

## Chapter 12

# VERBAL AND NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION OF FACILITATIVE CONDITIONS

Donald T. Tepper, Jr., and Richard F. Haase

It is becoming increasingly apparent that nonverbal communication in the counseling process is of critical importance in furthering our understanding of the conditions under which counseling is effective. Within the past decade nonverbal communication has gained increasing prominence as an object of study; within the past 5 years the counseling literature has begun to reflect the importance of the *total* communication process to the texture and outcome of the counseling relationship. Defined in a rather broad fashion, nonverbal behaviors which have been demonstrated to have measurable impact on the counseling process include eye contact, trunk lean, distance, body orientation, movement, facial expression, vocal intonation, gestures, and selected features of the spatial environment (Broekman & Moller, 1973; Chaikin, Derlega, & Miller, 1976; Dinges & Oetting, 1972; Ekman & Friesen, 1968; Fretz, 1966; Graves & Robinson, 1976; Haase, 1970; Haase & DiMattia, 1970, 1976; Haase & Tepper, 1972; Hackney, 1974; LaCrosse, 1975; Lee, Zingle, Patterson, Ivey, & Haase, 1976; Smith, 1975; Stone & Morden, 1976; Strahan & Zytowski, 1976; Sweeney & Cottle, 1976. A comprehensive review of much of the evidence relating nonverbal behavior to counseling can be found in Gladstein (1974).

The evidence which relates directly to counseling, as well as the more general literature in nonverbal communication, suggests that there exists a delicate balance between the verbal and nonverbal channels of communication of affect and attitude. Haase and Tepper (1972) found that the ratio of nonverbal to verbal message variance was 2:1 in the judged communication of empathy. Mehrabian (1968) indicates that as much as 55% of the communicational significance of the message is nonverbal; similar ratios have been reported by Birdwhistell (1970) and Argyle, Alkema, and Gilmour (1971). It seems fairly clear that the balance between verbal and nonverbal cues in the communication process is critical for the perceived impact of the overall message. As early as 1965 Argyle and Dean demonstrated that shifting the balance between verbal and nonverbal channels alters the perception and the communicational significance of the message. Inasmuch as the counseling process is so heavily rooted in a complex communicational context, an understanding of the balance and interplay between verbal and nonverbal cues in the relationship becomes important.

Of the many variables which have received attention in the counseling literature, the facilitative conditions proposed by Rogers (1951, 1957) have achieved wide acceptance in counseling practice. These conditions have been noted to be essential to the quality of the relationship; research evidence suggests that helping relationships depend heavily on these conditions in myriad forms (Bergin & Garfield, 1971; Carkhuff, 1971). Haase and Tepper (1972) have shown that the communication of empathy is heavily dependent on the verbal message but not to the exclusion of the

nonverbal channels of communication. They demonstrated that even high-quality verbal emphatic messages are undermined by contradictory and inconsistent nonverbal cues. Fretz (1966) and Shapiro (1968) demonstrated that the communication of empathy is dependent on nonverbal as well as verbal communications. Graves and Robinson (1976) have shown that judged counselor genuineness is significantly less when verbal and nonverbal cues are inconsistent and that a behavioral outcome variable (proximity to the counselor) was also significantly affected by the inconsistency. With the exception of these studies, little work has been completed which is aimed at disentangling the relative contribution of verbal and nonverbal cues in the communication of the basic facilitative conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness (congruence).

The purpose of the present study was, therefore, (a) to replicate the earlier findings of Haase and Tepper (1972) with regard to the judged empathy of multichannel communication; (b) to extend multichannel research to the facilitative conditions of respect and genuineness; (c) to operationalize the nonverbal cues of vocal intonation and facial expression which have not received extensive attention in the counseling literature; and (d) to include a sample of actual clients as well as counselors as judges of communicated attitude in the study.

## Method

### *Subjects*

The two groups of subjects used in this study consisted of 15 male students in varying stages of counseling at the University of Massachusetts Counseling Center, who ranged from age 18 to 25 and represented a variety of presenting concerns, and 15 experienced male counselors (8 doctoral level and 7 doctoral level counselors in training) who represented several theoretical orientations. Only male subjects were used to avoid the inclusion of a sixth factor in the design and to control for a source of extraneous variance.

### *Stimulus Materials*

A videotape stimulus was especially designed for this study which consisted of 32 role-played interactions between an actor counselor and an actor client. Both the counselor and client were male and relatively unknown to most of the subject-judges. The interactions showed a full view of the counselor as seen across the shoulder of the client. The client's shoulder served as a spatial frame of reference from which the subjects judged the counselor's response to the client's statement.

The 32 stimulus interactions represented all combinations of two levels of trunk lean (forward-backward), two levels of eye contact (direct contact-no contact), two levels of vocal intonation (concerned-indifferent), two levels of facial expression (concerned-indifferent), and two levels of verbal message (high-low).

The operational definitions of trunk lean and eye contact were as follows: in the

backward-trunk-lean condition, the counselor leaned backward in a professional swivel chair with his hands on the arms of the chair, while in the forward condition he leaned forward with his arms on his legs. The counselor's body orientation was maintained facing toward the client in all stimulus interactions. In the eye-contact condition, the counselor looked directly at the client's eyes and in the no-eye-contact condition looked downward into his own lap.

To operationally define the three independent variables of vocal intonation, facial expression, and verbal message, three preliminary operations were performed. The first was to select the high- and low-level message. Using as a guide verbatim excerpts extracted from Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and Carkhuff and Berenson (1967), 30 interactions were formed which represented varying degrees of counselor-communicated core conditions of empathy, respect or positive regard, and genuineness. These excerpts, consisting of one client statement and one counselor response, were mimeographed on four sheets of paper and given in random sequence to a group of counselors and counselors in training for judging. Each judge was given a booklet of statements and a criterion sheet which briefly described the dimension of empathy and positive regard and also the scale point identifications for judging the level of each. Each statement was judged according to a 5-point scale taken from Carkhuff (1969) for its level of emphatic understanding and also for its level of positive regard or respect shown for the client. The statements were not judged for genuineness because genuineness is defined as the congruence between at least two simultaneous cues only one of which (the verbal message) was present at this stage. There was at least a 1-day separation between the judging of empathy and the judging of positive regard, so as to reduce criterion contamination.

Two levels of verbal message were used in this study.<sup>1</sup> The statement which was most consistently judged highest for both empathy and positive regard and also one which was judged lowest in empathy and positive regard served as the two levels of the verbal message independent factor.

Determining the operational definitions for the vocal intonation and facial expression variables was somewhat more complicated. For the purpose of this study, an appropriate nonverbal intonational and facial response to a client utterance signifying depression was chosen and defined as that which conveys an understanding of and a concern for perceived client depression. The polar opposite of concern was defined as indifference; these two ends of the continuum defined the two levels of vocal intonation and facial expression.

Determination of the two levels of intonation was accomplished by having the counselor recite both the high- and the low-level message into a tape recorder. He was instructed to vary his intonational pattern (rate, pitch, volume, etc.) while attempting to convey varying levels of concern and indifference. These coded excerpts were rated by a group of adults according to 5-point, Likert type scale along an indifference-concern continuum for level of communicated concern. The judges were instructed to make their ratings on the basis of intonation only. Two statements were selected from the high-verbal-statement group (one with concerned intonation and one with indifferent intonation) and two statements from the low-verbal-statement group (one concerned and one indifferent). The concerned intonation was

---

<sup>1</sup>A Thurstone Equal Appearing Intervals Technique (Edwards, 1957) was used to scale and select all high and low levels of the independent factors.

characterized by soft, low tones and slow rhythm, while the indifferent intonation was harsher, higher pitched, and faster paced. These selected combinations of verbal message and vocal intonation were then retrieved from the coded master tape for later use in preparation of the stimulus videotape.

Facial expression was operationally defined by making 36 photographs of the counselor's face as he attempted to convey feelings from indifference to concern. An effort was made to vary the furrow of the brow, the pitch of the eyebrow, and the position of the cheekbone, since these facial features were believed through experience to convey concern (Darwin, 1872; Ekman, 1973). The photographs were then coded and judged by a group of adults along a 5-point Likert type scale for communicated concern and both a concerned and an indifferent facial expression were selected for duplication in the stimulus videotape. A concerned facial expression was characterized by a furrowed brow and lowered eyebrows, while the indifferent expression was typically bland and without meaningful contortion.

Employing these operational definitions for the two levels of each of the five independent variables, the stimulus tape was produced by seating the counselor in a swivel tilt armchair opposite the client at a distance of 55 in (140 cm). This distance was chosen because Kelly (1972) concluded that "closer distances (36") communicate positive counselor regard, while middle (55") and far (72") interactional distances tend to convey neutral and negative evaluative counselor feelings respectively" (p. 345). In order not to bias the stimulus communications, the neutral distance of 55 in (140 cm) was chosen.

For each of the 32 interaction conditions, a card was made which indicated the combination of independent variables for that particular interaction. The counselor was instructed to position himself according to the designated conditions listed on the reference card. For example, the instructions on one card were for the counselor to lean forward, maintain eye contact, speak a low-level message, and use an indifferent intonation while showing a concerned facial expression. The master audiotape recorder holding the appropriate verbal message-vocal intonation combinations (described earlier) was started simultaneously with the videotape recorder. The counselor timed his lip response to coincide with the audio portion which was dubbed directly onto the videotape. In this way, only the four segments which were previously judged to be concerned or indifferent intonation and high and low statements were recorded onto the stimulus tape. The 32 interactions were recorded onto four tapes of 8 interactions each to provide for random presentation to the judges.

### *Procedure*

Each of the 30 judges was shown the stimulus videotape either alone or with 1 other subject in a small room which was free from distractions. The subjects were seated behind a small desk about 4 ft (122 cm) from the television monitor and provided with pencils, answer sheet, and the appropriate instruction sheet for the dependent measure being judged. The four sets of 8 interactions each were then randomly presented to the subjects who made their ratings directly on a Digitek answer sheet. Each subject rated all 32 interactions on all three dependent measures (empathy, respect, and genuineness) one dependent measure at a time with at least 1 and not

more than 7 days between each rating. The order of rating the dependent measures was randomized for each subject.

All subjects were given instructions to make their judgments according to a 5-point scale taken from Carkhuff (1969) on the basis of brief descriptions of empathy, positive regard, and genuineness found in Carkhuff and Berenson (1967). The descriptions were written so that persons without previous knowledge of the technical terms would be able to make judgments easily. They were instructed to make the ratings according to their feeling about the attitude communicated by the counselor.

### *Design*

Each of the three dependent variables of judged empathy, respect, and genuineness were evaluated by a  $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$  analysis of variance design with repeated measures on five factors. This design had one between-subjects factor (group) with two levels (counselors and clients) and five within-subjects factors. The within-subjects factors all had two levels and consisted of trunk lean (forward-backward), eye contact (direct contact-no contact), vocal intonation (concerned-indifferent), facial expression (concerned-indifferent), and verbal message (high-low).

A repeated measures design was chosen in this study for several reasons, chief among which is the efficiency of the design relative to the number of subjects required. Although only 15 subjects in each group were employed, the design actually yields 960 individual observations. To attempt to reproduce this design as a completely randomized analysis of variance is prohibitive. Moreover, a completely randomized design cannot control for intersubject variance which is a major source of error. A repeated measures design, by its very nature, eliminates this source of variation from the error terms involved and therefore increases the power of the  $F$  tests involved. It should also be noted that each subject therefore responded to 32 videotaped segments, each of which differed only by the dictates of the levels of each factor described earlier. Hence a certain amount of redundancy and carryover effect must be expected. It was for this reason that the additional precaution of randomizing the presentation of segments of stimulus materials was instituted in this study. Any carryover effect which might occur would at least, in this case, be equally distributed across all conditions and might lower the overall level of the effect measured, but would not differentially affect comparisons between factors within the design (Winer, 1972). In addition to the usual analysis of variance, variance components were calculated following a procedure outlined by Vaughn and Corballis (1969).

### *Results*

The Results section has been divided in separate sections for each of the three facilitative conditions. Main and interaction effects for each analysis are further separated to emphasize the multichannel nature of the communication studied here.

### *Empathy*

Five of the six main effects achieved statistical significance for the dependent variable of empathic communication. The effects of trunk lean,  $F(1, 28) = 63.14, p < .001$ , eye contact,  $F(1, 28) = 79.35, p < .001$ , vocal intonation,  $F(1, 28) = 21.13, p < .001$ , facial expression,  $F(1, 28) = 96.55, p < .001$ , and verbal message,  $F(1, 28) = 86.18, p < .001$ , all proved to be highly potent in accounting for variability in the judged quality of the empathic communication. There were no overall differences between counselors' and clients' judgments of the videotaped interactions,  $F(1, 28) = 2.14$ . Calculated variance components reveal that the effect sizes of the variables included in this study were sizable. Facial expression accounted for 26.01% of the variability in judged empathy, followed by the verbal message (16.94%), eye contact (6.03%), trunk lean (3.14%), and vocal intonation (1.14%). The calculation of variance components reveals that even a highly statistically significant effect such as vocal intonation can actually account for a relatively minor portion of the variance in the response variate. Considering only the main effects, the nonverbal cues which were included accounted for over two times the variability in judged empathy accounted for by the verbal message alone.

In addition to the significant main effects, 14 of the interactions tested in this factorial arrangement also reached statistical significance. The complexity of the communicational value of empathy is reflected in the fact that all of the main effects are involved in at least 1 of these interactions, which must alter the outright interpretation of the main effects as independent entities.

Five of the 14 significant interactions in the judgment of empathy suggested that counselors and clients perceive the relative contribution of verbal and nonverbal cues differentially. The first-order Group  $\times$  Eye Contact interaction,  $F(1, 28) = 6.84, p < .05, \theta^2 = .81\%$ , reflects a greater judged difference between conditions of eye contact and no-eye contact for the clients than was the case for the counselors. While both groups judged the no-eye-contact condition about equally, the clients gave a higher judgment of empathy in the condition of eye contact than the counselors. The Group  $\times$  Vocal Intonation interaction showed a similar pattern, but is superseded by a higher order interaction involving groups, vocal intonation, and facial expression,  $F(1, 28) = 14.65, p < .001, \theta^2 = .92\%$ . This interaction reveals that the counselors perceived relatively equal differences between concerned and indifferent facial expressions, and these were distributed as generally higher judgments under conditions of concerned intonation than under conditions of indifferent intonation. The meaning of the interaction is within the client group who perceived little difference between concerned and indifferent facial expressions at both levels of intonation, but who judged the concerned face–concerned intonation combination higher than the concerned face–indifferent intonation. This judgment was also higher than the counselors offered at both levels of intonation. The clients were apparently more influenced by the congruent presence of cues in this interaction.

A significant Group  $\times$  Facial Expression  $\times$  Verbal Message interaction revealed similar differences between counselors and clients,  $F(1, 28) = 5.97, p < .05, \theta^2 = 1.18\%$ . The general pattern of this interaction suggests that the counselors were more influenced by the nature of the verbal message, while the clients seemed to base their judgments more on the basis of the nonverbal cues in the message. The key point of difference is within the high-verbal message wherein the clients assigned a

greater discrepancy between conditions of concerned and indifferent facial expression than did the counselors.

Two first-order interactions involving Trunk Lean  $\times$  Facial Expression,  $F(1, 28) = 18.78$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\theta^2 = 1.11\%$ , and Vocal Intonation  $\times$  Facial Expression,  $F(1, 28) = 17.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\theta^2 = .78\%$ , reflect a frequent finding in nonverbal communication literature, that is, one which might be called an additive model in which congruent pairs of stimuli produce higher ratings than pairs of cues which are opposed. In both of these interactions, empathy was judged higher when each of the cues was paired in the high or positive direction, followed sequentially by successively lower judgments of empathy.

### *Respect*

For the dependent variable of respect, five main effects and 22 interactions reached at least the .05 level of significance. The main effects and the more salient interactions are reviewed here.

With the exception of the group factor, all other main effects representing the nonverbal and verbal cues in the paradigm showed significant influence on the judgment of respect or positive regard. These significant effects included forward trunk lean,  $F(1, 28) = 72.97$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\theta^2 = 3.21\%$ , maintaining eye contact,  $F(1, 28) = 107.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\theta^2 = 6.95\%$ , concerned vocal intonation,  $F(1, 28) = 10.12$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\theta^2 = .32\%$ , concerned facial expression,  $F(1, 28) = 278.91$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\theta^2 = 39.62\%$ , and a high level of verbal message,  $F(1, 28) = 77.68$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\theta^2 = 9.62\%$ . Clearly the most potent independent cue in the judgment of respect is facial expression, accounting for two fifths of the variance in the judgments and two thirds of the variability accounted for by the main effects. The rank order of the importance of the main effects is identical to that found for the dependent judgment of empathy. Considered independently, maintaining a high-verbal message, direct eye contact, concerned vocal intonation, concerned facial expression, and a forward trunk lean all add to the increased perception of respect or positive regard in two-person encounters.

The main effects and their impact are altered by the numerous interactions among them occurring in this study. Counselor and client groups were involved in two of the interactions, one third-order and a second-order interaction involving groups, facial expression, and verbal message,  $F(1, 28) = 5.06$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\theta^2 = 1.18\%$ . This interaction reveals that counselors' and clients' judgments are almost parallel in every respect except for the High Message  $\times$  Indifferent Facial Expression interaction in which the clients tend to assign higher judgments of respect than do the counselors. Counselors apparently discount the impact of the verbal message under indifferent facial expression more than do the clients who are giving greater weight in the judgment to the verbal message.

Among the more noteworthy interactions (i.e.,  $\theta^2 > 1.00\%$ ), all of the verbal and nonverbal cues are represented; the pattern of the interactions is highly consistent with the additive model, that is, congruence between levels of the cues produces the highest judged levels of respect, while incongruence renders judgments that are perceived as communicating significantly less respect. The interactions of Trunk Lean  $\times$  Facial Expression,  $F(1, 28) = 17.93$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\theta^2 = 1.07\%$ , Eye Contact  $\times$  Facial

Expression,  $F(1, 28) = 17.72, p < .001, \theta^2 = 1.50\%$ , Vocal Intonation  $\times$  Facial Expression,  $F(1, 28) = 16.69, p < .001, \theta^2 = 1.25\%$ , and Verbal Message  $\times$  Facial Expression,  $F(1, 28) = 9.19, p < .01, \theta^2 = 1.18\%$ , all reflect the additive nature of these combinations of cues. It is notable that the facial expression is involved in each of these interactions, reflecting its power as a cue in the judgment of respect.

### *Genuineness*

The analysis of variance for the dependent variable of genuineness yielded four significant main effects and nine significant interactions. Significant main effects were found for trunk lean,  $F(1, 28) = 27.58, p < .001, \theta^2 = 2.47\%$ , eye contact,  $F(1, 28) = 90.43, p < .001, \theta^2 = 11.06\%$ , vocal intonation,  $F(1, 28) = 18.58, p < .001, \theta^2 = 1.25\%$ , and facial expression,  $F(1, 28) = 25.79, p < .001, \theta^2 = 9.16\%$ . The main effect for verbal message was not significant and accounted for none of the judged level of genuineness of the message,  $F(1, 28) = .09, \theta^2 = .00\%$ .

Among the most important and significant interactions accounting for variability in the judgments of genuineness was the Facial Expression  $\times$  Verbal Message interaction,  $F(1, 28) = 16.34, p < .001, \theta^2 = 6.19\%$ . The essence of this interaction lies in the difference between concerned and indifferent facial expressions at the level of high-verbal message. Under this condition the concerned facial expression clearly amplifies the judgment of genuineness and indifferent facial expressions suppress it. At the low-verbal message, the difference between concerned and indifferent facial expressions is less pronounced, while the level of the judgment for both of these conditions is below that of the optimum combination. Even under conditions of low-verbal message a concerned facial expression raises the judgment of genuineness, but not to the degree that is observed under conditions of high-verbal message.

Several statistically and practically significant interactions were found in the judgment of genuineness which involved the group differences between counselors and clients. The Group  $\times$  Verbal Message interaction,  $F(1, 28) = 19.82, p < .001, \theta^2 = 6.65\%$ , is explained by the clients tending to be more discriminating about the level of genuineness communicated by the verbal message than the counselors. The judgment of the counselors was approximately equal for both high- and low-verbal message, while the clients assigned a greater degree of genuineness to the high- than to the low-verbal message. This is paralleled by a Group  $\times$  Facial Expression  $\times$  Verbal Message interaction,  $F(1, 28) = 7.56, p < .05, \theta^2 = 1.50\%$ , which reveals that the counselors and clients discriminate levels of judged empathy in accord with expectations when concerned and indifferent facial expressions occur simultaneously with high-verbal messages. With the low-verbal message, however, counselors rated the concerned and indifferent facial expression equally, while the clients discriminated in the expected direction for concerned and indifferent facial expressions. The clients apparently were more responsive to the various combinations of cues, especially in the low-message condition, than were the counselors.

A similar pattern is revealed between counselors and clients in the Group  $\times$  Eye Contact  $\times$  Vocal Intonation interaction,  $F(1, 28) = 6.69, p < .05, \theta^2 = 1.29\%$ . Finally, group differences in the judgment of genuineness were revealed in a third-order Group  $\times$  Eye Contact  $\times$  Vocal Intonation  $\times$  Verbal Message interaction, which is not interpreted here.



Overall, the main effects and interaction effects in this study accounted for 68%, 84%, and 68% of the total variability in the judgments of empathy, respect, and genuineness, respectively. For the dependent variables of empathy and respect the main effects accounted for more variability as a group than did the interactions. However, in the ratings of genuineness, the interactions proved to account for greater variability than the main effects.<sup>2</sup>

## Discussion

The results of the analyses presented here clearly substantiate that complex combinations of verbal and nonverbal cues play an important role in the determination of perceived levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness. The major contribution of this study reflects the following: (a) the overwhelming importance of nonverbal cues in the communication process, and especially the factorial complexity of combinations of verbal and nonverbal cues; (b) the extension of nonverbal communication research beyond empathy to include the important facilitative constructs of respect and genuineness; (c) the inclusion of the nonverbal cues of vocal intonation and facial expression which have not received attention in the counseling literature; and (d) the inclusion of both clients and counselors as judges of the facilitative conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness.

The importance of nonverbal cues to the eventual judged level of empathy, respect, and genuineness cannot be overemphasized. With respect to each of these dependent variables, the results of this study clearly indicate that the nonverbal cues play a dominant role in the determination of message significance. Considering only the main effects, the ratios of nonverbal to verbal variance were 2:1 for empathy, 5:1 for respect, and 23:1 for genuineness. These figures compare favorably to similar ratios reported in the literature (Argyle et al., 1971; Haase & Tepper, 1972; Mehrabian, 1968). In the case of genuineness, the ratio reflects the overwhelming importance of the nonverbal cues.

Of even more importance, however, is that the cues manipulated in this study clearly operate as a *system* and depend heavily on the relative balance between the cues in terms of the message which is ultimately perceived. The sheer number and character of the interactions found in this study support the conceptualization of the communication process as a multichannel process. To continue to perform research which systematically manipulates only one cue within the context of what we now know to be a factorially complex transaction can only serve to cloud our understanding of the communication process in counseling.

The study described here has extended a more factorially complex perspective to the study of respect and genuineness in addition to empathy. With the exception of Graves and Robinson (1976) and Smith-Hanen (1977), few studies have focused on these two important dimensions of counseling relationship effectiveness. The results of the study regarding respect again indicate that the judgments of respect communicated in two-person encounters are dependent upon a delicate balance of the cues in the situation—verbal and nonverbal. All of the main effects studied

---

<sup>2</sup>Copies of the complete analysis of variance tables, means, and standard deviations are available on request from the first author.

entered into an interaction dictating the levels of judged respect. In general, all of these interactions were of the additive nature, that is, an interaction wherein positive combinations of cues resulted in the highest judged levels of respect, negative combinations of cues resulted in the lowest judgments, and the positive-negative combination of cues resulted in midlevel judgments. Such interactions have been found to be common (Graves & Robinson, 1976; Haase & Tepper, 1972; Kelly, 1972; Smith, 1975) and attest to the balancing quality of cues in multichannel communications.

With regard to the judgment of respect, it is notable that the facial expression cue played such a dominant role. Obviously a tremendous amount of the judgment of respect is made by employing the facial expression as a sort of benchmark in the decoding process. The additive model of the interactions for respect also played a key role in the results of judged empathy in this study.

The results of the judgment of genuineness are interesting from a number of perspectives. First, the complete absence of impact due to the verbal message main effect is revealing ( $\theta^2 = .00\%$ ). All the nonverbal cues in the design accounted individually for some portion of the variability in the judgments of genuineness, ranging from 1.25% to 11.06%. That the verbal message as an individual entity accounted for none of this message variance suggests that it is the least powerful of the cues for communicating a condition of genuineness on the part of the counselor. To discount the role of the verbal message altogether is not possible, as this cue entered into several significant interactions with other cues in the paradigm. Nonetheless, the fact that judges were able to make some discrimination in their own minds about genuineness on the basis of the nonverbal cues and were not able to do so with the verbal message is a finding worthy of further more refined research. The Facial Expression  $\times$  Verbal Message interaction is an apt illustration. In this case it appears that the verbal message serves as somewhat of an anchor point which cues from the second channel altered the decoded message in the expected direction. We chose to call the verbal message the anchor point, because even under conditions of low-verbal message the concerned facial expression is capable of raising the judged level of genuineness above the double negative combination. Furthermore, the Group  $\times$  Verbal Message  $\times$  Facial Expression interaction reveals that clients tended to be more responsive to the entire range of cues presented in making their judgments of genuineness than were the counselors. This phenomenon could possibly be due to the level of sophistication of the counselors, both about the constructs under examination and about the role of nonverbal cues in the communication process.

Although no significant main effects were detected in this study between counselors and clients, the presence of several significant interactions involving the group factor was detected—indicating that counselors and clients did indeed differ in response tendency and that these differences are dependent upon the presence or absence of additional conditions, namely, the verbal and nonverbal cues examined in this study. The presence of significant interactions clearly vitiates the meaningfulness of the preceding main effects (whether significant or not). That counselors and clients did differ significantly under certain other conditions in their judgments of empathy, respect, and genuineness raises an important issue. The issue centers around the fact that in any style of counseling which demands these core conditions for effectiveness, the conditions must be perceived by the client to be maximally effective. Previous research has suggested that clients and counselors often do not perceive these con-

ditions in the same way (Caracena & Vicory, 1969; Hansen, Moore, & Carkhuff, 1968). The data presented in this study lead to the same conclusion, but help to clarify some of the other cues in the multichannel communication process which may begin to explain the basis of these differences between counselor and client perception of facilitative conditions.

In a similar vein, Sweeney and Cottle (1976) reported no differences between a group of counselors and noncounselors in terms of their nonverbal acuity, but their noncounselor group employed a group of graduate students in a noncounseling discipline. The results of the study reported here employed clients not confederates.

The differences which were found between counselors and clients in this study were across all three of the dependent variables. In general the interactions involving groups in this study seem to reflect a greater range of usage of all the cues present by the clients than by the counselors. The range of judgments was greater for the clients in the majority of the interactions. These findings are similar to those presented by Lee et al. (1976), who also found client-counselor differences, but with respect to the judgment of counselor effectiveness. It is difficult to attach substantive meaning to the client-counselor differences found in this study beyond recognizing that differences in perception occur with some degree of regularity and that the principal factor to which this difference is attached is the role differentiation between the groups. It is impossible to speak of which set of perceptions is more accurate, since standards of accuracy against some external, and operationally well defined, criterion do not exist. Smith (1975) is one of the few authors who has attempted to grapple with this problem of definition of standards of judgment in the context of multichannel research in the counseling process. Nonetheless, the client-counselor differences found in this study cannot be ignored in future research or the development of training models in nonverbal communication. These differences may ultimately mean the difference between perceived and ignored facilitative conditions.

Finally, the present study has studied two additional nonverbal cues which have not appeared frequently in the counseling literature and which were operationalized in a fashion which has directly interpretable consequences for counseling encounter (Strahan & Zytowski, 1976). The cues of vocal intonation and facial expression proved significant contributors to the results of this study. The facial expression stimulus was especially powerful as a determinant of message variance in the judgment of facilitative conditions. The findings that the independent contribution of the facial expression main effect accounted for 26% and 40% of the message variance in the judgment of empathy and respect indicates the almost unbelievable power of the facial expression in the communication process (see also Hackney, 1974). The role of facial expression should prove a fruitful area of further research in the counseling process and the communication of emotion. New models for the study of facial expression which are being developed (Ekman & Friesen, 1976) have great implications for their application in the study of how individuals interact under the rather specialized social rules of the counseling interview. Other nonverbal cues are similarly important in the study of these specialized communication settings. Aside from the specific results presented here and elsewhere in the counseling literature in the past 5 years, the incontrovertible importance of studying the communication process in a multichannel, factorially complex fashion is paramount. At the present time, there are limits to this activity. However, as our hypotheses become more

sophisticated and our research tools expand to meet this sophistication, the pace of our understanding should quicken commensurately.

### References

- Argyle, M., Alkema, G., & Gilmour, R. The communication of friendly and hostile attitudes by verbal and non-verbal signals. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1971, *1*, 385–402.
- Argyle, M., & Dean, J. Eye contact, distance and affiliation. *Sociometry*, 1965, *28*, 289–304.
- Bergin, A. E., & Garfield, S. L. *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Birdwhistell, R. *Kinetics in context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.
- Broekman, N. C., & Moller, A. T. Preferred seating position and distance in various situations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1973, *20*, 504–508.
- Caracena, P. F., & Vicory, J. R. Correlates of phenomenological and judged empathy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1969, *16*, 510–515.
- Carkhuff, R. R. *Helping and human relations* (Vol. 2). New York; Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Carkhuff, R. R. *The development of human resources*. New York; Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. *Beyond counseling and therapy*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.
- Chaikin, A. L., Derlega, V. J., & Miller, S. J. Effects of room environment on self-disclosure in a counseling analogue. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, *23*, 479–481.
- Darwin, C. *The expression of emotion in man and animals*. London, England: Murray, 1872.
- Dinges, N., & Oetting, E. R. Interaction distance anxiety in the counseling dyad. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1972, *19*, 146–149.
- Edwards, A. L. *Techniques of attitude scale construction*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
- Ekman, P. *Darwin and facial expression*. New York: Academic Press, 1973.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. Nonverbal behavior in psychotherapy research. In J. M. Schlien (Ed.), *Research in psychotherapy* (Vol. 3). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1968.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. Measuring facial movement. *Environmental Psychology and Nonverbal Behavior*, 1976, *1*, 56–75.
- Fretz, B. R. Postural movements in a counseling dyad. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1966, *13*, 335–343.
- Gladstein, G. A. Nonverbal communication and counseling/psychotherapy. *Counseling Psychologist*, 1974, *4*, 35–57.
- Graves, J. R., & Robinson, J. D. Proxemic behavior as a function of inconsistent verbal and nonverbal messages. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, *23*, 333–338.
- Haase, R. F. The relationship of sex and instructional set to the regulation of interpersonal distance in a counseling analogue. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1970, *17*, 233–236.
- Haase, R. F., & DiMattia, D. J. Proxemic behavior: Counselor administrator and client preferences for seating arrangement in dyadic interaction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1970, *17*, 319–325.
- Haase, R. F., & DiMattia, D. J. Spatial environments and verbal conditioning in a quasi-counseling interview. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, *23*, 414–421.
- Haase, R. F., & Tepper, D. T. Nonverbal components of empathic communication. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1972, *19*, 417–426.

- Hackney, H. Facial gestures and subject expression of feelings. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1974, 21, 173-178.
- Hansen, J. E., Moore, C. D., & Carkhuff, R. R. The differential relationship of objective and client perceptions of counseling. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1968, 24, 244-246.
- Kelly, F. D. Communicational significance of therapist proxemic cues. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1972, 39, 345.
- LaCrosse, M. B. Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor attractiveness. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1975, 22, 563-566.
- Lee, D. Y., Zingle, H., Patterson, J., Ivey, A. E., & Haase, R. F. Development and validation of the Microcounseling Skill Discrimination Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, 23, 468-472.
- Mehrabian, A. E. Communication without words. *Psychology Today*, 1968, 2, 52-56.
- Rogers, C. R. *Client-centered therapy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1957, 22, 95-103.
- Shapiro, J. Relationships between visual and auditory cues of therapeutic effectiveness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1968, 24, 236-239.
- Smith, C. W. *Counselor perception of anger: Verbal and nonverbal cues*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1975.
- Smith-Hanen, S. S. Effects of nonverbal behaviors on judged levels of counselor warmth and empathy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1977, 24, 87-91.
- Stone, G. L., & Morden, C. J. Effect of distance on verbal productivity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, 23, 486-488.
- Strahan, C., & Zytowski, D. G. Impact of visual, vocal and lexical cues on judgments of counselor qualities. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, 23, 387-393.
- Sweeney, M. A., & Cottle, W. C. Nonverbal acuity: A comparison of counselors and non-counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1976, 23, 394-397.
- Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. *Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.
- Vaughn, G. M., & Corballis, M. C. Beyond tests of significance: Estimating strength of effects in selected ANOVA designs. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1969, 72, 204-213.
- Winer, B. J. *Statistical principles in experimental design*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.