

COUNSELOR-SUBJECT RAPPORT: EFFECT ON YOUTHFUL
OFFENDER'S SELF-REPORT OF BODY IMAGE

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY
PATRICIA ANN GREEN, B.A.

DENTON, TEXAS
DECEMBER, 1981

The Graduate School
Texas Woman's University
Denton, Texas

November 13, 19 81

We hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under

our supervision by Patricia Ann Green

entitled "Counselor-subject Rapport: Effect on Youthful

Offender's Self-report of Body Image"

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	iv
Chapter	
Introduction	1
Method	11
Participants	11
Instruments	11
Counselor Rating Form	11
Body Parts Rating Scale	12
Procedure	12
Results	17
Discussion	20
Tables	29
Appendix A	36
Appendix B	39
Appendix C	45
References	48

List of Tables

Table		Page
I.	Means and Standard Deviations of Measures of Counselor-subject Rapport by Rapport Group	29
II.	Means and Standard Deviations of Measures of Subject's Satisfaction with Body Parts by Rapport Group	29
III.	ANOVA of Mean Counselor-subject Rapport Ratings by Rapport Groups	30
IV.	ANOVA of Mean Satisfaction with Body Parts Ratings by Rapport Groups	30
V.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between Measures of Counselor-subject Rapport and Measures of Subject's Satisfaction with Body Parts	31
VI.	Means and Standard Deviations of Body Part Items by Group	32
VII.	Means and Standard Deviations of Counselor-subject Rapport Items by Group	34

Counselor-subject Rapport: Effect on Youthful
Offender's Self-report of Body Image

Although the term "rapport" has become a household word in the behavioral sciences, and although most of us in the field assume that we know what is meant by it and also that we are all in reasonable agreement as to its meaning, one quickly discovers, in reviewing the literature, that few of us really know what it is or how to define it. The scarcity of empirical or scientific research which deals directly with rapport attests to the validity of the previous statement. Some theoreticians and researchers avoid defining it but offer various criteria for its establishment and its recognition. Egan (1975) first lists the criteria for knowing whether or not rapport has been established:

The client comes to see him as an expert in some sense of that term, for he sees the counselor responding helpfully; he learns to trust him, for the counselor is acting in a way that engenders trust; and, generally speaking, he is attracted to the helper, for he sees him as an ally, a person he can respect, one who can help

him find his way out of the problems besetting him. In a word, the skillful counselor establishes good rapport. (p. 36)

Then he lists the steps that the counselor must take if he is to establish it:

He does so by presenting himself for what he is (or should be): an effectively living person who sincerely wants to help. Such a helper engages in a social-influence process in that he becomes a collaborator with the client in the latter's attempts to rid himself of his misery and live more effectively. (p. 36)

In empirical or scientific study, the researcher often avoids a general definition and offers only the operational definition such as "a subject attitude toward the interviewer measurable by the Semantic Differential" (Ullman, Bowen, Greenber, Machperson, Marcum, Marx, & May, 1968, p. 355). In a discussion of the unstructured research interview Stebbins (1972) states:

Rapport is essentially a subjective condition which, if successfully established, threatens objectivity....It is concluded that validity in this type of interview is increased, not by pursuing objectivity, but by pursuing

subjectivity. (p. 164)

It appears that there is no standard definition. One group of researchers, in regard to this situation, stated:

Like all too many words in psychology, the frequency with which 'rapport' is used is matched only by the variety of its definitions and the paucity of relevant experimental data. (Ullman, et al., 1968, p. 355)

Considering all the factors which are encompassed by the concept of counselor-client or experimenter-subject rapport, it is not surprising that theoreticians and researchers have found it difficult to offer a concise, meaningful, standard definition which is suitable for all purposes. The present study will use the operational definition offered by Ullman, et al. (1968): "a subject attitude toward the interviewer measurable by the Semantic Differential". (p. 355)

Rapport, or some component of it, has been cited on numerous occasions as being a factor to be considered in assessment of the nature and extent of the self-disclosures made by subjects to experimenters. Self-disclosure is generally defined as "any information about himself which Person A communicates verbally to a Person B"

(Cozby, 1973, p. 73).

Powell (1968) reported that subjects disclose more if the interviewer responds with open disclosure to the subject's self-references. When the interviewer used approval-supportive or reflection-restatement techniques, subjects disclose to a lesser extent. However, Vondracek (1969) reported that a probing interviewer is able to elicit more disclosures than a reflecting or disclosing interviewer.

Jourard and Friedman (1970) found that experimenters who disclose are rated as more trustworthy and more positively in general. They found that these experimenters are also able to elicit more disclosures from subjects. Jourard and Kormann (1968) demonstrated that subjects who receive disclosures from the experimenter change their responses on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. This finding suggests that the nature of the subject's responses in experimental situations may be affected by the experimenter's disclosures. The duration of the experimenter's disclosures has been shown to be a factor influencing the length or time factor involved in subjects disclosures (Jourard & Jaffe, 1970). Jourard and Kormann (1968) refer to the interaction between experimenter and subject as the "dyadic effect" when subjects

disclose more about themselves to an experimenter who is equally disclosing.

Merluzzi and Banikiotes (1978) found that subjects rated low-disclosing counselors higher in trustworthiness than high-disclosing counselors but noted that the counselors' disclosures were extreme and may have been deemed inappropriate by the subjects. These researchers also reported that the perceived expertness and attractiveness of the experimenter can influence the subject's willingness to disclose.

Jourard (1969) argues that honesty on the part of subjects can be increased by experimenter disclosure. He feels that it can reduce or eliminate the subject's feeling of being spied upon. Equity theory (Adams, 1965) is based upon the assumption that subjects perceive inequity in this situation and implies that experimenters who ask subjects to reveal something of themselves, yet reveal nothing themselves, create a situation of inequity. Subjects may be careless or lie in their attempts to restore equity.

Jaffee and Polanski (1962) tested the hypothesis that there is an inverse relationship between verbal accessibility and delinquency-proneness. These researchers surprised that "among pre-delinquent youngsters, not only

would we find a conscious unwillingness to communicate feelings, but an actual inability to do so" (p. 110). They supported the hypothesis and found that boys with delinquent trends tend to be relatively verbally inaccessible. However, while these researchers employed Black interviewers to conduct the interviews with the Black youths, no other considerations were made with regard to interviewer-subject rapport.

Domelsmith and Dietch (1978) investigated the relationship between Machiavellianism and self-disclosure. These researchers found as previous research had suggested, that Machiavellianism was significantly associated with an unwillingness to self-disclose for males. They did find, however, that Machiavellianism is positively associated to willingness to disclose for females. They offered, as a possible explanation for this difference between males and females, the dissimilarity in the current stereotypes for men and women:

According to current stereotypes, men are oriented toward individual achievement, while the goals of women are more 'social,' being popular, nurturant, skilled at getting along with others, etc. Women who accept these goals and who are willing to employ manipulative (Machiavellian) tactics to

achieve them could use self-disclosure effectively, while it would be an ineffective strategy for men. (p. 715)

Yochelson and Samenow (1976) observed that criminals often appeared to be self-disclosing but discovered later that the criminals had lied to a considerable degree in the belief that the researchers would be able to effect their pleas of not-guilty-by-reason-of-insanity.

A number of studies have investigated the relationship between self-concept and adaptation to one's social environment. Previous researchers have consistently demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between self-concept and adaptability. Significant results have been obtained in studies examining the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others (Berger, 1952; Omwake, 1954; Phillips, 1951; Sheerer, 1949; Stock, 1949; Suinn, 1961), self-acceptance and acceptance by peers (Zelen, 1954), satisfaction with self and adjustment (Block & Thomas, 1955; Hillson & Worchel, 1957), and self-concept and physical effectiveness (Lerner, Orlos & Knapp, 1976). The samples used in these and similar studies were varied so that there is general agreement that there exists a relationship between the concept of self and the behavior of human-beings.

Hendry and Gillies (1978) suggested that "the self, therefore, is seen as a social product, a function of the way in which an individual is reacted to by others".

(p. 182) Mead (1934) theorized that the attitudes that others take toward an individual are necessary before the development of the self is possible.

Numerous studies have demonstrated that physically attractive individuals are generally better liked (Byrne, London, & Reeves, 1968; Walster, Aronson, & Abrahams, 1966), possess greater social power (Sigall & Aronson, 1969), and are assumed to have more acceptable personal qualities (Berscheid & Walster, 1972; Miller, 1970). Teacher's expectations and evaluations have been shown to be influenced by the pupil's physical attractiveness (Clifford & Walster, 1973; Dion, 1972; Rich, 1975).

Cole and Hall (1970) reported that 256 adolescent males possessing inadequate masculine physiques had adjustment difficulties related to their feelings of inadequacy. Lerner and Karabenick (1973) asked groups of adolescent males and females to rate the physical attractiveness of 24 body parts and found that the correlation between attractiveness and self-concept was significant for females but not for the males. In a later study, Lerner, Orlos and Knapp (1976) asked groups

of adolescent males and females to rate both the attractiveness and effectiveness of 24 body parts and found that attractiveness was positively correlated to self-concept for the females but that effectiveness was positively correlated to self-concept for male subjects.

Yochelson and Samenow (1976) reported a number of observations concerning the self-concepts and personality characteristics of criminals. One of their observations concerns the criminal's tendency to downgrade his physical condition and appearance in numerous ways:

The criminal's dissatisfactions with his body include almost any physical feature....complaints about facial features are numerous....dissatisfaction with body build is exceedingly frequent....unhappiness about skin appearance was also common....some Black criminals were self-conscious about skin color....Black self hatred was quite evident....among the aspects of physical endowment that distressed criminals, one of the most prevalent was penis size. (p. 205)

It is interesting to note that the research by Cavior and Howard (1973) supports the hypothesis that both Black and White delinquents are significantly lower in facial attractiveness than non-delinquents. Also noteworthy is

the fact that Kurtzberg, Safar and Cavior (1968) reported that facial plastic surgery can be effective in reducing recidivism.

In view of the literature, it seems plausible to suggest that the self-concepts, in terms of satisfaction with various body parts, of youthful offenders would be more negative than those reported by youthful non-offenders. It also seems plausible to suggest that experimenter-subject rapport would be an asset in obtaining accurate self-ratings from any subject sample but especially crucial with regard to an offender sample.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between counselor-subject rapport and subject's self-disclosure in terms of body image. It is hypothesized that there exists a negative relationship between counselor-subject rapport and youthful offenders' self-report of satisfaction with body parts, or those subjects who have established rapport with the Counselor will report a more negative self-image than those who have not. A review of the literature suggests that adolescents and criminal populations are among those groups reporting the most negative self-images. It seems likely then, that a youthful offender population would possess a fairly negative self image. The literature also suggests that

rapport is necessary for total honesty pertaining to potentially uncomfortable or threatening self-disclosure.

Method

Participants

All 49 subjects were male, ranging from 13 to 18 years in age, and residents of Gainesville State School who had been in residence for a period of at least one month. The nature and degree of previous interpersonal interaction between each of the subjects and the Counselor varied from no previous interaction to several hours of very intimate interpersonal interaction. The Counselor was a male, resident counselor at Gainesville State School.

Subjects participated on a volunteer basis. The incentive used to recruit the subjects was determined by the staff at Gainesville State School. The subjects were given an extended (30 minute) "smoke break", which was to begin immediately after the data for the study had been collected.

Instruments

Counselor Rating Form. Subjects were asked to rate the Counselor using the Counselor Rating Form. This seven-point semantic differential scale was used to assess the subject's perception of the Counselor's

expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The scale consisted of 30 bipolar adjectives. The numbers "1" through "7" were used to designate the steps on the scale. The scales were arranged so that a rating of "7" always reflected a higher score than a rating of "1". For example, using a scale of "masculine vs. feminine", "masculine" appeared at the high end of the scale with "feminine" at the low end of the scale since the Counselor rated by the subjects was male. In other words, the scales were arranged in the manner that required the least amount of effort from the subjects and that was least potentially confusing for the subjects. The meanings of the numbers were defined and illustrated in the instructions. A rating of "4" designated "average" or "no opinion" (see Appendix A).

Body Parts Rating Scale. Subjects were asked to rate 24 body parts using a five-point Likert scale in terms of "satisfaction with" these parts of their bodies. Response alternatives ranged from "1" = "very dissatisfied" to "5" = "very satisfied" (see Appendix C).

Procedure

Each cottage at Gainesville State School houses 40 youths. The Counselor was the male resident counselor at one of these cottages. The Texas Youth Council requires

that counselors provide a minimum of one hour of individual counseling for each youth in his cottage per month. The nature of the relationship between the Counselor and the youths during these counseling sessions may definitely be termed "intimate", since the sessions are highly personalized and may involve any topic which pertains to human problems. Therefore, youths from the Counselor's cottage (the "rapport" group), and youths from each of two other cottages were recruited for the study. One of the other cottages selected was one which housed youths with whom the Counselor had had some form of interaction with most of its residents (the "some rapport" group), although the nature of the interaction most often was less than what would normally be termed as intimate. The Counselor's previous interaction with these youths involved no counseling but he knew all of them by sight, knew most of them by name and had chit-chatted informally with many of the youths on occasion. The remaining cottage was selected so that the Counselor had had no interaction at all with the majority of its residents (the "no rapport" group). The purpose for this procedure in the selection of cottages was to insure variability in the counselor-subject rapport variable. The "rapport" group contained 15 subjects, the "some rapport" group contained 15

subjects and the "no rapport" group contained 19 subjects.

The school cafeteria was used to administer the rating forms to all 49 subjects simultaneously. The subjects arrived en masse accompanied by a security officer two counselors and the resident Psychologist. The staff remained in the cafeteria throughout the data collection segment of the study.

The resident Psychologist made an opening statement explaining that the purpose of the gathering was to collect data for a research project. He explained that the subjects did not have to participate but those who did would receive an extended smoke break. All of the subjects present participated in the study.

The Experimenter was the female author of this paper and administered the Counselor Rating Form to all subjects. The Experimenter had had no previous interaction with the subjects. Initially, both the Experimenter and the Counselor, were introduced to the subjects. The Counselor then left the room. With the help of two recruits, the Experimenter distributed the Counselor Rating Form and the Body Parts Rating Scale to each subject. The subjects were immediately able to inspect the Counselor Rating Form since it had been distributed in unsealed envelopes; however, the Body Parts Rating Scale was

distributed in sealed envelopes. The Experimenter then explained that the research project involved two separate tasks and that the sealed envelope was to be used during the second task. It was requested that there be no identifying mark on the rating forms or the envelopes except the participant's cottage number. Subjects were told that they could not ask questions during the data collection segment but that they would be allowed to ask questions after the data had been collected.

The Counselor Rating Form was then explained to the subjects. They were instructed to rate the Counselor to whom they were introduced just minutes earlier. The interpretation of each of the points on the scale was explained using the example of the movie "Ten", and three sets of bipolar adjectives which were not on the form (poor vs. rich, ugly vs. pretty, stupid vs. smart) were used as examples.

The subjects were informed that their ratings of the Counselor would have no bearing upon their own status or the Counselor's status at Gainesville State School and that neither the Counselor nor any other person associated with Gainesville State School would have access to the individual rating forms used in the study. A brief description of each of the bipolar adjectives was read

aloud by the Experimenter to the subjects at 1-minute intervals so that all subjects considered and marked the first item simultaneously, the second item simultaneously, etc. (see Appendix B).

Subjects were instructed to remain silent and remain seated upon completion of the Counselor Rating Form. They were also instructed to return the completed Counselor Rating Form to the unsealed envelope and were asked to leave the envelope unsealed until completion of the second task. When all subjects had completed the Counselor Rating Form, the Counselor re-entered and took charge of the administration of the Body Parts Rating Scale. The Experimenter remained in the room near the exit and was visible to the participants but said nothing during this phase.

The Counselor explained the form briefly and asked the subjects to be as open and honest as possible in their ratings. He also instructed the subjects to remain silent and remain seated upon completion of the form. Subjects were instructed to enclose the completed Body Parts Rating Scale in the unsealed envelope with the Counselor Rating Form and, at this point, to seal the envelope. Subjects were again reminded to write their cottage number on the envelope if they had not done so.

When all subjects had completed the task the group was allowed to leave the room. The staff in attendance collected the envelopes as the subjects exited.

Results

All of the data collected were used in the analyses. All items left blank on the Counselor Rating Form were assigned a value of "4", which corresponds to "no opinion" on the semantic differential. The rate of missing values for this form was 1%. One subject in the non-rapport group had marked through the scale on the "impersonal vs. personal" item and had inserted a zero to the left of the scale (lower end). A "1" was coded on this item for this subject. All items left blank on the Body Parts Rating Form were assigned a value of "3", which corresponds to "equally satisfied and dissatisfied" on the form. The rate of missing values for this form was 2%.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to compare the mean counselor ratings for the counselor-subject rapport groups. The subject-mean scores on the Counselor Rating Form were used in the statistical analysis with a selected significance level of .05. The subject-mean scores were established by summing all of the ratings on each subject's Counselor Rating Form and then dividing

by the number of items. The means and standard deviations obtained on the subject-mean counselor ratings for each group are listed in Table I. The residents of the Counselor's cottage were expected to rate the Counselor significantly higher than the residents of the cottage with whom the Counselor had had no interaction. The mean differences between the three groups failed to reach significance, $F(2, 46) = 2.54, p < .09$ (see Table III). The Bartlett's Test indicated homogeneity of variance for the three groups, $F = 1.27, p < .28$.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was then used to examine the group means on the body parts ratings. The subject-mean scores on the Body Parts Rating Form were used in the statistical analysis with a selected significance level of .05. The subject-mean scores were established by summing all of the ratings on each subject's Body Parts Rating Form and then dividing by the number of items. The means and standard deviations obtained on the satisfaction with body parts ratings are listed in Table II. The residents of the Counselor's cottage were expected to rate themselves significantly lower than the residents of the cottage with whom the Counselor had had no interaction. The mean differences in the three groups failed to reach significance, $F(2, 46) = 2.49, p < .09$

(see Table IV). The Bartlett's Test indicated homogeneity of variance for the three groups, $F = 1.27$, $p < .28$.

The three rapport groups were further contrasted using a multiple discriminant function analysis that entered the prediction variables by the Wilks' method. Using the 30 items of the Counselor Rating Form as predictors, a significant discriminant function occurred, Wilks' Lambda = .26, $\chi^2 = 59.93$, $p < .001$. The centroids for Groups 1, 2, and 3 were -1.26, -.11, and 171, respectively. The following items (and their standardized discriminant function coefficients) entered the function: Item 1 (.52), Item 7 (-1.59), Item 10 (.86), Item 12 (-.50), Item 13 (-.37), Item 17 (.79), Item 19 (.69), Item 23 (-1.09), Item 25 (.45), and Item 28 (.55). These results indicate that Group 3, the rapport group, rated the Counselor as being more interested, reassuring, assertive, sensitive, involved, and excitable, as being warmer and softer but as being less personal and sincere. The fact that the centroid for the same rapport group was between that of rapport and no rapport groups suggests that using different cottages resulted in groups with different opinions of the Counselor. The attempt to discriminate among the three groups on the basis of the body-part ratings failed.

Pearson Product Moment Correlational analyses were used to determine whether or not relationships existed between the counselor-subject rapport ratings and the satisfaction with body parts ratings. In all cases, the subject-mean scores on the Counselor Rating Form were correlated with the subject-mean scores on the Body Parts Rating Form in the statistical analyses with a selected significance level of .05. The results for Group 1, Group 2, Group 3, and all subjects are reported in Table V. The expected result was a negative relationship between the counselor-subject rapport ratings and the satisfaction with body parts ratings. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation between counselor-subject rapport ratings and satisfaction with body parts ratings for Group 1 was .31 ($p < .10$). The correlation for Group 2 was .13 ($p < .32$). The correlation for Group 3 was .61 ($p < .001$). The correlation for all subjects was .40 ($p < .02$).

Discussion

The results of this study do not support the hypothesis that there exists a negative relationship between counselor-subject rapport and youthful offender's self-report of satisfaction with body parts. The correlation for each of the groups was found to be positive

rather than negative. The overall correlation between the counselor-subject rapport ratings and the satisfaction with body parts ratings produced an r^2 value which suggests that 16% of the variance in the ratings on the Body Parts Rating Scale may be attributed to the rapport variable. The correlation for Group 3 produced an r^2 value which suggests that 66% of the variance in the ratings on the Body Parts Rating Scale may be attributed to the rapport variable for this group.

In the absence of statistical analyses which support the hypothesis, it seems plausible only to suggest possible explanations for the lack of significant differences.

The literature concerning rapport attests to the fact that describing and measuring rapport is a difficult task since the nature of the rapport between Persons A and B may be very different from that between Persons B and C or Persons C and D. Yochelson and Samenow (1976, p. 388) concluded that trust is the most important factor in obtaining accurate self-disclosures from offenders if the nature of the self-disclosure is such that the offender might be chastised in some way or feel put down because of the disclosure. These researchers also point out that often the semantics employed by offenders is very different from the semantics employed by non-

offenders. For example, trust for an offender means that the other person will not betray him or "snitch" on him. It may be that the independent variable used in this study is experimentally inaccessible to effective manipulation.

It was intended that the reading aloud of the descriptions of the bipolar adjectives on the Counselor Rating Form would eliminate the possibility that the subjects might each be rating the Counselor from a different frame of reference. There is substantial reason to believe that some subjects paid little or no attention to what was said by the resident Psychologist or the Experimenter or the Counselor since 12 of the 49 subjects wrote their names on either the envelope or one of the rating forms which was administered (even though they had been asked not to do so). Several of the subjects failed to write their cottage numbers on the envelopes and had to be reminded to do so. The attending staff members who collected the envelopes checked to see that cottage numbers were visible and legible as the envelopes were collected. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that the reading aloud of the descriptions of the bipolar adjectives had little or no effect on the ratings made by some of the subjects. Therefore, some

subjects may have employed their own semantics in the rating of the Counselor.

One uncontrolled variable was the presence of the resident counselors and security officer who monitored the group of subjects during the data collection. Although the presence of these staff members was appreciated and probably essential to the maintenance of order so that the data collection might occur in the first place, their presence, particularly their meandering between the tables where the subjects were seated during the administration of the rating forms, had to have some effect on the scores reported. Some subjects may have feared that one of these staff members might see a low rating of the Counselor in question and may have feared some sort of repercussion even though they were informed that there would be none. Also, the subjects may have feared that the counselor would see a low rating that the subject made of himself and feel put down by it or fear that the counselor would tell, or perhaps the subjects would have felt extreme anxiety simply because someone else knew. The trust factor discussed earlier (applicable to the "monitoring" Counselor and not to the "rated" Counselor) may have played a very important role in determining the high ratings reported by the

subjects in this situation.

Plain boredom or disinterest or the anticipation of the promised smoke break may account for the consistency of some subject's ratings as if "just mark something and get it over with", and it may have seemed nicer or safer to rate the Counselor or themselves highly. All of the item means on both ratings forms were above average for all groups. The expected item mean for all items on the Counselor Rating Form for Group 1 (no rapport) was four (average or no opinion), since these subjects had had no interaction with the Counselor. It is interesting to note that all groups rated the Counselor and themselves consistently high but that none of the groups rated the Counselor and themselves consistently low. So, while boredom or disinterest or anticipation may have been responsible for the consistency of some of the ratings, it does not seem likely that it could be held accountable for the magnitude of the ratings.

It is possible that prior to the data collection, the "no rapport" subjects received some type of information concerning the Counselor from the "rapport" subjects, so that some of the "no rapport" subjects may have possessed preconceived notions concerning the Counselor before they were asked to rate him.

It is possible and perhaps probable that a percentage of the subjects used in the study, while qualifying as "offenders" according to the laws of the State of Texas, do not qualify as "criminal personalities". It is possible that the samples used in this study included every category from "normal" to "hardened criminal". If this were the case, the results would be more difficult to predict since the two populations have been found to differ on various attributes. In general, a non-offender population would not be expected to rate the Counselor or itself as extremely high or low as an offender population. A non-offender population would be expected to be more disclosing and reliable than an offender population.

Yochelson and Samenow suggest that the best way to identify criminals is to go to jail (1976, p. 104). While this may be true, it says nothing about what else one will find in jail besides criminals. There seems to be no thoroughly reliable pencil and paper method of identifying criminals. The most often used and most reliable test for this purpose appears to be the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) (Yochelson & Samenow, 1976). This inventory is popular for this purpose because it has a built in lie scale. In reality even the shortened version of this test is lengthy and

an investigator would probably have difficulty in getting a group of juvenile offenders to agree to take it even if the institutionalizing state agency, as guardian, were to allow it.

Since the procedure used in this study relied heavily upon verbal accessibility, both oral and written, and since the results were not found to be significant, the results of this study can be said to support the findings of Jaffee & Polanski (1972), that delinquency-prone youths are characterized by verbal inaccessibility. These researchers had theorized prior to the study, that pre-delinquent youngsters would not only display a conscious unwillingness to communicate feelings, but an actual inability to do so. This suggests that some type of measurement other than that used in this study would be more appropriate and yield more accurate results than those obtained in this study. Perhaps projective techniques or observational studies would produce more meaningful results.

In consideration of the fact that all of the youthful offenders who participated in this study were male, the results of this study may also support the results of DonelSmith and Dietch (1978) which indicated that Machiavellianism was significantly associated with an

unwillingness to self-disclose for males but positively associated with a willingness to disclose for females. They offered, as explanation for this difference, the dissimilarity in the current stereotypes for men and women. Females are currently more socially oriented than males. Females willing to employ manipulative techniques to attain their goals, might use self-disclosure more effectively than males who currently are more achievement oriented.

It is impossible to say whether these results support the conclusions drawn by Yochelson and Samenow (1976) that "the criminal's dissatisfactions with his body include almost any physical feature", (p. 205) because these researchers also concluded that trust was the most important factor in obtaining accurate information from criminals and that if this element were absent then the criminal would lie to prevent feeling put down by the disclosure. Their conclusions would also suggest, as discussed earlier, that criminals would lie, in the absence of the trust factor, about their perception of the Counselor if they feared chastisement.

In summary, it seems that lack of experimental control may have allowed for the confounding of extraneous variables with the effects of the independent

variable to such an extent that the results of this study should not be used as a premise for drawing conclusions concerning the populations or the variables involved.

Table I
Means and Standard Deviations of Measures of
Counselor-Subject Rapport by Rapport Group

Group	<u>n</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
Group 1 (No Rapp)	19	5.16	1.24
Group 2 (Some Rapp)	15	5.42	1.07
Group 3 (Rapport)	15	5.99	0.82

Table II
Means and Standard Deviations of Measures of
Subject's Satisfaction with Body Parts by Rapport Group

Group	<u>n</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
Group 1 (No Rapp)	19	3.70	0.95
Group 2 (Some Rapp)	15	4.29	0.58
Group 3 (Rapport)	15	4.05	0.69

Table III
ANOVA of Mean Counselor-Subject Rapport
Ratings by Rapport Groups

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between	2	5.8788	2.9394	2.536
Within	46	53.3072	1.1589	
Total	48	59.1859		

$p = .0902$

Table IV
ANOVA of Mean Satisfaction with Body
Parts Ratings by Rapport Groups

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between	2	2.9661	1.4831	2.489
Within	46	27.4039	0.5957	
Total	48	30.3700		

$p = .0941$

Table V
 Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between
 Measures of Counselor-Subject Rapport
 and Measures of Subject's Satisfaction
 with Body Parts

Group	<u>r</u>	<u>r</u> ²	<u>p</u>
Group 1 (No Rapp)	0.31	0.10	0.099
Group 2 (Some Rapp)	0.13	0.02	0.323
Group 3 (Rapport)	0.81	0.66	0.000
All Subjects	0.40	0.16	0.002

Table VI
Means and Standard Deviations
of Body Part Items by Group

Item	Group 1 (No Rapp)		Group 2 (Some Rapp)		Group 3 (Rapport)	
	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>
1 Facial complexion	3.63	1.21	4.00	0.93	3.80	1.01
2 Ears	3.74	1.15	4.33	0.72	4.20	1.01
3 Chest	3.53	1.07	3.87	1.25	3.80	1.32
4 Profile	3.63	1.26	4.27	0.80	3.93	0.88
5 Weight	4.21	1.18	4.47	0.92	3.87	1.41
6 Eyes	4.26	1.19	4.67	0.62	4.80	0.41
7 Height	4.11	1.05	4.60	0.91	4.73	0.59
8 Ankles	3.74	1.24	4.49	0.74	4.27	1.03
9 Waist	3.53	1.43	4.60	0.51	3.93	1.22
10 Arms	3.63	1.16	3.87	1.46	4.00	1.13
11 Shape of legs	3.53	1.43	4.53	0.74	4.00	1.25
12 General appearance	3.47	1.39	4.27	0.70	4.07	1.03
13 Hips	3.26	1.33	4.33	0.98	3.47	1.60
14 Width of shoulders	3.68	1.25	4.13	1.41	3.60	1.30

Table VI (cont)
Means and Standard Deviations
of Body Part Items by Group

Item	Group 1 (No Rapp)		Group 2 (Some Rapp)		Group 3 (Rapport)	
	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>
15 Mouth	3.79	1.40	4.67	0.49	4.33	1.29
16 Neck	3.58	1.46	4.33	1.05	4.20	1.15
17 Teeth	3.79	1.32	4.27	0.96	3.60	1.45
18 Nose	3.42	1.46	4.20	0.94	4.07	1.44
19 Chin	3.63	1.38	4.47	0.74	4.40	0.99
20 Hair texture	4.11	1.15	4.27	0.88	4.07	1.22
21 Body build	3.53	1.35	3.93	1.39	4.00	1.36
22 Hair color	4.05	1.22	4.20	1.21	4.20	1.32
23 Thighs	3.58	1.26	4.53	0.64	4.07	1.10
24 Face	3.68	1.42	4.33	1.11	4.13	1.19

Table VII
Means and Standard Deviations
of Counselor-Subject Rapport Items by Group

Item	Group 1 (No Rapp)		Group 2 (Some Rapp)		Group 3 (Rapport)	
	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>
1 Accepting	5.37	1.80	5.00	1.33	6.40	0.63
2 Interested	5.42	1.77	5.60	1.59	6.13	1.36
3 Consistent	4.16	1.80	4.87	1.46	5.53	1.92
4 Optimistic	4.68	1.42	5.33	1.45	6.00	1.25
5 Strong	5.21	1.81	5.33	1.63	6.47	0.99
6 Professional	4.95	2.20	5.27	1.57	6.13	1.30
7 Personal	5.26	1.76	5.07	1.10	5.80	1.32
8 Positive	5.16	1.89	5.47	1.81	5.87	1.30
9 Friendly	5.79	1.72	5.80	1.52	5.60	1.84
10 Reassuring	4.84	1.98	5.53	1.41	6.47	0.99
11 Skilled	5.89	1.45	5.80	1.32	6.13	1.19
12 Calm	5.05	1.68	5.93	1.22	5.13	1.85
13 Sincere	5.16	1.95	5.13	1.55	5.93	1.10
14 Non-Evaluative	4.84	1.92	5.33	1.18	5.20	1.52
15 Good	5.74	1.48	5.87	1.36	6.53	0.92

Table VII (cont)
Means and Standard Deviations
of Counselor-Subject Rapport Items by Group

Item	Group 1 (No Rapp)		Group 2 (Some Rapp)		Group 3 (Rapport)	
	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>
16 Direct	5.63	1.50	5.53	1.73	5.93	1.44
17 Warm	4.68	1.53	4.87	1.36	6.07	1.10
18 Wise	5.68	1.42	5.80	1.32	6.26	0.88
19 Assertive	4.79	1.27	5.33	1.29	6.27	1.16
20 Active	5.05	1.54	5.47	1.19	6.40	0.91
21 Encouraging	5.31	1.53	5.80	1.42	6.07	1.16
22 Relaxed	5.47	1.68	5.13	1.51	5.60	1.35
23 Hard	5.42	1.74	5.20	1.32	5.46	1.40
24 Sympathetic	4.79	2.07	5.07	1.53	5.73	1.16
25 Sensitive	4.53	1.84	5.00	1.36	5.80	1.15
26 Honest	5.84	1.61	5.87	1.25	6.60	0.91
27 Manipulative	4.74	1.66	5.00	1.07	5.47	1.51
28 Involved	5.05	1.84	5.73	1.10	6.33	0.98
29 Effective	5.32	1.38	5.47	1.55	5.93	1.28
30 Competent	5.05	1.78	5.87	1.51	6.47	0.92

Appendix A
Counselor Rating Form

Counselor Rating Form

average or

no opinion

- | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 Rejecting | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Accepting |
| 2 Uninterested | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Interested |
| 3 Inconsistent | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Consistent |
| 4 Pessimistic | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Optimistic |
| 5 Weak | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Strong |
| 6 Unprofessional | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Professional |
| 7 Impersonal | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Personal |
| 8 Negative | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Positive |
| 9 Hostile | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Friendly |
| 10 Threatening | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Reassuring |
| 11 Unskilled | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Skilled |
| 12 Excitable | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Calm |
| 13 Insincere | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Sincere |
| 14 Evaluative | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Non-evaluative |
| 15 Bad | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Good |
| 16 Evasive | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Direct |
| 17 Cold | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Warm |
| 18 Foolish | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Wise |
| 19 Meek | 1...2...3....4.....5...6...7 | Assertive |

Counselor Rating Form (cont)

average or

no opinion

20	Passive	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Active
21	Discouraging	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Encouraging
22	Tense	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Relaxed
23	Soft	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Hard
24	Unsympathetic	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Sympathetic
25	Insensitive	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Sensitive
26	Dishonest	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Honest
27	Permissive	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Manipulative
28	Detached	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Involved
29	Ineffective	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Effective
30	Incompetent	1...2...3....4....5...6...7	Competent

Appendix B

Descriptions of Bipolar Adjectives

Descriptions of Bipolar Adjectives

1. rejecting - refusing others recognition or acceptance
accepting - granting others recognition or acceptance
2. uninterested - indifferent, unconcerned
interested - caring, concerned
3. inconsistent - unsteady, unpredictable
consistent - steady, predictable
4. pessimistic - possesses a gloomy or negative view of
life
optimistic - looks on the bright side, possesses a
positive view of life
5. weak - lacking in character or courage, incapable of
exerting influence or authority
strong - morally powerful or courageous, capable of
exerting influence or authority
6. unprofessional - displays little skill or talent for
one's job, irresponsible, violates rules or ethics
of one's profession
professional - skilled in one's job, responsible,
respects the rules or ethics of one's profession
7. impersonal - does not refer directly to others, may
give the impression that he does not recognize
others as persons

Descriptions of Bipolar Adjectives (cont)

- personal - refers directly to others, gives the impression that he recognizes others as persons
8. negative - attitudes or opinions characterized by denial or questioning of traditional beliefs - may be overly skeptical
- positive - attitudes or opinions characterized by reasonable acceptance of traditional beliefs - does not appear to be overly skeptical
9. hostile - threatening, aggressive or unfriendly - warlike
- friendly - nonthreatening, nonaggressive, peaceable
10. threatening - frightening - impresses others as having an intention to inflict injury, humiliation or pain
- reassuring - calming - restoring courage or confidence in others
11. unskilled - without special training, incompetent
- skilled - possessing special training, competent
12. excitable - high strung, easily agitated
- calm - laid back, not easily agitated
13. insincere - does not express true feelings,

Descriptions of Bipolar Adjectives (cont)

hypocritical

sincere - expresses true feelings - nonhypocritical

14. evaluative - judgmental, attempts to determine the
worth of others

15. bad - immoral or useless

good - moral or useful

16. evasive - hard to pin down or understand

direct - straightforward, easy to understand

17. cold - uninfluenced by emotion, lacking affection,
indifferent to others

warm - affectionate, caring disposition, shows
emotion

18. foolish - showing a lack of good sense, ridiculous,
stupid

wise - displays good judgment, prudent, smart

19. meek - lacking spirit or backbone

assertive - spirited, possesses the ability to defend
one's beliefs

20. passive - inactive, surrenders without a fight, non-
productive

active - makes things happen, causes or promotes

Descriptions of Bipolar Adjectives (cont)

change, productive, busy

21. discouraging - lessens the confidence or courage of others

encouraging - builds the confidence or courage of others

22. tense - uptight, strained

relaxed - rested, unstrained

23. soft - pliable, easily manipulated, delicate

hard - solid, not easily manipulated, durable

24. unsympathetic - without compassion, no feeling for others

sympathetic - compassionate, has feeling for others

25. insensitive - incapable of being influenced or affected by others

sensitive - capable of being influenced or affected . by others

26. dishonest - not genuine, unfair, liar

honest - genuine, fair, truthful

27. permissive - not strict in discipline, too lenient

manipulative - manages others skillfully or shrewdly

Descriptions of Bipolar Adjectives (cont)

23. detached - uninterested, separated from others
involved - interested, interacts with others
29. ineffective - incompetent, cannot produce the desired
result
effective - efficient, competent, gets results
30. incompetent - unskilled
competent - skilled

Appendix C
Body Parts Rating Scale

Body Parts Rating Scale

- 1) very dissatisfied
- 2) moderately dissatisfied
- 3) equally satisfied and dissatisfied
- 4) moderately satisfied
- 5) very satisfied

1 Facial complexion	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
2 Ears	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
3 Chest	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
4 Profile	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
5 Weight	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
6 Eyes	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
7 Height	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
8 Ankles	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
9 Waist	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
10 Arms	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
11 Shape of legs	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
12 General appearance	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
13 Hips	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
14 Width of shoulders	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
15 Mouth	1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Body Parts Rating Scale (Cont)

- 1) very dissatisfied
 - 2) moderately dissatisfied
 - 3) equally satisfied and dissatisfied
 - 4) moderately satisfied
 - 5) very satisfied
-

16 Neck	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
17 Teeth	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
18 Nose	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
19 Chin	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
20 Hair texture	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
21 Body build	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
22 Hair color	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
23 Thighs	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
24 Face	1.....2.....3.....4.....5

References

- Adams, J. S. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental and social psychology (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Berger, E. The relationship between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. Beauty and the beast. Psychology Today, 1972, 5, 42-46.
- Block, J., & Thomas, H. Is satisfaction with self a measure of adjustment? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 254-259.
- Byrne, D., London, O., & Reeves, K. The effects of physical attractiveness, sex, and attitude similarity on interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality, 1968, 36, 259-271.
- Cavior, N., & Howard, L. R. Facial attractiveness and juvenile delinquency among black and white offenders. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 1973, 1, (2), 202-213.
- Clifford, M. M., & Walster, E. The effect of physical attractiveness on teacher expectations. Social Education, 1973, 46, 243-258.

- Cole, L., & Hall, I. M. Psychology of Adolescence. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.
- Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79 (2), 73-91.
- Dion, K. Physical attractiveness and evaluation of children's transgressions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24, 207-213.
- Domelsmith, E. E., & Dietch, J. T. Sex differences in the relationship between machiavellianism and self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 715-721.
- Egan, R. The Skilled Helper. Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1975.
- Hendry, L. B., & Gillies, P. Body type, body esteem, school, and leisure: A study of overweight, average, and underweight adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1978, 7 (2), 181-195.
- Hillson, J. S., & Worchel, P. Self-concept and defensive behavior in the maladjusted. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 83-88.
- Jaffee, L. D., & Polansky, N. A. Verbal inaccessibility in young adolescents showing delinquent trends. Journal of Health and Human Behavior, 1962, 3, 105-111.

- Jourard, S. M. The effect of experimenter's disclosure on the behavior of subjects in psychological experiments. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), Current topics in Clinical and Community Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Jourard, S. M., & Friedman, R. Experimenter-subject "distance" and self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 278-282.
- Jourard, S. M., & Kormann, L. A. Getting to know the experimenter, and its effect on psychological test performance. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1968, 8, 155-159.
- Jourard, S. M., & Jaffe, P. E. Influence of an interviewer's disclosure on the self-disclosing behavior of interviewees. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 252-257.
- Kurtzberg, R. L., Safar, H., & Cavior, N. Surgical and rehabilitation of adult offenders. Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1968, 3, 649-650. (Summary)
- Lerner, R. M., Karabenick, S. A., & Stuart, J. L. Relations among physical attractiveness, body attitudes, and self-concept in male and female college students.

Journal of Psychology, 1973, 85, 119-129.

- Lerner, R. L., Orlos, J. B., & Knapp, J. R. Physical attractiveness, physical effectiveness, and self-concept in late adolescents. Adolescence, 1976, 11 (43), 313-326.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Merluzzi, T. V., & Banikiotes, P. G. Perceptions of counselor characteristics: Contributions of counselor sex, experience, and disclosure level. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25 (5), 479-482.
- Miller, A. G. Role of physical attractiveness in impression formation. Psychonomic Science, 1970, 19, 241-243.
- Onwake, K. T. The relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance of others shown by three personality inventories. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 443-446.
- Phillips, E. L. Attitudes toward self and others; A brief questionnaire report. Journal of Consulting Psychology 1951, 15, 79-81.
- Powell, W. J. Differential effectiveness of interviewer interventions in an experimenter interview. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32,

210-215.

- Rich, J. Effects of children's physical attractiveness on teacher's evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67 (5), 599-609.
- Sheerer, E. T. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of and respect for self and acceptance of and respect for others in 10 counseling cases. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 169-175.
- Sigall, H., & Aronson, E. Liking an evaluator as a function of the physical attractiveness and nature of the evaluation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 93-100.
- Stebbins, R. A. The unstructured research interview as incipient interpersonal relationship. Sociology and Social Research, 1972, 56 (2), 164-179.
- Stock, D. An investigation into the interrelations between self-concept and feelings directed toward other person and groups. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 176-180.
- Suinn, R. The relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others: A learning theory analysis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 37-42.

- Ullman, L. P., Bowen, M. E., Greenberg, D. J., Macpherson, E. C., Marcum, H. B., Marx, R. O., & May, J. S. The effect of rapport of experimenter's approach and avoidance responses to positive and negative self-references. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1968, 6 (3), 355-362.
- Vondracek, F. W. The study of self-disclosure in experimental interviews. Journal of Psychology, 1969, 72, 55-59.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. The importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 508-516.
- Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S. E. The Criminal Personality (Vol. 1). New York: Jason Aronson, 1976.
- Zelen, S. Acceptance and acceptability: An examination of social reciprocity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 316.