

College Students' Perceptions of a Psychotherapist's Treatment of a Religious Issue: Partial Replication and Extension

Michael E. McCullough and Everett L. Worthington, Jr.

A study of the influence of a counselor's treatment of a client's religious values, observers' religiosity, and their interaction on observers' perceptions of counseling (Morrow, Worthington, & McCullough, 1992) was partially replicated and extended. Religious beliefs were differentiated from religious values as determinants of observers' perceptions of counseling. Student observers (N=148) viewed one of two videotaped counseling interactions in which a counselor either supported or challenged a client's religious values. Dividing observers into high and low levels of Christian belief did not result in their perceiving religiously supportive or challenging counseling differently. Dividing observers into high and low levels of religious values produced consistent differences in how they perceived religiously supportive and challenging counseling. Findings supported the theory that people with strong religious values perceive counseling differently than people with weaker religious values.

In an increasingly multicultural world, counselors can expect to be confronted by clients' religious beliefs and values more frequently than in the past. Many clients are highly religious; others are less so. If the client is highly religious, how is the counselor to act? Numerous religious beliefs may be brought up by clients. Should counselors be conversant with major religious beliefs, as has been suggested by Lovinger (1990)? Should counselors respect clients' religious values even if counselors disagree with clients' religious beliefs, as has been suggested by Worthington (1988)?

Religious and nonreligious people may respond differently to counseling (Worthington, 1988). Although several scholars (Goldsmith & Hansen, 1991; Kelly, 1990; Worthington, 1988) have hypothesized about the possible influence of religiosity on the client-counselor relationship and counseling outcome, research has consistently failed to show that religious and nonreligious people even perceive counseling differently (Johnson & Ridley, 1992; Morrow et al., 1992; Pecheur & Edwards, 1984; Propst, 1980), much less behave differently in response to counseling that deals explicitly with religious issues.

In particular, Morrow et al. (1992) had observers who espoused either high or low levels of traditional Christian belief watch one of three videotaped counseling interviews in which a counselor either supported, ignored, or challenged a client's religious values. The authors hypothesized a significant interaction between the counselor's treatment and observers' level of Christian belief, with individuals of high Christian belief responding more positively to the counselor who supported rather than ignored or challenged the client's religious values. Individuals low in Christian belief were expected to rate all three interviews similarly, regardless of the counselor's treatment of the client's religious values. Morrow et al. failed to find such an interaction, and therefore failed to identify religious belief as a moderator of observers' perceptions of religious counseling that deals explicitly with religious issues.

Methodological problems may have been responsible for the absence of significant interactions. First, Morrow et al.'s (1992) measure of religiosity, the Shepherd Scale (Bassett et al., 1981), was originally validated and normed using small groups of Christians and

non-Christians from a community sample. Morrow et al. split their college student sample based on the midpoint between Christians and non-Christians in Bassett et al.'s (1981) community sample and excluded individuals .25 standard deviations from the mean of that validation sample. Dividing the college sample into groups based on the norms of nonstudent community members may have created an artificial break between the groups that blurred any distinctions that could have been detected had the sample been split based on college student norms.

Second, Worthington's (1988) theories concerning the role of religiosity in observers' perceptions of counseling that explicitly addresses religious issues applies to *values* that individuals ascribe to their religious beliefs, not to the *content* of those beliefs. That the Shepherd Scale is a measure of content of religious beliefs, and not of religious values, may explain the lack of theoretically consistent results in Morrow et al. (1992). By measuring religiosity in terms of religious values rather than in terms of the content of religious beliefs, the role of religiosity as a moderator of observers' perceptions might be detected. To investigate these alternative explanations, a partial replication and extension of Morrow et al. were conducted.

The investigation was an analogue to counseling. Student observers completed measures of traditional Christian belief (Bassett et al., 1981; Glock & Stark, 1965) and of religious values (Kelly, 1990; Worthington, Hsu, Gowda, & Bleach, 1988). Observers then watched one of two videotapes of a counseling interaction that were used in the research by Morrow et al. (1992). In one videotape, called Support of Religious Values, the counselor supports the client's religious values, although he challenges her religious beliefs. In the second videotape, called Challenge of Religious Values, the counselor challenges the client's religious values and beliefs (suggesting that she has outgrown her dependence on religion), although he supports her by suggesting de-emphasis of her religious values as a way to reduce her guilt and distress. Thus, both videotapes contain personal support and challenge but differ on how religious values are treated.

With one data collection effort, we addressed five specific hypotheses through five multivariate analyses. For Analysis 1, we hypothesized a replication of the findings of Morrow et al. (1992),

dividing our college student sample using Bassett et al.'s Shepherd Scale as it was divided in Morrow et al. No significant interaction was anticipated.

In Analysis 2, the sample was divided based on the mean of the current college student sample to address the methodological weakness of using community norms in the Morrow et al. study and replication (Analysis 1). Even with the methodological adjustment the interaction of observers' levels of Christian belief and the counselor's treatment of the client's religious issue was not hypothesized to predict observers' perceptions of counseling based on theorizing by Worthington (1988).

To further substantiate that religious beliefs do not substantially affect perceptions of counseling, it is necessary to assess beliefs using other measures of belief than the Shepherd scale. In Analysis 3, Glock and Stark's (1965) Dimensions of Religious Commitment Scale was used to divide observers into levels of Christian belief. Results similar to those of Analysis 2 were expected.

In Analysis 4, a measure of religious values (Kelly, 1990) was used to divide observers into levels of religious commitment. We hypothesized, contrary to previous analyses, that the interaction of observers' level of religious commitment and counselor's treatment of the client's religious issue would predict observers' perceptions of counseling. Namely, highly religious observers were hypothesized to respond more positively to the counselor who supported the client's religious values than to the counselor who challenged the client's religious values. Observers with low to moderate religious values were hypothesized to show the opposite preferences.

In Analysis 5, more discrete measures of religious values (Worthington et al., 1988) based on Worthington's (1988) theory were used to divide observers into high and low levels of value afforded religious beliefs. We hypothesized that the interactions of discrete religious values and counselor's treatment of the client's religious issue would predict observers' perceptions of counseling. Thus, the crucial theory-relevant finding in all analyses would be the presence or absence of a significant multivariate interaction of observers' religiosity and counselor's treatment of the client's religious issue for measures of observers' perceptions of counseling.

In sum, the major hypothesis of the study was that high and low religious observers of counseling respond differently to counselors who support or challenge the client's religious values when observers are classified according to religious values but not according to religious beliefs.

METHOD

Participants

Participants (70% White, 21% Black, 4% Asian, 5% other ethnicity; 62% women, 38% men) were 148 undergraduate student volunteers from a psychology course at an urban university in the southeastern United States. Participants signed up for one of several sessions during which the study was conducted, according to their preference of time. Treatments were assigned randomly to sessions. Participants received extra credit of less than 1% of their grade in a psychology course.

Design

The designs were multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) in which the counselor's treatment of a client's religious issue (support and challenge of the client's religious values) was manipulated. In Analyses 1 and 2, Christian belief, as measured by the Shepherd Scale

(Bassett et al., 1981), was a subject variable. Observers were divided into two levels of Christian belief (*low* and *high*). In Analysis 3, Christian orthodoxy (Glock & Stark, 1965; five levels) was the subject variable. In Analysis 4, a measure of religious values (six levels) consistent with Kelly's (1990) theory was a subject variable. In Analysis 5, seven measures of religious values consistent with Worthington's (1988) theory (Worthington et al., 1988), with each subscale divided into *low* and *high*, were subject variables.

There were six dependent variables. Four were analyzed together in an initial MANOVA: observers' ratings of attraction to the counselor, receptivity to the counselor, likelihood of the return of the client to counseling, and likelihood of the observers' return to that counseling. These were analyzed together because each was thought to be related to observers' personal perceptions of and attraction to the counselor. The six intercorrelations among the four variables ranged from .83 to .50 with a mean of .64. Two were analyzed together in a second MANOVA: likelihood of observers' referral of a Christian friend and that of a non-Christian friend to the counselor. These were analyzed together because they were thought to be related to observers' propensity toward referring a friend to the counselor. Even though referring Christians and non-Christians would probably be expected to vary with client religiosity, a moderate correlation was expected and was obtained (.41). Intercorrelations of the four ratings of the counselor with the two referral ratings (ranging from .27 to .60; $M = .48$) were lower than the intercorrelations among the four counselor ratings. This pattern of intercorrelations supported the conceptual justification for grouping dependent variables into two MANOVAs.

Manipulated Independent Variable

Two 10-minute videotapes served as the stimuli in the two levels of the experimental manipulation for each study. Both videotapes depicted a counseling interaction in which a male counselor—a licensed clinical psychologist with 7 years postdoctoral experience in private practice—either supported or challenged the religious values of a female client who professed Christianity. The first 7 minutes of the two videotapes were identical. The client presented concerns about feelings of isolation and relationship difficulties. Later in the interaction the client expressed distress over a nonmarital sexual relationship that had recently ended. She claimed that her Christian values created guilt concerning her failure to uphold scripturally defined moral precepts.

The last 3 minutes of the videotapes differed. In both cases, the counselor suggested that a competing belief might help the client to overcome her guilt. The manipulation was directed at the counselor's treatment of the value that the client placed on her religious framework as a determinant of her moral standards. In the *supportive of religious values* condition, the counselor encouraged the client to continue to hold her Christian values as important but suggested that the client placed too much emphasis on the transgression of moral standards of her faith and not enough on the forgiveness she could receive as a Christian. He thus challenged the religious beliefs she was using while supporting her religious values. In the *challenge of religious values* condition, the counselor suggested that the client challenge the validity of her Christian values (and thus implied a challenge to her religious beliefs) as having been appropriate for her at a younger age but not for the current time. Also, the counselor suggested that therapeutic change would result if the client could focus her attention on what she wanted and how she felt about her sexual behavior, rather than on the dictates of the Bible and religious authority. In both conditions, counseling was conducted in an environment of support for the client's welfare. In an earlier manipula-

tion check, Morrow et al. (1992) reported that most students identified the tapes correctly as supporting (84%) or challenging (68%) of religious values.

Instruments

The Shepherd Scale. Level of traditional Christian belief was assessed using the Shepherd Scale (Bassett et al., 1981). This 38-item instrument measures respondents' espousal of traditional Christian beliefs and practices. The scale is divided into a component that measures agreement with Christian doctrinal statements and one that measures Christian lifestyle characteristics. Scores range from 38 to 152. In the original psychometric studies, the scale demonstrated good 2-week test-retest reliability ($r = .83$) and good internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .86. (Cronbach's alpha in the current study was .97.) The scale was useful at separating Christians from non-Christians without differentiating between sects of Christian belief (Bassett et al., 1981). Additional psychometric data have been subsequently presented (Bassett et al., 1991). Based on a sample of 15 community members who identified themselves as Christians and 15 who identified themselves as non-Christians, Bassett et al. (1981) found the mean score for Christians to be 131 and for non-Christians to be 91. The pooled standard deviation was 8.7. The midpoint score between Christians and non-Christians was 111, which was used in Morrow et al. (1992) and in our Analysis 1.

Individuals scoring within .25 standard deviations from the midpoint (109–113) were excluded. Means and standard deviations for each of the subject independent variables, scores excluded in dividing samples into levels, and means and standard deviations for the resulting levels of each subject independent variable are given in Table 1.

In Analysis 2, observers were split into high and low levels of Christian belief based on the mean score of the current college sample, which was 93, and the standard deviation, which was 24. By excluding observers within .25 standard deviations of this sample mean, observers scoring between 86 and 99 were not used.

Measure of Christian orthodoxy. Glock and Stark's (1965) Dimensions of Religious Commitment Scale (DRCS) includes four subscales: Orthodox Christian Belief, Practice, Experience, and Knowledge. Orthodox Christian Belief was used in Analysis 3. Numerous other standardized measures of religiosity were found to be significantly correlated with the Orthodox Christian Belief Scale, which was found to be the best of the scales at predicting aspects of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1965; Robinson & Shaver, 1973). Scores on the Orthodox Christian Belief Scale range from 0 to 4 (0 = *lack of orthodox belief* and 4 = *highly orthodox belief*). Reliability estimates were not reported by Glock and Stark. In the current study, Cronbach's alpha was .88.

Religiosity Self-Rating. In Analysis 4, observers' commitment to their religious beliefs was assessed using the Religiosity Self-Rating, which was created for the current study based on Kelly's (1990) taxonomy of religious commitment. Observers self-classified into one of eight categories of religious commitment: (a) My religious beliefs are consciously experienced, and are a significant influence on attitudes and behaviors in important aspects of my life; (b) I have a loyalty to a particular set of religious beliefs, and these beliefs have an impact on some of my attitudes and behavior; (c) I feel connected to a greater being, but I do not identify with an established religion or set of religious beliefs; (d) I do not have any strong spiritual or religious convictions, but I believe that spiritual and religious beliefs might be an important part of life; (e) I have some

TABLE 1

Sample Means and Standard Deviations, Scores Excluded, and Resulting Means and Standard Deviations for High and Low Levels of 11 Subject Independent Variables

Variable	N	M	SD	Scores Excluded	Resulting Level Characteristics					
					Low Level			High Level		
					N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Shepherd Scale ^a (Common Norms)	88	92.6	24.5	109–113	64	81.0	17.5	20	125.9	6.9
Shepherd Scale ^a (Sample Norms)	88	92.6	24.5	87–98	35	67.8	12.1	36	116.2	12.4
Orthodoxy ^b	137	2.7	2.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Religious Commitment ^c (Kelly)	148	2.8	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Religious Values ^d (Worthington)	140	47.8	16.7	45–51	75	35.3	5.8	48	67.2	11.7
Authority afforded sacred writings ^e	143	26.9	10.4	25–29	72	18.5	3.4	49	39.1	6.8
Authority afforded religious group identity ^e	142	16.0	6.9	15–17	74	10.6	2.2	54	23.5	4.7
Authority afforded religious leaders ^f	146	16.3	6.9	16–17	80	11.1	2.6	55	23.8	4.5
Toleration of different scriptural beliefs ^g	148	7.4	3.5	7	72	4.5	1.1	63	10.9	2.3
Toleration of different religious groups ^g	147	4.9	2.4	5	88	3.3	0.5	44	8.0	2.1
Toleration of different views on leadership ^g	148	7.8	2.9	8	72	5.3	1.3	60	10.7	1.6

^a Scale scores range from 4 to 152. Item scores range from 1 = *true* to 4 = *not true*. ^b Scale scores range from 0 to 4. Higher scores indicate more orthodox Christian belief. ^c Scale scores range from 1 to 8. Higher scores indicate less religious commitment. ^d Scale scores range from 20 to 100. Item scores range from 1 = *not at all true of me* to 5 = *totally true of me*. ^e Scale scores range from 8 to 40. Item scores range from 1 = *not at all true of me* to 5 = *totally true of me*. ^f Scale scores range from 11 to 55. Item scores range from 1 = *not at all true of me* to 5 = *totally true of me*. ^g Scale scores range from 3 to 15. Item scores range from 1 = *not at all true of me* to 5 = *totally true of me*.

religious beliefs, but I do not feel that they are particularly important in my life; (f) I am tolerant of religion in general and the religious beliefs of others, but religious and spiritual beliefs have no influence in my life; (g) Religion and spirituality are expressions of the unreal, and are unnecessary (perhaps even harmful) to understanding reality and living effectively. However, I do not feel hostile toward religion or religious people; (h) I am nonreligious, and am actively opposed to religion, religious groups, and the influence of religion on important aspects of society.

The Religiosity Self-Rating demonstrated a moderate correlation with the 20-item Religious Commitment subscale of Worthington et al.'s (1988) Religious Values Scale (RVS), $r = .59, p < .01$. It was thus concluded that the Religiosity Self-Rating was an adequate measure of religious commitment. In this sample, only one observer endorsed either category (g) and (h), so these two categories were deleted from the analysis. Although a college sample with so few individuals who are hostile to religion may be surprising, it is consonant with findings in nationally based polls (Gallup, 1985) in which respondents rarely identified themselves as openly hostile to religion or as completely nonreligious.

Religious Values Scale (RVS). Worthington et al. (1988) created the RVS to operationalize the seven major constructs of Worthington's (1988) theory. Respondents rate their agreement (1 = *not at all true of me* to 5 = *totally true of me*) on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Item scores are summed to create scores for each scale. These subscales, their ranges, and Cronbach's alphas are religious commitment (20–100; .92), authority afforded sacred writings (8–40; .92), authority afforded religious groups (8–40; .73), authority afforded religious leaders (11–55; .85), tolerance for others holding different views on scripture (3–15; .85), tolerance for those with different group identification (3–15; .77), and tolerance for those with different views regarding the authority of religious leaders (3–15; .73). Worthington et al. (1989) named the instrument the RVS and found that its factor structure accorded well with the theoretical factor structure. Subsequent exploratory factor analysis on a different sample showed a similar factor structure, but confirmatory factor analysis on that sample did not strictly confirm that structure; however, the fit was reasonably close (Worthington et al., 1989). In Analysis 5, observers were divided into high and low levels on each of Worthington et al.'s (1989) seven constructs based on the means and standard deviations on each subscale in the current college student sample.

Tape Rating Scale. Observers' attraction and receptivity to the counselor were measured with the Tape Rating Scale (Greenberg, 1969), which has been used by Haugen and Edwards (1976) and Morrow et al. (1992). The instrument consists of subscales to measure observers' attraction to the counselor and observers' receptivity to the counselor's influence. The attraction subscale consists of 26 items describing the positive and negative aspects of the counselor's interactions that are endorsed on a 7-point scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Attraction scores range from 26 to 182. Cronbach's alpha for the current administration was .92. The receptivity subscale consists of 10 statements concerning observers' attitudes toward the counselor and indicating observers' willingness to interact with the counselor. Receptivity scores range from 10 to 70 (Cronbach's alpha = .91).

Likelihood of referral and likelihood of return to counseling. Observers' ratings of their likelihood of referring a Christian and a non-Christian friend to the counselor were assessed using two 8-point (1 = *low*, 8 = *high*) items developed by Worthington and Gascoyne (1985). Two similar items by Morrow et al. (1992) assessed observers' opinion of the likelihood of the client's return and observers' likelihood of return to the counselor, had they been clients.

Procedure

Because the explicit attention given to observers' religiosity might have affected responding to the counselor's treatments of the client's religious issue in the videotapes, the study was conducted under the guise of two unrelated studies. The first "study" was conducted as an investigation of the relationship between observers' religious values and their styles of coping with sexual attraction. The Shepherd Scale, Glock and Stark's DRCS, the Religiosity Self-Rating, the RVS, and an instrument to assess styles of coping with sexual attraction were administered.

After completing these instruments, observers were told that the researchers were conducting a second study, in which observers evaluated a counselor's performance in a 10-minute counseling interaction. All observers agreed to participate, signed a second consent form, and heard an experimenter read instructions to "put yourself in the position of the client and imagine how you would respond to this particular counseling."

Observers viewed one of the two videotapes. After viewing the videotape, observers completed the Tape Rating Scale and the items about referring a friend from Worthington and Gascoyne (1985) and Morrow et al. (1992). At the end of the investigation, observers were debriefed. The deception was explained and observers were given the opportunity to have their data purged from the study. No observers requested this action.

RESULTS

Primary Analyses

Means and standard deviations of the six dependent variables for the levels of each subject independent variable by the two treatments of the client's religious issue for all analyses are given in Table 2.

For all five analyses, the effects of observers' level of religiosity, counselor's treatment of the client's religious issue, and their interaction were analyzed for six dependent variables. These six dependent variables were divided conceptually into two multivariate effects as described in the Design section. Because six theoretically relevant multivariate tests were performed for each analysis (two MANOVAs per dependent variable, each having two main effects and an interaction), the effects of ballooning alpha was a concern. Therefore, the studywise alpha was set at .05. Using Bonferroni's correction formula, the critical alpha for each multivariate test was set at .001. Multivariate F ratios were estimated with Wilks's lambda.

Because of the large number of statistical tests performed, only theoretically important tests (e.g., interactions between religiosity and treatment) with significant differences are reported in the text. Multivariate F ratios and p values for all MANOVAs, however, are given in Table 3. Post hoc univariate analyses of variance and comparisons of group means to identify univariate loci of multivariate effects were performed with alpha = .05.

Analysis 1: Level of Christian belief (Shepherd Scale, Using Bassett et al.'s Community Norms) \times Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Issue. Based on Morrow et al. (1992), it was hypothesized that no interaction of level of Christian belief and counselor's treatment of the client's religious issue would be found. This was the case for both multivariate interactions (see Table 3 for F ratios and p values for both main effects and interactions).

Analysis 2: Level of Christian belief (Shepherd Scale, Based On Sample Norms) \times Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Issue. It was hypothesized that even after dealing with the methodological weakness in Morrow et al. by using student norms, no significant interactions would be found. That was the case (see Table 3).

TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Observers' Level of Religiosity^a
and Counselor's Treatment of a Religious Issue

Item	Attraction ^b		Receptivity ^c		Client Return ^d		Observer Return ^d		Refer Christian ^d		Refer Non-Christian ^d	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Shepherd Scale (Community Norms)												
Support												
Low	153.8	29.1	36.5	12.5	5.8	1.7	5.4	2.0	5.3	1.7	4.6	1.8
High	165.6	26.0	37.5	13.6	6.3	1.5	4.9	2.4	5.4	1.8	4.2	1.9
Challenge												
Low	152.6	32.7	36.4	13.1	6.1	1.7	5.0	2.3	4.6	2.1	5.5	1.7
High	170.9	24.0	43.4	14.4	5.9	1.1	5.9	2.3	6.3	2.4	5.9	2.7
Shepherd Scale (Sample Norms)												
Support												
Low	159.5	32.7	38.4	14.4	5.8	1.7	5.6	2.1	5.5	1.7	5.2	1.9
High	162.0	25.6	38.1	13.4	6.6	1.2	5.3	2.2	5.4	1.7	4.1	1.9
Challenge												
Low	152.5	33.3	36.6	13.5	6.8	1.1	4.8	2.4	4.5	2.1	5.5	1.6
High	164.6	25.6	41.1	13.4	5.7	1.1	5.9	1.7	5.9	2.1	5.9	2.1
Orthodoxy												
Support												
0	155.8	24.6	35.5	13.2	6.0	1.5	5.0	2.2	5.0	1.9	4.0	2.0
1	148.6	32.7	29.5	8.2	5.8	2.0	4.7	2.5	5.1	1.9	5.1	1.8
2	159.2	25.9	45.2	9.4	6.4	1.5	6.2	1.5	6.2	1.5	4.4	1.7
3	144.4	26.5	32.9	17.5	5.1	2.2	4.7	2.7	4.3	2.3	4.4	1.9
4	162.7	31.0	38.3	12.9	6.0	1.6	5.9	1.6	6.3	1.4	5.2	2.0
Challenge												
0	168.4	24.0	41.8	13.0	6.0	1.5	5.7	2.0	5.4	2.0	6.0	2.0
1	160.0	23.3	44.5	7.8	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	6.5	0.7	6.5	0.7
2	165.3	30.8	41.1	13.7	6.8	1.1	5.9	2.7	4.8	1.9	5.2	2.2
3	148.4	32.4	36.0	10.4	5.8	2.4	5.2	2.3	3.8	2.4	6.0	2.0
4	146.9	34.5	33.2	14.3	5.7	1.7	4.1	2.2	3.1	1.9	4.3	2.1
Religious Commitment (Kelly)												
Support												
1	175.9	21.6	47.5	8.8	6.6	1.0	6.8	1.0	6.5	1.1	5.9	1.5
2	152.4	22.2	34.2	12.2	5.6	1.7	5.0	2.2	4.7	2.0	4.8	1.9
3	150.9	24.1	35.2	11.2	6.1	1.3	5.2	1.7	5.2	1.8	3.7	1.8
4	146.5	32.0	29.5	13.5	5.7	2.0	4.4	2.3	5.3	1.6	3.9	1.6
5 ^e	171.0	—	29.0	—	7.0	—	7.0	—	6.0	—	1.0	—
6	160.0	34.2	38.6	16.2	5.4	2.2	4.2	2.9	5.6	2.2	5.4	1.5
Challenge												
1	150.0	36.1	34.0	15.5	5.9	1.7	4.2	2.6	3.3	2.2	4.5	2.4
2	157.9	25.6	39.2	10.7	6.5	1.2	5.7	1.9	4.8	1.8	5.5	1.7
3	174.7	22.4	44.5	10.0	6.2	1.4	6.0	1.8	5.9	2.3	6.6	2.0
4	149.0	29.8	29.6	17.7	4.4	2.5	4.2	2.9	3.2	2.3	4.8	2.4
5	159.7	40.8	36.6	15.1	5.0	1.9	4.4	2.8	4.4	2.4	5.3	1.9
6	169.3	29.6	43.4	14.8	6.1	1.1	5.7	2.4	5.9	2.3	6.4	2.4
Religious Values (Worthington)												
Support												
Low	148.8	27.4	31.2	12.2	5.5	1.7	4.6	2.1	4.8	1.8	4.0	1.8
High	163.4	27.4	41.6	12.9	6.1	1.8	5.8	2.1	6.0	1.8	5.4	1.8
Challenge												
Low	167.7	22.5	41.9	12.9	5.9	1.7	5.7	2.2	5.2	2.3	6.1	2.0
High	150.6	28.8	35.0	13.5	6.0	1.6	4.4	2.2	4.0	2.1	4.8	1.8

TABLE 2 (Continued)
Means and Standard Deviations of Observers' Level of Religiosity^a
and Counselor's Treatment of a Religious Issue

Item	Attraction ^b		Receptivity ^c		Client Return ^d		Observer Return ^d		Refer Christian ^d		Refer Non-Christian ^d	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Authority Afforded Sacred Writings												
Support												
Low	151.6	26.2	32.2	12.4	5.8	1.5	4.7	2.0	5.0	1.7	4.0	1.8
High	159.4	30.0	39.7	14.0	5.8	1.8	5.5	2.3	5.7	2.0	5.5	1.8
Challenge												
Low	167.3	28.5	41.2	13.6	5.8	1.6	5.6	2.2	5.1	2.3	5.9	2.0
High	147.0	33.0	33.0	14.0	6.0	1.5	4.1	2.4	3.9	2.1	4.5	2.2
Authority Afforded Religious Group Identification												
Support												
Low	148.5	25.4	31.4	11.8	5.9	1.7	5.0	2.1	4.9	1.9	3.9	1.9
High	167.0	26.7	42.7	12.5	5.9	1.6	5.7	2.0	5.8	1.6	5.1	1.8
Challenge												
Low	166.4	28.6	40.8	13.7	5.8	1.7	5.4	2.2	4.8	2.4	5.7	2.3
High	152.6	30.5	37.2	13.3	6.2	1.6	5.0	2.2	4.4	2.0	5.4	1.7
Authority Afforded Religious Leaders												
Support												
Low	156.3	24.6	33.3	12.3	6.0	1.6	4.9	2.2	5.4	1.6	4.0	1.7
High	157.8	31.0	40.1	13.1	5.9	1.7	5.9	1.8	5.2	2.0	5.3	2.0
Challenge												
Low	166.8	29.6	40.7	12.2	6.1	1.6	5.6	2.1	4.9	2.2	5.8	2.0
High	151.8	29.2	35.5	13.3	6.0	1.5	4.7	2.3	4.1	2.0	5.0	2.0
Toleration of Different Scriptural Beliefs												
Support												
Low	153.1	26.4	32.1	12.0	5.9	1.6	4.7	2.2	4.8	1.9	4.0	1.9
High	162.4	26.2	41.2	12.7	6.1	1.6	5.9	2.0	6.0	1.6	5.2	1.7
Challenge												
Low	164.8	27.5	40.1	12.8	6.0	1.7	5.4	2.2	4.7	2.3	5.7	2.1
High	153.4	32.8	37.2	13.8	6.1	1.6	5.1	2.4	4.5	2.3	5.2	2.2
Toleration of Different Religious Groups												
Support												
Low	150.9	25.0	32.4	11.8	5.9	1.6	5.0	2.1	4.9	1.9	4.2	1.8
High	163.7	31.2	41.5	14.5	5.7	1.8	5.4	2.2	6.1	1.7	5.0	2.1
Challenge												
Low	165.6	26.7	41.1	11.6	6.1	1.7	5.8	2.1	5.0	2.1	6.0	1.9
High	144.1	26.3	32.1	13.0	5.6	1.4	3.9	2.2	3.6	2.0	4.5	2.2
Toleration of Different Views of Leadership												
Support												
Low	149.7	26.5	31.2	12.2	5.7	1.8	4.7	2.2	4.7	1.9	4.0	1.9
High	164.5	26.2	42.2	12.7	5.9	1.5	5.8	1.8	6.0	1.6	5.2	1.9
Challenge												
Low	161.3	24.6	38.1	12.5	6.0	1.6	5.3	2.2	4.7	2.2	5.5	2.0
High	159.5	32.8	39.7	14.0	6.0	1.7	5.1	2.4	4.5	2.2	5.5	2.2

^aAs measured by 11 subject independent variables. ^bScale scores range from 26 to 182. Item scores range from 1 = *strongly agree* to 7 = *strongly disagree*. ^cScale scores range from 10 to 70. Item scores range from 1 = *strongly agree* to 7 = *strongly disagree*. ^dScale scores range from 1 = *low likelihood* to 8 = *high likelihood*. ^eBecause there was only one observation in this cell, the standard deviation could not be computed.

TABLE 3

Multivariate *F* Ratios for Observer Religiosity, Treatment, and Their Interaction

Item	Four Counselor Variables			Two Referral Variables		
	R ^a	T ^b	R × T	R ^a	T ^b	R × T
Shepherd (community norms) ^a	1.81	0.16	1.03	2.50	4.74	1.22
Shepherd (student norms) ^c	1.21	0.28	4.33	3.06	5.20	1.57
Orthodoxy ^d	0.81	1.02	1.08	1.27	4.16	2.38
Religious Commitment (Kelly) ^e	1.23	1.34	1.68	1.53	11.46*	8.36*
Religious Values (Worthington) ^f	1.72	1.48	4.34	0.01	10.87*	8.79*
Authority Afforded Sacred Writings	1.22	0.82	4.33	0.30	6.48	8.44*
Authority Afforded Religious Group Identification	1.85	1.03	4.79*	0.87	12.11*	2.64
Authority Afforded Religious Leaders	1.54	1.35	2.74	2.02	9.60*	5.16
Toleration of Different Scriptural Beliefs	2.27	0.81	3.16	1.23	10.66*	3.34
Toleration of Different Religious Groups	2.31	0.86	5.64*	0.42	11.72*	8.07*
Toleration of Different Views on Leadership	2.14	1.00	1.47	1.70	9.70*	2.48

^aR = Religiosity of observer as measured by the measure of religiosity in the column at the left. ^bT = Treatment by the counselor: support the client's religious values versus challenge the client's religious values. ^cShepherd Scale (Bassett et al., 1981). ^dOrthodoxy is one subscale from the Dimensions of Religious Commitment (Glock & Stark, 1965, 1966). ^eReligious commitment is a six-level self-rating of religious commitment based on Kelly (1990). ^fReligious Values Scale has seven subscales, based on Worthington (1988).

* $p < .001$.

Analysis 3: Level of Orthodoxy × Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Values. It was hypothesized that no significant interaction of level of Christian orthodoxy with treatment would be found. This hypothesis was supported (see Table 3).

Analysis 4: Level of Religious Commitment-Religiosity Self-Rating × Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Issue. It was hypothesized that a significant interaction between religious commitment and treatment would be found. For the four counselor variables, the multivariate interaction was not significant. For the two referral variables, however, the multivariate interaction was significant, multivariate $F(10,268) = 8.36, p < .001$. Post hoc univariate ANOVAs revealed a significant univariate interaction for likelihood of referring a Christian friend, $F(5,135) = 3.98, p < .05$, and a non-Christian friend, univariate $F(5,135) = 4.09, p < .05$. Observers in the highest level of religious commitment were more likely to refer a Christian friend to the supportive counselor than to the challenging counselor. Observers in the third highest level of religious commitment were more likely to refer a non-Christian friend to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor.

Analysis 5: Religious Values Scale × Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Issue. For each of the subscales of the Religious Values Scale, it was hypothesized that for each of Worthington's (1988) seven measures of religious values, significant multivariate interactions would be found.

Commitment to Religious Beliefs × Counselor's Treatment of Client's Religious Issue. For the four counselor variables, the multivariate interaction was not significant. For the two referral variables, the multivariate interaction was significant, multivariate $F(2,118) = 8.74, p < .001$. Post hoc univariate ANOVAs to determine the loci of the multivariate interaction revealed univariate interactions to be significant for likelihood of referring a Christian friend, $F(1,119) = 10.49, p < .05$, and a non-Christian friend, $F(1,119) = 15.89, p < .05$. Simple main effects analyses showed that

observers of high religious commitment were more likely to refer a Christian friend to the supportive counselor than to the challenging counselor, but there were no differences in likelihood of referring a Christian friend for observers of low religious commitment. Individuals of low religious commitment were more likely to refer a non-Christian friend to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor, and there were no differences in likelihood of referring a non-Christian friend for individuals of high religious commitment.

Authority Afforded Sacred Writings × Counselor's Treatment of Client's Religious Issue. For the four counselor variables, the multivariate interaction was not significant. For the two referral variables, the multivariate interaction was significant, multivariate $F(2,116) = 8.44, p < .001$. Post hoc univariate ANOVAs revealed that the univariate interaction of observers' level of authority afforded sacred writings and counselor's treatment of the client's religious values was significant for likelihood of referral of a Christian friend, $F(1,117) = 6.39, p < .05$, and a non-Christian friend, $F(1,117) = 16.30, p < .05$. Observers who afforded high authority to sacred writings were more likely to refer a Christian friend to the supportive counselor than to the challenging counselor. There were no differences in likelihood of referral of a Christian friend between individuals who afforded low authority to sacred writings. Observers who afforded low authority to sacred writings were more likely to refer a non-Christian friend to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor. There were no differences in likelihood of referral of a non-Christian friend for individuals who afforded high authority to sacred writings.

Authority Afforded Religious Group Identification × Counselor's Treatment of Client's Religious Issue. For the four counselor variables, the multivariate interaction was significant, multivariate $F(4,114) = 4.79, p < .001$. Post hoc univariate ANOVAs revealed significant univariate interactions for observers' attraction to the counselor, $F(1,117) = 9.97, p < .05$; receptivity to the counselor,

$F(1,117) = 14.22, p < .05$; and likelihood of observer return, $F(1,117) = 4.92, p < .05$. Observers who afforded low authority to religious group identification were more attracted to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor. There were no differences among observers who afforded high authority to religious group identification. Observers who afforded low authority to religious group identification were more receptive to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor. There were no differences among observers who afforded high authority to religious group identification. There were no significant group differences for observers' likelihood of returning to counseling at $\alpha = .05$.

For the two referral variables, the multivariate interaction of observers' level of authority afforded religious group identification and counselor's treatment of the client's religious issue was not significant.

Authority Afforded Religious Leaders \times Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Issue. For neither the four counselor variables nor the two referral variables was the multivariate interaction significant.

Toleration of Different Scriptural Beliefs \times Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Issue. For neither the four counselor variables nor the two referral variables was the multivariate interaction significant. For the four counselor variables, the multivariate interaction was significant, multivariate $F(4,117) = 5.64, p < .001$. Post hoc univariate ANOVAs revealed significant interactions for observers' attraction to the counselor, $F(1,120) = 11.19, p < .05$; observers' receptivity to the counselor, $F(1,120) = 19.00, p < .05$; and observers' likelihood of returning to counseling, $F(1,120) = 9.75, p < .05$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that observers with low toleration for different religious groups were more attracted to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor. Observers with high toleration for different religious groups were more attracted to the supportive counselor than to the challenging counselor. Observers with low toleration for different religious groups were more receptive to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor. Observers with high toleration for different religious groups were more receptive to the supportive counselor than to the challenging counselor. Observers with high toleration for different religious groups were more likely to return to counseling with the supportive counselor than with the challenging counselor. There was no difference in the likelihood of return to counseling for individuals with low toleration of different religious groups.

For the two referral variables, the multivariate interaction was significant, multivariate $F(2,127) = 8.07, p < .001$. Post hoc univariate ANOVAs revealed that the univariate interaction was significant for observers' likelihood of referring a Christian friend, $F(1,128) = 12.96, p < .05$; and observers' likelihood of referring a non-Christian friend, $F(1,128) = 10.02, p < .05$. Observers with high toleration for different religious groups were more likely to refer a Christian friend to the supportive counselor than to the challenging counselor. There was no difference in likelihood of referring a Christian friend for observers with low toleration for different religious groups. Observers with low toleration for different religious groups were more likely to refer a non-Christian friend to the challenging counselor than to the supportive counselor. There was no difference in likelihood of referring a non-Christian friend for observers with high toleration for different religious groups.

Toleration of Different Views on Leadership \times Counselor's Treatment of the Client's Religious Issue. For neither the four counselor variables nor the two referral variables was the multivariate interaction significant.

DISCUSSION

This study partially replicates and extends the findings of Morrow et al. (1992). Such replication studies are rare in the literature on religion in counseling. Furthermore, this study demonstrates a pattern of theoretically relevant results, which, although not completely consistent, at least suggests that observers' religious values influence their perceptions of religious counseling more than do religious beliefs. Our findings have implications for methodology and theory development in research on religious counseling.

The first methodological implication of these findings is that the way religiosity is operationalized in investigations of religious counseling may strongly affect the results. Measures of religious *belief* (i.e., the Shepherd Scale and Glock & Stark's [1965] orthodoxy scale) were insensitive predictors of individuals' perceptions of the two treatments of the client's religious issue. This finding is consistent with the results of other studies in which religious *beliefs* failed to predict perceptions of religious counseling (Haugen & Edwards, 1976; Pecnik & Epperson, 1985).

Alternatively, measures of religious *values* were more consistent predictors of observers' perceptions of different counselor treatments of a client's religious issue (Analyses 4 and 5). Even with religious values, the pattern is not consistent. Religious values, especially degree of religious commitment, were more influential in affecting likelihood of referral to a counselor than in affecting people's perceptions of the counselor's attractiveness. Thus, future investigations of the influence of religiosity on perceptions of counseling that explicitly addresses religious issues might focus on specific measures of religious values rather than on religious beliefs as predictors of many of individuals' perceptions of counseling.

The stronger influence of religious values than of religious beliefs has implications for theory as well. Several researchers (Goldsmith & Hansen, 1991; Kelly, 1990; Worthington, 1988) have theorized that individuals' religious beliefs do not predict their perceptions of counseling that explicitly addresses religious issues well. These writers have argued that individuals' perceptions are more dependent on their commitment to and value for their religious beliefs than on the content of those beliefs.

Individuals who highly value their religion seem more likely to evaluate a counselor positively whom they perceive as generally proreligious or supportive of clients' religion. Individuals who value their religion less highly may either be indifferent to a supportive treatment of clients' religious issues or may see religious issues as psychologically irrelevant, and may thus prefer a counselor who challenges clients' religion. This interpretation, however, was only partially supported by our findings. Future research needs to explore the specific perceptions affected by clients' religious values.

Observers with high religious commitment or with high value for religion were generally more likely to refer a Christian friend to the supportive counselor than to the challenging counselor, whereas observers of low religious commitment or with low value for specific religious beliefs were more likely to refer a non-Christian friend to the challenging counselor. Religiously committed observers may conclude that a counselor who supports religious values is desirable for religious clients (because these observers themselves tend to prefer the supportive counselor), although they are not sure whether a supportive counselor or a challenging counselor would be appropriate for less demonstrably religious clients. Likewise, observers with less religious commitment may conclude that a challenging counselor (who views religion as either psychologically irrelevant or

counterproductive for counseling) may be appropriate for nonreligious clients like themselves while being unsure whether a counselor who challenges clients' religious values is appropriate for religious clients.

Because of theoretical and methodological problems, findings of the current investigation must be interpreted carefully. First, the sample was drawn from a nonclinical population, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, participants were observers of a counseling interaction, not clients. Third, stimulus tapes were identical for 7 of 10 minutes; however, in the final 3 minutes, differences could have occurred in counseling style, phraseology, and implication. These differences could have confounded the alleged treatment. Replication of the studies using other counselors and clients of all gender combinations would offer evidence about possible confounds. Finally, our dependent variables were pencil and paper measures of observers' responses to a counselor rather than actual behavior. As the evidence regarding the role of religiosity in individuals' perceptions of religious counseling converges, it becomes more critical that these findings be investigated in clinical studies or in analogues to counseling with near-clinical populations, which would more closely approximate actual counseling (see Johnson & Ridley, 1992).

REFERENCES

- Bassett, R. L., Camplin, W., Humphrey, D., Door, C., Biggs, S., Distaffen, R., Doxator, I., Flaherty, M., Hunsberger, P. J., Poage, R., & Thompson, H. (1991). Measuring Christian maturity: A comparison of several scales. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19*, 84-93.
- Bassett, R. L., Sadler, R. D., Kobischen, E. E., Skiff, D. M., Merrill, I. J., Atwater, B. J., & Livermore, P. W. (1981). The Shepherd scale: Separating the sheep from the goats. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 9*, 335-351.
- Gallup, G. (1985). *Religion in America—50 years: 1935-1985*. Princeton, NJ: Gallup.
- Glock, C., & Stark, R. (1965). *Religion and society in tension*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Goldsmith, W. M., & Hansen, B. K. (1991). Boundary areas of religious clients' values: Target for therapy. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 10*, 224-236.
- Greenberg, R. P. (1969). Effects of pre-session information on perception of the therapist and receptivity to influence in a psychotherapy analogue. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33*, 425-429.
- Haugen, C. D., & Edwards, K. J. (1976). Religious values and their effect on the perception of a therapist in a therapy analogue. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 4*, 160-167.
- Johnson, W. B., & Ridley, C. R. (1992). Sources of gain in Christian counseling and psychotherapy. *Counseling Psychologist, 20*, 159-175.
- Kelly, E. W., Jr. (1990). Counselor responsiveness to client religiousness. *Counseling and Values, 35*, 69-72.
- Lovinger, R. J. (1990). *Religion and counseling: The psychological impact of religious belief*. New York: Continuum.
- Morrow, D., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & McCullough, M. E. (1992). Observers' perceptions of a psychotherapist's treatment of a religious issue. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71*, 452-456.
- Pecheur, D. R., & Edwards, K. J. (1984). A comparison of secular and religious versions of cognitive therapy with depressed Christian college students. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 12*, 45-59.
- Pecnik, J. A., & Epperson, D. L. (1985). Analogue study of expectations for Christian and traditional counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*, 127-130.
- Propst, L. R. (1980). The comparative efficacy of religious and nonreligious imagery for the treatment of mild depression in religious individuals. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 4*, 167-178.
- Robinson, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. (1973). *Measures of social psychological attitudes*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1988). Understanding the values of religious clients: A model and its application to counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 166-174.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Gascoyne, S. R. (1985). Preferences of Christians and non-Christians for five counselors' treatment plans: A partial replication and extension. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 13*, 29-41.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hsu, K., Gowda, K. K., & Bleach, E. (1988, November). *Preliminary tests of Worthington's (1988) theory of important values in religious counseling*. Paper presented at the First International Congress on Christian Counseling, Atlanta.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., Berry, J. T., Hsu, K., Gowda, K. K., Bleach, E., & Bursley, K. H. (1989, October). *Measuring religious values: Factor analytic study of the Religious Values Survey*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Virginia Psychological Association, Richmond.

Michael E. McCullough is an assistant professor in the Department of Behavioral Sciences at Louisiana Tech University. Everett L. Worthington, Jr., is a professor in the Department of Psychology at Virginia Commonwealth University. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Michael E. McCullough, College of Education, Louisiana Tech University, P.O. Box 10048, Ruston, LA 71272.