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Studies investigating aspects of social influence or power in counseling settings have examined the relationship between nonverbal cues and social influence or power. This study investigated perceptions of power, responsiveness, attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness by manipulating posture, facial expression and sex of therapist. After viewing photographs of stimulus therapists and listening to audio tapes, 96 male and 98 female undergraduates completed the Counselor Rating Form and a questionnaire measuring therapists' power and responsiveness. Results indicated that facial expression was more salient than posture. Smiling decreased ratings of power and increased ratings of attractiveness, responsiveness, and trustworthiness. Open posture was seen as more attractive and more powerful than closed posture. Surprisingly, females were viewed as more powerful than males. Other gender differences were found only in interaction with other variables.
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NONVERBAL POWER CUES

Although Strong and Schmidt (1970) found that nonverbal behaviors by themselves were not enough to significantly affect subjects' behaviors, others have found that nonverbal behavior can have strong effects. Argyle, Salter, Nicholson, Williams, and Burgess (1970) found that nonverbal cues have over four times the impact of verbal cues when the two are used simultaneously. Knapp (1978) discussed Birdwhistle's contention that in normal dyadic conversation, less than 35% of the social meaning is carried by verbal channels. Consequently, at least one expert believes that more than 65% of the meaning of the situation is transmitted nonverbally. Similarly, Haase and Teppner (1972) reported that in rating counselor empathy in comparison to counselor verbal communication, nonverbal behavior accounted for twice the amount of variance. Also, in a study concerning impression management, Argyle et al. (1970) found that nonverbal cues had 4.3 times the impact of verbal cues on shifts in rated impressions and accounted for 10.3 times the variance of verbal cues. Thus, for meaning to be clear in communication, a combination of verbal and nonverbal behaviors are encoded and decoded by participants. However,
in spite of the popular lay belief, nonverbal behavior usually has different meanings, varying with the context in which it occurs (LaFrance & Mayo, 1979).

Nonverbal behavior is important in the counseling setting in at least two ways. First, the client can influence the counselor by transmitting personal information, attitudes, and emotions nonverbally. For example, Ekman and Friesen (1967) have found that facial expressions change faster and occur more frequently than body actions. Thus perceptions of specific emotions or the nature of emotion is more often derived from facial cues than body cues. Information about the intensity of emotion is available from both head and body cues. Facial expressions and body positions can convey the full range of emotional intensity, while body actions usually convey only moderate to high intensity. Clearly, then, it is important for counselors to be able to decode the nonverbal messages of their clients. According to Sherer and Rogers (1980), most articles on nonverbal behavior in the counseling/clinical literature have focused on facilitating therapy through attention to client's nonverbal messages.

A second way nonverbal behavior is important is in the effects the counselor may have on the client's behavior. For example, it has been found that a counselor with an open body position is more persuasive than one using a closed
body position (McGinley, LeFevre, and McGinley, 1975). Strong (1968) reviewed opinion change research and concluded that the higher the perceived expertise of a counselor, the more influence he or she had regarding client's opinion change. The same effect was noted for perceived trustworthiness. Strong reported that liking was associated with perceived similarity. Similar people were found to influence each other more than those who were dissimilar.

Part of the process of therapy is that the counselor directly or indirectly influences the client to adopt more appropriate behavior. This guidance is one form of social influence, closely related to persuasion or other types of power usage. When counselors successfully influence the behavior of their clients, they are demonstrating power. Counselors attempts to influence the adoption of preferred behavior, and their degree of influence increases with heightened perceived expertise. It is a logical assumption that social influence and perceived expertise or power are important to guidance and counseling. Counseling is, therefore, a form of social influence and power.

Within sociological and psychological research, persuasion is recognized as a subset of social influence. The following discussion addresses specific aspects of social influence, and selectively draws from literature on persuasion and power. For present purposes then, the terms
persuasion and social influence will be used interchangeably.

Most forms of social influence and power contain many elements including attraction, the transmission of a positive attitude, dominance, the ability to persuade, perceived status, and power. Edinger and Patterson (1983) referred to power as the relative amount of influence available to an individual in an interaction. To Nelson and Kahn (1982), power was the control of resources which enable one person to influence the behavior of another. Using either description, in the counseling setting both counselors and clients have power; they influence each other. A major problem with the literature on power is the comparability of measures. For example in management literature and business literature, power is conceptualized in French and Raven's (1959) use of power and leadership styles (Hersey & Natemeyer, 1975; Likert & Likert, 1976; Richmond, McCroskey, David, & Koontz, 1980). In the literature on personal characteristics, many personality inventories have sub-scales of dominance or dogmatism which they may conceptualize as power (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Gordon, 1963; Gough, McClosky, & Meehl, 1951; Jackson, 1967; LaForge & Suczek, 1955; Scott, 1965). Many researchers have developed their own scale to fit their study. Each study examining power tends to
measure the concept differently. Consequently, comparing results across studies measuring or investigating power is problematic. For present purposes, the focus will be on the counselor's use of power. Researchers have identified a number of behaviors associated with a high level of power. Common nonverbal power cues include postural openness, smiling, and gender.

**Nonverbal Power and Counseling**

Power relates to counseling in several ways. Power forms a major part of the process by the importance of influencing clients to adopt new attitudes and behaviors. Some researchers have tried to define power, influence, and persuasion as it relates to counseling, and to determine necessary uses of power in counseling. Strong (1968) postulated that in counseling, the counselor attempts to influence his or her clients to attain the stated goals of counseling. He described counseling as an interpersonal influence process in which the objective is client attitude and behavior change.

Strong and Matross (1973) viewed counseling as a series of social influence or power strategies. They asserted that these strategies were designed to enhance counselor social power, decrease client opposition to change, and minimize client resistance to influence to achieve the desired goal.
Strong and Matross hypothesized that a counselor's social power resulted from a client's needs for resources believed to be possessed by counselors. Power was one of the source characteristics reviewed by McGuire (1969). He stated that power consisted of 1) control over positive or negative sanctions to be applied to the recipient or client, 2) concern over whether or not the client complied, and 3) the extent to which the source can observe and discern client/recipient compliance.

Other researchers have attempted to determine the most important components of influence or power. Strong and Schmidt (1970) studied the effect of high or low status introductions and the expert or inexpert role of a male counselor as sources of perceived expertise on interpersonal influence. Behaviors such as leaning toward the subject, using responsive facial expressions, and responsive posture were indicative of counselor expertise on the part of the counselor. They found that while neither the introduction nor role alone produced a significant effect, role had a stronger effect than introduction. Strong and Schmidt concluded that the expertise displayed by an interviewer's behavior exerts some control over the extent to which he or she influences another person.

Counselors can use influence and power in a variety of ways. Edinger and Patterson (1983) reviewed research which
suggested that by managing the impression others have of them, counselors can increase their ability to influence. Edinger and Patterson asserted that expertise was an important dimension in the counseling setting. Tedeschi and Lindskold (1976) stated that an expert is superior to a nonexpert in persuading others to conform to communications.

Expert nonverbal behaviors are quite important in the counseling setting. Claiborn (1979) conducted a study to determine the effect of nonverbal behavior and verbal behavior on counselor's perceived ability to influence. Significant main effects relating to perceived expertise of the counselor were found to be linked directly to counselor nonverbal behavior. The male counselor was rated more expert, trustworthy, and attractive when his nonverbal behavior was responsive than when it was nonresponsive. Siegel and Sell (1978) also found significant effects for expert nonverbal behavior directed toward clients. Expert nonverbal behavior was consistently more effective in determining the subject's perceptions of the counselor than was objective evidence. Nonverbal cues included vocal variety, facial expressiveness, eye contact, and gestures.

Other investigators have noted the use of perceived expertise and influence in the counseling setting. Zimbardo (1960) asserted that the client's perception of the counselor's expertise is one of the factors which moderate
the degree to which the client will change his or her views to those of the counselor, rather than discredit the counselor. Strong (1968) agreed that the extent to which a counselor is seen as expert, attractive, and trustworthy decreases the likelihood of his or her being discredited. He suggested a two-stage model. In the first stage, counselors should enhance their perceived expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. In the second stage, counselors should use their influence to precipitate opinion and/or behavioral change in clients. This change is an example of persuasion. LaCrosse (1975) cited one of his previous studies which defined persuasiveness as the degree to which a counselor's actions have the effect of inducing the client to believe that attitudinal and/or behavioral change might be beneficial.

Nonverbal behavior often connects persuasiveness with attractiveness in the counseling setting. To Strong (1968) perceived attractiveness and persuasiveness are important attributes of counselors. LaCrosse (1975) found that the only significant source for attractiveness ratings was a main effect for counselor nonverbal manner. Subjects in the study described behaviors that made one counselor seem more or less attractive and persuasive. Examiners counted the frequencies of cues reported by subjects as reasons for their judgements. Most subjects based their ratings of
attractiveness and persuasiveness on at least one of six categories of nonverbal behavior that constituted the affiliative manner role. The most frequently noticed cues were duration of eye contact, smiles, and gestures.

Some investigators have focused on attractiveness in the counseling setting. Bersheid and Walster (1969) found that attractive communicators are more effective in influencing the attitudes of a recipient. It is reasonable to speculate that this effect would apply to counselor/client relationships as well. Patton (1969) combined preinterview introductions (i.e. anticipated liking or not liking the counselor) with two counselor roles (i.e. liking or not liking for the client) during a simulated counselor interview. Results indicated that ratings of attraction were more influential in altering subjects opinions of themselves.

Slightly different results were found by both Carter (1978) and Lewis and Walsh (1978). Both studies found that physical attractiveness exerted more influence for female counselors and clients. In other words, physically attractive female counselors were perceived more favorably by female clients. The Lewis and Walsh study included only an attractive or unattractive female counselor and male and female subjects. Carter's study included male and female stimulus counselors and subjects. Carter found a
significant main effect for attractiveness. Heppner and Dixon (1981) reviewed the research on the effects of perceived attractiveness on counselor power including nine studies of nonverbal behavior. Research has focused on so many different variables that no firm conclusions could be drawn. For example, Claiborn (1979) suggested that initial perceptions of counselor attractiveness were more dependent on nonverbal than verbal behaviors. Strong, Taylor, Bratton, and Loper (1971) found that counselors exhibiting greater frequencies of movement, including changes in body position and posture, smiling and frowning, and crossing and uncrossing of legs, were rated by subjects as higher in perceived social influence or counselor power. Patton (1969) found that attractive counselors were more influential in altering students' opinions of themselves. Thus, it is reasonable to speculate that attractive counselors have greater social influence, and that this attractiveness may be transmitted nonverbally.

Posture

Some investigators have examined the relationship between posture and persuasion. This relationship varies according to whether posture is open or closed. Open posture includes asymmetrical arm and leg positions. Closed posture includes crossed arms or arms held close at sides,
and legs held close together. Posture also includes kinesic behaviors such as bodily movements, relaxation, and facial expressions used in communication. Machotka (1965) conducted a study in which subjects rated line drawings displaying different degrees of the openness of arm arrangement of nude female figures. He observed that subjects were attracted more to figures with moderately open armed position. Closed-arm female figures were perceived as cold, rejecting, shy, and passive. Mehrabian (1968) found that males demonstrating open posture, were not perceived by subjects as communicating a more positive attitude than those with closed posture. An open posture for females, however, was perceived as communicating a more positive attitude.

Mehrabian and Williams (1969) examined the relationship between posture and persuasion. They found a different relationship between postural relaxation (arm and leg asymmetry, arm openness) and persuasiveness depending upon the sex of the stimulus person. Among males, a slight degree of tension was associated with decreased persuasiveness, whereas a slight degree of relaxation increased persuasion. In contrast, among females, slight tension or slight relaxation had no differential effect on persuasiveness. Postures and positions which communicated liking when combined with a less dominant body position were
associated with intended or perceived persuasiveness when demonstrated by either sex. Postures and positions indicative of liking included close proximity of the speaker and the subject, increased eye contact, small reclining angles, head nods, and moderate relaxation for both sexes. For females only, gesticulation and direct orientation were found to communicate liking. For males only, indirect orientation was found to communicate liking. Less dominant body positions included decreased self-manipulation and low rates of leg and foot movement.

Sherer and Rogers (1980) investigated therapists' nonverbal behavior in relation to Mehrabian's (1972) three-dimensional theory of nonverbal communication. They reported that Mehrabian's three basic dimensions are 1) evaluation, 2) potency or status, and 3) responsivity. Sherer and Rogers employed subjects to rate therapists on a videotape for effectiveness. The evaluation dimension was formulated in terms of immediacy. High immediacy cues included a close therapist-client distance, eye contact and head orientation toward the client 90% of the time. Low immediacy cues included a larger client-therapist distance, and eye contact and head orientation toward the client 10% of the time. The high potency condition used a relaxed posture including slight lean and asymmetrical arm and leg positioning. The low potency condition included sitting
erect, no leaning, and arms and legs symmetrically placed. Sherer and Rogers found that a therapist was perceived as liking a client more in the high immediacy condition than in the low condition, and was rated as being more effective. Postural relaxation was found to not significantly affect subjects' ratings of the therapist's potency and status. Immediacy manipulations even influenced the high and low responsivity condition.

Thus it would appear that immediacy is an important aspect of a therapist's nonverbal communication. Sherer and Rogers suggest one interpretation of the findings is that the immediacy dimension may be the most salient, easily noticed, and readily interpreted of the nonverbal dimensions in therapy. In other words, in combination with the other cues, the relaxation cues may have been too subtle to be noticeable. Sherer and Rogers' conclusion is that with respect to Mehrabian's 1972 three-dimensional conceptualization of nonverbal behavior, only immediacy was found to be an important aspect of a therapist's nonverbal communication.

Other researchers have examined the relationship between posture and persuasion. McGinley, LeFevre, and McGinley (1975) conducted a study to determine whether communicators using open body positions would be more persuasive. Persuasion was associated with opinion change
in others. The subjects were shown color slides of the confederate with an open, closed, or neutral body position while ostensibly discussing her beliefs. McGinley et al. found that the female subjects viewing an open-body position changed their opinion in the direction of the speaker. However, subjects who saw a closed-body position did not differ in attitude change from those who viewed neutral body positions or from control subjects whose opinions were simply retested later. Also when the subject and speaker had similar attitudes, speakers were rated as having higher social status and social control and greater interpersonal effectiveness when they exhibited an open position. Thus, there is reason to believe that speakers may be perceived as more powerful when they display an open-body position. A follow up study (McGinley, Nicholas, and McGinley, 1978), did not support the hypothesis that individuals with open-body positions exert greater social influence. No overall effect for open-body position on opinion change or on evaluation was found. The effect of body position was found only in groups possessing similar attitudes.

Researchers (Henley, 1977; Pearson, 1985) have suggested that differences in kinesic behavior may also indicate power differences. Investigators have found that when persons of different status communicate, those who are
superiors more often exhibit relaxed positions and postures than do those of lower status. For example, in a hospital study, Goffman (1956) found that nurses and attendants exhibited far more circumspection in their kinesic behavior than did the physicians with whom they worked.

Smiling

Apparently, smiling affects outcomes even in situations where smiles would be expected to be irrelevant. Forbes and Jackson (1980) studied nonverbal behaviors of 101 teen-agers being interviewed for positions as engineering trainees. All but three interviewees were male. The applicants were either accepted, put on a reserve list, or rejected. Smiling was found to be significantly correlated with acceptance. There was no correlation between body position and the acceptance or rejection as trainees. Although these applicants were supposedly judged on their qualifications, smiling influenced the outcome. Smiling was apparently important in their evaluation.

Experience suggests that smiling has different meanings in different contexts. For example, smiling may be interpreted as smugness, friendliness, or embarrassment. Smiling can also indicate liking or positive effect (Jorgenson, 1978; Laird, 1974; Mehrabian, 1971), which is important in counseling. People attribute positive
characteristics to those who smile (e.g. intelligence, a good personality, and being a pleasant person). For example, Lau (1982) studied the relationship between smiling and evaluations. Subjects were asked to rate smiling or non-smiling photographs. Smiling was associated with a positive evaluation. Since perceived attractiveness or liking often has an effect on the amount of influence available to a counselor, smiling can be important to her/his repertoire of behaviors.

Smiling is often used as a manipulation of affiliative behavior. LaCrosse (1975) conducted research on the effects of persuasion as it is related to affiliative and nonaffiliative nonverbal behaviors. Subjects rated videotapes of counselors on perceived attractiveness and persuasiveness. LaCrosse included smiling among the affiliative behaviors and the absence of smiling among nonaffiliative behaviors. Results showed that affiliative behaviors were significantly associated with persuasiveness in the counseling setting. Smiling was reported by subjects to be one of the most frequently recognized affiliative behaviors.

Smiling has also been associated with power and persuasion. Keating, Mazur, and Segall (1977) related smiling to persuasion, dominance, and power. They found that photographs of non-smiling models were described as
more dominant than smiling models. Adult males and females from various racial backgrounds served as models. Keating, et al., referred to social dominance or status as the relative amount of influence or power an individual has in a small, face-to-face group.

**Sex Differences**

A number of sex differences have been found in the literature on nonverbal behavior. It seems that women are more skillful at decoding nonverbal cues and may be more effective interpersonally. It also appears that women do not receive the same recognition as men when they use male power cues. Differences have been found between sexes in regard to leadership, posture, and smiling. Rosenthal, Hall, and their colleagues (Hall, Rosenthal, Archer, DiMatteo, and Rogers, 1978; Rosenthal, Hall, Archer, DiMatteo, and Rogers, 1979; Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, and Archer, 1979) have claimed that people who are more skillful at decoding nonverbal cues are more effective in their interpersonal relationships; and women have been found to be more skilled at decoding (Hall, 1978). Parsons (1955), Parsons, Bales, and Shils (1953), and Zelditch (1955) assert that women in our culture have traditionally played expressive, emotional, and supportive roles, rather than instrumental roles. Due to their roles and their
superiority at decoding nonverbal cues, women should have superior interpersonal relationships. Thus, it is reasonable to speculate that female counselors decoding their clients' nonverbal messages may be more effective than male counselors. That may explain Hill's (1975) finding that both male and female clients were more satisfied with women counselors, and that all female clients did more self exploring than male clients.

Power.--Porter and Geis (1981) and Knapp (1978) found that women did not receive the same leadership recognition as men when both presented identical nonverbal leadership cues in mixed-sex groups. According to Porter and Geis, sex role stereotypes are apparently more salient than nonverbal power cues in mixed-sex groups. Perceived dominance, as demonstrated by the head-of-the-table effect, held for men across same and mixed-sex groups, but for women only in same-sex groups.

Leadership differences have also been found between the sexes. In 1969, Megargee studied four groups, crossing two levels of dominance with sex to determine how leadership decisions were made. While those low in dominance were allowed by the high dominants to make the decision, they decided to be followers, thereby referring the decisions back to those high in dominance. The most interesting effect was found in groups of highly dominant women and men
low in dominance. In spite of the dominance factor, there was a low incidence of female leaders.

Henley (1975) noted that sex differences in touching, self-disclosure, and verbal interruptions are the same as the behavior differences between high and low-power people. Parlee (1979) studied the use of nonverbal behavior indicative of either high or low status. She found that both males and females exhibiting high-status behavior were perceived as holding a high-level job. However, a male was perceived as holding a much lower-level job when he demonstrated low-status behavior with a high-status female, than when with a high-status male. Kahn (1984; Nelson and Kahn, 1982) asserted that the everyday nonverbal behavior of men demonstrates power: For example, relaxed posture (Frieze and Ramsey, 1976; Henley, 1977); and less-frequent smiling (Bugental, Love, and Gianetto, 1971; LaFrance & Mayo, 1979).

Sex-role stereotypes and societal expectations of gender appropriate power strategies may account for the different power tactics observed in males and females. Johnson (1976) investigated the possibility that sex-role stereotypes are responsible for different uses of power between men and women. Male and female subjects answered questionnaires employing the Raven (1965: French & Raven, 1959) power bases. As predicted Johnson found that subjects viewed indirect power strategies as stereotypic of females,
and direct power strategies as stereotypic of males. Further, the effect was stronger for males than females. Johnson suggests that this may be because males are allowed to show feminine characteristics in power styles, but females are not allowed to have masculine power styles. In other words, males are allowed to use either strong, aggressive-type power bases, or weak, less-aggressive ones. Females, though, are limited by society's expectations to the less-powerful bases.

There is recent support for the finding that males and females apparently use different power strategies (Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, 1980). Falbo and Peplau suggested that while sex-role socialization might be one explanation for existing sex differences in the use of power strategies, power differences may also account for these sex differences. They argue that men use bilateral and direct strategies because they expect compliance to their influence attempts. Women and others who expect noncompliance are more likely to use unilateral strategies which do not require the partner's cooperation. Perhaps, then, part of the problem in perception of nonverbal power cues may be due to a lack of recognition that women use different strategies of power. Their strategies may not be recognized as such due to their lower status in society.
Support for the argument that the use of different strategies may be more a function of power or status inequality than gender was provided by Cowan, Drinkard, and MacGavin (1984). They reasoned that children have less power than parents, but equal power with same-sex best friends. They found no gender differences. All children operated from a position of powerlessness relative to their parents in their choice of unilateral, indirect power strategies. In equal relationships (peers) they exhibited bilateral, direct strategies. These findings support the notion that the cause of sex differences in power usage and recognition may be due to actual power or status differences between the sexes.

Posture.--In research discussed earlier, Mehrabian (1968) found that open posture was associated with positive attitudes only for females. A sex difference was also found by Mehrabian and Williams (1969) with slightly relaxed males and slightly tense females considered more persuasive. Pearson (1985), reviewing the research on sex differences in nonverbal communication, suggested that if women assume a less-relaxed posture, they may be communicating dislike for the other person. However, Mehrabian and Williams thought that slight tension was appropriate behavior for females communicating to strangers.
Pearson (1985) suggested that men have an advantage in the bodily posture they maintain. She stated that when others have similar attitudes, men are more likely to be judged positively than are their female counterparts who typically have closed-body positions, and are more proper in their posture. She further asserted that the larger amount of space that men use by stretching their arms and legs out when they sit, as compared to the small space that women use as they cross their legs or ankles, and place their hands in their laps, also implies a power difference. Along with this, a woman's personal space is not observed to the same extent as a man's. Henley (1977) cites Willis' 1966 study on sex status and unequal distribution of space. He found that women are approached more closely than are men, by both men and women. Peterson (1975) stated that men tend to establish more trunk relaxation, greater backward lean, and open leg positioning. Women tend to sit and stand in a more closed position and demonstrate more trunk rigidity. It has been well documented that women show more sensitivity and flexibility in their behavior to others than do men (Mehrabian, 1972; Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, and Archer, 1979; & Weitz, 1976). Men maintain their more relaxed postures regardless of the sex of the other interactant. Pearson (1985) asserted that in general, communicators are more relaxed with women than men. If so,
it may be because of the greater relaxation and flexibility shown by women.

Henley and Freeman (1975) suggested that even if women adopt male power cues, they may be unsuccessful. They asserted that women who try to assume male postures may be frustrated in their efforts, since people expect women to sit with their knees together, not cross-legged or bending over. Pearson (1985) believes that women who violate these expectations or norms may be judged harshly or may be ridiculed. She points out that it is not feasible to encourage women to sit with their feet up or with their legs apart, to take long strides when they walk, or to use their bodies in forceful ways. Using feminine bodily postures does not seem to be beneficial either. Besides being awkward, difficult postures to maintain (e.g. sitting with knees together, stooping, never bending down, etc.) women's bodily postures appear to encourage others to treat them in submissive ways.

Women may not only be unsuccessful adopting male nonverbal power cues, they may have interpersonal problems when not conforming with societal expectations of nonverbal behavior deemed appropriate for women. Rosenthal and DePaulo (1979) observed that women are more polite in the nonverbal aspects of their social interactions. They found that when women are less accommodating in their nonverbal
behaviors, they experience less-successful interpersonal outcomes. Pearson (1985) suggests that nonverbal changes are difficult and dangerous. Although altering nonverbal behaviors may produce social change, personal risks are involved, one of which could be evidenced in the way women are evaluated.

**Smiling.**—Parlee (1979) investigated nonverbal cues and power, and found that women who use nonverbal cues associated with high status (e.g. less smiling, and less facial expressiveness) are perceived as having higher status. Men who smile receive higher evaluations on such characteristics than do women. Lau (1982) also noted sex differences and found that smiling increased the attractiveness of both the male and female, but more so for the male. No sex difference was found when both were not smiling. Chesler (1972) stated that both women and men feel threatened by a woman who does not smile very often and yet is apparently not unhappy. LaFrance and Mayo (1979) supported Chesler's view. Parlee may not be in conflict with Chesler and LaFrance and Mayo. It could be that women who are believed to have high status are also perceived as threatening.

Pearson (1985) stated that women lose power and effectiveness when they smile. She suggested that they appear less genuine if the smile is in response to societal
expectation and not actual happiness. When she discussed the notion that women are externalizers and are encouraged to express their feelings, Pearson suggested that women become increasingly vulnerable when they mirror their feelings on their faces.

Clearly, the literature shows that women have little nonverbal power. The exception to this has been addressed by Kahn (Kahn, 1984; Nelson and Kahn, 1982) and Pleck (1977). The power that is easily available to women they termed masculinity-validating power. By acting less powerfully, women have the power to validate or reaffirm men's masculinity or power. The proposed study will address the question of whether women are perceived to have power other than masculinity-validating power, and whether it is recognized by the same power cues as is men's power.

**Rationale and Hypotheses**

According to the literature, nonverbal behavior is important in counseling. When it is used to influence attitude and behavior change, this influence process can be considered power usage. Several nonverbal cues have been selected for examination: Posture, smiling, and gender.

Postures such as open-body positions have been found to be associated with persuasion, positive attitudes, and increased attractiveness. Closed-body positions have been
found to be associated with submission and decreased persuasion.

Smiling has been found to indicate affiliation and positive effect, which has been associated with persuasion. In contrast, other findings indicate that nonsmiling models were perceived as more dominant than smiling models. It has also been suggested that women lose power and effectiveness when they smile. Therefore, the exact effect of smiling on persuasion and power is unclear.

Based on the literature, the proposed study will examine counselor power and influence. The effect of body position and posture will be studied relative to perceived power. Also, smiling and its relationship to perceived power and dominance will be examined. Finally, sex differences will be noted in connection with different meanings attributed to nonverbal behavior demonstrated by each sex.

The specific hypotheses are as follows.

1. a) Main effects are expected for sex, smiling, and posture on power. Males and stimulus persons demonstrating open posture will be seen as more powerful. Smiling stimulus persons will be seen as less powerful.

   b) Sex and posture are expected to interact. While males and females demonstrating open posture will both be seen as more powerful than with closed posture, the effects will be significantly stronger for males.
c) Sex and smiling are expected to interact. Smiling females will be seen as significantly less powerful than smiling males. Although both males and females will be seen as more powerful when they demonstrate a neutral expression, the effect of expression will be greater for females.

2. a) Main effects for sex, smiling and posture are predicted on expertness. Males, persons demonstrating neutral expression, and persons demonstrating open posture will be seen as more expert.

b) Sex and posture are expected to interact. While males and females demonstrating open posture will both be seen as more expert than with closed posture, the effects will be significantly stronger for males.

c) Sex and smiling are expected to interact. Smiling females will be seen as significantly less expert than smiling males. Although both males and females will be seen as more expert when they demonstrate a neutral expression, the effect of expression will be greater for females.

3. a) Main effects are predicted for sex, smiling, and posture on attractiveness. Males, smiling stimulus persons, and persons demonstrating open posture will be seen as more attractive.
b) Sex and posture are expected to interact. While males and females demonstrating open posture will be seen as more attractive than with closed posture, the effect will be significantly stronger for males.

c) Smiling and posture are expected to interact. Although open posture will be perceived as more attractive than closed, a combination of open posture and smiling will increase attractiveness ratings significantly above neutral expression and open posture.

d) Sex and smiling are expected to interact. While both males and females will be perceived as more attractive when they smile, the effect will be significantly greater for males.

4. a) Main effects are predicted for sex, smiling, and posture on responsiveness. Males will be seen as less responsive. Smiling stimulus persons and persons demonstrating open posture will be seen as more responsive.

b) Sex and posture are expected to interact. Open posture compared to closed posture will increase ratings of responsiveness for both sexes, but the difference between effects of open and closed posture will be significantly greater for females.

c) Smiling and posture are expected to interact. Although open posture will be perceived as more responsive than closed, a combination of open posture and smiling will
increase responsiveness ratings significantly above neutral expression and open posture.

d) Sex and smiling are expected to interact. While both males and females will be perceived as more responsive when they smile, the effect will be significantly greater for females.

5. a) Main effects are predicted for smiling and posture on trustworthiness. Smiling stimulus persons and persons demonstrating open posture will be seen as more trustworthy.

b) Sex and posture are expected to interact. Open posture compared to closed posture will increase ratings of trustworthiness for both sexes, but the difference between effects of open and closed posture will be significantly greater for females.

c) Smiling and posture are expected to interact. Persons demonstrating neutral expressions and closed posture will be seen as significantly less trustworthy than when they are smiling with either open or closed posture. Both smiling and neutral expression persons will be perceived as significantly more trustworthy when demonstrating open posture than with closed posture, although the effect will be greater for smiling persons than those with neutral expressions.
No main effect for sex or interaction for sex and smiling on trustworthiness is predicted. No interaction for smiling and posture is expected on powerfulness or expertness.

Method

Subjects.--The subjects were 96 male and 98 female undergraduates enrolled in psychology, sociology, and speech classes. Students received extra credit for their participation.

Design.--A 2 (counselor gender) x 2 (facial expression) x 2 (posture) factorial design experiment was planned. However, due to availability of subjects, subject sex was included, creating a 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 design. All variables were between subject. Male or female counselors who were smiling or not smiling displayed open- or closed-body postures.

Stimulus Materials.--Two types of stimulus materials were employed. Photographs were the first type of stimulus material used. Stimulus pictures were black and white. A total of eight different pictures, four of a male and four of a female, were used in a pilot study. Seven male and 10 female undergraduates participated in the pilot study. They rated a set of photographs of graduate students (four male and eight female). The photographs were rated on three sets
of seven-point bipolar adjectives; 1) attractive-unattractive, 2) professional- non-professional, and 3) warm-cold. (See Appendix A.). Photographs of one male and one female were chosen based on similarity of ratings. Male and female subjects did not rate these two photographs differently. T-tests found no significant differences between the two photographs on the three variables.

Varying combinations of smiling and posture were used: One showing each individual smiling or having a neutral expression, combined with arms either symmetrically placed on the chair arms, or lying next to the body with hands on the lap. All photographs depicted the individual as relaxed and looking at the camera. The setting was void of wall or room decorations. The stimulus counselors were dressed in dark suits, seated and shown from above the knees.

Audio tapes were the second type of stimulus material used. Two audio tapes were made. In each tape the counselor read from a script describing reasons for seeking therapy and the general process of therapy (See Appendix B). The script was written to present descriptions of counseling from four theoretical frameworks: Psychoanalytic, social-behavioristic, humanistic, and existential described in lay terms. A male and a female student were chosen for similarity in accent. Each individual was trained to read
the script at the same rate and with the same inflection. The tapes were made by the two individuals under the same conditions.

Procedure.--Subjects were randomly assigned to one of the eight experimental conditions, so that the proportion of males and females were equivalent across cells. Subjects were run in groups of three to 15. A male experimenter, blind to the study's purpose, greeted the subjects and explained the study's purpose as the evaluation of announcements regarding therapeutic process. After completing an informed consent form, (see Appendix C) subjects were told the following:

We are developing a public service announcement about psychotherapy. You will be presented with a version of the announcement. You will be viewing a photograph of a therapist and listening to an audio tape. Later you will be asked to fill out a set of questionnaires.

Subjects were provided with envelopes containing one of the stimulus photographs and the dependent measures. In this way, subjects within one group were randomly assigned to different conditions. After the introduction, the experimenter quietly shuffled papers at the front desk and the subjects listened to the audio tape while viewing the stimulus photograph. At the end of the tape, the
experimenter collected the photographs and instructed the subjects to complete the questionnaires evaluating the stimulus counselors. He then left the room while subjects were debriefed by one of the researchers.

Instrumentation.—Power and responsiveness were measured through the use of bipolar adjectives rated on seven-point scales. (See Appendix D.) Larson and Minton's (1971) 15-item attributed social power scale was included. Although they reported reliability and validity data in the original article, there remain some problems with the scale. For example, it is unclear whether or how well undergraduates understood the words (see Appendix E). Consequently, other bipolar adjectives conceptually related to power were drawn from Snider and Osgood (1972) and developed for this research. The list in Appendix F shows the bipolar adjectives conceptually related to power. Since counselors may be believed to be responsive, conceptually related bipolar adjectives to measure responsiveness were also included. (See Appendix G). Items from the three sets were interspersed and randomized to alleviate problems of response bias.

Perceived therapist expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness were assessed using the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) developed by Barak and LaCrosse (1975). (See Appendix H.) The CRF consists of 36 seven-point bipolar
scales, 12 sets representing each of the three dimensions. Data on the CRF supports its reliability and utility in the evaluation of counselor characteristics (Barak & Dell, 1977; Barak & LaCrosse, 1977; Larosse & Barak, 1976).

Results

Preliminary Analysis.--Factor analysis was used to determine the underlying dimensions of the bipolar items created for this study. Principal axis factoring with varimax rotation was employed, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences ("SPSS User's Guide", 1983). Varimax converged in three iterations. A decision rule to drop variables loading under .4 was observed. One item, attentive-not attentive, was eliminated because it loaded under .4 on factor one. As expected, two dimensions or factors were found from the bi-polar adjectives. The combined factors accounted for 50.3% of the variance. Factor one, power, accounted for 34.5% of the variance. Factor two, responsiveness, accounted for 15.8% of the variance. Factor loadings for power and responsiveness items are listed on tables in appendix H.

Tests of reliability were performed on the power and responsiveness measures as well as the Larson and Minton scale. An alpha of .76 was found for the Larson and Minton scale. The two dimensions from the developed scale, power and responsiveness, had alphas of .9511 and .943,
respectively. Due to high reliability values, and clear distinctions from the factor analysis, a decision was made to sum each set of variables. Consequently, each subject had three scores. The sum of his or her ratings on the Larson and Minton items yielded a score for attributed power. Subjects' scores on factor one items were summed to yield a power score. Subject responsiveness scores were the sum of items loading on factor 2.

Subjects' ratings of adjective pairs on each subscale of the counselor rating form (CRF) were summed. Subjects then had scores for counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Checking the reliability, alphas of .915 was found for expertness, .903 was found for attractiveness, and .889 was found for trustworthiness.

A Pearson correlation yielded a negative correlation \( r = -0.17, p < 0.01 \) between the power dimension and the Larson and Minton power score. The correlation between power and responsiveness scores was .55 \( (p < 0.001) \). The correlation between the Larson and Minton score and responsiveness was .43 \( (p < 0.001) \). A Pearson correlation between the dependent variables was then performed. Means and standard deviations of each dependent variable are listed in Table 1.

The correlations between each of the dependent variables are shown in Table 2. All correlations were statistically significant. Negative correlations were found
between the Larson and Minton power score and power, responsiveness, expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The remaining correlations between dependent variables were positive.

Nonparametric correlations between all variables and the independent variables were also performed. The independent variables were not correlated with each other. However, some of the dependent variables were significantly correlated with facial expression and therapist sex. See Table 3.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) were then performed on the added scales: The Larson and Minton power adjectives, the power factor, the responsiveness factor, and the variables (expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness) from the CRF. The main effects and interactions of posture, facial expression, therapist sex, and sex of subject were examined.

Hypothesis One: Power

Hypothesis la. Two sub-hypotheses on the effects of sex and posture were supported. Posture was not found to affect ratings of power.

It was hypothesized that the male would be perceived as more powerful than the female. ANOVA revealed no significant main effect for the Larson and Minton power scale on sex of stimulus therapist. \( F(1,176) = .419, \) n.s. However, a main effect for therapist sex was found using the
created power scale, although the effect was in the opposite
direction than hypothesized. Females (M=117.23) were seen
as more powerful than males (M= 108.51) F(1,170)= 6.613,
p<.011.

A main effect was hypothesized for facial expression on
power. As expected, smiling stimulus persons were seen as
significantly less powerful. Using the Larson and Minton
scale, neutral expression (M=57.84) was found to attain
higher ratings of power than smiling (M=50.31), F(1,176) =
30.87, p< .001. No significant main effects were found
using the power scale developed for this research,
F(1,170)=.096, n.s.

Hypothesis 1b. Sex and posture were expected to
interact on ratings of power. However, no significant
interaction was found for either power scale.

Hypothesis 1c. Sex and smiling were predicted to
interact on ratings of power. The smiling female was
expected to be seen as less powerful than a smiling male.
On the contrary, the smiling female (M=113.67) was perceived
as more powerful than the smiling male (M=112.94), according
to the developed power scale. Both sexes were expected to
be seen as more powerful when demonstrating a neutral
expression, although the effect was expected to be greater
for the female. The increased power was found only for the
female. The female demonstrating a neutral expression
(M=120.78) was seen as more powerful than the smiling male or female, and also more powerful than the male with a neutral expression (M=103.89). Thus, ratings of power for the female increased when she demonstrated a neutral expression as opposed to smiling, and decreased for the male. F(1, 170)= 5.669, p<.018.

**Hypothesis Two: Expertness.**

None of the hypothesized effects were obtained on ratings of expertness. Main effects and interactions for sex, smiling, and posture were predicted on expertness, but none were found.

**Hypothesis Three: Attractiveness.**

**Hypothesis 3a.** A main effect for sex on attractiveness was predicted. According to the attractiveness subscale, no main effect for sex of therapist F(1,164)= 3.209, n.s., or for posture F(1,164) = .008, n.s. was found on ratings of attractiveness.

A main effect was also hypothesized for smiling on ratings of attractiveness. Smiling stimulus persons were expected to be perceived as more attractive, and the results support this hypothesis. Smiling stimulus persons were perceived as more attractive (M=59.57) than neutral expressioned persons (M=50.52) F(1,164)=29.357, p<.001.

**Hypothesis 3b.** No significant results were found to support the expected interaction of sex and posture on attractiveness ratings. F(1,164)= 1.554, n.s.
Hypothesis 3c. Smiling and posture were expected to interact. While open posture was predicted to be perceived as more attractive than closed, the combination of open posture and smiling was expected to increase attractiveness ratings significantly above neutral expression and open posture. Again, no significant results were found for an interaction between smiling and posture $F(1,164)=.404$, n.s. However, when the additional variable of subject sex was included, analyses revealed a three-way interaction between smiling, posture, and subject sex. The hypothesis was only partly supported. Male subjects rated persons demonstrating open posture and neutral expression ($M=52.45$) as more attractive than those with closed posture and neutral expression ($M=48.55$). Males also rated smiling persons of either posture ($M=59.5$, closed and $M=58.74$, open) as more attractive than those with a neutral expression. Females' perceptions were similar only in that they saw smiling persons as more attractive than those with neutral expressions, regardless of posture. However, in contrast to male subjects, they viewed smiling persons with open posture ($M=61.64$) as more attractive than smiling persons with closed posture ($M=58.48$). Also in contrast to male subjects, females perceived persons demonstrating closed posture and neutral expression ($M=53.38$) as more attractive than those demonstrating open posture and neutral expression ($M=47.45$) $F(1,164)=4.193$, $p<.042$. 
Hypothesis 3d. An interaction was predicted for sex and smiling on attractiveness. While both therapists were expected to be seen as more attractive when they smiled, the effect was expected to be significantly greater for the male. However, although both therapists were perceived as more attractive when they smiled, the effect was greater for the female. The smiling female (M=59.17) was viewed as more attractive than the smiling male (M=58.76). Both smiling therapists were viewed as more attractive than the female (M=55.63) or male (M=46.09) demonstrating a neutral expression F(1,164)= 6.143, p<.014. The effect of neutral expression was greater for the male.

Hypothesis Four: Responsiveness

Main effects were expected for sex, smiling, and posture on responsiveness. Analyses revealed only a significant main effect for smiling on responsiveness. Smiling stimulus persons (M=125.69) were perceived as more responsive than stimulus persons demonstrating a neutral expression (M=111.39), thus supporting the hypothesis. F(1,172)=21.68, p< .001. No significant interactions were found for sex and posture F(1,172)= .633, n.s., smiling and posture F(1,172)= .643, n.s., or sex and smiling F(1,172)=2.506, n.s., on ratings of responsiveness.
Hypothesis Five: Trustworthiness

Main effects were hypothesized for the independent variables on ratings of trustworthiness. Only a main effect for smiling was revealed. As expected, analyses indicated that smiling stimulus persons (M=62.94) were perceived as more trustworthy than persons demonstrating a neutral expression (M=59.43) $F(1,173) = 4.759$, $p< .031$. Neither sex and posture $F(1,173)= .159$, n.s., nor expression and posture $F(1,173)= .139$, n.s., interacted on subject ratings of trustworthiness.

Discussion

Results of the present study were mixed. In some instances hypotheses received full support. Results only partially supported or contradicted other hypotheses. Conforming to the introduction of this paper, the results are discussed in sections on posture, smiling and sex differences.

Posture.--The results did not support the hypothesis that open posture would be perceived as more powerful and expert. McGinley, Le Fevre, and McGinley (1975) and McGinley, Nicholas, and McGinley (1978) conducted studies to determine if speakers were more powerful when they demonstrated open posture as opposed to closed or neutral posture. The earlier study found that speakers might be perceived as more powerful when demonstrating open posture.
However, the later research did not support this finding. This study produced significant effects for posture only in interaction with facial expression and subject sex. It could be that the open versus closed posture as manipulated here is less salient to observers than would be a combination of asymmetry and open posture.

According to the results, open posture affected ratings of attractiveness. This dimension may be related to affiliation. Open-arm position may in some way be perceived as affiliative and thus would be expected to affect ratings on associated dimensions like attractiveness. Perhaps this could be due to some perceived association between physical and attitudinal openness. Future research could systematically vary cues to these two types of openness and determine the contribution of each. There is less reason to assume that power and expertness would be perceived as affiliative behaviors.

Smiling.--The results indicate that facial expression may be a more salient nonverbal cue than the other independent variables included in this study. The results of the present study supported the hypotheses that smiling would decrease ratings of power, and increase ratings of attractiveness, responsiveness, and trustworthiness. This is not surprising in view of LaCrosse's (1975) finding that one of the most frequently noticed nonverbal cues is
smiling. These findings are complementary to those of Lau (1982) who found smiling to be associated with a positive evaluation. They are also in accord with Keating, Mazur, and Segall (1977) who found that nonsmilng models were described as more dominant or powerful. In this study smiling decreased ratings of power, and neutral expression increased ratings of power.

**Sex Differences.**--Differences in results due to gender were of two types. Effects for the sex of the therapist were tested as were effects due to the sex of subject. Only one main effect of therapist sex on ratings of power was found and this was in the opposite direction from the hypothesis. The remainder of the gender effects were found in interactions with other variables.

**Power.**--The results contradicted the hypothesis that the male therapist would receive higher ratings of power than the female, even when both were smiling. However, when the female therapist demonstrated a neutral expression, she received higher ratings of power than when she smiled, and higher ratings than the male therapist whether his expression was smiling or neutral. Surprisingly, ratings of power decreased for males when they demonstrated a neutral expression instead of smiling. This is somewhat at odds with the findings of Porter and Geis (1981) and Knapp (1978) who reported that women did not receive the same leadership
recognition as men when both presented identical nonverbal cues. Since leadership and power are related, the seeming difference in results are probably due to methodological differences. In the earlier research, the context was mixed sex groups. Here, the male or female was rated individually.

Parlee (1979) found that women who use nonverbal cues associated with high status (e.g., less smiling and less facial expressiveness) are perceived as having higher status. Present results indicated that females who did not smile, and instead demonstrated a neutral expression received higher ratings of power than females who smiled. However, Parlee found that males who smiled received higher evaluations on status characteristics than females. In contrast, in this study a female with a neutral expression received higher ratings of power than a male regardless of expression.

Pearson (1985) asserted that women lose power and effectiveness when they smile. Supporting that notion, this study found that smiling decreased power ratings; a smiling female was seen as less powerful than a nonsmiling female. However, the male gained power when he smiled. Overall, though, the male was still seen as less powerful than the smiling female.
Attractiveness.--Another example of partial support for one of the hypotheses involves the attractiveness ratings. Both males and females were expected to be seen as more attractive when they smiled, although the effect was expected to be greater for males. As expected, both therapists were perceived as more attractive when smiling. However, the effect was greater for the female. The smiling female was viewed as more attractive than the smiling male. Interestingly, the male therapist demonstrating a neutral expression was perceived as least attractive. Thus, the effect of neutral expression was greater for males.

Although there was agreement with Lau (1982) that smiling increased attractiveness ratings for both sexes. The results contradict Lau's finding that smiling increased attractiveness ratings more for the male than the female. Mehrabian (1968) found that subjects viewed females demonstrating open posture as communicating a more favorable attitude, but the same was not true when viewing males. This study yielded no significant main effects for posture. Nor was there a significant interaction between posture and sex of therapist.

A significant three-way interaction was found between smiling, posture, and subject sex. Open posture was predicted to be perceived as more attractive than closed, while the combination of open posture and smiling was
expected to increase attractiveness ratings significantly above neutral expression and open posture. Both male and female subjects saw smiling persons of either posture as more attractive than those demonstrating neutral expression. Male subjects tended to support the posture portion of the hypothesis in that they perceived persons demonstrating open posture and neutral expression as more attractive than those with closed posture and neutral expression. Female subjects supported the posture part of the hypothesis only when the therapist was smiling. Female subjects viewed smiling persons with open posture as more attractive than smiling persons with closed posture. However, female subjects perceived therapists demonstrating closed posture and neutral expression as more attractive than those demonstrating open posture and neutral expression. Thus, therapist expression significantly affected the ratings of female subjects. This may be related to Hall's (1978) finding that women tend to be more skilled at decoding nonverbal cues. It may be that open posture combined with neutral expression is more ambivalent to women than closed posture. Open posture may be contradicted by the neutral expression in some way. Male subjects perceived therapists demonstrating open posture and neutral expression as more attractive than closed posture and neutral expression. This may be due to males perceiving open posture as more accepting than closed posture.


**Smiling.**—Smiling or facial expression appears to be a salient nonverbal cue. More significant main effects and interactions were found involving facial expression than for any other independent variable (posture, therapist sex, or subject sex). For example, smiling significantly decreased ratings of power and increased ratings of attractiveness, responsiveness, and trustworthiness. Posture and sex of therapist or of subject were not as salient. It is possible that open versus closed posture is not as effective an indicator of differences on the dependent variables as asymmetrical versus closed or symmetrical posture.

Unexpectedly, effects concerning sex of therapist and of subjects were not strong. It is possible that perceived sex differences are not as great as assumed, at least regarding early impressions of counselors. Or, it may be that the differences between the two stimulus therapists were not great in spite of being different sexes. On choosing for similarity, the female may have appeared stronger in some way and the male gentler than is usual for studies of this type. This also may have interacted with the context in that counselors, regardless of sex, could be perceived to be as gentle as females often are. Further, the stimulus therapists were chosen from the pilot study specifically to be similar on attractiveness, warmth, and professionalism. Also, subjects tend to rate individuals of
the two sexes differently based on certain vocal characteristics (e.g., breathiness, tenseness, etc.; Knapp, 1978). It may be that when an individual of either sex attempts to put softness and gentleness into the voice and match someone of the other sex on rate of delivery and inflection, they are perceived similarly. The paraverbal similarity could have decreased any differences due to sex of stimulus, especially in the context of describing therapy. These three variables (vocal and physical characteristics and the counseling context) may have individually and in combination operated to decrease any sex difference that may usually exist. While sex differences exist in the literature, those differences are not exclusively associated with one sex or the other, but are in the characteristics that generally accompany each sex to validate the differing perceptions.

The sex differences that were obtained were frequently surprising. For example, higher ratings of power were attributed to the female even when both sexes were smiling. The female's neutral expression was perceived as more powerful than any other combination of therapist sex and facial expression. Although males gained power and females lost power when they smiled, smiling males received lower power ratings than females of either facial expression.
Another surprising result regarding sex differences was found for effects of facial expression on attractiveness. Therapists of both sexes were expected to be perceived as more attractive when they smiled with the effect greater for males. Instead, smiling females were seen as more attractive than smiling males. The female demonstrating a neutral expression was seen as more attractive than the male with a neutral expression. However, the smiling male was perceived as more attractive than the female demonstrating neutral expression. It seems that females may be regarded more positively than in previous studies. The reason for this is unclear. Since this is one of few studies on attributed power, further research should help clarify and explain these findings.

Further research is needed in the area of nonverbal cues and attributed power. Although many studies have been done on self-perceived power, very few have been done on attributed power. Most studies in the former area have addressed dominance more than power. It is a reasonable possibility that the created power scale in this study actually measured perceptions of status. Similarly, a study examining different perceptions of asymmetrical posture versus closed posture would be helpful for understanding perceptions of power. Although conceptually rather distinct, operationally, status and power are often
confounded in the literature. Later research should address the separation of these two variables. Future research should also try to determine what nonverbal cues are most effective for communicating power or responsiveness. Further examination of perceived sex differences for separate and combined nonverbal cues should also be considered.
Appendix A
Evaluation of Photograph Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture letter:</th>
<th>______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of evaluator:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix B

Audio Tape Script

Script

Therapy is very helpful and sometimes necessary. Most people can deal with the average ups and downs of everyday life. But sometimes our world is filled with just too many downs. When this happens some people need someone supportive and nonjudging to talk with. Someone who can act as a sounding board so they can get their life in order. Others will need someone to help them organize their lives and help them deal with all the changes. People may turn to therapy because their friends and family members are unable to help them. It may be that the problem concerns this friend or family member. Or this other person may be too involved, or too close. In addition, the person seeking help is too involved, or too close. In addition, the person seeking help is too wrapped up in their own problems to step back and look at it from a different angle. The therapist, being a neutral, unbiased person outside of the situation, can offer an objective perspective and can therefore be of assistance. Also, unlike a friend, the therapist's involvement with the person is solely for the individual's benefit. The therapist is there to listen to and help the individual.
Appendix B--Continued

Most clients enter therapy feeling pretty down about things. They have an ideal for themselves, but this ideal doesn't seem to match the person they are right now. This difference, between their ideal self and their real self leads to an overall uneasiness about their life. Frequently they find themselves unsure about who they are. At the start of therapy, the average person usually becomes more confused. But as therapy continues they start pulling things together. For therapy to progress it is important that they are open and willing to deal with their problems. As they explore themselves they usually develop a more realistic idea of who they want to become or they become more accepting of the person they are. When this occurs they are freed to investigate their relationships with others in their lives. They can then increase those situations and relationships that make them feel good. By doing this, they will become more sure of themselves and come to realize that they are in control of what happens in their life. This, in turn, will cause them to become less confused and uncertain about themselves and their place in life. For example, their fear of competing with others will decrease, and they will be less confused and nervous about life's values. In addition, they will become more effective in dealing with the day-to-day pressures of life and
problems of relating to other people. Eventually, the process of therapy will enable them to live their life relatively happily and productively.

Therapy can, of course, be of great assistance to those with more serious problems. Even mentally disabled individuals can benefit from this exchange with a trained professional. The emphasis may vary a bit depending on the problem and its severity, but the same basic approach is used. The goal, helping the individual, certainly remains the same. The important thing to remember is that almost everyone can benefit from therapy. Be it a serious all-consuming problem, or some on-going disagreeable situation, therapy can help in many ways. A recent hassle or just needing someone to talk to are perfectly good reasons to turn to a therapist.

Total time: 3 min. 30 sec.
Appendix C

Informed Consent Form

In the following pages you will be asked to describe, in your opinion, what you think of three different kinds of people. The three kinds of people you are asked to describe probably are not related in any way so try to think of each set of items separately. Also do not let yourself be influenced on one item by what you indicated in another item.

The purpose of this research is to refine three different scales so that they may be used in the future by myself (Dr. Marshall) and others. If you have any questions or want to know the results you may contact me at 565-2649, Room 105, Terrill Hall.

You are in no way required to complete these questionnaires. If you choose not to participate, just sign your name at the bottom of this page and turn in your blank or partially completed questionnaires. In that way, we can insure that you receive your extra credit. Do the same if you have already completed the questionnaire in another class. Since the informed consent forms will be in a pile separate from the questionnaires, no one will know whether you filled out the form or not. If you have an experimental card be sure to get it stamped.

You are asked some information about yourself. This is not so that we can identify you. It is so we can examine complete questionnaires are from different people. When you turn in your questionnaires, the experimenter will answer any questions you have.

NAME

DATE
Appendix D

Bipolar Adjective Scale measuring
Power and Responsiveness

Age       Sex

________________________

INSTRUCTIONS: In this questionnaire you are asked to
give your impression of the therapist. Each scale
below consists of a pair of characteristics.

EXAMPLE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
          hostile          friendly

If you think the therapist is quite hostile then circle
the 1. If you think the therapist is quite friendly
then circle the 7. If you think the therapist is
neither particularly friendly nor hostile, then circle
the 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constraining</td>
<td>loosening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checking</td>
<td>facilitating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not interfering</td>
<td>restraining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>expanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>limiting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attentive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>not attentive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>weak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>powerful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>compelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>not intimidating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>persuasive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>coercive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>enforcing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>not imposing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>freeing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>suppressing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling</td>
<td>not regulating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not confining</td>
<td>restricting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>rejecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberating</td>
<td>repressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enslaving</td>
<td>freeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td>bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meek</td>
<td>bold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high status</td>
<td>low status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yielding</td>
<td>insistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>forceful</td>
<td>spineless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>follower</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effective</td>
<td>ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taking</td>
<td>giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dominant</td>
<td>submissive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>potent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>impotent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>approachable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>not approachable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unassuming</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arrogant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>distant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>close</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>intelligent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dumb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dynamic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>static</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>foolish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>free</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>constrained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferocious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inferior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbitrary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compulsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not compulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follows rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privileged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not privileged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not persuasive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persuasive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncaring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Larsen and Minton's Dichotomous Power-Laden Adjectives

1) constraining-loosening
2) checking-facilitating
3) restraining-noninterfering
4) limiting-expanding
5) powerful-weak
6) compelling-noninterfering
7) coercive-persuasive
8) enforcing-nonimposing
9) suppressing-freeing
10) controlling-nonregulating
11) restricting-nonconfining
12) repressing-liberating
13) enslaving-freeing
14) arbitrary-reasonable
15) compulsive-noncompulsive
## Appendix F

### Table of Factor Loading

#### Power Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>follower-leader</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong-weak</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful-powerless</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive-not assertive</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forceful-spineless</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potent-impotent</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high status-low status</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important-unimportant</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent-incompetent</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep-shallow</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective-ineffective</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superior-inferior</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active-passive</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant-submissive</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful-unsuccessful</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellegant-dumb</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes rules-follows rules</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privileged-not privileged</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamic-static</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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bold-meek .588
wise-foolish .571
efficient-inefficient .555
persuasive-not persuasive .519
mature-immature .505
complex-simple .463
Appendix G

Table of Factor Loadings

Responsive Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kind-cruel</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant-unpleasant</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice-awful</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful-ferocious</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting-rejecting</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approachable-not approachable</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive-insensitive</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentle-harsh</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting-demanding</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approachable-distant</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair-unfair</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring-uncaring</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving-taking</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft-hard</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-bad</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative-competitive</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful-indifferent</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close-distant</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free-constrained</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Pair</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>responsive-not responsive</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unassuming-arrogant</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic-pessimistic</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested-bored</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yielding-insistent</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

The Counselor Rating Form

Age: __________
Sex: __________

Impression Ratings

INSTRUCTIONS: In this questionnaire you are asked to give your impression of the therapist you just listened to and viewed. Circle the number on each scale that most closely indicates your impression.

EXAMPLE OF SCALE:

unfair 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 fair

On the top of the next page is a seven point scale (See scale below.)

very accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 quite close
quite slightly related 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 neutral slightly related
slightly related close
Appendix H--Continued

If you feel that the adjective at one end of the scale is very accurate in describing your impression of the therapist, circle the 1 (unfair) or 7 (fair).

If you feel that the adjective at one end of the scale is quite close in describing your impression of the therapist, circle the 2 (somewhat unfair) or 6 (somewhat fair).

If you feel that the adjective at one end of the scale is only slightly related to your impression of the therapist, circle the 3 (slightly unfair) or 5 (slightly fair).

If you feel neutral, that is, both sides of the scale seem to describe your impression of the therapist equally, or if the adjectives are irrelevant, then circle number 4.

Work as quickly as you can without looking back and forth through your answers. Your first impression is the best answer.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very accurate</th>
<th>quite close</th>
<th>slightly related</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly related</th>
<th>quite close</th>
<th>very accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undependable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untrustworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unalert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indifferent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unprepared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insincere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexperienced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vague</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreeable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insightless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diffuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompatible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illogical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suspicious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikeable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straightforward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexpert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unreliable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I

**Table 1**

**Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson and Minton</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created</td>
<td>112.82</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>118.69</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>55.04</td>
<td>12.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

Pearson Correlation Between Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Created Power</th>
<th>Respons-iveness</th>
<th>Expert-iveness</th>
<th>Attract-iveness</th>
<th>Trustworth-iness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larson and Minton Power</td>
<td>-.1691</td>
<td>-.762</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>-.604</td>
<td>-.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Power</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td></td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level is <.01. No significance level is <.001 for the remaining correlations.
## Table 3

Nonparametric Correlation of Independent and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Arm Position</th>
<th>Therapist Sex</th>
<th>Subjec Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson and Minton Power</td>
<td>-.358¹</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Power</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.143²</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>.325¹</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>.345¹</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>.140²</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Significant at p<.001  
²Significant at p<.03
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