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This study assessed adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican male students preference for proxemic interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter and examined their preference for Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors. The subjects included twenty adolescent male Anglo students and twenty adolescent male Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8, attending an inner city parochial school in Western Massachusetts.

The subjects were shown eight video tape vignettes, four with an Anglo male student and an Anglo male counselor and four with an Anglo male student and a Puerto Rican male counselor interacting at four different distances (30 inches, 39 inches, 48 inches and 66 inches). The subjects were asked to rate each video tape vignette on the semantic differential scale, as if they were the client who had come to the counselor with a personal problem. They checked off the adjective on the semantic differential scale which best described how they felt about each counseling session.
The data obtained from the semantic differential was analyzed by a 2 x 4 x 2 multiple classification analysis of variance with repeated measures using the Biomedical Computer Program BMDP2V. Significant main effects were graphically presented.

The results indicated that the counseling interaction distance which generated the most positive subject attitude for adolescent Anglo male students was 48 inches and for adolescent Puerto Rican males 30 inches. It was also suggested that adolescent Anglo students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 view the dyadic counseling session as a "personal-social" encounter while the adolescent Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 view the counseling interaction as a strictly "personal" encounter.

No statistically significant differences were found with relation to Anglo and Puerto Rican students preference for Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors. However, when the Anglo and Puerto Rican students were viewed as a combined group, the resulting data was statistically significant. The combined group (Anglo and Puerto Rican students) prefer an interaction distance of 30 inches with an Anglo counselor and an interaction distance of 48 inches with a Puerto Rican counselor. Several possible reasons for these results were outlined.

It was concluded that Puerto Rican male students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer a closer interaction distance (30
inches) in the dyadic counseling encounter than Anglo male students (48 inches) and that Puerto Rican students view the counseling session as a "personal" encounter, unlike Anglo students who view the counseling interaction as a "personal-social" encounter. Suggestions for the implications of the findings with relation to cross-cultural counseling and counselor training were discussed.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to test whether adolescent Puerto Ricans within American society react differently than do Anglo adolescents to varied non-verbal behaviors, variations in personal space and preference for counselor ethnicity.

Puerto Rican students comprise a significant percentage of potential clients for many counselors. In the Northeastern United States the percentages range from 25 to 75 percent of a school counselor's case load. Any counseling relationship is more complex when the counselor or the client comes from a different culture, ethnic group, or value orientation. A counselor must be aware of the cross cultural variables of his clients if he is to be effective (Pedersen, 1973).

In recent years a considerable amount of data concerning man and his use of space and distance in his everyday activity has been generated. Anthropologist Edward T. Hall has studied different cross cultural customs which have their foundations in man's relationship to time and space. Hall coined the term "proxemics" to refer to how man unconsciously structures microspace, the distance between men in the conduct of their daily activities, the organization of space in their homes and buildings and ultimately the layout of their towns (Hall, 1969).
It is evident from the studies of Hall (1969), and Banks' (1973) that differences in social interaction patterns exist between nationalities. It can be assumed from such studies that proxemic behavior is a learned phenomenon. Banks (1973) says, "Unfortunately, the empirical literature is deficient in regard to the differences in proxemic behavior patterns existent among subcultural groups living within a society in which the predominant culture is not their own" (p. 2).

Statement of Problem

There appears to be no research investigating the social spacing patterns existent between mainland Puerto Ricans and Anglos and between Puerto Rican and Puerto Rican, within the dyadic counseling interaction. The problem arises when Anglo counselors who are unaware of Puerto Rican culture are assigned Puerto Rican clients. Christensen (1975) says there are approximately two million Puerto Ricans in the United States and they come to the mainland primarily for jobs. They generally do not intend to remain here, and as economic conditions for their families improves, increasingly they return to the island. There is a great need for school counselors to understand the uniqueness of clients from other cultures and ethnic backgrounds. Many counselor training programs do not seem to be meeting the cross cultural counseling needs.
Christensen (1975) states:

The problem of understanding Puerto Ricans is compounded by the fact that today there are really two groups of Puerto Ricans. From a crowded island not overly endowed with natural resources beyond its people and its climate, thousands of Puerto Ricans have come to the mainland, especially in the period since World War II. . . . Scarcely a state is without any Puerto Ricans, and some places, such as New York City, Boston, Hartford (Connecticut), and several areas in New Jersey, have large numbers of Puerto Ricans. Many have raised families on the mainland, and the second- and third-generation Puerto Ricans are different in many significant ways from those who were raised on the island.

The mainland-raised Puerto Rican, sometimes called neo-Rican, is generally English-dominant with respect to language. This Puerto Rican has adapted, as one might expect, to the unique environment of the urban setting but has retained a strong influence from and linkage to a primarily Latin American setting. Thus, having been brought up in another climate, with another language, with different fears and aspirations, and perhaps often with a different reference group, the mainland Puerto Rican is understandably different from the island Puerto Rican. Yet the culturally dominant group in the United States defines all Puerto Ricans in the same way, and the neo-Ricans often suffers from the same prejudices inflicted on the recent arrival from San Juan, Ponce or Ciales (p. 550).

School counselors working with Puerto Ricans are usually not aware of the dual cultural (island Puerto Rican versus mainland neo-Ricans) problem. The counselor needs more cross cultural data to work more effectively with this population. The focus of this study is directed towards establishing a body of knowledge that is specifically related to the non-verbal proxemic behavior of Puerto Ricans within the American culture.
Cultural and Geographical Background

Puerto Rico is an island in the Caribbean, about 1,050 miles from Miami, Florida and about 1,650 miles from New York. The island is 35 miles by 100 miles and has a population over 2.8 million. Its population density is greater than that of China, Japan, or India. Puerto Ricans are all American citizens, proclaimed so by the Jones Act of 1917. The population is a mixture of Taino Indians, Africans, and Spaniards, although the Indian influence is much more cultural than biological, as conflicts with the Spaniards practically decimated that group. Skin color ranges from as white as any Scandinavian to as black as the darkest African, with all shades and mixtures in between (Christensen, 1975, p. 350).

Definition of Terms

The term "proxemics" is used in this study according to Hall's (1969) definition of how man unconsciously structures microspace, the distance between men in the conduct of their daily activities, the organization of space in their homes and office buildings and ultimately the layout of their towns. In particular, it refers to how individuals of different race and culture structure their interaction distance zones within the context of a projected dyadic counseling interaction.
In his anthropology of space, he uses an organizing model in which Proxemics is a manifestation of microculture having three main aspects: 1) fixed-feature space, 2) semi-fixed-feature space, and 3) informal space. Hall (1969) discovered four separate distances within informal space. He termed these distances: 1) intimate, 2) personal, 3) social, and 4) public distance. These concepts will be explained in Chapter II, the Review of Related Research.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

There will be no significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican population, of preferred counselor behavior as measured by ratings on the semantic differential scale of video vignettes illustrating four differences in interaction distance between counselor and clients.

Hypothesis II

There will be no significant difference between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican populations, of preferred counselor behavior as measured by ratings on the semantic differential scale of video vignettes illustrating four differences in interaction distances between counselor and client when the counselor in the video vignettes is either Anglo or Puerto Rican.
Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter I of the dissertation consists of a statement of the need for the study, its purpose, cultural and geographical background of subjects, definition of terms and hypotheses. Chapter II presents a review of the literature and research related to non-verbal behavior. Chapter III describes the assessment methodology, the instruments used, population involved in the study, statistical design and procedure. Chapter IV is the presentation and analysis of the data and Chapter V includes a discussion of the findings, implications, limitations and suggestions for further research, summary and conclusions.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Interest in non-verbal communication is not new, counselors and therapists have been aware of the non-verbal components in the counseling relationship for many years. What is new is the recent upsurge of research in proxemics (man's use of space in his every day interaction, and the spatial organization of his home, office and towns) and non-verbal behavior and its relationship to the counseling and psychotherapeutic process.

Within the last decade many new and sophisticated scientific instruments have been developed to measure and statistically analyze subtle non-verbal communication. Equipment such as video tape machines, stop motion movie cameras, speech synthesizers and recorders make it possible to record subtle non-verbal behavioral cues and isolate them for research and study.

Gladstein (1974) discovered in searching the published and unpublished literature from 1947 to 1973 that seventy-five percent of the non-verbal communicational literature dealing with counseling and psychotherapy was published in the last ten years. This period of time coincides with the development of advanced scientific equipment to measure and record non-verbal behavior.
A comprehensive review of the non-verbal communicational literature is reported here. To provide as wide a scope as possible, and in order to highlight the many new areas of research, the author has utilized a broad variety of research tools, such as the E R I C (Educational Resources Information Center) system, Psychological and Dissertation abstracts and has interviewed prominent people doing research in the area of non-verbal communication.

Multiplicity of Approaches in Studying Non-Verbal Behavior

Gladstein (1974) states that much of the present research produces a very confused and complex picture. He postulates three reasons for all the confusion in non-verbal communicative research:

(1) Various researchers, theorists and reviewers look at different aspects of non-verbal communication;
(2) Different research models and methods were used;
(3) Different populations, both helpers and helpees were studied. (p. 35)

With these difficulties in mind, non-verbal literature which has a heuristic and practical application in the counseling and therapeutic interaction, rather than that which is concerned solely with animal or biological research will be reviewed. A second purpose of this paper is to delineate the reasons counselors and therapists should be cognizant of non-verbal behavior and how the subtleties of non-verbal communication can be used to enhance the counseling encounter.
Cross cultural implications in the counseling process will also be reviewed.

In studying the nature of non-verbal communicational research it is imperative to be aware of the researchers' views. Some writers, according to Gladstein (1974) include everything except the words used in the counseling encounter. Hall (1969) for example in describing proxemics (space and distance as used by man) takes a very broad view seeing communication and culture as one.

Birdwhistell (1970) looks at non-verbal communication as all encompassing, and typically not in man's awareness. On the other hand we have researchers who restrict themselves to just one form of non-verbal communication such as eye contact, kinesic actions or proxemics.

Another question posited by Gladstein (1973) which has to be answered before the literature can be reviewed is what is the origin of non-verbal behavior? He suggests it is possible to identify most writers along a continuum, with biological on one end and cultural on the other. Hall and Birdwhistell would be placed on the cultural end, because of their environmental and cultural views of non-verbal communicational behavior. Hall in his writings spends much time distinguishing between English, Arabs, Germans and Japanese people with relation to proxemics and their cross cultural viewpoints.
On the biological end of the continuum, is found Darwin (1965) who emphasized an evolutionary and genetic basis for the expression of behavior. Darwin believed that non-verbal behavior was passed on through the evolutionary process. In the middle of the continuum we find Ekman and Friesen (1968). They argue for and document, with cross cultural empirical research an interaction model. For them the pan cultural muscular movements in the face document the biological basis while the specific meaning given to facial displays, shows the cultural difference.

A third question he raises is what function does non-verbal communication serve. Gladstein believes that writers who emphasize biological origins tend to see non-verbal communication preceding verbal communication. As such non-verbal communication serves the more primitive needs of man, and we revert back to non-verbal communication when we are unable to satisfy our needs through the usual rational linguistic means.

Reusch (1965) is a good representation of this position, for him while non-verbal communication is always present it is relied on most frequently in a regression situation.

In the process of recalling early memories a patient may suck his thumb or caress the arms of his chair. . . . Even more informative are the primitive and uncoordinated movements of patients at the peak of severe functional psychosis, such movements may be viewed as attempts to re-establish the infantile system of communication through action. (pp. 326-327)
Writers such as Schefeler (1968) who emphasize the cultural factors tend to see non-verbal communication as an interacting or going along beside and supplementing vocal communication. They view the individual as constantly reacting to his environment and functioning as a total person with others. His verbal and non-verbal communication are so intertwined that they believe it does not make sense to identify different functions for each, they have to be seen as total patterns.

Ekman and Friesen (1969) take a position which tends to incorporate the various points of view. It is imperative for the reader to be aware of the questions posed by Gladstein (1973) when reviewing non-verbal literature.

(1) Did the author take a broad or narrow view of the subjects?

(2) Does the author view the origins of non-verbal behavior as biological or cultural?

(3) What function does the author believe non-verbal communication serves.

(4) Does it precede verbal communication as the biologists view postulates?

(5) Is it entirely different from verbal communication or is it a combination of both verbal and non-verbal intertwined? (p. 35)

Before an accurate evaluation of the literature can be attempted the reader must have specific knowledge of the situation and subjects involved in the research.
A commonality among many researchers is the acceptance of the main categories of non-verbal behavior (Duncan 1969; Tepper 1972).

1. Body motion and Kinesic behavior, which include gestures, facial expressions, eye movements and postural movements.

2. Paralanguage, which includes, laughing, yawning, and grunting as well as the many voice qualities such as pitch, rate, volume, timing and vocal variations.

3. Proxemics, a term coined by Hall which refers to how man unconsciously structures micro-space. It is the distance between men and the conducting of their daily transactions. It also includes the organization of space in his home and buildings and ultimately the lay-out of his towns.

**Historical Overview**

In reviewing the development of non-verbal behavior down through the ages it is evident that man has been aware of the importance of non-verbal behavior in the communicational process.

The study of facial expression as a means of reading character was ancient subject when Aristotle (334 B.C.) wrote the treatise on Physiognomy. This tract is a mixture of traditional and casual observation. The Apostle Paul (Acts, 14: 8-9) was well aware of the importance of facial expressions
and body posture as a means of communication over two-thousand years ago (Adams (1973)).

**Darwin (1872) Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals**

Darwin's (1872) monumental work "The Expression of Emotion in Man and Animals" (1965) helped to lay the foundation for research in non-verbal behavior. The scope of his data was extremely broad. He observed animals as well as man and he included cross-cultural material, developmental data and observations of human behavior in various clinical conditions. For example he observed healthy people, patients in psychosis, and blind and deaf people to gather data for his book on the expression of emotions. Darwin introduced, according to Mahl (1968), concepts (or emphasized those of others) that anticipated the ideas of disciplines as widely divergent as psychoanalysis and modern structure linguistics.

Mahl (1968) states:

1. Darwin concluded that distinctive non-verbal behavior patterns are characteristic of many distinct emotional states. He thought these patterns often consisted of very slight movements that have developed from larger movements and more extensive patterns present in childhood. He suggested the clenched fist of an angry man, for example is a remnant of a more extensive attack pattern. The downturned mouth of sadness, and the frown of displeasure, he proposed were remnants of screaming in childhood.

2. He emphasized that these remnants of emotional patterns become involuntary.

3. They may occur transiently or chronically.
(4) When an individual attempts to repress overt emotional expression, movements of some kind are very likely to occur. These might be expressive remnants that have become involuntary or they might be random "purposeless" acts like the tail switching of an annoyed cat. The latter are a result of the sheer quantity of excitation of the nervous system.

(5) Many expressive movements may also have a signaling or communicative function. He articulated the principle of contrasting pairs in the connection which have become a fundamental concept of modern linguistics. (Darwin noted, for example an angry cat arches his back and that these contrasting patterns might very well have a signaling function.) The same might be true, he speculated, of the depressed mouth of the sad person and the upturned mouth of the happy man.

(6) Although Darwin emphasized the universality of expressive behavior patterns among the cultures of man, he also noted that cultural patterning might occur. (p. 296)

It is evident from Darwin's work (1965) and Mahl's (1968) commentary that historically, people have been aware of the importance of non-verbal communication in the behavior patterns of animals and man and the possible cross cultural implications.

James (1931) Expression of Body Posture

William James (1931) published "A Study of the Expression of Bodily Posture." His experiment consisted of observations of photographs of a large number of bodily postures systematically selected and presented with an instruction to report the expressive value of posture, and if possible to designate the factor most significant for the expression
given. Postures were seen as an expression of attitude or emotion and secondly as an expression of movement.

From James' (1931) research it is evident that body posture does carry expressions and attitudes to the observer. Body language does play an important role in the communicational process. It may not always be eminently clear what is being expressed, but usually the attitude or emotion being expressed is clear to the critical observer.

It was not until recently that research began to appear that led to greater empirical understanding of the role non-verbal behavior plays in the communicational process. Of the many categories of non-verbal behavior three areas seem to emerge with relation to current research. Perhaps because these areas of non-verbal behavior are easier to measure, analyze and record. The three areas are: body language, paralanguage and proxemics. The names of three men, Birdwhistell, Trager and Hall emerge as pioneers in these areas for establishing foundations and strategies upon which to develop future research.

**Birdwhistell (1952) Kinesics and Body Motion**

Birdwhistell (1952) opened up the whole area of body motion and kinesic behavior as a mode of communication to systematic study. He says kinesics is:

... the systematic study of those patterned and learned aspects of body motion, which can be
demonstrated to have definite communicational value. (1963, p. 125)

He states that the human face alone is capable of making some two-hundred fifty thousand expressions. Kelly (1970) found that facial expressions rather than verbal dialogue convey the feelings of warmth, genuineness and respect in a non-verbal way to the client during the counseling session.

Birdwhistell (1970) states:

As professionally literate members of a culture devoted to literacy, we are strongly tempted to believe that words carry meaning and that all other non-word behavior merely modifies it. Thus, there are those who feel that words form the natural center of the communicational universe and that all other modes of communication are to be studied as subsystems subordinate to it. Such a decision predetermines the nature of the communicational process and I am as yet unwilling, from the situations which I have examined, to assign any such priority to any of the infra-communicational systems. For the kinesicist, silence is just as golden as are those periods in which the linguistic system is positively operating.

Correlated with the process of verbalization, kinesic markers, whether an aspect of the speaker's production of the message or the listener's contribution to the transaction, deserve special attention in an assessment of communicational exchange. (pp. 188-189)

Birdwhistell's prolific research clearly states the importance of non-verbal behavior and kinesic markers in communicational exchanges. Words are not the center of the universe in the communicational process and non-verbal behavior just a modifier, on the contrary, both verbal and non-verbal communication are intertwined and equally important. The foundation which Birdwhistell established has been built upon by Scheflen (1964), Ekman and Friesen (1968), Mehrabian
Trager (1958) Paralanguage

George Trager (1958) pioneered the area of paralanguage. He worked on differentiating areas of vocal behavior.

Trager (1956) states:

For many years linguists and other students of language and of communication as a whole have been aware that communication is more than language. They have known that all noises and movements entering into the activity of people talking to each other and exchanging communications needed to be taken into account if a total picture of the activity was to be arrived at. At the same time it was known by a sort of tacit consent that much of what went on was not accessible to study by such scientific methods as had yet been devised. Accordingly, linguists limited themselves to examination of such parts of linguistic structure as they could define and examine objectively, and other communication systems than language proper remained undefined. (p. 1)

Trager, in his research (1941, 1949, 1955, 1956) explored language and its attendant phenomena. Early in his work he realized that communication is more than language. He developed a theory of accentual systems (1941) in which he treats such accentual phenomena as stress, pitch, quantity and other paralanguistic qualities. Trager, in considering communication much more than just verbal dialogue laid the foundation for empirical research in the age of paralanguage. 

Tepper, (1972) in reviewing Trager's work discovered that paralanguage has the two principle components of
vocalizations and voice qualities. Vocalizations include the acoustical qualities of intensity (volume), pitch level and extent, behavior such as laughing, crying, belching and the vocal symbols such as uh-uh for negation, uh-huh for affirmation and uh for hesitation. Vocalization, according to him, included pitch, range, resonance, articulation control and vocal lip control (p. 10). Others have added to his findings: Hall (1969), Birdwhistell (1970), Louner (1970), etc. 

Hall (1959) Proxemics

Hall (1959) coined the word "proxemics" and began an entire investigation into man and his social and communicational use of space and distance. Edward T. Hall is a professor of anthropology at Northwestern University and a pioneer in the area of "proxemics" (man's reaction to the microspace around him, in his home and community).

Distance is not only physical but includes many psychological aspects, a phenomena which is controlled by eye contact, trunk lean and body orientation (Scheflen, 1967). Research in the area of proxemics has been added to by Sommer (1969), Haase (1970), Haase and DiMattia (1970), Pierce (1970), Kinzel (1970), Dinges and Oetting (1971), Kelly (1971) and Banks (1973).

The area of proxemics is a valuable area of investigation for the counselor, for, by being aware of proxemic variables he can gain valuable insight into what his client is
or is not communicating non-verbally. By the distance a client chooses to position himself from the counselor, information can be gleamed as to the client's feelings about the dyadic interaction in which they are both engaged. A client may appear very friendly and open and yet set up a proxemic distance (Hall, 1969) at the public range rather than at the personal or social range. A complete explanation of Hall's (1969) distance theory will be given in the latter part of the paper. Counselors awareness of proxemic distances can be of invaluable aid in establishing a genuine and warm counselor--client relationship.

The emphasis of this review of literature will be on the non-verbal components of the communicational process vis-a-vis the counseling relationship. The behaviors of central importance in this review are body orientation and proxemics.

Communicational Significance of Body Orientation and Trunk Lean

It has been researched and documented that body position and posture are major factors in communicating emotional and attitudinal messages. In a pioneering study, James (1931) studied body posture to: (1) determine how far body posture may be expressive; (2) if it is expressive, to determine the relative expressive values of the various parts of the total posture; and (3) to determine whether or not there is in the experience of the observer a correlated attitudinal or
emotional pattern. James (1931) used three hundred forty-seven different postures in his study. They were chosen with no prior assumptions other than the expectation that various postures might be expressive. They were obtained by photographing a human manikin on a 35 mm film. The five variables considered were head, trunk, feet, knees and arms. As a result of more than 1200 observations of 347 postures, James found that the head and the trunk were the most important indications of the basic attitude categories judged.

Of these, one was labeled approach, (an attentive posture communicated by a forward lean of the body) and another was withdrawal, (a negative, refusing or repulsing positive communication by drawing back or turning away). In conclusion, James found that a forward lean communicated positive affect and a backward lean communicated a negative affect.

Relation of Attitude to Posture and Distance

Mahrabian (1968) studied the relationship of attitude to seated posture, orientation and distance. The study was an attempt to investigate the functional relationship of a communicator's posture, orientation, and distance from his addressee. Fifty undergraduate subjects who were left alone, with a set of instructions, assumed ten different postures which they considered to be typical of their postures with each of intensely disliked, moderately disliked, neutral, moderately liked and intensely liked male and female
addressees whose presence in a given location they were asked to imagine.

The raters observed the subjects through a one-way mirror and independently rated the behavior. The addressee sex and the subject sex and liking for the addressee constituted the independent variables. The dependent variables were eye contact, distance, head, shoulders, and leg orientation; arm and leg openness, and measures of hand, leg and body relaxation. The findings of the study indicate that eye contact, distance, orientation of the body, and relaxation of the body (as measured by the seated communicators reclining angle or backward lean and by his sideways lean) are significant indexes of the subjects liking for the addressee. The remaining measures did not yield any significant relationships to liking: the results of Mehrabian's research indicates that there is more eye contact with a liked than a disliked addressee and that shoulder orientation is most direct for neutral addresses and is least direct for intensely disliked addressees and moderately direct for intensely liked addressees. A counselor who is aware of the relationship of attitude to seated position, orientation and distance will be better able to understand what his client is communicating non-verbally, this will either confirm or negate the verbal dialogue in the counseling interaction.

The methodology employed in Mehrabian's study seems questionable to the writer. It would have been a more valid
study if real people were used or at least a video tape rather than asking the subjects to imagine addressees present. Haase and Markey (1973) confirm this belief in their study. Using 36 subjects they compared four common methodologies in the measurement of personal space. They ask the question--To what extent do differing methodologies render comparable results? To what degree is the experimental task employed a model of reality and how much validity, therefore, is there in the inferences made therefrom (p. 2)?

It is of the utmost importance if research is to be generalized to counseling outcome, to use as naturalistic a situation as possible. Would subjects asked to imagine people present in a counseling situation act exactly the same way when the subjects are actually present? It is important to use actual people or at least video tapes as a stimulus if the research is to be generalized to actual counseling. The methods can roughly be ordered along a dimension of involvements. The in vivo task representing most direct involvement while the viewing of the photographs would represent the most projective and least involved. The results of this study show the best estimate of actual behavior in a proxemic situation is the situation where the subject is asked to observe the live interaction of two other persons (R = +.75; P = .01). The next most valid methodology was the felt board technique (R = +.56; P = .01). Finally, the
the least accurate representation of in vivo behavior was the use of photographs \((R = .30; P = .05)\).

It is evident from Haase and Markey's (1973) study that Mehrabian's (1968) research would have produced better empirical data if he had used real people as addressees rather than asking the subjects to imagine people present. Mehrabian being aware of the possible weakness stated:

The use of this particular method was dictated due to the difficulty of creating a more realistic experimental setting in which five degrees of attitude of a communicator toward another person could have been experimentally induced, or in which individuals whom the subjects liked to varying degrees could have been present as addressees. It is reassuring to note, however, that the results of the present study corroborate existing evidence wherever such evidence is available. (p. 29)

Mehrabian's study is important because it does provide additional information about the functional relationship of a communicator's attitude toward his addressees through his posture and position. He says such information can be of assistance in the inference of attitude when these attitudes are not overtly verbalized either in an experimental situation or in a clinical setting.

**Postural Marker: Its Effect on Dyadic Interaction**

Scheflen (1964) describes the significance of posture in the communication system. He studied eighteen therapists, conducting sessions with a wide range of theoretical and doctrinal viewpoints, from orthodox psychoanalysis to very
active and manipulative schools. Scheflen made sound motion picture recordings of selective sessions, and analyzed them to determine the common denominator of communicative behavior in psychotherapy.

Scheflen (1964) states:

Configuration of posture or body positioning indicates at a glance a great deal about what is going on in an interaction. . . . These postural configurations, which are reliable indicators of the following aspects of communication: (1) they demonstrate the components of individual behavior that each person contributes to the group activities; (2) they indicate how the individual contributors are related to each other; (3) they define the steps and order in the interaction. All English speaking people (who also move in English) seem to utilize these postural information unconsciously for orienting themselves in a group. A counselor's knowledge of their postural functions is of great value in research in human behavior and in studying or conducting a psychotherapy session informedly. (p. 316)

Scheflen (1964) found that when an Anglo speaker uses a series of syntactic sentences in a conversation, he changes the position of his head and eyes every few sentences. He may turn his head right or left, tilt it, cock it to one side or the other, or flex or extend his neck so as to look at the floor or ceiling. He believes each of these shifts marks the end of a structural unit. These structural units are called points because it corresponds crudely to making a point in a discussion. The maintenance of head position indicates the duration of the point.

An example of these points, according to Scheflen (1964) for the psychotherapist are:
Point 1  Head slightly downward, cocked to the right, averting eyes from patient. Used while listening to patient.

Marker  Head tilted up. Marker termination of point one and transition to point two. Signals preparation to interpret.

Point 2  Head erect, looking directly at patient. Used while making an interpretation.

Marker  Head turned far to the right, away from patient. Marks termination of point 2.

The Patient

Point 1  Head erect, turned to his right. Used while therapist is interpreting and avoids his gaze.

Point 2  Head facing directly toward therapist. Used during response to interpretation. Stares at therapist as he minimizes interpretation importance.

Point 3  Head cocked, gaze to therapists left. Patient takes up narrative of another incident not manifestly related to therapists interpretation accompanied by childlike manner of speech. (p. 322)

Scheflen (1964) found that the therapist begins the session seated, with legs and arms crossed, and leaning backward, away from the patients. In this posture, he uses the clinical tactic of not answering and "eliciting free association." After about five minutes he leans toward the patient, uncrossing his legs. After the postural shift, he is more active--reassuring, interpreting, conversing. He is likely to think of his tactic as "establishing rapport" (p. 323).

The above description demonstrates two markers of position for a psychotherapy session. The therapist shifted from the initial position in which he listened, to a position in which he interpreted and reassured the patient actively.
Then he shifted back to his original position and resumed clinical listening. Scheflen states that this is a characteristic sequence in psychotherapy.

Besides head and posture movements, eyelids and hand movements are included as markers. A sequence of several points constitute a larger unit of communication which Scheflen calls a "position." This unit corresponds roughly to a point of view that a person may take in an interaction. This position is marked by a gross postural shift involving at least half the body. Positions generally last from about half a minute to five or six minutes. Most people in social situations which Scheflen observed show about two to four positions. An example of position would be the therapist uncrossing his legs and arms and leaning forward to listen to his patient.

The largest unit of position in the communicational system that Scheflen has studied is called the presentation. The presentation consists of the totality of one person's positions in a given interaction. They have a duration of from several minutes to several hours; and the termination is a complete change in location. For example, a participant may leave a meeting altogether or change his place in the room. He says such familiar acts as going to the bathroom, going to get a cigarette, or going to make a telephone call are in fact often markers of presentations. After such an
interruption, the re-entrant usually assumes a different role or engages in a new type of interaction (p. 324).

Scheflen's (1964) research is extremely useful for the practicing counselor, whether the counselor is in the classroom, doing group counseling or involved in a one to one counseling interaction. Using this research a counselor can tell if his client is listening, if he is preparing to interpret and respond or wants to engage in a new type of interaction.

In summary Scheflen states:

There appears, then to be at least three levels of structural units above the syntactic sentence that are marked by postural activities ... Our research shows that the function of an individuals posture in communication is to make or punctuate the units at multiple levels. The unconscious observation of postures and shifts seem to help American communicants orient themselves in interaction. An explicit knowledge of the markers can increase the psychotherapists awareness of what is happening and of what kind of unconscious boundaries both he and the patient are observing. (pp. 323-324)

It seems evident from Scheflen's research that posture plays a significant role in the communications system. A counselor who is cognizant of the multiple levels of postural meaning in the communication process can better understand what is or is not occurring in the dyadic counseling interaction. Once the counselor is alerted to these functions of posture, he will quickly collect his own observations as to what postures are used in various counseling situations. For example, postural shifts involving movement away from others
often seem to indicate completion and temporary disengagement. Counselors should be careful not to overload these markers with significance they do not have. They mark a natural division in a behavior stream, but they do not as yet indicate what the behavior or shift is. The postural shift is like the referee's whistle at the end of a play in football, it means that some unit has ended but does not identify the unit (Scheflen 1964; p. 324).

The subject in most of these studies appear to be Anglo, there is very little cross cultural research. It is important for counselors to know if the same communicational significance holds true for their Puerto Rican client's non-verbal behavior.

The Counseling Interview

Since counselors spend much of their time interviewing students, Mahl's (1968) study of body movements and there meanings during interviews, will help counselors gain valuable insight into their clients. In addition to Anglo subjects, cross culture studies should be pursued because the school counselor is constantly working with students from other cultures.

In studying gestures and body movements in interviews Mahl's (1968) research included: (1) individual differences in the non-verbal behavior of psychiatric patients during the initial interview; (2) intra-individual variations in the
non-verbal behavior during the initial interview; and (3) the relationship between these individual differences and personality variables.

Intake interviews of eighteen people seeking psychiatric outpatient treatment were tape recorded. Upon completing a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the gestural record, incontaminated inference of leading conflicts, character structure, traits and concerns were made for fourteen of the patients. Independent criterion materials included the verbal content of this initial interview and most importantly, entries in the clinic records. An observer also watched the interview through a one way mirror, but did not hear any of the interview. He dictated a running account of the patients behavior onto a second tape.

The results of Mahl's (1968) research showed:

(1) There were marked individual differences in non-verbal behavior.

(2) Some of the differences appear to be sex related. (Men pointed more frequently than women, women shrugged their shoulders, shook their heads and turned their palms up and out and patted their hair more frequently than did men.)

(3) Many of these differences appear to be a function of personality variables. One of the patients was very methodical and put things in order, methodical holding of cigarettes, setting his tie in place, and brushing clothes, the observer judged him to have an obsessive compulsive.
character. The clinical records confirmed an obsessive compulsive neurosis.

(4) He observed four kinds of relationships between the non-verbal and verbal transactions within the interview.

Some gestures and acts have the same meaning as the concurrent manifest verbal context. Some betray contrary meanings. Some anticipate later verbal statements. Some seem to be a direct function of interaction within the interviews. (p. 321)

As a result of Mahl's (1968) research it is clear that trained observers were able to detect leading conflicts, character structure and traits of patients, just by viewing their non-verbal behavior. Although Mahl's sample of eighteen patients is small the results are very positive and suggest more research in the area of gesture and body movements should be pursued. The results of such research can benefit both patient and therapist.

Ekman and Friesen (1968) concur with Mahl and state that visually distinctive movements or positions have distinctive psychological meaning. Specific non-verbal acts have specific psychological meaning. For example, the type and frequency of foot and hand acts were found to change radically from the beginning to the end of psychiatric hospitalization. The hand toss which communicates frustrated anger, is shown only at admission and not at discharge. They continue by stating that it does seem likely that measures of non-verbal behavior of the patient during different therapy hours could be utilized for "in therapy outcome measures" of change and
that initial interview non-verbal behavior might serve as part of the basis for classification and assignment of patients to treatment conditions.

Counselors who master the interpretation of non-verbal cues will possess the ability to gain much additional insight in the initial counseling interview. These non-verbal interpretation cues can be used when: (1) a client is not willing to verbalize the information or, (2) because he cannot be directly asked for the information, or (3) he does not know the information, in the sense it is not within his awareness, or (4) because there is reason to doubt what he says verbally (p. 214).

Birdwhistell (1970) cautions:

While body motion is based in the psychological structure, the communicative aspects of the behavior are patterned by social and cultural experiences. The meaning of such behavior is not so simple that it can be itemized in a glossary of gestures, nor is meaning encapsulated atomistically in particular motions. It can be derived only from the examinations of the patterned structure of the system of body motion as a whole as this manifests itself in the particular social situation. (p. 173)

It is imperative for counselors and therapists to understand that non-verbal gesture and behavior must be studied and interpreted in the context of the social and clinical setting in which they are manifest. Research must also be pursued to establish if the non-verbal behavior of Anglo client is the same as that of Puerto Rican clients within our culture.
Differences in Client Perception of Interaction

Distance and Counselor Trunk Lean

Pierce (1970) studied client attitudes generated by varied interaction distances and counselor trunk lean in the dyadic counseling interaction. The subject population (N=30) was composed of 10 male clients, 10 male counselors and 10 male administrators from the University of Massachusetts.

One surprising result was that there were no differences between clients, counselors and administrators in terms of preference for interaction distance or posture. Pierce found the interaction distance which generated the most positive subject attitude were the two middle distances of 39 inches and 48 inches. It is interesting to note that these two distances fall within Hall's (1969) personal distance. The distance which contributed the less positive attitude were 30 inches and 60 inches.

Subjects in Pierce's study preferred a forward trunk lean and the upright position on the part of the counselor as opposed to a backward trunk lean on his part. Pierce's study concurs with the research of James (1932) and Mehrabian (1968) who also found that subject attitude in a social encounter was more positive for forward trunk lean and upright position on the part of the interactor as opposed to a backward lean of the trunk.
In short, Pierce (1970) found the greater the interaction distance, the more preferable a forward trunk lean becomes. The closer the interaction distance the more preferable the upright position becomes. The most preferable posture by distance combination for the counseling interaction were the upright position at 39 inches and the forward trunk lean at 48 inches. The implications of this research for counselors who wish to generate a positive client attitude is obvious.

Pierce's (1970) findings appear to be contrary to research conducted by Haase and DiMattia (1970) which found significant differences between three groups of subjects similar to Pierce's sample. One basic difference between the studies, however, is that the significant difference between counselors, clients, and administrators in the Haase and DiMattia study were in terms of preference for furniture arrangement in a counseling encounter, whereas, the present study focused upon different distance within the same furniture arrangement. Another difference was that Pierce used all undergraduate students and in the Haase and DiMattia study, the counselors and administrators were graduate students with some experience in counseling.

A limitation of the Pierce study is that all of the subjects were male and students with similar cultural backgrounds, therefore it is difficult to generalize the findings to other groups. The stimuli presented to the students were
black and white slide photographs and it is apparent from Haase and Markey's (1973) study on methodology, that photographs are a weak stimulus. Video tape, actors, or an in vivo situation would have resulted in a stronger stimuli.

However, Pierce's data is confirmed by other studies, James (1932), Mehrabian (1968), Tepper (1972) and Kelly (1971). This data is very important for the practicing counselor in establishing client-counselor rapport, but he must understand the implication of the original research and to whom it can be generalized.

Non-verbal Counselor Characteristics

Strong, Taylor, Bratton and Loper (1971) studied non-verbal behavior and preceived counselor characteristics. To determine the impact of counselor's non-verbal behavior on student's descriptions of counselors, 86 college coeds viewed and/or heard one of two counselors who emitted either high or low frequencies of non-verbal movements in a standard interview segment.

The results of the study are surprising, coeds hearing and seeing the counselors versus only hearing them, described the counselors more negatively, apparently because some visual cues disrupted their positive stereotype of counselors. High frequencies of movement led to more positive descriptions of counselors than low frequencies which yielded descriptions such as cold, aloof and analytic (p. 554).
The results of the study leave little doubt that counselors' gestural, postural and other non-verbal movements have an impact on how he is perceived and described by observers. It seems whether the counselor moves much has an effect on how he is described. Counselor's movements in counseling may have a similar impact on clients, even, though, unlike observers, clients attend to their own behavior as well as the counselors'.

The studies reviewed so far indicate the importance of non-verbal behavior in the counseling interaction. A counselor who is aware of the non-verbal dynamics occurring during the counseling session is better able to understand and help his client. In the following studies, Kelly (1971) worked with hospitalized patients and not a student population and studied selected therapist proxemic variables on these patients.

**Effects of Selected Therapist Proxemic Variables on Client Attitudes**

Kelly (1971) studied non-verbal communication in the counseling and psychotherapeutic process. He investigated the differential effects of selected therapist proxemic variables on client attitudes. Sixty male subjects, age 18 to 25, representing paranoid schizophrenic character disorders, educational and vocational difficulties and controls, were individually shown 72 pictures of a therapist seated and
talking with a client. In each picture, the following therapist proxemic cues were varied; interaction distance, eye contact, openness of arms and legs, trunk lean and body orientation. The subjects were asked to rate, from each picture, on a five-point scale, how they thought the therapist felt about them, based on how he was seated.

Kelly's (1971) research indicates that the following non-verbal therapist cues are instrumental in the conveyance of positive therapist affect or attitude:

1. Closer interaction distance
2. Eye contact
3. A forward trunk lean
4. A face to face body orientation

It appears from Kelly's study, that widely disparate client groups do not perceive the therapist non-verbal cues in a significantly different manner. He concludes that different non-verbal therapist proxemic cues are instrumental to the conveyance of positive or negative affect to the client within the context of a counseling or psychotherapeutic analogue situation.

The result of Kelly's research has important implications for the practicing counselor or therapist. The author feels it would be valuable to examine Kelly's specific empirical data with relation to:

1. Distance in the counseling session
2. Eye contacts
3. Body orientation
4. Trunk lean
5. Posture

Distance

That physical distance functions as a cogent evaluation therapist cue was demonstrated in Kelly's (1971) study. The interaction distance of 39 inches appears to be a cogent stimulus which may be ordered along a positive evaluative dimension. It would seem reasonable that during those periods of the counseling relationship that are characterized by a special need for "closeness" that the interpersonal distance is instrumental in the conveyance of positive therapist regard. Likewise, a distance of 80 inches is equally important, it would seem that this distance emerges as a strong negative discriminative therapist stimulus, possibly communicating to the client disapproval, reproach and rejection. The 80 inches distance is not seen as desirable by clients and most likely has fairly strong negative communicational connotations (Kelly 1971; pp. 147-148).

This information is invaluable for counselors and therapists in setting up their office for counseling or therapy, in which they wish to convey a positive or negative affect with their clients.
Eye Contact

Therapist eye contact also emerged as a vital component related to the communication process. All of the client groups perceived therapists visual interaction as being related to the communication of a positive evaluative attitude. However, the absence of eye contact by the therapist consistently was related to the communication of negative affect or attitude (Kelly 1971; pp. 148-149).

Body Orientation

How the counselor or therapist positions himself (i.e., face to face as opposed to rotated) in relation to the client, can create a positive or negative attitude. If the therapist engages in direct, face-to-face orientation during the counseling interaction, this is generally perceived by the client as favorable and indicative of a positive counselor affect. However, turning away from the client (90 degrees rotation) signals or conveys negative therapist feelings or attitudes to the client (Kelly 1971; pp. 149-150).

Trunk Lean

When the counselor leans forward, slightly, towards his client, this is most likely to be interpreted by the client as a positive affective strategy. On the other hand, by leaning backwards, the therapist conveys a less preferential
and most likely negative attitudinal set to the client. An overall assessment of the communicational valence of the three types of trunk lean conditions would seem to indicate that the forward trunk lean falls on the positive end of the evaluative continuum, the upright position seems to have mainly neutral connotations and the backward trunk lean condition has definite negative communicational overtones (Kelly 1971; pp. 150-151).

If a counselor or therapist assumes either a forward or a backward trunk lean while interacting with the client, it is easier to predict what the client's response will be than if the counselor assumes the upright position.

**Posture**

Does the therapist's posture (i.e., open arms and legs) have a significant and positive effect on the client's inferred attitude in the counseling situation? Kelly's research indicates that the accessibility of therapists' posture has little ascertainable influence on the client insofar as the communication of positive or negative affect is concerned (Kelly 1971; pp. 152-153). These findings seem to concur with Mehrabian (1968) with relation to the importance of posture (i.e., open arms and legs).

The following conclusions may be drawn from Kelly's (1971) study. Close interaction distance to the client, combined with eye contact, a forward trunk lean and a
face-to-face orientation, all emerge as factors which would seem to lead to more positive communication between the counselor and his client. On the other hand, by increasing the interaction distance, avoiding eye contact, leaning backward and not facing the client, a counselor would, in all likelihood, increase the probability that he is actively communicating negative or less preferential attitudes to the client (p. 179).

The author believes Kelly's (1971) research is an important contribution in the field of counseling and therapy. He did not use a student population but actual patients at the state hospital. The only limitation would be the methodology. The data would have been more generalizable if he had used a live counseling session, actors, or a video tape presentation as a stimulus rather than black and white photographs. It is difficult to generalize from photographs to an in vivo counseling or therapeutic sessions.

Kelly (1971) does not describe the cultural background of any of his subjects. This cross cultural data would have been very important for the practicing counselor, because he finds himself counseling more and more students from different cultures, particularly Puerto Ricans. There appears to be little or no research on proxemic variables of Puerto Rican students. Hall (1969) studied the proxemic variables (man's use of space and distance) of the Germans, French,
English, Arabs and Japanese people and it will be reviewed in the latter part of Chapter II.

It is important for the reader to realize that non-verbal communication does not just occur in the one-to-one counseling sessions, but it also is an important part of group counseling (Rogers 1970), assertive training (Serber 1972), and other areas (Fast 1974) of social interaction.

**Non-verbal Components of Assertive Training**

Serber (1972) in teaching the non-verbal components of assertive training states that most published and verbal reports dealing with assertive training concentrate primarily on the explicit verbal message. Serber believes, as in teaching of verbal behavior, the elements that are considered most important for communication are selected, giving priority to those whose shaping is likely to contribute most significantly to the end product which he calls "a total socially meaningful behavior." Serber breaks down the components of non-verbal behavior in assertive training into the following:

1. Loudness of voice
2. Fluency of spoken word
3. Eye contact
4. Facial expression
5. Body expression
6. Distance from person with whom one is interacting (p. 180)
When counselors are working with clients with assertive problems, they must be aware of all of the non-verbal components to help the client deal with his problem effectively.

**Inter-family Relationships and Body Language**

Counselors do not only work with students but also their families. Parent conferences for many counselors seem to be increasing, whether it be for maturational adjustment, educational or vocational reasons. Much non-verbal communication occurs during family counseling. Fast (1974) describes some of the non-verbal family interaction.

Fast (1974) says:

Body language has also shed new light on the dynamics of inter-family relationships. A family sitting together, for example, can give a revealing picture of itself simply by the way its members move their arms and legs. If the mother crosses her legs first and the rest of the family then follows suit, she has set the lead for the family action, though she, as well as the rest of the family, may not be aware she is doing it. In fact, her words may deny her leadership as she asks her husband or children for advice. But the unspoken, follow-the-leader clues in her actions, gives the family set-up away to someone knowledgeable in Kinesics. (pp. 1-2)

While working with a student and his family, a counselor can gain much insight if he is aware of the interplay of body language and the verbal dialogue.
Tepper (1972) studied the communicational significance of verbal and selected non-verbal cues in the perception of specific counselor attitudes of empathy, respect and genuineness. Four channels of verbal, vocal, facial and body communication were studied with the purpose of understanding how each channel contributed to the transmission of these counselor attitudes.

Because of the potential value of Tepper's (1972) study to the author's intended research, which will study proxemic and non-verbal variables for Anglo and Puerto Rican students with relation to Anglo and Puerto Rican counselors, an extensive and indepth review will be presented.

An experimental procedure was used which allowed for the simultaneous presentation of both verbal and non-verbal cues of attitudinal communication for rating by both experienced counselors and actual clients. A video tape stimulus was specially designed which consisted of thirty-two role played interactions between an actor-counselor and an actor-client. The counselor's response contained the thirty-two possible combinations of a forward-backward trunk lean, direct-averted eye gaze, concerned-indifferent vocal intonation, concerned-indifferent facial expression and high-low verbal message.
All subjects rated all thirty-two interactions on all three counselor attitudes of empathy, respect and genuineness, along a five point scale.

Tepper used Truax and Carkhuff's (1967) definition of empathy which is defined as one which "involves both the therapist's sensitivity to current feelings and his verbal facility to communicate this understanding in a language attuned to the client's current feelings" (p. 64). It is an ability to feel the client's fears, disappointments and anger, etc., as if it were the counselor's own and the ability to convey this understanding to the client in a way that helps him see it with more clarity. An empathic individual sees the other person's world as that person sees it.

Unconditional positive regard, respect or non-possession warmth is defined by Rogers (1961) as "an acceptance of and a caring for the client as a separate person, with permission for him to have his own feelings and experiences and to find his own meaning in them" (p. 283).

Genuineness is defined by Truax and Carkhuff (1967) as "beginning at a very low level where the therapist presents a facade or defends and denies feelings and continuing to a high level of self-congruence when the therapist is freely and deeply himself" (p. 68).

What is important for counselors to know, is the relationship of the core condition of empathy, respect and genuineness to the counseling outcome. Does it make a
difference? After an extension review of the research literature relating psychotherapy outcome with the core condition, Truax and Mitchell (1971) concluded that:

These studies taken together suggest that therapists and counselors, who are accurately empathic, non-possessively warm in attitude and genuine are indeed effective. (p. 310)

They go on to say that the findings:

... hold for a wide variety of therapists and counselors, regardless of their training or theoretical orientation and with a wide variety of clients and patients. (p. 310)

A counselor or therapist having these three attitudes is not enough, for personal growth to take place, as stated by Rogers (1967):

... unless some communication of these attitudes has been achieved then such attitudes do not exist in the relationship as far as the client is concerned. (p. 78)

Tepper's research investigated the relationship between the verbal and non-verbal channels of communication to client perception of counselor empathy, respect and genuineness.

Two groups of subjects were selected for the study. One group consisted of 15 male students who presented themselves for counseling at the University Counseling Center. The students ranged in age from 18 to 25 and represented a variety of counseling problems.

The second group of subjects consisted of 15 experienced male counselors and psychotherapists or doctoral level counselors in training. A video tape stimulus consisting of
thirty-two roles played interactions between an actor counselor and an actor-client were shown to all subjects.

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

Each subject rated all thirty-two interactions on all three dependent measures (empathy, respect and genuineness). All subjects were given instruction to make their judgments according to a modified five-point scale adapted from Carkhuff (1969) on the basis of brief description of empathy, positive regard and genuineness. They were instructed to make the ratings according to the feelings about the attitude communicated by the counselor.

Example of the scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No feelings</th>
<th>Surface Feelings</th>
<th>Deep Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The counselor communicates no understanding of obvious feeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The counselor communicates some understanding of obvious feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The counselor communicates accurate understanding of surface, but not deep feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The counselor communicates accurate understanding of surface and some deep feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The counselor communicates accurate understanding of surface and deep feelings. (p. 163)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tepper (1972 says:

The data was analyzed for each of the three dependent measures of empathy, respect and genuineness by the separate 2 X 2 X 2 X 2 X 2 X 2 factorial analysis of variance with repeated measures on the five independent factors. The results indicate that higher levels of all three counselor attitudes were communicated when the counselor was in a forward trunk lean position, maintained direct eye contact, spoke in a concerned vocal intonation and showed a concerned facial expression. The verbal message factor was a significant determinant for higher levels of empathy and respect, but did not reach significance for the genuineness dimension.

Counselors and clients did not differ significantly in their response . . . In general, the interaction effects were more important in the communication of genuineness, but for all three attitudes, the interaction effects suggested a compensatory and additive function when the communication cues were transmitted simultaneously. (pp. IV-V)

Tepper explains the non-verbal component . . . the non-verbal effects explained from two to nine times the amounts of variability in judgment as was explained by the verbal factor. The general conclusion was reached that non-verbal cues are extremely important factors in the communication of counselor empathy, respect and genuineness (p. V).

It is evident from Tepper's (1972) research that non-verbal behavior plays a part in the communicational process of the counseling interaction. Kelly (1970), Pierce (1970) and others give strong support to Tepper's conclusions. In calculating the ratio of the effect of non-verbal cues to verbal cues, Tepper found the ratio for empathy is about 2:1 with non-verbal cues accounting for twice the variability in judged empathy. For respect (unconditional positive regard)
the ratio is 5:1 with five times the variability being accounted for by non-verbal cues. He found the verbal components of genuineness did not account for any of the variability in genuineness. A ratio can only be calculated if we assign the verbal component the rank of one and then the ratio is 24:1. According to the data, non-verbal cues account for 24 times the variability than verbal cues in the communication of counselor genuineness.

Tepper's study will give many counselors and therapists an additional insight into understanding their clients and patients. Tepper's (1972) study has established an empirical foundation for the present author's future research. He has demonstrated the contribution of non-verbal cues in the counseling process. What needs to be researched is the cross cultural implication of proxemic and non-verbal cues in the counseling process. In particular, with the influx of Puerto Ricans into our schools, a counselor must be aware of the cultural difference of Puerto Ricans with relation to non-verbal communication and proxemic variables. There appears to be little or no research studies concerned with mainland Puerto Rican proxemics and non-verbal cues in the counseling process.

Non-verbal Behavior in the Initial Helping Interaction

D'Augelli (1974) studied the non-verbal behavior of helpers in the initial helping interaction. He says that
non-verbal attending behavior is important in the creation and maintenance of a helping relationship. Of the behaviors studied, smiling and nodding were most consistently related to indexes of helpers' performance. Observers' ratings of helper interpersonal skills were related positively to both smiling and nodding. They viewed those who smiled as warm and those who nodded as showing empathic understanding. Nodding was the most salient index of attentiveness discovered in D'Augelli's (1974) research study.

It is evident from the multifacted research quoted that kinesics and body language, which includes gestures, facial expression, eye movement and postural movements, communicate many non-verbal messages to a client. A counselor who is cognizant of the meaning of the non-verbal cues will be in a better position to help his client attain the changes desired.

Proxemics: A Closer Look

No one knows how much space is necessary for any individual person. It depends upon many variables, such as, personality, geographical location and cultural background, etc. What is important in studying body language and proxemics is what happens to a person when his space or territory is invaded.

Hall (1969), Professor of Anthropology at Northwestern University, has coined the word proxemics to describe his
theories and observations about zones of territory and how man uses them. Hall drew largely from the work of zoologists, ethnologists and observations in formulating his theories.

Hall's (1969) studies of proxemics (i.e., how man unconsciously structures microspace--the distance between men in the conduct of daily transactions, the organization of space in his house and buildings and ultimately the layout of his cities and towns) has three main aspects. In his anthropology of space, he uses an organizing model in which proxemics is a manifestation of microculture having three main aspects.

1. Fixed-feature space
2. Semifixed-featured space
3. Informal space

He discovered, contrary to popular belief, that territorial behavior for any given stage of life (such as dating or rearing children) is quite fixed and rigid. The boundaries of the territories remain reasonable, constant, as do the locations for specific activities within the territory, like sleeping and eating. The territory is an extension of the organism, which is marked by visual, vocal and olfactory signs. Man has created material extension of territoriality as well as visible and invisible territorial markers (pp. 101, 102, 103).
Fixed-featured Space

Fixed-featured space is one of the basic ways of organizing the activities of individuals and groups. It includes material manifestations as well as the hidden, internalized designs that govern behavior as man moves about on the earth. Hall says buildings are one expression of fixed-featured pattern, but buildings are also grouped together in characteristic ways as well as being divided internally according to culturally determined designs. The layout of villages, towns, cities and the intervening countryside is not haphazard but follow a plan which changes with time and culture. Some aspects of fixed-feature space are not visible until one observes human behavior. For example, the invisible boundary which separates one yard from another in suburbia is also a fixed feature of American culture. The important point about fixed-featured space is that it is the mold into which a great deal of behavior is cast. One of the problems facing us today in rebuilding our cities is understanding the needs of large numbers of people. Architects are building huge apartment houses and mammoth office buildings with no understanding of the needs of the occupants (pp. 103-107).

Semifixed-featured space

The second aspect of proxemics has been designated semifixed-featured space. Semifixed space enables man to
increase or decrease his rate of interaction with others. He does this by means of furniture arrangement and organization.

Hall (1969) states:

What is desirable is flexibility and congruence between design and function so that there is a variety of spaces and people can be involved or not, as the occasion and mood demand. . . . Many have had the experience of getting a room nicely arranged only to find that conversation was impossible if the chairs were left nicely arranged. (p. 110)

It is important to realize that what is fixed-featured space in one culture, according to Hall, may be semifixed in another. In Japan, for example, the walls are movable, opening and closing as the day's activities change. In the United States, people move from room to room or from one part of a room to another for each different activity, i.e., eating, sleeping, working or socializing. In Japan, it is quite common for a person to remain in one spot while the activities change.

Haase and DiMattia (1970) studied counselors, clients and administrators' preference for seating arrangements in a dyadic interaction, a study involving semifixed featured space. They discovered that counselors, clients and administrators showed distinct preference for one kind of furniture arrangement over others in the dyadic interaction.

The most preferred interaction position across all subjects is that which depicts the participant interacting over the corner of a desk. However, there were also significant interaction between group members in the preference for a
particular arrangement. For example, administrators preferred across the desk interviewing while counselors thought the face to face position was more effective.

**Informal Space**

In addition to the fixed and semifixed aspects of space, described above, there is also an informal space. Hall (1969) says this informal space is perhaps the most significant for the individual because it includes the distance maintained in encounters with others. These distances are for the most part, outside awareness, but informal space patterns have distinct bounds and such a deep significance that they form an essential part of our culture.

Birds and mammals have territories which they occupy and defend against their own kind. They also have a series of uniform distances which they maintain from each other. These animal distances have been classified as flight distance, critical distance and personal and social distance. These distances have been amply substantiated by animal psychologists such as Hediger.

In studying man, flight distances and critical distances have been eliminated from human reactions but personal and social distances, according to Hall (1969) are obviously still present.

In the study of man, Hall (1969), influenced by Hediger's animal work, has discovered four separate distances
within informal space. He termed these distances: (1) intimate, (2) personal, (3) social, and (4) public. He says how people are feeling toward each other at the time, is a decisive factor in the distance used. Each of the four distance zones has a near and a far phase which can vary somewhat with differences in personality and environmental factors. For example, high noise levels or low illumination will ordinarily bring people closer together.

Hall (1969) describes the four distances in its near and far phase.

**Intimate Distance Close Phase**

At the close phase of intimate distance, there is less than six inches separating the participants. This is the distance for love-making and wrestling, comforting and protecting. Physical contact or the high possibility of physical involvement is uppermost in the awareness of both persons. Vocalization, at intimate distances, plays a very minor part in the communicational process. A whisper can have the effect of expanding the distance.

**Intimate Distance—Far Phase**

The far phase of intimate distance, six to eighteen inches, is still close enough to hold hands and touch each other. The heat and odor of the other person's breadth may
may be detected at six to eighteen inches, the voice is used but is normally held at a very low level of even a whisper.

The use of the intimate distance in public at the far phase is not considered proper by adult, middle-class Americans. However, it should be noted that American proxemic patterns for intimate distance are by no means universal. Middle Eastern subjects in public places, do not express the outraged reaction to being touched by strangers which one encounters in American subjects.

**Personal Distance--Close Phase**

Personal distance from one-and-a-half to two-and-a-half feet can be thought of as a small protective sphere or bubble that an organism maintains between himself and others. At the close phase, one can hold or grasp the other person. For example, a wife can stay inside the circle of her husband's close personal zone with impunity. For another woman to do so is an entirely different story.

**Personal Distance--Far Phase**

Keeping someone at arm's length is one way of expressing the far phase of personal distance. It extends from two-and-a-half to four feet. A point that is just outside easy touching distance by one person to a point where two people can touch fingers if they extend both arms. When people meet in the street, they will stop at this distance to talk.
There is no real physical domination at this distance. Subjects of personal interest and involvement can be discussed at this distance.

Social Distance--Close Phase

The close phase of social distance is from four to seven feet. Impersonal business occurs at this distance. People who work together tend to use close social distance. It is a very common distance for people who attend casual social gatherings. The office manager would use this distance with his secretary and receptionist.

Social Distance--Far Phase

The far phase of social distance, seven to twelve feet, is for more formal social and business relationships. Desks in the offices of important people are large enough to hold visitors at the far phase of social distance. A proxemic feature of social distance is that it can be used to insulate or screen people from each other. This distance makes it possible for them to continue to work in the presence of another person without appearing to be rude. At this distant phase, the voice level is noticeably louder than for the close phase.
Public Distance—Close Phase

The close phase of public distance extends from twelve to twenty-five feet. This is suited for more informal gatherings, such as teachers addressing a roomful of students or a boss at a conference of workers. A term applied to the close phase of public distance is "formal style" and this appropriately portrays social involvement at that distance.

Public Distance—Far Phase

Finally, the far phase of public distance extends from twenty-five feet or more. Thirty feet is the distance that is automatically set around important public figures. The usual public distance is not restricted to public figures but can be used by anyone on public occasions.

Why Four Distances?

Hall (1969) states the hypothesis behind the proxemic classification system:

It is the nature of animals, including man, to exhibit behavior which we call territoriality. In so doing, they use the senses to distinguish between one space or distance and another. The specific distance chosen depends on the transaction; the relationship of the interacting individuals, how they feel and what they are doing. The four-part classification system used here is based on observation of both animals and men. Birds and apes exhibit intimate, personal and social distances just as man does. (p. 128)

Hall (1969) discovered that differences in the zones and even their existence, became apparent only when Anglos began
to interact with foreigners who organize their senses differently so that what was intimate in one culture might be personal or even public in another. For the first time, Anglos became aware of their own spacial envelopes, which he had previously taken for granted. Hall (1955) found that Latin Americans prefer a closer interaction distance than their Anglo counterpart. The present study will investigate adolescent mainland Puerto Rican students preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter.

The ability to recognize the various zones of involvement and the activities, relationships and emotions associated with each, has now become extremely important. Hall says the world's population is crowding into cities and builders are packing people into vertical filing boxes, both offices and dwellings. However, if one sees man surrounded by a series of invisible bubbles which have measurable dimensions, architecture can be seen in a new light.

If people are cramped into spaces, with no regard to the four zones of distance, they find themselves forced into behavior, relationships or emotional outlets that are overly stressful. When stress increases, sensitivity to crowding rises, people get more on edge and more and more space is required as less and less is available.
Body Buffer Zones

Dr. Augustus E. Kenzel (1970) evolved a theory, while working at the U.S. Medical Center for Federal prisoners, which may point the way toward detecting, predicting and even treating violent behavior in men. He asked the question, are violent individuals provoked simply by physical closeness to others? From his observations of prisoners, he discovered that physical proximity to another inmate was at least as powerful a trigger of violence as were threats, thefts or other more overt provocations.

The hypersensitivity to physical closeness appeared quite similar to what ethologists refer to as reaction distance. Kenzel (1970) studied comparative measurement of the body-buffer zones of eight violent and six nonviolent prisoners. He found that the zones of the violent group to be almost four times larger than the nonviolent. In the violent group, the rear zones were larger than the front zones. The average zone area for the violent group was 29.3 square feet while the average for the nonviolent group was 7.0 square feet. The violent prisoners appeared to react differently from the nonviolent group when approached from the rear. They were less able to tolerate closeness in the rear and many said they experienced tingling and goose pimples across the shoulders and backs. All this suggests that the violent group perceived their rear zone as a vulnerable body area.
The large zone of the violent group may reflect a pathological body image state.

Although Kenzel's (1970) sample of fourteen prisoners was small and he performed the sampling and procedures himself, the author feels the data generated lays an excellent foundation for further experimental research.

If counselors are aware of Kenzel's body buffer zone theory, it will help them to be more effective in dealing with potential violent and disruptive students. It is obvious that potentially violent students should not be forced into a two by four counseling cubicle to discuss their problems. Also, counselors should advise teachers of the body buffer zone theory for dealing with potentially violent students.

Moreover, Kenzel (1970) suggests that body-buffer zone measurements may also be of value in the treatment and prognosis of individuals showing a predisposition toward violent behavior. Periodic zone measurements might document the effect of psychotrophic medication, need for incarceration and imprisonment. Such information is urgently needed by courts, staffs of correctional institutions and psychiatrists working with violent individuals, who now have to make such distinction on an impressionistic basis. Kenzel's study emphasized the view that violent behavior may be one sign of a distinct psychopathological complex that includes, among other factors, a marked disturbance in personal space.
The work of Hall (1969), Pierce (1970), Kelly (1971) and Kenzel (1970) gives empirical support to the hypothesis that man has variable interaction distances for differing situations. These studies also tend to bear out the hypothesis that both personality and interpersonal attitude affect interaction distance in a variable manner.

**Interaction Distance Anxiety**

Dinges and Oetting (1971) studied the interaction distance anxiety in the counseling dyad. Sixty-six male and sixty-six female undergraduate volunteers rated anxiety associated with five dyadic interaction distances with either no instructional set or with a personal-counseling set.

At all distances, females responded with higher anxiety scores than males and personal-counseling set subjects responded with higher anxiety scores than no-set subjects. Anxiety scores across distance indicated that the nearer (30 inches) and the far (88 inches) distance received the highest anxiety ratings with intermediate distances being rated significantly lower.

Photographs depicting seated male and female models at varying interaction distances were used as the interaction distance stimuli. The actual distances were 30, 39, 50, 66 and 88 inches. The differences between subjects responding to interaction distance stimuli under a personal counseling instructional set and those responding without the set
indicates that the counseling situation is associated with greater anxiety. Since the anxiety level is higher at all distances in the counseling set as opposed to the interpersonal interaction set, it should be obvious to the counselor that to be optimally effective, he must be aware of and sensitive to interaction distance as an important non-verbal component of the counseling process.

Lecompte and Dumont (1973) examined the effects of various intensities of lighting as well as interpersonal distance on the communication of empathy by counselors in analogue counseling situations. Eighteen counselors-in-training in a masters degree program were randomly assigned to three levels of interpersonal distance, 30 inches, 50 inches and 80 inches and three levels of lighting intensity, one-foot candle, 32-foot candles and 200-foot candles. Twenty minute interviews, dealing with personal concerns of the clients were scheduled. Extracts from each third of the interviews were randomly selected for judges to rate according to Carkhuff's scale of communication assessment.

An analysis of the results indicate that there was an interaction effect between lighting intensity and interpersonal distance, indicating that the communication of counselor empathy was enhanced when lighting in the counseling office was minimal (one-foot candle) and interpersonal distance was medium (50 inches). The communication of positive counselor attitude at the intermediate distance is supported
by the research of Dinges and Oetting (1971), Kelly (1971) and Pierce (1970).

In studying proxemic behavior as a function of race and sex, Banks (1973) investigated blacks within American society to see if they learn and enact different personal space definitions from those of the majority culture. The forty subjects were exposed, via video tape stimulus materials to four social interaction scenes in which the race and sex of the models and confederate were systematically varied. The results of the study showed statistically significant differential preferences for social interaction distances between black and white subjects. The white subjects preferred closer interaction distance than did the black subjects.

The interpretation of the main effect which implies that white subjects preferred closer interaction distance than did the black subjects must be altered when the race of subject by race of stimulus interactions is examined. According to Banks (1973) in the interaction, there is no differential preference for interpersonal interaction distance between white and black subjects when the race of the stimulus is black. However, a reversal of this pattern is observed when the stimulus is white. Under this condition, black subjects position themselves farther from the white stimulus than did white subjects.

Banks (1973) concluded that implications for counselors, derived from the study, suggest that white counselors in a
dyadic interaction with black clients must be especially aware of differential preference for interaction distances. It seems especially important that white counselors not interpret the non-verbal cues of the black client based on their knowledge of the function of proxemic space which has been primarily generated on predominately white subject population.

Summary of Proxemic Studies

These studies appear to indicate that man uses interpersonal space according to certain rules which vary from situation to situation. Different phases of the distance zones can vary somewhat with differences in personality and environmental factors. For example, high noise levels or low illumination will usually bring people closer together.

Banks (1973) demonstrated that there are statistically significant differential preferences for social interaction distances between blacks and whites. Counselors should not interpret the non-verbal cues of the black client based on their knowledge of the function of proxemic space which has been primarily generated on predominately white subject population. There appears to be little research dealing with adolescent Puerto Ricans preference for proxemic variables in the dyadic counseling encounter.

Knowledge of proxemics, man's use of space, is an invaluable tool which can help counselors to interpret and
understand the multifaceted non-verbal behavior of the clients. Proxemic variables, although different, for other cultures, can give the practicing counselor valuable insight into his multi-cultured client. It is important for the reader to be aware that most of the studies do not validate the counseling outcome. These studies make the counselor aware of the process and dynamics of the client-counselor interaction but have not been related to the actual resolution of a client's problems. The research makes the counselor aware of the attitude he is conveying to his client by his body language, paralanguage and proxemic distance and makes him cognizant of the attitude being conveyed by his client. There is little hard research relating this process to the resolution of client problems. It is strongly suggested that future research be directed towards validating the process with relation to the resolution of client problems.

Cross Cultural Implications

Any counseling relationship, according to Pedersen (1974) is more complicated when the counselor or the client come from different cultures, ethnic groups or value orientation.

Pedersen (1974) posits some questions which clearly demonstrate how complicated cross-cultural (racial and ethnic) counseling can be.
1. What are the ways that cultural differences between a counselor and counselee affect counseling?
2. What are the alternatives to "counseling" in non-Western cultures?
3. How can a counselor evaluate his own implicit cultural bias?
4. How could counselors be better trained to work in a multi-cultural population?
5. How do psychological problems vary with the culture of the clients?
6. Why are some methods better than others in working with persons from other cultures?
7. How can we learn from other cultures in sharpening our own skills as counselors?
8. Can we assume that all counseling is to some extent "cross-cultural"?
9. What are the dangers of cultural encapsulation for a counselor?
10. What are some of the ways in which culture and cultural systems might "cause" problems requiring counseling?
11. Is there evidence that professional counselors are culturally conditioned in their responses?
12. What is "culture shock" and what are the behaviors that indicate its presence?
13. What are some of the barriers to accurate communications across cultures?
14. In what sense are open-minded counselors likely to be better than more dogmatic colleagues as demonstrated in the research literature?
15. How might a counselor from some different culture face advantages and disadvantages in working with a client as compared to a counselor from the client's same culture?
16. What are some of the ways that counselor education programs could be modified to make them more sensitive to multicultural value systems?

Pedersen (1973) in describing the culturally encapsulated counselor says that the construct of "healthy" and "normal" which guides the delivery of mental health and counseling services are not shared by all persons from every culture and may cause the culturally encapsulated counselor to become a tool of his own dominant, political, social or economic values.
He says:

Ethnocentric notions of adjustment tend to ignore inherent cultural values, allowing the encapsulated counselor to evade reality while maintaining a cocoon of internalized value presupposition about what is "good" for the client. This tendency toward cultural isolation is accentuated by the inherent capacity of culture bound and time-honored values to protect themselves against the tentativeness of new knowledge. This very concept and data which define the task of counseling can take on a concrete meaning in reinforcing model stereotypes of cultural groups, separating counselors from the social reality of people from other cultures. (p. 1)

Cultural Differences Which Affect Counseling

Espin and Renner (1974), studying counseling in Latin America state that the needs that gave birth to guidance program in the United States are not the same as those in Latin America. Cultural differences between the United States and Latin America as well as among the Latin American countries themselves, sometimes contribute to the ineffectiveness of approach that has worked well in the United States. The researchers believe that much of the United States youths' need for personal and vocational guidance outside the home stems from the fact that many parents urge the exercise of independent initiative as a valuable learning experience.

In Latin America, Espin and Renner (1974) found the reverse to be true. The deep personal involvement in a young person's behavior on the part of members of the youngster's extended family has traditionally made the counselor much less in demand. Jobs are frequently provided by relatives
and friends, thus students need to pay less attention to developing vocational aptitudes and abilities. Even the Spanish verb for counseling, "aconsejar" presents a problem, for the word means "to tell a person what to do" (p. 298).

The absence of puritan tradition as well as differences in pupil-teacher status relationships, rigidity of instructional programs and the political influences of student elections are also factors that have to be considered when applying North American counseling techniques to Latin American countries. For example, the instructional program rigidity implies, among other problems, that in any given course of study, there are few, if any, electives. Thus, there are fewer pupil-counselor decisions to be made.

On the other hand, many Latin American countries have become increasingly urbanized, with the result that growing numbers of middle class and even lower class youth have moved into higher levels of formal schooling. Many of these youngsters are the first in their family to go beyond elementary school and cannot rely on family advice to make intelligent career choices.

... thus adequate vocational guidance, combined with counseling to solve some difficulties that may arise, are of the greatest importance for the fullest development of human potential. (p. 299)

When students from other cultures come to live in the United States, it is imperative for counselors to understand
the cultural background and psychological needs of their potential clients.

**Barriers to Cross Cultural Counseling**

Barna (1970) cites five barriers to accurate communication across cultures (racial and ethnical):

First, there is the obvious barrier of language differences. Language is much more than learning new sounds syllables, there are many important meanings behind those syllables . . .

Secondly, there is an area of non-verbal communication, such as gestures, posture and other meta messages on which we depend for communication. There is some difficulty in recognizing unspoken codes which come so automatically that they may not even be conscious in our own most familiar culture but which will communicate a definite feeling or attitude.

The third barrier of preconceptions are the over-generalized stereotypes that provide structure to the scrambled raw experiences of our own or another culture. We perceive pretty much what we want to or expect to perceive, screening out many contradictory experiences.

A fourth deterrent is a tendency to evaluate, in an approving or disapproving judgment, the content of communication received from others. Evaluation frequently interferes with understanding the other person from the other's point of view and falling into the trap of communicating that "I know better than you what you should do."

A fifth barrier is the typically high level of anxiety which shrouds cross-cultural communication, where you are dealing with unfamiliar experiences. (pp. 119-132)

Hall (1969) studied the cross cultural implication of proxemics behavior and states:

The Germans, the English, the Americans and the French share significant portions of each others cultures, but at many points, these cultures clash. Consequently, the misunderstandings that arise are all the more serious
because sophisticated Americans and Europeans take pride in correctly interpreting each other's behavior. Cultural differences which are out of awareness are, as a consequence, usually chalked up to ineptness, borishness or lack of interest on the part of the other person. (p. 131)

Hall (1969) describes some of the cultural difference between the Germans, the English and the Americans with relation to privacy, space, neighbors and talking loud or soft. It is evident, from his research, that different use of the senses leads to very different needs regarding space, no matter on what level one cares to consider it. Everything from an office to a town or city will reflect the sense modalities of its builders and occupants.

Hall (1969) cites many examples of cultural differences between Americans and the English, Germans and the French. In a comparison of eye behavior between the English and the Americans, Hall (1969) says:

The Englishman is taught to pay strict attention, to listen carefully, which he must do if he is to be polite. He does not bob his head or grunt to let you know he understands. He blinks his eyes to let you know that he has heard you. Americans, on the other hand, are taught not to stare. We look the other person straight in the eye without wavering only when we want to be particularly certain that we are getting through to him. Proper English listening behavior includes immobilization of the eyes at social distance, so that whichever eye one looks at gives the appearance of looking straight at you. As a result of this, Englishmen are never sure whether an American is listening and Americans are equally unsure as to whether the English have understood them. (p. 143)

Hall says the French home is for the family and the outdoors is for recreation and socializing. The French
entertain in restaurants and cafes. Their homes are quite crowded. The working class and the petite bourgeoisie are particularly crowded which means that the French are sensually much more involved with each other than Americans. The layout of their offices, homes, town, cities and countryside is such to keep them involved.

The Germans, according to Hall, feel that the American structures time very tightly and are sticklers for schedules and leave no free time for themselves. Germans will schedule fewer events in the same time that Americans do and feel less pressed for time than Americans. The meaning of the open door and the closed door are quite different in the two countries. In offices, Americans keep doors open. Germans keep doors closed. Germans think open doors are sloppy and disorderly. To close the door preserves the integrity of the room and provides a protective boundary between people.

In studying the cultural implications of Japan and the Arab world, Hall (1969) discovered that the Japanese view what Americans see as fixed featured space to be semifixed-featured space. To Americans, the walls of a house are fixed. In Japan, they are semifixed.

The walls are movable and rooms are multipurpose, a wall slides back and a meal is brought in. When the meal is over and it is time to sleep, bedding is unrolled in the same spot in which eating, cooking, thinking and socializing took place.
Americans in the Middle East are immediately struck by two conflicting sensations. In public, they are compressed and overwhelmed by smells, crowding and high noise levels. In Arab homes, Americans are apt to feel exposed and often somewhat inadequate because of too much space. Arab spaces, inside their upper middle-class homes, are tremendous by our standards. They avoid partitions because Arabs do not like to be alone. If one is not with people and actively involved in some way, one is deprived of life. Hall (1969) quotes an old Arab saying which reflects their values: "Paradise without people should not be entered because it is Hell." Arabs in the United States, often feel socially and sensorially deprived and long to be back where there is human warmth and contact (p. 159).

Puerto Ricans comprise a significant percentage of potential clients for many school counselors in the Eastern United States. Christensen (1975) says the migration of Puerto Ricans to the mainland over the years has created cultural differences between Puerto Ricans raised in Puerto Rico and those raised in the United States, but both groups are at a disadvantage in the dominant American culture.

In recent years, counselor trainers have become increasingly concerned with helping students whose cultural backgrounds are different from those of the dominant culture in the United States. This is evident from the increase in minority programs and cultural seminars at the Personal and
Guidance conventions and from the increase of journal articles dealing with cultural implications in counseling (Espin and Renner, 1974; Christensen, 1975; etc.).

One of the outcomes of the increased attention given to minority groups is the tendency to lump all minority individuals together. Much of the legislation was originally designed to help blacks, American Indians, Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans and gave the impression that they all had the same needs and disadvantages.

Each group has protested this treatment, according to Christensen (1975) and all have insisted that their uniqueness be recognized and preserved. The need to understand the uniqueness of clients from specific cultures and ethnic backgrounds should be at the top of the list of priorities for every practicing counselor.

Christensen (1975) describes cultural characteristics of which counselors should be aware of in working with Puerto Ricans:

Typically the Puerto Rican is highly individualistic, a person who is not used to worked in concert with others, following in single file and in general, organizing in ways that Anglos would call "efficient." Whether in a traffic jam or a line in a bank, a Puerto Rican may break line and take a position ahead of others. But the Puerto Rican will also offer another person the same privilege, being much more tolerant than Anglos of the demonstration of individuality.

Another characteristic of Puerto Ricans is their demonstration of love and toleration for children. Their love for children is stronger than its stateside equivalent; generally speaking, in fact the family unit is stronger among Puerto Ricans. It is not unusual for
families to add to their broods with nephews, nieces, godchildren and even the children of husbands' alliance with mistresses. It is therefore difficult for the Puerto Ricans arriving at a mainland school to understand all the fuss about different last names and shades of skin color and all the confusion about birth certificates among siblings. (p. 351)

The characteristic of gregariousness, a trait common to nearly all Puerto Ricans, often dismays many Americans, who view it as excessive when compared with their own culture. The existence of larger families or extended families and life on a crowded island are probably causes as well as effects of their gregariousness. Puerto Ricans, love to talk, discuss, gossip, speculate and relate. No one needs an excuse to have a fiesta. Music, food and drink appear instantly if someone comes to visit (pp. 351-352).

Christensen (1975) states that Puerto Ricans are seldom found in professional or managerial jobs. They are usually working in low paying, menial occupations, to an even greater degree than blacks. Christensen, who married into a Puerto Rican family, says there are many causes for this. The low educational levels of Puerto Ricans on the mainland is undoubtedly a significant factor. Prejudice, suspicion, language difficulties and the familiar self-fulfilling prophecy of low aspiration leading to lowly positions also play heavy roles in maintaining the Puerto Rican on the bottom rung of the economic and vocational ladder.

The literature is scant or non-existent with relation to differences between Anglos and Puerto Ricans in the dyadic
counseling interaction. In particular, there seems to be little evidence of any empirical research on proxemic variables, body language or paralanguage in the counseling process, with relation to mainland Puerto Ricans. It is strongly suggested that research in the area be initiated to meet the need of potential clients and to train new counselors more effectively.

**Summary--Cross Cultural**

Hall (1969) says cultural and proxemic patterns differ. By examining them it is possible to reveal hidden cultural frames that determine the structure of a given people's perceptual world. Perceiving the world differently leads to differential definition of what constitutes crowded living, different interpersonal relations and a different approach to both local and international politics.

Puerto Ricans comprise a significant percentage of potential clients for many school counselors. To be a more effective counselor, it is important to be aware of the cultural difference among clients. It is strongly suggested that research dealing with proxemic variables and body language, among mainland Puerto Ricans, be pursued.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Interest in non-verbal communication is not new but it is only within the last decade that researchers have
investigated the relationship between non-verbal behavior and the counseling and psychotherapeutic process. Non-verbal behavior has been classified in the following way:

1. Body language and kinesic behavior including gestures, facial expressions, eye movement and positive movements.
2. Paralanguage: This includes yawning, laughing and grunting as well as the many voice qualities such as pitch, rate, volume, timing and vocal variations.
3. Proxemics: A term which refers to how man unconsciously structures the space around him, and the distance between man and his conduct of his daily transactions. It also studies how man organized his home and buildings and ultimately his cities and towns. (Hall, 1969)

Gladstein (1974) says that seventy-five percent of the non-verbal behavioral research has been done in the last ten years. One reason for this is the development of new scientific equipment to analyze and record the non-verbal data.

A brief historical development of non-verbal communication was presented. Non-verbal behavioral cues were explored in the dyadic counseling encounter, in group counseling and in assertive training groups.

Cross-cultural implications for Anglo counselors with black and Puerto Rican clients was explored. It was evident from the studies of Hall (1955, 1969) and Banks (1973) that differences in social interaction patterns exist between nationalities. Banks (1973) says that the empirical literature is deficient in regard to cross cultural proxemic behavior patterns among subcultural groups living within a society in which the predominant culture is not their own. There
appears to be little research with relation to adolescent mainland Puerto Rican students preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter.

It was demonstrated that from one third to two-thirds of the clients perceive feelings of empathy, respect and genuineness, for the counselor are communicated non-verbally. The problem which arises is that many counselors are not aware of what they are or are not communicating non-verbally in the counseling process. It is also difficult at times for the counselor to understand what the client is communicating non-verbally, which usually confirms or denies what is being communicated verbally.

This problem is magnified when an Anglo counselor works with a client from another culture whose non-verbal behavior differs from Anglo clients. Training programs must be developed to help Anglo counselors understand the many cross cultural differences of their new clients.

Until recently, counseling theory and practice provided very little information related to proxemic variables and interpersonal space in the cross cultural dyadic counseling encounter. The theories and studies compiled prior to this study indicated that man uses interpersonal space according to certain rules which seem to vary from culture to culture. It seems in many instances that positive attitude for Anglo students was indicated by closer interaction distances in the counseling encounter. This study addressed itself to
assessing adolescent Anglo and mainland Puerto Rican male students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 preference for interaction distance and counselor ethnicity in the dyadic counseling encounter.

The results of this study will help counselors and counselor educators better understand the adolescent Puerto Rican students preference for interaction distance and counselor ethnicity in the dyadic counseling encounter. It is hoped that the information will help counselors to become more effective in working with these Puerto Rican clients.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into five main sections. It deals with the description of subjects, the development of the instruments, the apparatus used in testing the subjects, and the statistical design and procedure used in analyzing the data.

The purpose of the study was to assess adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican male students preference for proxemic interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter and to examine their preference for counselor ethnicity.

Subjects

The subject population (N=40) was composed of 20 adolescent Anglo male students and 20 adolescent Puerto Rican male students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8. Each subject was randomly selected and matched for grade and ethnicity. The subjects ranged in age from 11 to 15 years and attended an inner city parochial school in Western Massachusetts. The subjects' socio economic status appeared to be in the lower middle range.

Table I shows the grade placement and ethnicity of the subjects who participated in this study.
TABLE I
SUBJECT POPULATION MATCHED BY GRADE AND ETHNICITY
(N=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Anglo Students</th>
<th>Puerto Rican Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrumentation

The Semantic Differential

The semantic differential (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957) was chosen as the evaluative instrument for this study because it is a reasonably reliable indicator of attitude or preference (Snider and Osgood, 1964; Pierce, 1970). Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) state, with relation to reliability, test-retest correlation data (Reliability Coefficients), that: "Tests and retests were correlated across the 100 subjects and the 40 items producing an N of 4,000. The resulting coefficient was .85" (p. 127).

An instrument is said to be valid when it measures what it is supposed to measure and it is valid to the extent that
scores on it correlate with scores on some criteria of that which is supposed to be measured. The semantic differential is proposed as an instrument for measuring meaning; ideally, therefore, it should be correlated with some independent criteria of meaning—but there is no commonly accepted quantitative criterion of meaning (Osgood, Suci, Tannenbaum, 1957).

In lieu of such criterion, the "face validity" of the semantic differential was examined. An instrument has "face validity" to the extent that the distinctions it provides correspond with those which would be made by most observers without the aid of the instrument. Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) state, "Throughout our work with the semantic differential we have found no reason to question the validity of the instrument on the basis of its correspondence with the results to be expected from common sense" (p. 141).

In a study of the validity of semantic factors Rowan (1954) reports correlations of .983 and .975. Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) state: "An approximate equality of intervals between scales and a similar placement of origins across scales, it seems reasonable to conclude that the scaling properties assumed with the semantic differential have some bases other than mere assumption" (p. 152). " . . . The evaluative dimension of the semantic differential displays reasonable face-validity as a measure of attitude" (pp. 192-193). In a comparison with the Thurstone (1931) scale, it is apparent, that whatever the Thurston scales measure, the
evaluation factor of the semantic differential measures it just about as well. Indeed, when the six validity coefficients are corrected for attenuation, each is raised to the order of .90 or better (Osgood, Suci, Tannenbaum, 1957, p. 194).

In a comparison of semantic structures in American Southwest culture groups, Suci (1960) states that Spanish-American subjects define the semantic space similar to the English-speaking population.

The present study is one of a series investigating the similarity of semantic structures for different groups of subjects—in this case S's from different American Southwest cultures. The factor structures of a sample of semantic scales indicated that Zuni, Hopi, Spanish, and English-speaking S's define a semantic space with similar evaluative and dynamism dimensions (p. 287).

The secondary reason for the selection of the semantic differential is its ease of construction and administration combined with its capability of being objectively scored.

The basic format of the semantic differential consists primarily of a concept to be rated (in this study, interaction distance and counselor ethnicity), followed by a number of scales. The scales are bipolar adjective continua, i.e., "good-bad." Direction of attitude, favorable or unfavorable, is simply indicated by the selection of pole terms by the subject, if the score falls toward the more favorable poles, then the attitude is taken to be more favorable and vice versa (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957).
The initial adjective continua for the semantic differential used in the present study was adapted from the work of Osgood, Suci, Tannenbaum (1957). The criteria for item selection were the high factor analytic loadings for each item as listed in Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957). Originally twelve pairs of adjective continua were chosen (see Appendix A) based on Pierce's (1970) research establishing the validity and reliability of these semantic differential items or instruments for measuring preference in counselor-client interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter. The semantic differential was shown to have construct validity by Osgood, Suci, Tannenbaum (1957) and Pierce (1970).

It has been demonstrated (Osgood, Suci, Tannenbaum (1957) that there are primary factors which contribute to the meaningful judgments made by subjects. The factors which appear to be dominant are evaluation, potency, and activity.

Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) commenting on the Stability of the Evaluative, Potency, and activity Factors state:

A pervasive evaluative factor in human judgment regularly appears first and accounts for approximately half to three-quarters of the extractable variance. Thus the attitudinal variable in human thinking, based as it is on the bedrock of rewards and punishments both achieved and anticipated, appears to be primary... the second dimension of the semantic space to appear is usually the potency factor, and this typically accounts for approximately half as much variance as the first factor--this is concerned with power and the things associated with its size, weight, toughness and the like. The third dimension, usually about equal to or a little smaller in magnitude than the second, is the activity
factor—concerned with quickness, excitement, warmth, agitation and the like. And when other factors can be extracted and identified they typically, again, account for no more than half the amount of variance attributable to the second and third factors (pp. 72-73).

The semantic differential was translated into Spanish for the Puerto Rican subjects. The initial translation was done by the author and reviewed by a junior high school Puerto Rican student attending local public schools. When the translation was finished it was submitted to the director of bilingual services for the public schools to be checked for cultural nuances. Some minor changes were made in order to adapt the adjective pairs of the semantic differential to the mainland Puerto Rican culture (see Appendix A). The final translation was submitted to the bilingual counselor in the target school because she was familiar with the subject population, and as a result one minor change was made (see Appendix A).

Although the subjects in the study were bilingual, the semantic differential was translated into Spanish to eliminate any possibility of misinterpreting the adjective pairs on the check list. The final translation was recorded on audio tape and played for each subject in order to insure the same pronunciation of the Spanish adjectives for all subjects.

A field study was conducted with a similar student population (grade 7 and 8), but not the actual students or schools to be tested in the study, in order to assure the
clarity of the dialogue of the semantic differential, the readability of the instructions and the timing needed to complete the scale.

As a result of the initial field study three of the adjective pairs were eliminated (awful-nice, sacred-profane, and active-passive) because of the lack of comprehension on the part of the middle school students (see Appendix A for final form of semantic differential). To eliminate the possibility of error the subjects recorded their responses on the semantic differential check list rather than Digitek answer sheets.

**Stimulus Materials**

The stimulus materials presented to the subjects were eight black and white video vignettes of a counselor interviewing a junior high school male student. These video vignettes depict individuals interacting at four different distances from each other. Two ethnically different male counselors were used, one an Anglo and the other a Puerto Rican with similar body types.

Examination of Table 2 reveals the ethnical composition of the eight video tape vignettes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>39&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>66&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>39&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>66&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four video vignettes were made with an Anglo counselor and four with a Puerto Rican counselor. The Anglo counselor in the video vignette was employed in the Northeastern United States, male, in his late twenties, early thirties, and in casual dress (sport shirt). The Puerto Rican counselor in the video vignette was a mainland Puerto Rican counselor, employed in the Northeastern United States, male, in his late twenties, early thirties and dressed casually (sport shirt). The clients in the video tape vignettes were Anglo male students representing the age group of the subjects tested (12-13 years old) and dressed informally (sport shirt or sweaters). Two different male students were chosen as clients in order to eliminate any chance of a response set.
In order to identify any possible confounding factors about the person who played the role of the counselors in the video tape vignettes a field study of what the subject population viewed as a typical junior high school counselor was undertaken. The second part of the field study focused on insuring that the subject population was clearly able to distinguish between the Anglo and Puerto Rican counselors in the video tape vignettes.

Results of the present study depend on the subject population being able to identify the Anglo and Puerto Rican counselors in the video tape vignettes without being told which one is Anglo or Puerto Rican. In order to insure the identification the following preliminary study was undertaken.

Photographs were taken of typical Anglo and Puerto Rican counselor types. The photographs were black and white, eight by ten inches, with a front full face view and a plain background. The experimenter was not included in the photographs or the video tapes. A sampling of the subject population was asked to choose from the photographs the person they felt represented a typical Anglo and Puerto Rican counselor and also to positively identify the Puerto Rican counselor.

The subjects, Anglo and Puerto Rican in grades 6, 7 and 8 were presented 8 photographs and asked to: "Put the number of the counselor's picture who you think looks most like a typical Anglo/Puerto Rican junior high school counselor in
the box." The subjects were also asked to check off how sure they were about their choice (see Appendix B for field study questionnaire).

The population for the field study consisted of 69 adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican male students in grades 6, 7 and 8 from two different middle schools in Western Massachusetts. After viewing the photographs 73% of the Anglo and Puerto Rican students choose counselor photograph No. 2 to represent the typical Anglo middle school counselor. Counselor photograph number 4 was chosen by 49.3% of both Anglo and Puerto Rican students to represent a typical Puerto Rican junior high school counselor. Students taking part in the field study attended an inner city parochial school in Western Massachusetts and an upper middle class school in Western Massachusetts. The selected Anglo and Puerto Rican counselors were then used as actors in the video tape vignettes.

Table 3 and 4 show the results of the preliminary photographic field study to determine the typical Anglo and Puerto Rican junior high school counselor. This field study was necessary because the subjects must be able to differentiate between the Anglo and Puerto Rican counselors in the video tape vignettes without being told which is Anglo or Puerto Rican. This field study proved that there is a statistically significant number of subjects who can identify the Puerto Rican counselor.
TABLE 3

RESULTS OF PHOTOGRAPHIC FIELD STUDY AT AN INNER CITY SCHOOL
TO SELECT A TYPICAL ANGLO AND PUERTO RICAN COUNSELOR
(N=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Votes for Anglo Counselor</th>
<th>Votes for Puerto Rican Counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key of Counselor Photographs

1 - Anglo
2 - Anglo
3 - Chinese American
4 - Puerto Rican
5 - Guamanian
6 - Anglo
7 - Puerto Rican
8 - Anglo
### TABLE 4

**RESULTS OF PHOTOGRAPHIC FIELD STUDY AT MIDDLE CLASS SCHOOL TO SELECT A TYPICAL ANGLO AND PUERTO RICAN COUNSELOR (N=20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Votes for Anglo Counselor</th>
<th>Votes for Puerto Rican Counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Student Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key of Counselor Photographs**

1 - Anglo 5 - Guamanian  
2 - Anglo 6 - Anglo  
3 - Chinese American 7 - Puerto Rican  
4 - Puerto Rican 8 - Anglo

Examination of Tables 5 and 6 shows that of the 69 students (49 students from the inner city school and 20 from the upper middle class school) in grades 6, 7 and 8 who participated in the photographic field study, 50 (73%) students selected counselor photo number 2 as the typical Anglo junior.
high counselor and 34 (49.3%) students positively identified counselor photo 4 as a typical Puerto Rican counselor.

**TABLE 5**

RESULTS OF COMBINED PHOTO FIELD STUDY TO SELECT A TYPICAL JUNIOR HIGH ANGLO COUNSELOR (N=69)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Photo No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key of Counselor Photographs

1 - Anglo
2 - Anglo
3 - Chinese American
4 - Puerto Rican
5 - Guamanian
6 - Anglo
7 - Puerto Rican
8 - Anglo
TABLE 6
RESULTS OF COMBINED PHOTO FIELD STUDY TO SELECT A TYPICAL JUNIOR HIGH PUERTO RICAN COUNSELOR (N=69)

| Grade Votes | Photo No. | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|             | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8           | 1        | 0 | 1 | 24| 8 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| 7           | 5        | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 6           | 2        | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Totals      | 8        | 0 | 1 | 34| 16| 0 | 6 | 4 |
| Percent     | 11.6     | 0 | 1.4| 49.3| 23.2| 0 | 8.7| 5.8 |

Key of Counselor Photographs

1 - Anglo  5 - Guamanian
2 - Anglo  6 - Anglo
3 - Chinese American  7 - Puerto Rican
4 - Puerto Rican  8 - Anglo

Apparatus

Video Tape Vignettes

The four interaction distances, depicted in the video vignettes were 30 inches, 39 inches, 48 inches and 66 inches as measured from the center of the counselor chair to the center of the client chair. A neutral upright body position and a neutral verbal dialogue were used so as not to influence the subject's perception one way or the other.
interaction distances were chosen in accordance with Hall's
(1969) theory of personal space and interaction zones.

The video vignettes were timed long enough for the sub-
ject to project himself into the counseling interaction (one
minute). The camera was placed in the same position for the
recording of all eight video vignettes.

Figure 1 depicts the experimental setup for recording
the video tape vignettes. The SONY video camera was placed
15 feet from the client and counselor. Exact distances (30
inches, 39 inches, 48 inches and 66 inches) were measured and
masking tape placed on the floor to make each interaction
distance. Measurements were made for the center of the cli-
ent's chair to the center of the counselor's chair. After one
video tape vignette was recorded, the counselor was
instructed to move to the next marked interaction distance.
Identical lighting and props were used for all eight video
tape vignettes in order to standardize the experiment. A
SONY black and white video tape recorder model 3600 with 1/2
inch new format video tape was used to make the video
vignettes.
Fig. 1 Camera angle and design for recording video vignettes on Sony video tape recorder Model No. 3600 1/2 inch new format video tape.

Statistical Design

This study was designed so that each of the subjects (N=40) responded to the nine item semantic differential (Appendix A) for each of the eight video vignettes. The responses of the subjects were scored by summarizing the values of the semantic differential item for each vignette. These eight totals served as the criterion measure for the study. The data were analyzed in accordance with the prescriptions for a multiple classification analysis of variance with repeated measures (Winer, 1962, p. 319).
The analysis of variance was a $2 \times 4 \times 2$ model: two levels of subject (Anglo--Puerto Rican), four levels of interaction distance (30 inches, 39 inches, 48 inches and 66 inches), and two levels of counselor ethnicity (Anglo--Puerto Rican) were used. Means and standard deviations pertaining to main effects have been presented. Significant interactions have been interpreted by graphs. Data was analyzed by the Biomedical Computer Program BMDP2V. The model for the analysis of variance appears in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TWO GROUPS OF SUBJECTS (ANGLO--PUERTO RICAN) A, RESPONDING TO COUNSELOR ETHNICITY (ANGLO--PUERTO RICAN) B, OVER FOUR PROXEMIC INTERACTION DISTANCES C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within groups</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Counselor ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX Subject within groups</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Distance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Subject within group</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCX Subject within group</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A separate multiple classification analysis of variance was conducted to see if there was any significant difference between students in middle school grades (5-6) and junior high school students (7-8) with relation to their preference for interaction distance and counselor ethnicity in the dyadic counseling encounters. The second analysis of variance was used in testing significance by grade in order that no additional degrees of freedom be lost, and so that no loss of precision in estimating the variance of the main effects in the original hypothesis would occur. The model for that analysis appears in Table 8.

### TABLE 8

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TWO GROUPS OF SUBJECTS (ANGLO-PUERTO RICAN) A, RESPONDING TO COUNSELOR ETHNICITY (ANGLO-PUERTO RICAN) B, OVER FOUR PROXEMIC INTERACTION DISTANCES C, BY GRADE (7-8 Vrs. 5-6) D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Subject ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Grade of Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error between subjects</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Counselor ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX Subjects within group (error B)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D X B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Subject within group (error C)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X A X D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X Subjects within group (error BC)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

Upon entering the testing room the subjects (6 to 8 students) were seated in front of the video tape equipment (Sony 21-inch T.V. receiver). The subjects were presented with a set of standardized semantic differential instructions which have been modified for use with video tape vignettes and machine scored Digitek answer sheets (see Appendix C). In order to standardize the instructions and use the same Spanish pronunciation of the adjectives on the semantic differential and eliminate any possibility of confounding variance, the initial instructions were recorded in English for the Anglo and bilingual Puerto Rican subjects. The paired adjectives on semantic differential scale were recorded by the experimenter in Spanish and English to eliminate any possibility of misinterpretation.
The subjects were placed in a projective situation and asked to express their attitudes about a series of interpersonal interactions (depicted by video tape vignettes), attempting to envision themselves in such a situation. The subjects were expected to respond to variations in interaction distance and the culture (ethnicity) of the counselor without having these factors pointed out to them as such.

The student was asked to respond to how he feels about the counseling interaction, as if he were the client who is discussing a personal problem with the counselor (see Appendix A for exact instructions).

The subjects (6 to 8 at a time) were tested in a room approximately 10 feet by 20 feet, which contained a desk for the 21 inch Sony video tape recorder, student chairs (6 to 8), experimenter's chair and a table for the audio tape cassette and testing materials (see Appendix D for floor plan of room). The 21 inch television receiver was placed about five feet in front of the subject. The room had a combination of natural and artificial lighting and it was kept constant for all subjects. The temperature of the room was thermostatically controlled so that the average temperature remained the same for all subjects.

The subject recorded their answers on a separate semantic differential check list for each video vignette. They were allowed as much time as they needed after each video vignette to record their answers on the check list.
If for any reason the students seemed to be experiencing difficulties in comprehending the instructions, the experi-
menter again explained the nature of the task by reading aloud the instructions again.

The paired adjectives on the semantic differential check list were randomized from positive to negative (good-bad), and from negative to positive (bad-good) to eliminate any chance of a response set. In order to eliminate any chance of response error, the experimenter recorded the subjects' answers from the semantic differential check list onto DIGITEK answer sheets in a positive to negative order (1= highest score; 5= lowest score) for key punching and computer analysis.

The order of presentation of the eight video vignettes was randomized with relation to counselor ethnicity and counselor client distance according to the tables of random num-
bers taken from the CRE Handbook of Tables for Probability and Statistics Miscellaneous Statistical Tables of 14,000 random units, to eliminate subjects response sets.

The randomization is shown in Table 9. For example, video vignette number 2, an Anglo counselor at a distance of 39 inches from the client, after being processed through the table of random numbers was presented as video vignette num-
ber 7 to the subjects. Underlined numbers represent the order of presentation.
TABLE 9
RANDOMIZED VIDEO TAPE VIGNETTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Distance in Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>5 4/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The administration of the entire experimental task took about twenty minutes for each group of students.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

A two by two by four multiple classification analysis of variance and covariance including repeated measures was used to analyze the data from this study. Data relevant to the hypotheses were analyzed by the Biomedical Computer Program BMDP2V. Results of this analysis have been presented in Table 10 (see page 102).

Mean and standard deviations of main effects have been presented in Table 11 (see page 103).

Hypothesis I

There will be no significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students, of preferred counselor behavior as measured by ratings on the semantic differential scale of video vignettes illustrating four differences in interaction distance between counselor and client.

Examination of Table 10 and 11 reveals that the first part of the hypothesis which states: that there is no significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican population, of preferred counselor behavior is true. The second part of the hypothesis which states that there is no significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican populations, preference for counselor-client interaction distance was rejected. Table 10 clearly shows a
TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TWO GROUPS OF SUBJECTS (ANGLO-PUERTO RICAN) A, RESPONDING
TO COUNSELOR ETHNICITY (ANGLO-PUERTO RICAN) B, OVER
FOUR PROXEMIC INTERACTION DISTANCES C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82.1547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Subject ethnicity)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2702</td>
<td>.2702</td>
<td>.1254</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within groups (A)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81.8844</td>
<td>2.1548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>81.9312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Counselor ethnicity)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7850</td>
<td>1.7850</td>
<td>2.6191</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6102</td>
<td>1.6102</td>
<td>2.3627</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X Subjects within group A (error B)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.8984</td>
<td>.6815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Distance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3210</td>
<td>.1070</td>
<td>.5247</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6438</td>
<td>.8812</td>
<td>4.3208</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Subjects within group A (error C)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23.2513</td>
<td>.2039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7245</td>
<td>.5478</td>
<td>2.7190</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5943</td>
<td>.1981</td>
<td>.9370</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC X Subjects within group A (error BC)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>24.1023</td>
<td>.2114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Anglo Students</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Puerto Rican Students</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>30 inches</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>39 inches</td>
<td>1.855</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>48 inches</td>
<td>1.765</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>2.265</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>66 inches</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>2.085</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>30 inches</td>
<td>2.295</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>2.065</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>39 inches</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>48 inches</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>66 inches</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
statistically significant difference (F = 4.320 p < .01) between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students preference for counselor-client interaction distances.

Figure 2 graphically presents the Puerto Rican students preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling session. Judging from the mean responses it would appear that the most preferred interaction distance for counseling is 30 inches (F = 4.320 p < .01). The remaining three distances, 39 inches, 48 inches and 66 inches are the least preferred counseling interaction distances according to Puerto Rican students.

![Graph showing mean scores for interaction distance of Puerto Rican students.](image-url)
Figure 3 graphically presents the Anglo students preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter. The mean response seems to indicate that the most preferred interaction distance is 48 inches ($p < .01$). The next most preferred distances were 66 inches and 39 inches. The least preferable interaction distance for the Anglo student was 30 inches.

![Graph showing mean response for interaction distance for Anglo students.](image)

1 = highest score  
5 = lowest score

Fig. 3 Mean score for interaction distance for Anglo students.

Figure 4 depicts the adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican male students preference for interaction distance in the
dyadic counseling encounter. Puerto Rican students prefer a closer interaction distance for the counseling encounter than their Anglo counterpart \((F = 4.320 \text{ at } p < .01)\).

The first part of Hypothesis I was accepted, there appears to be no significant difference between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students preference for counselor behavior as measured by ratings on the semantic differential. The second part of the hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference between adolescent Anglo and Puerto
Rican students preference for counselor-client interaction distance was rejected. It was shown that adolescent Puerto Rican students prefer a closer interaction distance (30 inches) than do Anglo students (48 inches).

**Hypothesis II**

There will be no significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican population, of preferred counselor behavior as measured by ratings on the semantic differential scale of video vignette illustrating four differences in interaction distances between counselor and client when the counselor in the video vignettes is either Anglo or Puerto Rican.

Examination of Table 10 reveals that there are no statistically significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican populations preference for counselor behavior when the counselor is either Anglo or Puerto Rican. However Table 10 does reveal a statistically significant difference ($F = 2.719$ at $p < .05$) of preference for interaction distance toward an Anglo or Puerto Rican counselor in a dyadic counseling session by the combined Anglo and Puerto Rican student population.

Figure 5 graphically presents combined Anglo and Puerto Rican students, in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8, preference for interaction distance with an Anglo counselor. Judging from the mean responses it would appear that the most preferred
interaction distance with an Anglo counselor is 30 inches. The least preferred distances were 66 inches, 39 inches and 48 inches.

Fig. 5 Mean scores for preference of interaction distance with an Anglo counselor by total group of students (Anglo and Puerto Rican).

Preference for interaction distances with a Puerto Rican counselor by combined Anglo and Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 are graphically prescribed in Figure 6. The most preferred interaction distance with a Puerto Rican Counselor judging from mean response was 48 inches and 66
inches. The least preferred distances were 39 and 30 inches.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{interaction_distance.pdf}
\caption{Mean score for preference of interaction distance with Puerto Rican counselor by total group of students (Anglo-Puerto Rican).}
\end{figure}

Figure 7 graphically presents the combined Anglo and Puerto Rican students, in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 preference for interaction distance with Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors. The mean responses in Figure 6 show that middle school and junior high school students prefer a closer interaction distance with an Anglo counselor and a medium to far interaction
distance with the Puerto Rican counselor in the dyadic counseling encounter.

![Graph showing interaction distances]

**Fig. 7** Mean scores for preference of interaction distance with Anglo and Puerto Rican counselors by total group of students (Anglo - Puerto Rican).

Table 12 reports the means and standard deviation of the students preference for interaction distance with Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors.
TABLE 12
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR INTERACTION DISTANCE
BY ANGLO OR PUERTO RICAN COUNSELOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Distance in Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 1.78$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 2.18$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis II which states that there will be no significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students preference for counselor ethnicity was accepted. There were no statistically significant differences in Anglo or Puerto Rican student preference for Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors, however, there were significant differences of preference for interaction distances toward an Anglo or Puerto Rican counselor by the combined student (Anglo and Puerto Rican) population. The group (Anglo and Puerto Rican students) preferred an interaction distance of 30 inches with an Anglo counselor and a distance of 48 inches with a Puerto Rican counselor.

A separate 2 by 2 by 4 by 2 multiple classification analysis of variance and covariance including repeated measures was performed using the Biomedical Computer Program
BMDP2V. This analysis of variance was designed to test the hypothesis with relation to significant differences between junior high students (grade 7 and 8) and middle school students (grade 5 and 6) preference for counselor ethnicity and interaction distance. Table 13 depicts the grade placement and ethnicity of subjects analyzed in this study.

**TABLE 13**

**SUBJECT POPULATION MATCHED BY GRADE AND ETHNICITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Anglo Students</th>
<th>Puerto Rican Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of Table 14 reveals that there were no statistically significant differences in the subjects preference for counselor ethnicity or interaction distance when analyzed by grade (7-8 versus 5-6). Therefore the subjects will be treated as a total group rather than by separate grades for the discussion of results in the next section. Chapter V includes a discussion of the findings, implications, limitations and suggestions for further research, the summary and conclusion.
**TABLE 14**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TWO GROUPS OF SUBJECTS (ANGLO-PUERTO RICAN) A, RESPONDING TO COUNSELOR ETHNICITY (ANGLO-PUERTO RICAN) B, OVER FOUR PROXEMIC INTERACTION DISTANCES C, BY GRADE (7-8 VRS. 5-6) D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81.9946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject ethnicity (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1102</td>
<td>.1102</td>
<td>.0513</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade of student (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1794</td>
<td>1.1794</td>
<td>.5494</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4312</td>
<td>3.4312</td>
<td>1.5985</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error between subjects</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77.2737</td>
<td>2.1464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>81.4234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor ethnicity (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6829</td>
<td>1.6829</td>
<td>2.4268</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3722</td>
<td>1.3722</td>
<td>1.9788</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1029</td>
<td>.1029</td>
<td>.1484</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8314</td>
<td>.8314</td>
<td>1.1990</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX Subjects within group (error B)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.9640</td>
<td>.6934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2748</td>
<td>.0916</td>
<td>.4552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4343</td>
<td>8.114</td>
<td>4.0327</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6865</td>
<td>.2288</td>
<td>1.1373</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D X B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8338</td>
<td>.2779</td>
<td>1.3813</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Subjects within group (error C)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>21.7309</td>
<td>.2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8161</td>
<td>.6053</td>
<td>2.8078</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5909</td>
<td>.1969</td>
<td>.9136</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4946</td>
<td>.1648</td>
<td>.7647</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X A X D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3222</td>
<td>.1074</td>
<td>.4981</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X Subjects within group (error BC)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23.2854</td>
<td>.2156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 level    ** p < .01 level
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to: (a) investigate adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students preferences for interaction distance in dyadic counseling encounter; (b) to examine the adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling session when the counselor is either Anglo or Puerto Rican.

Within this context two specific hypotheses were investigated. This chapter discusses the results pertaining to the problems investigated, implication of the findings, some limitation of the present study along with some suggestions for future research, and, lastly, conclusions and summarization of the present research.

Distance

The findings of this study indicate that there are statistically significant differences between adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounters presented through the vignettes.

Distance Anglo Student

The interaction distance which generated the most positive subject attitude for adolescent Anglo students in grades
5, 6, 7 and 8 was 48 inches. This distance falls on the boundary between the far phase of personal distance and the close phase of social distance according to Halls (1969) theory of proxemics and interpersonal space. It is interesting to note that the interaction distance of 30 inches which generated the least positive subjects attitude, falls within Hall's (1969) close phase of personal distance. This seems to indicate that the 30 inch distance was seen by the Anglo students as too close for effective counseling interaction.

Kenzel (1970) in studying the body buffer zones of prisoners reported that physical proximity to another inmate was at least as powerful a trigger of violence as were threats, thefts or other more overt provocations.

The results of the present study are consistent with the findings of Pierce (1970) who reported positive subject attitudes in counseling encounters at distances of 39 inches and 48 inches and less positive attitudes at distances of 30 inches and 66 inches. Kelly (1971) also reported that the middle interaction distance of 39 inches created a positive subject attitude.

Kelly (1971) says of the 39-inch interaction distance:

It would seem reasonable that during those periods of the counseling relationship that are characterized by a special need for "closeness" that the interpersonal distance, or small deviation therefrom, is instrumented in the conveyance of positive therapist regard. (p. 147)

Mehrabian's (1968) findings also indicate that closer interaction distances convey a positive counselor attitude.
Dinges and Oetting (1971) studying interaction distance and anxiety in the counseling dyad reported that anxiety scores across distance indicated that the nearer (30 inches) and the farther (88 inches) distance received the highest anxiety rating with intermediate distances being rated significantly lower.

The results of the Lecomte (1973) study on interpersonal distance and its communication of counselor empathy strongly support the findings of the present study. They discovered that of three interpersonal distances, 30 inches, 50 inches and 80 inches that the medium distance (50 inches) convey the most counselor empathy.

Finally the findings of the present study seem to indicate that Anglo middle school and junior high school students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer a medium interaction distance of 48 inches and view the dyadic counseling interaction as a personal-social encounter. According to data in this study, the least preferred interaction distance for the counseling encounter by Anglo students is 30 inches.

Distance Puerto Rican Students

The interaction distance which generated the most positive subject attitude for adolescent Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 was 30 inches. This distance falls on the boundary between the close phase of personal distance and the far phase of personal distance according to Hall's (1969)
theory of proxemics and interpersonal space. The remaining distances (39 inches, 48 inches and 66 inches) all conveyed a less positive subject attitude.

These results seem to indicate that the Puerto Rican students prefer a closer interaction distance for the counseling encounter regardless of counselor ethnicity, than the Anglo students. The Puerto Rican subjects also view the counseling session as a "personal" encounter rather than a "personal-social" encounter as does the Anglo students.

The results of the present study are consistent with the findings of Hall (1960). Writing in the Harvard Business Review why it is so important for American businessmen to have a real understanding of the various social, cultural and economic differences they will face in foreign countries, Hall describes Spanish and Latin American spacial preferences.

A Latin American official illustrated the Spanish view of this point while showing me around a plant. Opening the door to an 18 by 20 foot office in which seventeen clerks and their desks were placed, he said, "See, we have nice spacious offices. Lots of space for everyone." (p. 90)

Hall (1960) says American businessmen in Latin America feel people get too close to them, lay their hands on them and generally crowd their physical being. The findings of the present study confirm Hall's (1960) statement about closeness. The adolescent Puerto Rican students prefer a
closer interaction distance regardless of counselor ethnicity than their Anglo counterpart.

In writing on the anthropology of manners in Scientific American, Hall (1955) asks the question: "If an American addresses a Latin from a distance of 20 inches, is he impolite?" (p. 84) He says in Latin America touching is more common and the basic unit of space seems to be smaller.

Hall, in the same article, confirms the findings of the present study in his research on the proxemics of Latin Americans. It has been clearly demonstrated that Puerto Rican students prefer a closer interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter and that they view the counseling interaction as a personal-social encounter. Hall (1955) states:

An analysis of the handling of space during conversation shows the following: a U.S. male brought up in the Northeast stands 18 to 20 inches away when talking face to face to a man he does not know very well; talking to a woman under similar circumstances he increases the distance about four inches . . . yet in many part of Latin America . . . distances which are almost sexual in connotation are the only ones at which people can talk comfortable. In Cuba, for instance, there is nothing suggestive in a man's talking to an educated woman at a distance of 13 inches. If you are a Latin American, talking to a North American at the distance he insists on maintaining is like trying to talk across a room . . . the interesting thing is that neither party is specifically aware of what is wrong when the distance is not right. They merely have vague feelings of discomfort or anxiety, as the Latin American approaches and the North American backs away, both partners take offense without knowing why. (p. 86)

When the North American has this problem pointed out to him and he permits the Latin American to get close enough, he
will immediately notice that the latter seems much more at ease.

The mean response of the Puerto Rican students in the present study confirm Hall's (1960) findings. The adolescent Puerto Rican in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer a closer interaction distance (30 inches) for the dyadic counseling encounter. They also appear to view the counseling session as a personal encounter rather than a personal-social relationship.

Cunningham (1971) points out attitudes towards touching are strikingly different. She notes that psychologist Sidney Jourard observed couples sitting at cafes in four cities:

In Paris, the average couple came into physical contact 110 times during an hour (and they were just having a conversation). In San Juan, Puerto Rico, couples patted, tickled and caressed 180 times during the same interval but the typical London couple never touched at all and Americans studied, patted once or twice in an hour's conversation. (p. 115)

It is important for counselors to be aware of the preferences of their Puerto Rican client for closer interaction distance if they wish to establish a meaningful counseling relationship.

Overall, then, the present results indicate that adolescent Anglo students in middle school and Junior high school (grades 5, 6, 7 and 8) prefer an interaction distance of 48 inches for the dyadic counseling encounter. This distance conveys the most positive subject attitude and in addition the Anglo student views the counseling relationship as a
"personal-social" encounter. These findings support the conclusion of Haase and DiMattia (1969) and Pierce (1970) with relation to their discovery that the counseling encounter is different from a strictly social encounter in terms of preferred Anglo interaction distance and may be different from a completely personal encounter as well.

The adolescent Puerto Rican students on the other hand prefer an interaction distance of 30 inches for the dyadic counseling encounter. This distance conveyed the most positive subject attitude for the Puerto Rican subjects in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8. These students view the counseling interaction as a strictly personal encounter according to Hall's (1969) theory of proxemic and interpersonal space. These results strongly support Hall's (1955, 1960) research and affirm the fact that a counselor must be aware of the cross-cultural differences of his clients to be effective.

Ethnicity

Interaction Effects

There was no statistically significant differences concerning interaction effects for student ethnicity (Anglo vs. Puerto Rican) by counselor ethnicity (Anglo vs. Puerto Rican). The present study did not reveal any relevant data to indicate whether adolescent Anglo students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer an Anglo or Puerto Rican counselor or whether
adolescent Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer an Anglo or Puerto Rican counselor.

There are at least four possible reasons for the lack of statistically significant data for preferred counselor ethnicity by Anglo or Puerto Rican students.

1. Each subject attended the same private parochial school and may have seen no real cultural differences, since they have the same teachers in integrated classes. At their present age their "student identity" may have been more powerful than their cultural identity;

2. All the subjects attending the inner city school appeared to be from a similar socio economic background. Since most of the Puerto Rican students were born and brought up in the Northeastern United States, their similar socio economic status may have outweighed their cultural status;

3. The school population was predominantly Anglo (about 70%) and as a result of this Puerto Rican students could have felt social or peer pressure (consciously or unconsciously) to accept Anglo counselors or teachers. There appeared to be no Puerto Rican teachers in the school although some of the teachers were bilingual;

4. The subject was asked to perceive himself as a client and project himself into the video tape
vignettes he was rating. This psychological "set" given to each subject may have obliterated any existing difference between ethnic groups.

**Group By Distance By Counselor Ethnicity**

Although there was no significant differences in adolescent Anglo or Puerto Rican students preference for counselor ethnicity or interaction distance by counselor ethnicity, the results of the present study did indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in group (combined Anglo and Puerto Rican students) preference for interaction distance by counselor ethnicity at the p < .05 level.

In other words when the adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 are analyzed as a combined group, statistically significant differences were revealed, with relation to their preference for interaction distance with Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors.

These results should be interpreted cautiously because of the four reasons mentioned earlier, and the level of significance (p < .05) and lastly because of the possibility of some confounding order effects in the presentation of the video tape vignettes. These results should not be generalized beyond these students.

Figure 4 graphically presented the groups (combined Anglo and Puerto Rican students) preference for interaction distance with an Anglo counselor. Judging from the mean
response it would appear that the most preferred interaction
distance with an Anglo counselor is 30 inches. This distance
was indicated as creating the most positive attitude by the
group while the least preferred interaction distances were
66 inches, 39 inches, and 48 inches.

There are several possible reasons why the Anglo and
Puerto Rican students, when considered as a group, preferred
an interaction distance of 30 inches with an Anglo counselor.
These reasons are:

1. The first video tape vignette shown to all students
(although the master video tape was randomized in
the order of presentation) was that of the Anglo
counselor at 30 inches. An order effect could have
occurred and the subjects could have assigned
higher ratings to the first video tape shown. A
Spearman Roe correlation coefficient was performed
to see if an order effect could be determined
(Freund 1970). The result was a-.20 which can only
account for a small amount of the variability;

2. Puerto Rican students, in general, prefer a closer
interaction distance and may have scored the seman-
tic differential rating scale very high in that
direction;

3. The school population is about 70% Anglo and the
Puerto Rican students may feel some social or peer
pressure to rate the Anglo counselor higher on the scale;

4. A combination of the above reason can account for some of the variability in the preference of the combined Anglo and Puerto Rican students for a 30 inch interaction distance with an Anglo counselor.

Figure 5 graphically presented the groups (combined Anglo and Puerto Rican students) preference for interaction distance with a Puerto Rican counselor. The most preferred interaction distance with a Puerto Rican counselor, judged from the mean response of the group was 48 inches. Haase and DiMattia (1969), Pierce (1970) and Kelly (1971) also found the middle distance of 39 to 48 inches to be the most favorable in producing a positive subject attitude.

Generally then the present study indicates that students (Anglo and Puerto Rican combined) prefer an interaction distance of 30 inches with an Anglo counselor and an interaction distance of 48 inches with a Puerto Rican counselor in the dyadic counseling encounters.

Grade

Grade By Student Ethnicity by Distance by Counselor Ethnicity

A separate two by two by four by two multiple classification analysis of variance and covariance including repeated measures was performed to see if there was any
significant difference in preference for interaction distance and counselor ethnicity by Anglo and Puerto Rican students at different grade levels.

This analysis of variance was designed to examine any differences in preference between junior high school students (grade 7-8) and middle school students (grade 5-6). No significant differences were revealed by the analysis and it was concluded that students in grade 7 and 8 and in grade 5 and 6 react in similar ways to preference for counselor ethnicity and interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter.

**Implications**

With the influx of clients from other cultures into our school systems, the counselor must take the lead in helping them adjust to cultural shock. There are approximately two million Puerto Ricans living in the United States (Christensen, 1975), scarcely a state is without any Puerto Ricans and some places such as New York City, Boston, Springfield, Hartford and several areas in New Jersey have large Puerto Rican communities.

It is evident from the studies of Hall (1969) and Banks (1973) that differences in social interaction patterns exist between nationalities. Banks (1973) reported that black subjects position themselves farther from white counselors than did white subjects. Hall (1955, 1960) discovered that Latin
American subjects prefer close interaction distances than their North American counterparts.

One implication for the present study is that it provides Anglo counselors, who are in a dyadic counseling interaction with Puerto Rican clients, with data concerning the Puerto Rican clients differential preference for interaction distance. The study also provides counselors with information on how to arrange their offices in order to provide Puerto Rican clients with the most comfortable proxemic interaction distance.

It is very important that Anglo counselors not interpret the non-verbal proxemic cues of the Puerto Rican client based on the knowledge of the function of proxemic space which has been primarily generated on predominately Anglo subject population. Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer a closer interaction distance (30 inches) in the dyadic counseling encounter than their Anglo counterpart regardless of counselor ethnicity.

The implications and potential application of the results of the present study are several. Of particular importance is the fact that the findings of this study have once more affirmed the communicative significance of non-verbal behavior across cultures. As a result, counselors, counselor educators and counselor trainers must give special attention to the importance and potential contribution of
non-verbal cross cultural proxemic variables, in this particular case counselor-client interaction distance.

There are many areas of non-verbal communication such as eye contact, body orientation, trunk lean, touch and paralanguage. This study specifically researched the proxemic variables in the counseling process across cultures. Adolescent Puerto Rican students felt the interaction distance of 30 inches was the most comfortable for them to interact with a counselor. Anglo students felt it was easier to communicate with a counselor at an interaction distance of 48 inches regardless of counselor ethnicity.

Based on the findings of the present study, it would seem reasonable to assume that male counselors would generate a more positive attitude to male Puerto Rican clients in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 by interacting at a distance of 30 inches, and with Anglo students by interacting at a distance of 48 inches.

The findings also indicate that Anglo students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 see the dyadic counseling interaction as a "personal-social" encounter according to Hall's (1969) theory of proxemics and interpersonal space.

The Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 see the counseling session as a strictly personal encounter. These findings can aid the cross cultural counselor in developing a relationship with his Puerto Rican clients. Hall (1969) says of the 30 inch interaction distance that
subjects of personal interest and involvement can be discussed. The 48 inch interaction distance Hall (1969) says is used for impersonal business and casual social gatherings.

One possible assumption of these findings, and Hall's interpretation, are that a Puerto Rican student may prefer to discuss personal interests with the counselor, such as his family or peer relations. On the other hand, an Anglo student might prefer to discuss impersonal business, such as his choice of school subject or college placement rather than his family.

Junior high school is a crucial time in the life of many inner city Anglo and Puerto Rican students. It is at this time that many make the decision to leave or continue their formal education. It is of the utmost importance that counselors who are working with these students be cognizant of cross cultural proxemic variables, so that they can be effective in helping their clients make such far reaching decisions.

Depending on the counselors theoretical outlook, the information found in this study can help towards the establishment of client-counselor rapport. For example, a process oriented counselor or one who tends to be humanistic could establish a warm and accepting counseling atmosphere by sitting at an interaction distance which conveys the most positive accepting attitude to the client. This study indicated that the most positive client attitude is created with an
Anglo student at a interaction distance of 48 inches and at a distance of 30 inches for a Puerto Rican student in the dyadic counseling encounter.

A counselor who is primarily behavioristic in orientation can use the proxemic variables as a positive or negative reinforcement. The counselor can convey liking, respect and positive regard by sitting at the proper interaction distance and conversely he can communicate dislike, disrespect and create anxiety, by his choice of interaction distance, for individuals whose behavior he is shaping. Behavior modification proponents, particularly those who emphasize the role of the counselor as a social reinforcer, should investigate the differential effectiveness of different proxemic interaction distances, according to the demands of the situation.

The results of the present study can also be utilized in the training of cross cultural counselors. Many times the beginning counselor is concerned with demonstrating his grasp of counseling theory, and in activating what he does nonverbally interferes with positive counseling outcome. Until recently, teaching a cross-cultural counseling student what to do non-verbally was given little attention. Maybe trainers thought it would somehow take care of itself or it may be that they did not know what to teach. There is very little research on mainland junior high or middle school Puerto Rican students preference for interaction distance in the counseling encounter.
For example, a counselor who wishes to convey warmth, positive regard and genuineness to his clients and sits too close to an Anglo student or too far from a Puerto Rican student would create an atmosphere of anxiety and unnecessary tension and he would not realize it unless he became aware of the importance of the non-verbal variables in the counseling interaction.

In addition to interaction distance a counselor should be aware of the other non-verbal variables which can convey warmth, positive regard and genuineness. Some of these non-verbal variables include eye contact, trunk lean, body position and paralanguage (concerned tone etc.). A model proposed by Ivey, Normington, Miller, Morrill and Haase (1968) has incorporated the non-verbal elements into its Anglo counselor training and seems to be successful. However in training cross-cultural counselors the non-verbal variables will differ and research, such as the findings of the present study must be incorporated into this method if it is to be successful in training and educating future cross-cultural counselors.

The results of the present study will aid counselor educators in training future cross-cultural counselors particularly counselors who will be working with Puerto Rican junior high school clients. This study clearly shows the adolescent Puerto Rican student preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling encounter.
Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

The scope of the present study is limited as follows:

1. The study was limited to 20 adolescent Anglo male students and 20 adolescent Puerto Rican male students attending an inner city parochial school in Western Massachusetts. As a result of the subject population, all generalizations were limited to a hypothetical population of those ages, schools, culture and sex. The Anglo and Puerto Rican students were limited to grades 5, 6, 7 and 8, and range in age from 11 to 15 years of age.

2. Subjects in the selected schools came from low socio-economic areas and there was no way to control for slight variations within the sub-groups.

3. A methodological limitation and a recommendation for further replication of similar studies is that the video tape vignettes be randomized for each presentation to every group of new subjects to eliminate any possibility of an order effect, rather than just randomizing the master video tape.

4. This study researched proxemic and cultural variables which can help both client and counselor better understand the dynamics of the counseling interaction. It was concerned with the process of the counseling interaction and not actual
counseling outcomes. It is therefore recommended that future research be pursued in order to study the relationship of positive process dynamics and counseling outcome. Data obtained in the study should be validated by researching the outcomes or resolutions of the problems in the in vivo counseling process.

5. The sampling period was limited to the year 1975. There are many limitations in doing a process study. However, there appear to be no research on mainland Puerto Ricans' preference for counseling interaction distance or counselor ethnicity. The number of Puerto Rican clients in our schools is constantly increasing and it is imperative for guidance counselors to be aware of cross-cultural differences.

The author believes this study has provided an empirical foundation for counselor cross-cultural awareness and provides data for future research which should validate interaction distance with relation to counseling outcome.

**Summary and Conclusions**

This study was primarily concerned with assessing adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 preference for proxemic interaction distance between client and counselor in the dyadic counseling encounter, when the counselor was either Anglo or Puerto Rican.
The results of the study indicate that adolescent Anglo students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer an interaction distance of 48 inches for the dyadic counseling encounter and they view the counseling session as a "personal-social" encounter. On the other hand, adolescent Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 prefer an interaction distance of 30 inches for the dyadic counseling encounter and they view the counseling session as a personal encounter.

No significant differences were found to indicate a preference for Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors on the part of the adolescent Anglo or Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8. When considered as a group, the Anglo and Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 expressed a preference for an interaction distance of 30 inches in the dyadic counseling encounter with an Anglo counselor and an interaction distance of 48 inches with a Puerto Rican counselor.

There appears to be no other research studying the preference of mainland Puerto Rican students, in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8, for counselor-client interaction distance on counselor ethnicity to compare with the result of the present study.

No significant differences were discovered when the data was analyzed by subjects grade placement (junior high school 7-8 versus middle school 5-6). It was assumed that students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 have similar preference for counselor interaction distance in a dyadic counseling encounter.
Overall, then, adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican students in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 preference for interaction distance in the dyadic counseling session were presented. It was also discovered that the students view the counseling session as either a personal or a personal-social encounter and the implication of their preferences were explored. In addition, the combined student population (Anglo and Puerto Rican) preferences for interaction distance with Anglo or Puerto Rican counselors was presented.

This study has generated additional knowledge of proxemics and interpersonal space based on an adolescent Anglo and Puerto Rican population which should be very useful in training cross cultural counselors. It is hoped that these findings will help cross cultural counselors relate more fully with their Anglo and Puerto Rican clients.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

This appendix includes:


2. Revised Semantic Differential After Initial Field Study

3. Semantic Differential Randomized and Translated into Spanish for Presentation to Subjects

4. Semantic Differential With Instructions used in the Final Study
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL USED IN THE INITIAL PHASE OF THE
DEVELOPMENT OF THE NINE ITEM SCALE (PIERCE 1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sacred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pleasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A    B    C    D    E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>SAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUABLE</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>WORTHLESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>BAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>DISHONEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANT</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>UNPLEASANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>UNFAIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASING</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>ANNOYING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>UGLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>:     :     :     :</td>
<td>CRUEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL RANDOMIZED AND TRANSLATED INTO SPANISH FOR PRESENTATION TO SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>Alegre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUABLE</td>
<td>Valioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>Malo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td>Honrado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANT</td>
<td>Agradable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>Justo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNOYING</td>
<td>Irritante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>Hermoso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUEL</td>
<td>Cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>Triste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTHLESS</td>
<td>Sin Valor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISHONEST</td>
<td>Deshonesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPLEASANT</td>
<td>Desagradable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFAIR</td>
<td>Injusto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASING</td>
<td>Grato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGLY</td>
<td>Feo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>Simpatico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you speak Spanish at home?........

How long have you lived on the mainland U.S.A.?........

You are about to view a set of eight video tapes. Each is a different counseling session between a guidance counselor and a student. You will also be given a nine word check list.

For each video tape, please respond as if you are the student who has come to the guidance counselor for help with a personal problem.

Check off the word which best describes the way you feel about the counseling session.

Here is how to respond to each video tape session by using the check list. Each of the paired words on the check list is provided with 5 lettered spaces A through E.

If you feel that the video tape counseling session you are rating is very closely related to one end of the check list, you should check the scale as follows.

A B C D E
GOOD X ______ BAD

or
A B C D E
GOOD ______ X BAD

If you feel the video tape counseling session you are rating is slightly related to the word check list, you should check the scale as follows.

A B C D E
GOOD ______ X or ______

A B C D E
GOOD ______ X BAD

If you feel the video tape counseling session you are rating is neutral or in the middle, or if the word is not meaningful or related to the counseling session, check the middle space.

A B C D E
GOOD ______ X ______

1. Be sure that you check all nine words for each video tape counseling session. Try not to omit any. You will use the same nine words for checking each video tape counseling session.
2. Check only one answer space for each word pair.
3. Make each item an independent judgment. It is usually better to work quickly through all the word scales. Remember, it is your first impression and 'feeling' about each video tape counseling session that is important.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>Alegre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUABLE</td>
<td>Valioso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>Malo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td>Honrado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANT</td>
<td>Agradable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>Justo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNOYING</td>
<td>Enojozo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>Hermoso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUEL</td>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAD</th>
<th>Triste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORTHLESS</td>
<td>Sin Valor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISHONEST</td>
<td>Deshonesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPLEASANT</td>
<td>Desagradable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFAIR</td>
<td>Injusto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASING</td>
<td>Grato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGLY</td>
<td>Feo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>Simpatico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Survey to Select Anglo and Puerto Rican Counselor-Actors for Video Tape Vignettes
SURVEY TO SELECT ANGLO AND PUERTO RICAN COUNSELOR-ACTORS FOR VIDEO TAPE VIGNETTES

Name_________________________ Age_________ Grade____

PUT THE NUMBER OF THE COUNSELOR'S PICTURE WHO YOU THINK LOOKS MOST LIKE A TYPICAL ANGLO JUNIOR HIGH GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN THIS BOX. ___________

CHECK OFF HOW SURE YOU ARE ON THE LINE BELOW.

SURE       ALMOST SURE      MAYBE      PROBABLY NOT      NOT SURE

_________ : __________ : __________ : __________ : __________ :

PUT THE NUMBER OF THE COUNSELOR'S PICTURE WHO YOU THINK LOOKS MOST LIKE A TYPICAL PUERTO RICAN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN THIS BOX. ___________

CHECK OFF HOW SURE YOU ARE ON THE LINE BELOW.

SURE       ALMOST SURE      MAYBE      PROBABLY NOT      NOT SURE

_________ : __________ : __________ : __________ : __________ :
APPENDIX C

This appendix contains a copy of the Digetek answer sheet used in recording the student answers from the semantic differential check list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>SEMESTER: FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form of Test:**
- A = 2
- B = 3
- C = 4
- D = 5

**Grading:**
- A
- B
- C
- D

**Test Instructions:**
- Student absent for part of test.
- Teacher only.

**Standard Answer Sheet:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grade:**
- A
- B
- C
- D

**Scanning Instructions:**
- Optical Scanning Corporation
- Form DS 2130-A

**Tour Code:**
- A
- B
- C
- D

**Student Code:**
- A
- B
- C
- D

**Date Code:**
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6

**Birth Date:**
- A
- B
- C
- D
APPENDIX D

Floor Diagram of Room in Which Testing was Conducted
Fig. 8: Floor diagram of room in which testing was conducted.
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