of this investigation.

A total of 90 volunteer participants was selected from seminars at a large Air Force base in the southwestern United States. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 46 years, with 68 males and 22 females participating. Rank of participants was divided into 69 enlisted personnel (56 males and 13 females) and 21 officers (12 males and 9 females). Three videotapes were made depicting a counselor in three respectively different attire conditions: civilian; military officer; and military enlisted. A pilot study was completed, with counselor attire conditions on the videotapes masked, which validated the research assumption that the videotapes differed only in the counselor's attire conditions.
Participants were randomly assigned to three treatment groups, with a randomized block design utilized to control subjects' rank status. After each group was shown a videotape which portrayed the counselor in one of the three attire conditions, participants were administered the Counselor Rating Form and the Referral Questionnaire. The Counselor Rating Form is composed of three scales designed to assess respondents' perceptions of counselors' trustworthiness, attractiveness, and expertness. The Referral Questionnaire was developed to assess subjects' preferences to see a specific counselor in the event counseling were desired.

Two main hypotheses, each having three associated subhypotheses, were developed for the study. The first main hypothesis and its subhypotheses were treated statistically by analysis of variance procedures with data organized in a 3 X 2 design. Post hoc analysis of results was accomplished with Scheffe's methods when appropriate. The second main hypothesis and related subhypotheses were treated statistically by analysis of variance procedures with data organized in a 2 X 2 design.

Findings

Main hypothesis 1 stated that subjects would rate
a counselor in civilian attire significantly higher than counselors in military attire, as measured by total scores on the Counselor Rating Form (CRF). Results of statistical treatment of the data indicated participants did respond to the counselor in civilian attire with significantly higher CRF scores. Main hypothesis 1 was, therefore, retained.

Subhypothesis 1a stated that subjects would rate a counselor in civilian attire as significantly more trustworthy than counselors in military attire, as measured by the CRF trustworthiness scale. Results of statistical treatment of the data indicate participants did not consider the counselor in civilian attire as significantly more trustworthy than the counselors in military attire, and subhypothesis 1a was, therefore, rejected. However, the margin for rejection of this hypothesis was narrow.

Subhypothesis 1b stated that participants would rate a counselor in civilian attire as significantly more expert than counselors in military attire, as measured by the CRF expertness scale. Results of statistical treatment of data indicate subjects did consider the counselor in civilian attire as significantly more expert than the other counselors, and subhypothesis 1b was, therefore, retained.

Subhypothesis 1c stated that participants would express a significantly greater willingness to enter counseling with
a counselor in civilian attire, compared to counselors in military attire, as measured by the Referral Questionnaire. Results of statistical treatment of the data indicate that participants did indicate a significantly greater preference for the counselor in civilian attire, and subhypothesis 1c was, therefore, retained.

Main hypothesis 2 stated there would be significant positive interactions between classification variables (O and E) and treatment conditions (B and C), as measured by subjects' ratings of counselors on the CRF. Results of analysis of variance procedures indicate participants did not respond in a significantly more positive manner to counselors of their own rank status. Main hypothesis 2 was, therefore, rejected.

Subhypothesis 2a stated that participants would rate a counselor of their own rank status as significantly more trustworthy than counselors of different rank status, as measured by the CRF trustworthiness scale. Results of statistical treatment of data indicate that participants did not consider a counselor of their own rank status as significantly more trustworthy than the other counselors, and subhypothesis 2a was therefore rejected.

Subhypothesis 2b stated participants would rate a counselor of their own rank status as significantly more
expert than a counselor of different rank status, as measured by the CRF expertness scale. Results of the statistical treatment of data indicate participants did not perceive a counselor of their own rank status as significantly more expert than the other counselors, and subhypothesis 2b was, therefore, rejected.

Subhypothesis 2c stated participants would express a significantly greater willingness to enter counseling with a counselor of their own rank status, as measured by the Referral Questionnaire. Results of statistical treatment of data indicate participants were not significantly more willing to see a counselor of their own rank status, and subhypothesis 2c was, therefore, rejected.

Several findings serendipitous to original research intentions were discovered. A preliminary investigation of data revealed that response patterns of participants of ethnic minorities may be different from those of the general participant population. These individuals tended to respond to counselors in civilian and officer attire conditions in a much less positive manner than other participants. They also indicated generally less willingness to see counselors for assistance, regardless of the counselors' attire conditions.

Similarly, the response patterns of female participants tended to be different from other subjects in general. This
group indicated somewhat greater willingness to see any
counselor for assistance, regardless of the counselor's
attire conditions.

Another finding incidental to the primary purposes of
this study concerned the variability in participants' willingness to see certain counselors based upon the type
of counseling assistance needed. Participants tended to be much more willing to seek help from a counselor in
military attire for job or professional concerns, and less willing to see the same counselor for substance abuse
concerns. Conversely, participants appeared much more willing to seek help for substance abuse concerns from a
counselor in civilian attire. Although outside the purview
of the present study, further analysis of the additional data gathered in this investigation may provide additional insights into the military counseling environment.

Discussion and Implications

Main hypothesis 1 and its associated subhypotheses were developed to assess participants' reactions to
counselors in civilian attire in comparison to counselors in military attire conditions. Main hypothesis 2 and its associated subhypotheses tested participants' reactions to counselors in two military attire conditions representing officer and enlisted ranks.
It is clear from the data analysis and testing of the first set of hypotheses that the participants indicated significantly more positive perceptions of and definite preferences for the counselor in civilian attire. Total CRF scores were significantly higher for the counselor in civilian attire (main hypothesis 1). Participants rated the counselor in civilian attire as considerably more trustworthy (.0511) than the counselor in military attire (subhypothesis la), although the computed F value was slightly out of range for acceptance of the hypothesis at the .05 level of confidence. The counselor in civilian attire was perceived as significantly more expert (.002) than counselors in military attire (subhypothesis lb). Participants further indicated a significantly greater preference (.0003) for seeing the counselor in civilian attire in the event counseling were desired (subhypothesis lc).

When comparing subjects' perceptions of and preferences for military counselors, it appears that the rank of the counselor was not a significant factor. It had been hypothesized that participants would respond significantly more positively to a counselor of their own rank status, and would indicate a significant preference for such a counselor. However, participants' own rank and the counselors' did not significantly interact when comparing
total CRF scores (main hypothesis 2). Similarly, the participants' perceptions of counselors' trustworthiness and expertness showed no significant interactive effects (subhypotheses 2a and 2b). Finally, participants did not significantly prefer to see a counselor of their own rank in the event counseling were desired (subhypothesis 2c). In fact, both officer and enlisted personnel indicated a slight preference to see a counselor of officer status, given the choice between a counselor of officer and enlisted status.

These findings clearly indicate that participants perceived a counselor in civilian attire more positively, and were significantly more willing to see a counselor in civilian attire if counseling were desired. The participants' significantly more positive perceptions of and preferences for counselors in civilian attire presents a different finding than Spencer's study (1982). In that study, Spencer found that participants did not perceive military counselors in civilian attire as significantly more trustworthy, nor did participants indicate a significantly greater willingness to self-disclose.

It appears from the literature that the area of military counseling has not been extensively investigated. The outcomes of this research study suggest a number of possible implications for counseling research and practice.
Additional research and investigations are needed to assist in understanding how military counselors are perceived. Studies are needed to investigate the possible influences of client demographic factors, such as race or ethnic origin, sex, age, or military rank. Littrell and Littrell (1982) have found that clients of different ethnic origins differently perceive counselors in various levels of attire formality. Numerous studies exist in the research literature which have investigated the influence on counseling of demographic factors such as those listed above. Although nearly 20 percent of the total Air Force population are women, 18 percent are black, and 15 percent are of other ethnic origins, no studies were found which investigated the interactive effects of such factors with military attire.

Research is needed to investigate outcomes of actual counseling activities involving counselors in civilian or military attire. It is possible that attire conditions of military counselors do not significantly influence the effectiveness of actual counseling practice. Several studies (Drummond, 1974; Spencer, 1982) concluded that counselor attire conditions did not significantly affect clients' perceptions of counseling effectiveness. These findings and the present study suggest the possibility
that the military uniform may affect potential clients’ willingness to seek treatment, but may not be significant once counseling activities are initiated. Further studies to clarify the uniform’s influence on willingness to seek treatment and the effectiveness of actual counseling services may be useful.

The scope of research investigating attire which represents institutional or organizational affiliation should be broadened. A number of professions require uniform wear; for example, state and local police forces, fire departments, the U. S. Postal Service, and other branches of the armed forces. Most of these organizations provide counseling services for employees. Research should focus on the influence of uniform wear by counselors providing services to those populations.

The factor of the sex of a counselor in uniform should be investigated. Several research studies have been conducted which indicate female counselors are perceived differently from their male counterparts. Lewis and Walsh (1978) found that individuals responded much more positively to an attractive female psychologist and tended to rate her very highly in competence and expertness. It is possible that female military counselors in uniform are perceived differently from uniformed male counselors.
An important implication of this study concerns the need to investigate perceived differences between counselors on active military duty and military counselors who are genuinely civilians. In the current study, the researcher ensured the counselor in civilian attire projected an appropriately military appearance in terms of grooming. The counselor's hair was neatly cut and his mustache was trimmed. Although study participants probably perceived the counselor in civilian attire as being a civilian, a more definitive characterization of a genuinely nonmilitary counselor may provide interesting results.

Future studies which focus on clients' willingness to see civilian or military counselors based on clients' presenting concerns may be fruitful. In the present study, the investigator found apparent differences in participants' willingness to see certain counselors based on presenting concerns. For example, participants indicated greater willingness to see counselors in military attire for job or professional concerns, and were much more willing to see the counselor in civilian attire for substance abuse concerns. Many military counselors have long believed that clients are less willing to discuss illegal or prohibited activities (homosexuality, for example) with
a counselor who may be perceived as being part of the military "system". Further investigation of this area could assist in determining which concerns military clients are willing to discuss with military counselors.

Several studies (Littrell & Littrell, 1981; Raia, 1972) have concluded that clients respond differently based on the levels of formality of counselor attire. The concept of level of formality should be applied to military attire and investigated. The present study presented one level of military and civilian attire (formal). In actual practice, military counselors have a number of attire combinations and formality levels which may be worn in the counseling environment. Additional study of levels of military attire formality may lead to greater understanding of the overall impact of attire in military counseling.

The factor of clients' perceptions of military counselors' trustworthiness requires more investigation and elaboration. Results of the current study indicate that participants perceived the counselor in civilian attire as somewhat more trustworthy than the counselor in military attire. The statistical finding narrowly missed being significant at the .05 level of confidence. Air Force regulations require counselors to report to authorities information received from clients concerning certain illegal
or prohibited activity. For example, clients who report involvement in homosexual or certain drug abuse activities to counselors must be reported to proper authorities. The effects of these reporting requirements on military clients' willingness to self-disclose information should be studied. Furthermore, it may be beneficial to investigate the effects of such requirements on the military counselor, especially as these factors may result in ethical conflicts for counselors.

Implications for military counseling practice have also emerged from the current study. Currently, the United States Air Force requires military counselors in most counseling settings to wear appropriate military attire. Although not specifically discussed in regulations or policies, this requirement generally stems from two basic perspectives. The first perspective is, generally, that individuals who develop personal or emotional problems while living and working in the military environment should remain in that military environment while receiving counseling assistance. The second perspective stems from the concept that Air Force counselors are members of the military first and foremost, with counseling as their job specialty, and the uniform should be worn while performing duties.
Without disputing the validity of those perspectives, the researcher believes the results of this investigation provide indication that the wearing of the uniform by the military counselor may influence potential clients' perceptions of and willingness to seek counseling from military counselors. It is possible that more individuals could be attracted to needed treatment, and counseling services could be more effective, if military counselors wore civilian attire. Certain military counseling environments, such as substance abuse treatment centers, may be able to provide more effective treatment programs with military counselors attired in civilian clothing. A pilot study or test program by the Air Force to further investigate the influence of uniform wear in the counseling environment may result in greater understanding of these factors.

Recommendations

As a result of the findings and implications of this investigation, the following recommendations are made.

1. A similar research study should be conducted in which demographic characteristics of subjects are more comprehensively controlled and investigated. Some factors which should be investigated are age of subjects; race or
ethnic origins of subjects; years of military service of subjects; and, lower versus higher ranks of subjects within officer or enlisted categories.

2. A similar research study should be conducted in which investigators study outcomes of counseling activities involving counselors in civilian or military attire. Clients' stated perceptions of the effectiveness of counseling services received from counselors in civilian and military attire should be the focus of such an investigation.

3. A similar research study should be conducted which investigates uniform wear by counselors in other branches of the military services, such as the Army, Navy or Marine Corps. Additional studies should also focus on counseling programs offered by non-military organizations which require uniform wear, such as state or local police forces or the United States Postal Service.

4. A similar research study should be conducted which utilizes female counselors, or a combination of male and female counselors, attired in military and civilian clothing.

5. A similar research study should be conducted which portrays the counselor in civilian attire as a civilian, perhaps with longer hair or beard.
6. A similar research study should be conducted which tests subjects' perceptions of analog counseling activities involving civilian and military counselors.

7. A similar research study should be conducted which investigates subjects' willingness to see civilian or military counselors concerning specific counseling topics.

8. A similar research study should be conducted which investigates additional and varying levels of civilian and military attire. The present study compared formal civilian and military attire conditions.

9. A similar research study should be conducted to determine if potential clients in a military population are actually dissuaded from seeking counseling by the military status or uniform of counselors.

10. A research study should be conducted which investigates confidentiality and ethical issues as they pertain to the military counselor.
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APPENDIX A

REQUEST FOR AND PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY
21 August 1984

7 BMW/SL (Captain XXXX)  
XXXXXXXXX AFB, XX

Dear Captain XXXX:

Request your permission to seek volunteers from substance abuse prevention seminars for participation in a research study designed to investigate the effects of counselor-dependent variables on individual preferences for counselors. As we previously discussed, participation in the study is completely voluntary for all individuals. In addition, the following parameters will apply:

- a. Volunteers will view a brief (3 minute) film clip and will complete a questionnaire. Total time required will not exceed 20 minutes.

- b. All responses will be completely anonymous, and no demographic data will be collected except participant's rank, age and sex.

- c. Conduct of this investigation will be monitored at all times by my doctoral dissertation committee at North Texas State University, and the research design has been reviewed to ensure it does not violate participants' basic human rights.

- d. Participants will be provided results of the study if they so desire.

Thanks for your help and consideration. I will work hard to ensure no disruption in your staff's normal work flow occurs.

Sincerely,

/s/James E. Huddleston  
JAMES E. HUDDLESTON, Captain, USAF  
Assistant Professor of Aerospace Studies
SL

Substance Abuse Seminar Research Studies

Captain James E. Huddleston

1. I am writing to inform you that my staff and I will be more than happy to assist you in your research study. We would like to meet with you at a later date to discuss all further details. We welcome the opportunity to help other Air Force family members when the need arises.

2. If we can be of further assistance to you or the Division of Aerospace Studies at North Texas, don't hesitate to call at (817) 735-5636.

/s/
XXXXXXX X. XXXX, CAPT, USAF
Chief, Social Actions
APPENDIX B

REQUEST FOR AND PERMISSION TO UTILIZE THE COUNSELOR RATING FORM
October 8, 1984

Dr. Michael B. LaCrosse
Skyview Medical Center
109 N. 15th
Norfolk, NE 68701

Dear Dr. LaCrosse:

I’m a doctoral counseling student here at North Texas State University, currently struggling to organize my dissertation research. My study involves investigation into effects of military attire in the counseling environment, an area similar to that of a friend and colleague, Dr. Leon Spencer. In his research, Dr. Spencer utilized the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), and I’d very much like to do so as well. Therefore, I’m requesting your permission to utilize the CRF in my study.

Although I’m familiar with the CRF, and I’m certain it’s the right instrument for my study, I’ve been unable to find one for my own use. Dr. Spencer indicated you might be willing to provide me the CRF — if so, I’d be happy to reimburse you for any expenses you might incur.

Thanks in advance for your assistance, Dr. LaCrosse. I’ve encountered your work a number of times in my literature review, and I’m honored to correspond with you. Please call me collect anytime if I can clarify my request in any way. My numbers are (817) 566-0288, home, and (817)565-2077, work.

Sincerely,

/s/James E. Huddleston
James E. Huddleston, Ph.D. (Cand.)
Assistant Professor of Aerospace Studies
December 5, 1984

Mr. J. E. Huddleston
Box 5398
NT Station
Denton, Texas 76201

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This is to verify that James E. Huddleston obtained appropriate permission for use of the Counselor Rating Form in his dissertation research. This permission was obtained from me personally in earlier correspondence with me.

Sincerely,

/s/Michael B. LaCrosse
Michael B. LaCrosse, Ph.D.
Clinical Psychologist &
Clinical Director

MBL/mm
APPENDIX C

COUNSELOR RATING FORM

REFERRAL QUESTIONNAIRE
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

Appendix C, pages 87-91
INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for your help in this research study. The purpose of this investigation is to study factors which may improve counseling and psychological services provided military members and their families. Your participation in this investigation is completely voluntary; in addition, all responses are anonymous and absolutely no attempt will be made to identify you or your responses. The information below will help us better understand the data we have collected for this study.

Please provide the following information concerning yourself:

RANK: __________________

AGE: _________________

SEX: _________________

RACE/ORIGIN: __________

TOTAL YEARS MILITARY SERVICE: _________________

HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION: __________________

Please circle the appropriate responses to the questions below:

Have you ever sought assistance for yourself from an Air Force counselor? Yes No

Have you ever sought assistance for a family member from an Air Force counselor? Yes No

Have you ever sought assistance for yourself from a civilian counselor? Yes No

Have you ever sought assistance for a family member from a civilian counselor? Yes No

(PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE)
COUNSELOR RATING FORM

Listed below are several scales which contain word pairs at either end of the scale, and seven spaces between the pairs. Please rate the counselor you just saw on each end of the scales.

If you feel that the counselor very closely resembles the word at one end of the scale, place a check mark as follows:

FAIR: X:__:__:__:__:__:_X:UNFAIR

OR

FAIR: __:__:__:__:__:__:_X:UNFAIR

If you think that one end of the scale quite closely describes the counselor, then make your check mark as follows:

ROUGH: __:__:__:__:__:__:_X:SMOOTH

OR

ROUGH: __:__:__:__:__:__:_X:SMOOTH

If you feel that one end of the scale only slightly describes the counselor, then make your check mark as follows:

ACTIVE: __:__:_X:__:__:__:_PASSIVE

OR

ACTIVE: __:__:__:__:_X:__:_PASSIVE

If both sides of the scale seem equally associated with your impression of the counselor, or if the scale is irrelevant, then place a check mark in the middle space:

HARD: __:__:__:__:_X:__:_PASSIVE

Your first impression is the best answer.

PLEASE NOTE: PLACE CHECK MARKS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SPACES

Copyright ©, M. B. LaCrosse, and A. Barak, 1974, 1975. Not to be reproduced without permission.

(PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE)
AGREEABLE: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: DISAGREEABLE
UNALERT: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: ALERT
ANALYTIC: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: DIFFUSE
UNAPPRECIATIVE: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: APPRECIATIVE
ATTRACTIVE: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: UNATTRACTIVE
CASUAL: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: FORMAL
CHEERFUL: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: DEPRESSED
VAGUE: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: CLEAR
DISTANT: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: CLOSE
COMPATIBLE: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: INCOMPATIBLE
UNSURE: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: CONFIDENT
SUSPICIOUS: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: BELIEVABLE
UNDEPENDABLE: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: DEPENDABLE
INDIFFERENT: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: ENTHUSIASTIC
INEXPERIENCED: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: EXPERIENCED
INEXPERT: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: EXPERT
UNFRIENDLY: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: FRIENDLY
HONEST: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: DISHONEST

(Please go on to the next page)
INFORMED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:IGNORANT
INSIGHTFUL:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:INSIGHTLESS
STUPID:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:INTELLIGENT
UNLIKEABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:LIKEABLE
LOGICAL:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:ILLOGICAL
OPEN:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:CLOSED
PREPARED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNPREPARED
UNRELIABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:RELIABLE
DISRESPECTFUL:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:RESPECTFUL
IRRESPONSIBLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:RESPONSIBLE
SELFLESS:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:SELFISH
SINCERE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:INSINCERE
SKILLFUL:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNSKILLFUL
SOCIALABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNSOCIALABLE
DECEITFUL:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:STRAIGHTFORWARD
TRUSTWORTHY:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNTRUSTWORTHY
GENUINE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:PHONY
WARM:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:COLD

(PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE)
REFERRAL QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to the items below in the same manner as your responses to the previous questions.

1. How willing would you be to seek assistance for personal concerns from the counselor observed?
   UNWILLING: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:WILLING

2. How willing would you be to seek assistance for marriage or family concerns from the counselor observed?
   WILLING: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:UNWILLING

3. How willing would you be to seek assistance for job or professional concerns from the counselor observed?
   UNWILLING: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:WILLING

4. How willing would you be to seek assistance for substance abuse concerns from the counselor observed?
   WILLING: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:UNWILLING

5. How willing would you be to seek assistance for a family member from the counselor observed?
   UNWILLING: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:WILLING
APPENDIX D

CONSENT TO ACT AS A SUBJECT FOR RESEARCH
AND INVESTIGATION
CONSENT FORM

Consent To Act As A Subject For Research And Investigation

1. I hereby agree to participate in the study conducted by James E. Huddleston associated with his investigation of improvements in military counseling. I understand that I will be asked to view a videotape of a counselor, and then to complete a questionnaire.

2. I have been informed that my participation in this investigation is completely voluntary. I have further been informed that any personal information I may reveal is confidential, and will be protected from inadvertent or improper use. I have been informed that any information pertaining to the identity of those taking part in the study will be destroyed at the investigation's end.

(Subject's Signature)

(Date)
APPENDIX E

SCRIPT UTILIZED BY COUNSELOR IN VIDEOTAPES
MY NAME IS RON MERRITT. I'M AN AIR FORCE COUNSELOR, AND I'D LIKE TO BRIEFLY EXPLAIN SOME COUNSELING SERVICES AND PROGRAMS AVAILABLE FOR AIR FORCE PEOPLE.

AS A COUNSELOR, MY JOB IS TO ASSIST ACTIVE-DUTY AND RETIRED PERSONNEL, AND ELIGIBLE FAMILY MEMBERS, WHO MAY EXPERIENCE PERSONAL OR EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS. I'M AVAILABLE TO HELP INDIVIDUALS, COUPLES, AND FAMILIES IN SUCH AREAS AS INTERPERSONAL OR SOCIAL PROBLEMS, MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPY, STRESS ASSOCIATED WITH AIR FORCE LIFE, SUBSTANCE ABUSE, AND OTHER PROBLEM AREAS.

I ALSO PROVIDE GROUP COUNSELING FOR SPECIFIC CONCERNS, SUCH AS WEIGHT CONTROL, ASSERTIVENESS TRAINING, OR ALCOHOLISM.

I AM A TRAINED AND EXPERIENCED COUNSELOR. MY GRADUATE DEGREE IS IN PSYCHOLOGY, AND I HAVE WORKED FOR THE AIR FORCE AS A THERAPIST FOR THE PAST THREE YEARS. ALL COUNSELING INFORMATION IS PROTECTED BY A PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS RELATIONSHIP.

I WORK AT THE BASE MENTAL HEALTH CLINIC. YOU CAN ALSO FIND COUNSELORS AT THE SOCIAL ACTIONS OFFICE AND AT THE FAMILY SUPPORT CENTER.
THE AIR FORCE LEADERSHIP RECOGNIZES THAT OUR PERSONNEL, LIKE OTHER PEOPLE, SOMETIMES EXPERIENCE PERSONAL DIFFICULTIES. IF YOU OR A MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY NEED PERSONAL COUNSELING, SEE ME OR ANY AIR FORCE COUNSELOR. IT'S OUR JOB TO HELP YOU."
APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA AND RAW DATA FROM
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY PARTICIPANTS
GROUP A (CIVILIAN ATTIRE)

RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TOTCRF</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>TOTRQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GROUP B (MILITARY OFFICER)
#### RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TOTCRF</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>TOTRQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROUP C (MILITARY ENLISTED)
RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TOTCRF</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>TOTRQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>084</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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