



8-1-1974

# Relationships among personality, empathic ability and counselor effectiveness

Brian R. Brewer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

## Recommended Citation

Brewer, Brian R., "Relationships among personality, empathic ability and counselor effectiveness" (1974). *Theses and Dissertations*. 453.

<https://commons.und.edu/theses/453>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [zeinebyousif@library.und.edu](mailto:zeinebyousif@library.und.edu).

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PERSONALITY, EMPATHIC ABILITY  
AND COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS

by

Brian R. Brewer

Bachelor of Science, University of North Dakota, 1968  
Master of Science, University of North Dakota, 1971

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August  
1974

TT974  
B758

This dissertation submitted by Brian R. Brewer in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

---

(Chairman)

---

---

---

---

---

---

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PERSONALITY, EMPATHIC ABILITY AND  
COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS

Department Counseling and Guidance

Degree Doctor of Philosophy

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Robert A. Apostol, chairman of my doctoral advisory committee for his patience, assistance, and guidance.

I wish to express a special thanks to Dr. H. Duane Luessenheide for his encouragement and friendship as well as his participation as a member of my advisory committee.

I wish to acknowledge my appreciation to Dr. John D. Williams, Dr. Alice T. Clark, and Dr. Charles W. Carter for their help and participation as members of my advisory committee.

I wish to thank Dr. Calvin J. Becker, Dr. H. Duane Luessenheide and Dr. Charles M. Page, for their time and efforts in judging the tapes. I also wish to thank Dr. John Teigland, chairman of the Department of Counseling and Guidance at North Dakota State University, for his cooperation and assistance regarding the participation of his students in this study.

A special expression of gratitude is for Susan, my constant companion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
ABSTRACT . . . . .	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem	
Research Questions	
Delimitations of the Study	
Limitations of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Research Describing Selection Practices	
Research Describing Counselor Characteristics	
Research Relating Counselor Characteristics to Counselor Effectiveness	
Research Regarding the Measure of Counselor Effectiveness	
III. METHOD . . . . .	25
Subjects	
Instruments	
Judges	
Procedures	
Statistical Analyses	
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	32
Hypothesis Testing	
Stepwise Backward Elimination Procedures	
Inter-Judge Reliability	
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	45
Discussion	
Conclusions	

APPENDIX A. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire Scores by Subjects . . . . .	52
APPENDIX B. Affective Sensitivity Scale Scores by Subject . . . .	56
APPENDIX C. Blocher's Scale Scores by Subject . . . . .	58
REFERENCES . . . . .	61

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Correlation Coefficients Between Personality Characteristics and Counselor Effectiveness Ratings . . . . .	33
2. Correlation Coefficients Between Empathy Levels and Counselor Effectiveness Ratings . . . . .	34
3. Correlation Coefficients Between Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels . . . . .	36
4. t Values Between Less Effective Counselors and More Effective Counselors for Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels . . . . .	37
5. Stepwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels with Role Adaptation as the Criterion . . . . .	38
6. Stepwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels with Cognitive Flexibility as the Criterion . . . . .	40
7. Stepwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels with Perceptual Sensitivity as the Criterion . . . . .	41
8. Stepwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels with Involvement with Client as the Criterion . . . . .	42
9. Stepwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels with Overall Rating as the Criterion . . . . .	43
10. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire Scores by Subjects . . . . .	53
11. Affective Sensitivity Scale Scores by Subject . . . . .	57
12. Blocher's Scale Scores by Subject . . . . .	59



## ABSTRACT

### Problem

The purpose of this study was to measure personality characteristics and empathic ability of masters level counseling students and then to determine the relationship of these dimensions to independent ratings of their counseling effectiveness. Relationships between personality characteristics and empathic ability were also examined as were differences in personality and empathy between more effective and less effective counselor groups.

### Method

The subjects were 34 masters level counseling students enrolled in their first counseling practicum. They completed Form A and Form B of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), the measure of personality, and the Affective Sensitivity Scale, the measure of empathic ability. At the end of their practicum they submitted an audio tape recording of what they considered to be one of their better counseling efforts of the practicum experience.

From each tape submitted three segments of three minutes each were transcribed and placed in random order on a master tape. The three segments were taken from the first third, middle third, and last third of each tape. The segments were rated by three qualified judges trained in the use of an adapted form of Blocher's (1968) scale, yielding five ratings for each segment including Role

Adaptation, Cognitive Flexibility, Perceptual Sensitivity, Involvement with Client, and an Overall Rating.

Correlation coefficients were found among the 16PF scores, the Affective Sensitivity Scale scores, and the counselor effectiveness ratings. A stepwise backward multiple linear regression was computed to identify predictors of counselor effectiveness. Finally, t tests were applied to determine the significance of differences between the more effective and less effective counselor groups on the personality and empathy variables.

### Results

1. Fourteen significant correlations were found between personality characteristics and counselor effectiveness. Specifically, Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing) correlated  $-.35$  with Role Adaptation and  $-.34$  with Involvement with Client. Factor G (Expedient vs Conscientious) correlated  $-.33$  with Perceptual Sensitivity. Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) correlated  $.30$  with Cognitive Flexibility,  $.35$  with Perceptual Sensitivity, and  $.36$  with Overall Rating of counselor effectiveness. Factor O (Placid vs Apprehensive) correlated  $.32$  with Cognitive Flexibility,  $.36$  with Perceptual Sensitivity,  $.37$  with Involvement with Client, and  $.32$  with Overall Rating of counselor effectiveness. Factor Q<sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled) correlated  $-.36$  with Perceptual Sensitivity and  $-.32$  with Involvement with Client and  $.29$  with Overall Rating of counselor effectiveness.

2. Three significant correlations were found between empathic ability and counselor effectiveness. Empathic ability correlated  $.29$

with Cognitive Flexibility, .36 with Perceptual Sensitivity and .30 with Overall Rating.

3. None of the correlations between personality and empathic ability was significant.

4. Three of the t values between the more effective and less effective counselor groups were found to be significant. The more effective counselors scored lower on Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing), and higher on Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) and Factor O (Placid vs Apprehensive).

5. The stepwise backward elimination procedures identified several variables as significant predictors of counselor effectiveness. The best predictors were Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing) and Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, and empathic ability as measured by the Affective Sensitivity Scale.

#### Discussion

The results were discussed in terms of their relationship to other research and in terms of their implications for counselor selection. In particular, the research findings of the present study on the 16PF were found to be in direct contrast to those of Myrick, Kelly and Wittmer (1972). The differences were attributed to the different methods of rating counselor effectiveness; the present study used independent judges whereas the Myrick study employed supervisors' ratings. The literature has suggested that independent ratings may be superior to supervisors' ratings.

The results also indicated that the less effective counselors were more outgoing, more trusting, and more placid than those in the norms group for the 16PF and those classified as more effective counselors. It was suggested that individuals in counseling programs who are less effective counselors may deviate from the normal population in unrealistic and naive ways.

Finally, the Affective Sensitivity Scale showed promise as a predictor of counselor effectiveness and as a discriminator between more and less effective counselor groups. Most noteworthy, however, was the finding that empathic ability as measured by the Affective Sensitivity Scale was unrelated to personality as measured by the 16PF. In view of this finding, it was suggested that personality and empathic ability may be independent factors related to counselor effectiveness. The implications of this finding for counselor selection were drawn.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In response to the Russian space probe of 1957, the National Defense Act of 1958 provided funds on a large scale for the preparation of school guidance counselors. This Act provided major impetus to the field of counselor education. As a result of the 1958 legislation, the creation of National Defense Education Act Institutes for the training of school guidance counselors emerged in the graduate training programs of colleges and universities nationwide. The institutes were conducted on a short term basis during a summer school session and also on a year long basis during an academic year. Between 1959 and 1963 14,000 secondary school counselors were trained in over 400 National Defense Education Act Institutes. The number of full time secondary school counselors grew from approximately 12,000 in 1958 to 29,545 in 1964 (Odell, 1973).

Today, the focus of counselor education programs has changed considerably. No longer do these programs exist solely for the preparation of school guidance personnel. Employment opportunities for counselors are now found in a variety of social as well as educational settings such as employment bureaus, vocational rehabilitation services, mental health centers, correctional institutions, juvenile courts, vocational schools, community and junior colleges as well as elementary and secondary schools. The training of people specifically as school

counselors may continue to decrease because of a more stabilized demand for teachers and counselors in the public schools and a declining birth rate.

The typical counselor education training program offers its students information in the areas of history and development, theories, and research in counseling and guidance together with practical training. Specific course work is offered in principles of guidance and student personnel, occupational and educational information, theory of vocational development, group dynamics, personality theory, appraisal, and methods of research together with a supervised practicum experience. The student must also complete a thesis or independent study.

The successful completion of these requirements usually requires the equivalent of three semesters in graduate school culminating with a Master's degree.

Presently intellectual or academic variables are used almost exclusively in the selection of individuals for counselor training. As might be expected, these variables do relate to success in counselor education programs (Blocher, 1963; Callis and Prediger, 1964; Bernos, 1966). However, it has also been shown that these traditional selection criteria have little or no correlation with counselor effectiveness (Bergin and Solomon, 1963; Joslin, 1965; Arbuckle, 1968; Wittmer and Lister, 1971). In spite of this evidence, academic variables have remained the most frequently used criteria for determining admission to graduate school programs in counselor education (Santavicca, 1959; Hill, 1961; Gimmestad and Goldsmith, 1973).

### Statement of the Problem

Counseling is a personal field requiring individuals with the capacities and capabilities to engage in successful interpersonal relationships. Thus the need is very high to identify personality variables which relate to counselor effectiveness.

Tyler (1961) stated:

. . . the problem of selection for the profession is much more difficult than the problem of training. It is generally agreed that there are personal characteristics related to counseling success, but just what these characteristics are is not so generally agreed.

Therefore, the purpose of the present investigation was to determine if significant relationships exist between counselor personality and counselor effectiveness.

This topic has already received considerable research attention. The present study builds on the work of Myrick, Kelly, and Wittmer (1972) and further examines the Sixteen Factor Personality Questionnaire's (16PF) usefulness as a discriminating instrument of counselor effectiveness. Myrick et al. (1972) administered the 16PF to counseling practicum students identified by their supervisors as effective or ineffective. Four factors discriminated between the two groups and four factors showed a tendency to discriminate. However, the results of their study may be in question as the accuracy of supervisory judgments of students' counseling effectiveness has been disputed by Payne and Gralinski (1968) and Wedeking (1973). An interaction effect between supervisors and students tends to cause supervisory ratings to be higher than independent ratings.

The present study examined the 16PF's relationship to independent judgments of counselor effectiveness. It also examined the relationship

between the Affective Sensitivity Scale, a new measure of empathy, and counselor effectiveness. Finally, the study reports data on the relationship between the Affective Sensitivity Scale and the 16PF.

#### Research Questions

The specific purpose of this study was to measure personality characteristics and empathic ability of counseling practicum students and then to determine the relationship of these characteristics to a measure of counselor effectiveness. To achieve this purpose, the following research questions were posed:

1. Are there relationships between personality characteristics and counselor effectiveness?
2. Are there relationships between empathy levels and counselor effectiveness?
3. Are there relationships between personality characteristics and empathy levels?
4. Are there differences in personality characteristics and empathy levels between groups of counselors identified most effective and least effective?

#### Delimitations of the Study

1. This study was delimited to volunteer graduate students in counseling and guidance enrolled in the master's level counseling practicum at the University of North Dakota and North Dakota State University during the spring session of 1974.
2. This study was delimited by the adaptation of Blocher's Scale, the measure of counselor effectiveness.



### Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited by the reliability and validity of the instruments used to obtain the various measures, the Sixteen Personality Questionnaire and a measure of personality characteristics, the Affective Sensitivity Scale as a measure of empathy, and Blocher's Scale, as a measure of counselor effectiveness.

### Definition of Terms

Affective Sensitivity Scale. An instrument providing a measure of the testee's ability to identify affective states of clients from videotape segments of actual counseling sessions (Campbell, Kagan, and Krathwohl, 1971).

Blocher's Scale. An instrument designed for judgments of counselor behaviors including role adaptation, cognitive flexibility, perceptual sensitivity, and involvement with the client together with an overall rating (Blocher, 1968).

Counselor Effectiveness. A composite score arrived at by independent judgments of tape recorded counseling segments using Blocher's Scale.

Empathy. The measure of individual ability to identify client affect as measured by the Affective Sensitivity Scale.

Personality Characteristics. Those characteristics of the individual as described by the 16 factors of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. An instrument which purports to measure sixteen personality dimensions of the individual including Factors A; reserved vs. outgoing; B, less intelligent vs.

more intelligent; C, affected by feelings vs. emotionally stable; E, humble vs. assertive; F, sober vs. happy-go-lucky; G, expedient vs. conscientious; H, shy vs. venturesome; I, tough-minded vs. tender-minded; L, trusting vs. suspicious; M, practical vs. imaginative; N, forthright vs. shrewd; O, placid vs. apprehensive; Q<sub>1</sub>, conservative vs. experimenting; Q<sub>2</sub>, group-dependent vs. self-sufficient; Q<sub>3</sub>, undisciplined self-conflict vs. controlled; Q<sub>4</sub>, relaxed vs. tense (Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research pertaining to counselor selection has consisted of reviews of the selection practices of various counselor education programs and reviews of research in counselor selection. The present chapter reviews the following topics: research describing selection practices of training programs; research describing counselor characteristics; and research relating counselor characteristics to counseling effectiveness. Also, research focusing on questions regarding reliable measures of counselor effectiveness was reviewed.

#### Research Describing Selection Practices

The research describing selection practices of counselor training programs has showed that selection decisions are made on the basis of academic criteria to a much greater extent than on the basis of non-academic criteria. For example, an early survey of the selection practices of 21 universities training counseling psychologists was completed by the Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association (1954). Major emphasis was placed on academic criteria. Eighty-six per cent of the schools used either undergraduate grade point average, Millers Analogies Test (MAT), Graduate Record Examinations (GRE), or some combination thereof. The most common non-academic criteria were the Strong Vocational Interest Blank used by 38 per cent of the schools and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory used by 28 per cent of the schools.

Similar differences among schools on selection practices were reported by Wellman (1955). His survey of college personnel programs showed that academic criteria ranked most important by 75 per cent of the schools requiring evidence of academic ability. Counseling aptitude was ranked next most important but only 36 per cent of the schools required evidence of such aptitude. Keppers (1961) surveyed 181 counselor education programs and 81 per cent required scores from the MAT and GRE while only 12 per cent required scores from a personality test. Rehabilitation counselor training programs followed the same pattern: 70 per cent used an academic aptitude test; 22 per cent used an interest test; and 22 per cent used a personality test (Patterson, 1962).

Evidence that these selection practices exists at the present time is offered by Gimmetad and Goldsmith (1973) who made the following conclusion after conducting a survey of selection procedures of counselor education programs:

Predictors which are keyed to academic success continue to dominate the scene as initial screening criteria in graduate programs in counselor education. Most programs require a minimum grade point average and a minimum score on the Graduate Record Examination or another test of academic aptitude (p. 177).

#### Research Describing Counselor Characteristics

Research of counselor characteristics had its beginnings in subjective descriptions of ideal counselor characteristics. An example of this subjectivity was reported by Cox (1945) who summarized such counselor characteristics as fairness, sincerity, personality, good character and wholesome philosophy together with twenty other traits.

Cottle (1953) reviewed the literature on counselor characteristics and suggested most of the early studies contained subjective

judgments and made little attempt to use objective testing of personality characteristics. Wood (1971), commenting on this early research stated:

Occasionally, these opinionated analysis of the ideal personal characteristics of counselors were based on surveys, such as descriptions by school principals of the professional and personal qualities of the counselors in their schools and ratings of their effectiveness. It is surprising that it was seldom questioned whether a non-psychologically oriented administrator could validly assess characteristics or counseling effectiveness (p. 165).

In the fifties research was beginning to appear describing counselor characteristics using objective instruments. The Kuder Preference Record was administered to a sample of male vocational rehabilitation counselors (DiMichael, 1949). This sample scored high on the Social Service, Literary, Scientific and Computational scales. Kreidt (1949) obtained Strong Vocational Interest Blank profiles of 1048 Ph.D. psychologists listed in the APA directory. The 155 guidance psychologists showed interest in social service.

Wrenn (1952) administered the Allport-Lindzey Study of Values, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS) and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) to advanced MA and Ph.D. education psychology students. On the Study of Values the group scored high on the Theoretical scales. The group scored high on five scales of the GZTS: Restraint, Emotional Stability, Friendliness, Objectivity, and Personal Relations. The MMPI results had not been completed; however, initial indications showed high K scale scores for the students. Cottle and Lewis (1954) corroborated Wrenn's (1952) findings on the GZTS and MMPI. Further results of the MMPI in the Cottle and Lewis (1954) study revealed scores above the mean on the F and Masculinity-

Femininity scales, and below the mean on Hypomania and Social Introversion-Extroversion. Patterson's (1962) samples were high on K, Masculinity-Femininity, and Hypomania and low on Social Introversion-Extroversion. Foley and Proff's (1965) results were similar to Patterson's (1962) for the MMPI.

Patterson (1962) also reported mean profiles for the Kerr-Speroff Empathy Test, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) and Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). The population was 550 graduate students in rehabilitation counseling. Women scored at the 70th percentile and men between the 50th and 55th percentile on the Kerr-Speroff; however, the test's validity was questioned. The students showed social service interest on the SVIB.

EPPS profiles were close to the college student norms. The women scored high on Intraception and low on Abasement. The men scored high on Intraception, Deference, and Nurturance. Kemp's (1962) male sample of secondary school counselors scored high on Intraception and Affiliation and low on Endurance and Aggression. Scores for Dominance, Abasement, Change, Heterosexuality, and Nurturance were not reported. Foley and Proff's (1965) findings were similar. The men scored high on Intraception, Affiliation, and Deference; the women scored high on Intraception and Deference and low on Abasement.

Patterson (1962) concluded:

It would thus appear that those individuals entering rehabilitation counseling through the training programs established under OVR grants compare favorably with other counseling students and show characteristics that should lead to their development into capable counselors (p. 16).

A contrasting conclusion is offered by Mahan and Wicas (1964). They studied 25 NDEA students who completed the Ways of Life; Self-Description, a forced-choice adjective checklist measuring dominance, inducement, submission and compliance; and the Structural Objective Rorschach Test, a forced-choice group administered adaptation of the Rorschach psychodiagnostic technique. The authors concluded that the students:

. . . appear as highly controlled, as sensitive to the expectations of society and authority, as "doers" rather than "thinkers" as defenders of the established order, and as rather repressed individuals not given to introspection or self-analysis (p. 81).

The differences may be due in part to the differences in the samples and to the differences in the instruments used in the particular studies.

Moredock and Patterson (1965) studied groups of counseling students at four different levels of preparation, using six scales of the California Personality Inventory (CPI): Sociability, Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, Tolerance, Intellectual Efficiency, and Flexibility. Mean scores for students at the first two levels were close to the mean for college students in the CPI manual. Scores tended to increase with the level of training with mean T scores at practicum (highest level) of approximately 60.

Although these studies for the most part showed counseling students differing in preferred directions from norms groups, the differences, although significant in some places, were too small to be of any practical value. A good example of this lack of discrimination was the research using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality

Inventory (MMPI). In a review of the use of the MMPI in studies of counselors, Heikkinen and Wegner (1973) concluded:

Overall, we can conclude tentatively that on the MMPI, counselors appear more extroverted (low Si) and perhaps more defensive (high K), more calm and efficient (lower Ma), and more honest (low L) than other professional groups (p. 277).

The authors go on to state, "the MMPI thus far is hardly exciting in its implications for counseling research" (p. 277).

Another obvious weakness is that none of this research describing counselor characteristics was related to counselor effectiveness. The Mahan and Wicas (1964) study suggested that some counselors do not possess the assumed desirable characteristics so the relationship of characteristics to effectiveness was open to question.

#### Research Relating Counselor Characteristics to Counselor Effectiveness

A major criticism of the early descriptive studies was that they did not include a measure of counselor effectiveness as an independent variable. This criticism led to a number of investigations which attempted to relate counselor characteristics to counselor effectiveness.

One of the earliest studies in this area was reported by Arbuckle (1956) who compared counseling students' scores on the Heston Personality Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and Kuder Preference Record to their selection of each other as potential counselors. Selected students were significantly higher than non-selected students on the Confidence scale of the Heston Personality Inventory; higher on the Social Service, Persuasive, Literary, and Scientific scales of the Kuder; and lower



on Hysteria, Depression, Paranoia, Hypochondriasis, Schizophrenia and Social Introversion-Extroversion scales of the MMPI. Students not selected were higher on Hysteria, Paranoia, Hypochondriasis, Schizophrenia, Psychopathic Deviate, and Hypomania scales of the MMPI.

Differences from Arbuckle's (1956) results on the MMPI and Kuder were found in later research. The Schizophrenia scales of the MMPI correlated  $-.51$  with staff ratings of counselor's willingness to engage in counseling relationships (Wasson, 1965) and  $-.31$  with practicum grades of female students (Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, and Stone, 1967) concurring in part with Arbuckle's (1956) findings. However, Brams (1961) found no relationship between any MMPI scales and counselor-client rapport, and Hoover (1971) found no differences in the MMPI scales between effective and less effective counselor groups. Demos and Zuwaylif (1966) reported that the Kuder did not discriminate between groups of most effective and least effective counselors.

From this evidence it would appear that the MMPI and Kuder are questionable instruments for discriminating between effective and ineffective counselors. Moreover, Heikkinen and Wegner (1973) concluded in a review of MMPI studies on counselors, ". . . we simply cannot say that the MMPI is a proven discriminator between effective and ineffective counselors" (p. 277).

In addition to the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Brams (1961) used the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, Index of Adjustment and Values and the Berkley Public Opinion Questionnaire, a measure of tolerance for ambiguity, as dependent variables. These variables were related to the students' effectiveness of communication

in counseling. Only the Berkley Public Opinion Questionnaire showed a relationship with the independent variable. Brams (1961) concluded, ". . . counselors who create successful communicative counseling relationships are more tolerant of ambiguous material" (p. 29). Similar results were obtained by McDaniel (1967) who examined the relationship between the Budner Scale of Tolerance-Intolerance of Ambiguity and supervisors' ratings of counselor effectiveness, and Gruberg (1969), who found that counselors tolerant of ambiguity used more client-centered rather than directive leads.

Stefflre, King, and Leafgren (1962) related students' scores on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) to peer selection as a potential counselor. Selected students scored higher than non-selected students on Public Administrator, YMCA Secretary, Social Studies High School, City School Superintendent, and Minister of the Occupational Scales. They also scored higher on Deference and Order and lower on Abasement and Aggression scales of the EPPS and lower on dogmatism.

Wasson (1965) also related students' Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) and Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) scores to ratings of the counselor's willingness to engage in counseling relationships. Four criteria were employed, pre-selection ratings, counseling segment ratings, staff ratings, and peer ratings of the counselor's willingness to form a relationship.

From the SVIB the Artist scale related positively to counseling segments and staff ratings and City School Superintendent and Interest Maturity related positively to pre-selection ratings. These

last two scales, City School Superintendent and Interest Maturity showed some similarity to the findings of Stefflre et al. (1962); however, on the basis of the same criterion (peer ratings), there was no similarity. Different results on the SVIB were also reported by Johnson et al. (1967) who found the Architect scale to be positively related to practicum grades for males and the Dentist scale to be negatively related to practicum grades for females.

Wasson's (1965) results for the EPPS showed Nurturance positively related to counseling segment ratings and Heterosexuality positively related to peer ratings. Demos and Zuwaylif (1966) found that the most effective counselors scored higher on Nurturance and Affiliation and that the least effective counselors scored higher on Autonomy, Abasement, and Aggression. Asa (1967) related EPPS scales to counseling leads. Dominance correlated  $-.56$  with accepting leads and  $.67$  with probing-projecting leads. Aggression correlated  $-.74$  with interpreting leads and  $.58$  with diagnosing leads. Johnson et al. (1967) found no significant relationships between EPPS scales and counselor effectiveness.

Nurturance, Aggression, and Abasement were the only EPPS scales common to two of the four studies reviewed above. Moreover, the statistical treatment applied by Demos and Zuwaylif (1966) was soundly criticized by Mills and Menke (1967). Also Asa's study employed a coached client presenting a single situation which questions the generalizability of her results. Thus, there is little support for using the EPPS to predict counselor effectiveness.

Low dogmatism scores appeared to be consistently related to counselor effectiveness. Low dogmatism was found to be significantly

related to counselor peer selection as a potential counselor (Stefflre et al., 1962), and client ratings of counseling (Cahoon, 1962) and to expert judges' ratings of counseling (Russo, Kelz, and Hudson, 1964 and Milliken and Patterson, 1967). However, Foulds (1971) did not find a significant relationship between low dogmatism scores and counselor ability to communicate facilitative conditions, although all scores were in the predicted direction.

Kazienko and Neidt (1962) compared self descriptions of good and poor counselor groups using the Bennet Polydiagnostic Index. This instrument assessed four areas of the individual including self-concept, motives, values, and concept of social environment. The instrument differentiated between good and poor groups, however, information regarding the instrument's rationale, reliability, and validity was not provided. The results were reported in terms of a multiplicity of descriptions using vague phrases such as "soft of voice," "serious of purpose," and "reserved judgment." This type of description lacks substance and, as a consequence the results may be questionable.

An interesting study by Combs and Soper (1963) related counselors' perceptual organization, including the characteristic ways of perceiving self, others, and counseling, to counselor effectiveness. Of the twelve perceptual variables tested ten were significant at the .01 level of confidence and two were significant at the .02 level.

Wicas and Mahan (1966) reported further on the data of a previous study (Mahan and Wicas, 1964). Comparisons were made between counselors rated high on counseling effectiveness using the Ways of

of Life, Self Description, and Structural Objective Rorschach Test (SORT). On Self Description the high rated counselors were higher than those rated low on Submission and Compliance and lower on Dominance. The SORT showed high rated counselors higher on Conformity and lower on Persistence.

Freedman, Antenen, and Lister (1967) compared counseling student's scores on the California Personality Inventory (CPI) and Guilford Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS) to their judged counseling behaviors. A multiple regression technique was employed to analyze the data. Factors accounting for three per cent or more of the total variance in counseling behaviors were reported. Dependent variables common to three or more criterion variables were Responsibility, Sense of Well Being, Dominance, Self Control, and Flexibility of the CPI and Sociability of the GZTS.

The results may be limited with regard to their generalizability. The client was role-played by a graduate student in counseling portraying one situation and the judges were also graduate students in counseling. This peer interaction at all levels may have weakened the design.

Another study which related CPI and GZTS scores to counselor effectiveness was reported by Johnson et al. (1967). The Well Being Scale of the CPI related positively and the Friendliness Scale of the GZTS related negatively to staff ratings.

The final group of studies reported employed the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) as the dependent variable.

McClain (1968) compared the 16PF scores of counseling students rated as excellent, average, and poor by their supervisors. For men,

the excellent group differed from the average and poor groups on eight of the sixteen factors. Those in the excellent group were more outgoing, assertive, happy-go-lucky, venturesome, group-dependent, forthright, liberal, and less tender-minded than the average and poor groups. For women, the excellent group differed from the average and poor groups on ten of the sixteen factors. Those in the excellent group were more outgoing, practical, forthright, conservative, casual, and less assertive, venturesome, happy-go-lucky, and relaxed than those in the average and poor groups.

Similar findings were reported by Myrick, Kelly and Wittmer (1972) who compared 16PF scores between groups identified as good and poor counselors. Four of the sixteen factors discriminated significantly between the two groups and four other factors suggested some discriminating ability.

Sixteen PF scores were compared to client ratings of unconditioned positive regard, empathic understanding, congruence, and trust (Donnan, Harlan, and Thompson, 1969). Factor A (reserved vs outgoing) correlated .49 with unconditional positive regard and .36 with total relationship ratings. Factors I (tough-minded vs tender-minded) and C (affected by feelings vs emotionally stable) correlated .43 and -.34 respectively with congruence and Factor H (shy vs venturesome) correlated .44 with trust.

Wittmer and Lister (1971) found the 16PF Regression Equation, an index of predicted counseling effectiveness, to correlate significantly with supervisory ratings of counselor effectiveness.

### Summary of Findings

An examination of the preceding studies shows, with one exception, the inability of multi-dimensional personality instruments to predict counselor effectiveness reliably on more than one of its dimensions. Instruments showing no relationship to the criterion included the Heston Personality Inventory (Arbuckle, 1956), Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and Index of Adjustment and Values, Bennet Poly-diagnostic Index (Kazienko and Neidt, 1962), and Ways of Life (Wicas and Mahan, 1966). Those instruments which showed some discriminating ability but whose results were not consistent with later studies included the Kuder Preference Record (Arbuckle, 1956 and Demos and Zuwaylif, 1966), the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (Stefflre et al., 1962 and Wasson, 1965) and the Guilford Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Freedman et al., 1967 and Johnson et al., 1967). Instruments which showed a relation for at least one variable, but in which only one study had been conducted included Self Description and Structural Objective Rorschach Test (Wicas and Mahan, 1966) and a measure of perceptual organization (Combs and Soper, 1963).

Instruments which showed a relationship between at least one variable and a criterion of counselor effectiveness, and whose results were consistent in at least two studies included the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Arbuckle, 1956; Wasson, 1965; Demos and Zuwaylif, 1966; and Asa, 1967), and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (McClain, 1968; Donnan et al., 1969; and Myrick et al., 1972).

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory research in studies of counselors was strongly criticized by Heikkinen and Wegner (1973) and research using the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule contained weaknesses in design. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire remained the exception. At least four of its factors (Factor A, Reserved vs Outgoing; Factor E, Humble vs Assertive; Factor H, Shy vs Venturesome and Factor I, Tough-minded vs Tender-minded) were found to relate consistently to counselor effectiveness. It is true that low dogmatism (Stefflre et al., 1962; Cahoon, 1962; Russo et al., 1964; and Milliken and Patterson, 1967) was related to counselor effectiveness as was tolerance for ambiguity (Brams, 1961; McDaniel, 1967; and Gruber, 1969); however, these results were limited to a single dimension of personality.

The present study was based on the assumption that counselor effectiveness is the product of many components of the counselor's personality operating at the same time in his interactions with the counselee, but it is recognized that the use of multiple instruments for measuring these components is generally impractical (Wasson, 1965; Johnson et al., 1967). It is based on the further assumption that although there may be certain measurable characteristics associated with success, a given counselor need not score high on all of them. He may be low on particular ones but compensate for these deficiencies by possessing other relevant characteristics to a high degree. These assumptions point to the need for a reasonably simple device for combining scores, some specification equation that could help differentiate the successful counselor from the unsuccessful counselor. From



the preceding evidence, the 16PF appears to be the instrument with the best potential for achieving such a differentiation.

Research Regarding the Measure of  
Counselor Effectiveness

As well as the difficulty involved in finding a multidimensional instrument able to differentiate counselor effectiveness on a number of personality dimensions, there was the difficulty involved in measuring counselor effectiveness itself.

A variety of approaches to rate counselor effectiveness were reported in the literature (Anderson and Anderson, 1962; Dilley, 1965; Myrick and Kelly, 1971). Ratings were made by peers, independent judges, supervisors, or a combination of these.

The Communication Rating Scale (CRS) was introduced by Brams (1961). This was a modification of a 50 point rating scale used as a measure of effective communication in counseling devised by Anderson and Anderson (1962). Reliability coefficients between judges ranged from .81 to .95, all significant at or greater than the .05 level of confidence. The correlations between supervisors and peer ratings was .73, significant at .001 level. The correlation between supervisors and self ratings was .22 and between peer and self ratings was .21 both nonsignificant. Brams questioned the accuracy of self ratings as every trainee rated himself consistently high.

Dilley's (1965) Field Practice Check List is composed of 66 items selected from a pool of 724 standardized rating statements. Supervisory ratings correlated .66 with peer ratings, and .78 with instructor ratings, both coefficients significant at the .05 level.

The Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI), originally designed for client ratings of counseling by Linden, Stone, and Shertzer (1965) was utilized by Brown and Cannaday (1969) in a study comparing supervisor, client, and counselor self ratings of counseling effectiveness. A client ranked the counselors according to his perception of their level of counseling skills. Correlations between client and counselor self ratings were .13, supervisor and counseling self ratings  $-.08$ , and client and supervisor ratings  $.81$ . The only significant correlation was the last, at the  $.01$  level of confidence.

Bishop (1971) conducted a similar study in which the CEI was the sole rating instrument. Bishop found a correlation of  $.41$  between supervisor and counselor self ratings, significant at the  $.05$  level. No significant relationship was found between supervisor and client ratings. These findings are contrary to those of Brown and Cannaday (1969).

Myrick and Kelly (1971) developed the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS), a 27 item instrument yielding scores in the areas of counseling and supervision. A split-half reliability coefficient of  $.95$  was reported together with a test-retest reliability coefficient of  $.94$ .

The discrepancy of the above ratings among supervisors, clients, and counselors is probably due to the particular interaction among them. Payne and Gralinski (1968) studying changes in empathy levels of counseling students commented:

Perhaps the most striking finding from this study was the discrepancy between the supervisor's judgement of counselor improvement and those of independent judges. This perception of improvement by the supervisor regardless of the

treatment method and regardless of perceived improvement by judges suggests that a supervisor's judgement of his counselor is like women's intuition--"that which tells a woman she's right, whether she's right or not." Such findings give support to the suggestions of Arbuckle (1963) Truax et al. (1964) that the performance of a practicum student be evaluated by persons other than his supervisor (p. 521).

Wedeking (1973) found evidence supporting the comments of Payne and Gralinski (1968). He found no significant correlation between counselor self ratings and independent judges' ratings or between supervisor ratings and independent judges' ratings of counseling segments. However, a correlation of .54 significant at the .01 level of confidence was found between counselor self ratings and supervisors' ratings.

It would appear from this evidence that the most reliable and valid assessments of counselor effectiveness are those provided by independent judges. Therefore, the studies reported by McClain (1968) and Myrick, Kelly and Wittmer (1972) relating 16PF scores to supervisory ratings of counselor effectiveness may be in question.

Blocher (1968) designed a comprehensive instrument for the independent evaluation of counseling behaviors. This instrument obtains measures for five areas of the counseling process: Role Adaptation, Cognitive Flexibility, Consistency of Communication Between Verbal and Nonverbal Behavior, Perceptual Sensitivity and Involvement with Client as well as an Overall Rating. A list of approximately 500 items relating to relevant counselor behaviors was assembled from supervisor critique sheets, a review of the literature, and client questionnaires. This number was reduced to 153 items which were in turn sorted by experienced counselor educators into the five areas to be measured. A final list of 122 items

was classified reliably in the same way by three counselor educators and these are the items of the Blocher's scale.

Interjudge reliability for the five areas were reported as .89, .89, .86, .87, .89. Overall interjudge reliability was .91. Independent judgments of 60 films of practicum students' interviews correlated .42 with staff rankings of overall predicted success as a counselor, .42 with composite rankings of immediate supervisors, and .32 with practicum grades. The first two correlations were significant at the .05 level.

When adapted to the present study Blocher's scale offered the most comprehensive evaluation of counselor effectiveness as yet reported in the literature.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

#### Subjects

The subjects for this study were 34 volunteer counseling and guidance graduate students, 21 males and 13 females, enrolled in the masters level counseling practicum at the University of North Dakota and North Dakota State University. Their ages ranged from 22 years to 38 years with an average age of about 28 years.

These students engaged in their practicum experiences at a wide range of locations including public schools, vocational rehabilitation services, mental health centers, alcohol and drug addiction centers, juvenile hostels, employment service bureaus, and senior citizen homes.

#### Instruments

##### Affective Sensitivity Scale

The Affective Sensitivity Scale is a measure of empathy obtained through responses to videotape segments of actual counseling sessions. Campbell, Kagan, and Krathwohl (1971) described the development of the instrument and presented evidence for its reliability and validity.

The scale was developed from a procedure called Interpersonal Process Recall. In this procedure a client reacts to a videotape of

his immediately preceding counseling session with a trained individual to identify his feelings in various parts of the counseling session. To construct the scale, videotaped counseling segments were extracted and from the information obtained through Interpersonal Process Recall multiple choice questions were developed. Two kinds of items were used, one questioned the client's feelings about himself, the other questioned the client's feelings about his counselor. The questions were composed of one correct answer and two detractors.

The instrument is composed of 33 counseling segments involving 11 different clients and counselors representing a variety of counseling situations varying in emotional depth and content. Following each segment the subject answers a number of multiple choice questions to describe the affective state the client was "really" experiencing. The measure of empathy is the number of correct responses the subject makes.

The test-retest reliability coefficient was .75 over a one week period. Scale score reliability coefficients over a six month period for two groups were .58 and .67. Concurrent validity was reported as follows. Affective Sensitivity scores correlated .53 with therapist ranking of group members, significant at the .01 level of confidence. Coefficients of .32 and .28, significant at the .06 level, were obtained between Affective Sensitivity scores of doctoral practicum students and their supervisors' ranking of the students' sensitivity. Predictive validity was reported between Affective Sensitivity scores and doctoral practicum students' peer rankings of counselor effectiveness. Coefficients of .31 and .32 significant at the .05 level of confidence were reported. Also Affective Sensitivity scores correlated .42, .17, and

.32 with peer ratings of counselor effectiveness. The .42 coefficient was significant at the .025 level of confidence and the .32 coefficient approached significance (an  $r$  of .33 was needed for significance at the .05 level).

The authors concluded:

Evidence of the predictive validity of Form B is significant but the predictive utility of the scale is not established. If such utility was substantiated using Form B and other criterion measures, the scale would have value to counselor education programs as both a research and selection instrument.

The predictive validity of the Affective Sensitivity Scale in relationship to independent judgment of counseling effectiveness has not been assessed.

#### Blocher's Scale

Blocher (1968) developed an instrument to measure counseling effectiveness around five theoretical constructs of counselor behavior; role adaption, cognitive flexibility, consistency of communication, perceptual sensitivity, and interpersonal involvement. From these constructs the five rating scales were developed and identified.

Role adaptation includes the number of roles in which the counselor is able to engage, his ability to choose the proper role at the proper time, and his ability to shift roles efficiently when the need arises. Cognitive flexibility is demonstrated by the counselor's range of psychological concepts, his repertoire of interview techniques within a particular role, and his supply of relevant information about the client and his world. Consistency of communication is consistency in terms of what the counselor says verbally and his voice inflection, facial expressions, posture, gestures, and

mannerisms. Perceptual sensitivity includes counselor comprehension of and responses to simple verbal expressions as well as subtle communication expressed through changes in voice quality, facial expressions, gestures, and nervous mannerisms. Finally, involvement with the client includes the extent to which the counselor shows a genuine feeling of acceptance and caring for the client, and the extent to which the counselor reveals himself frankly and openly.

The instrument was adapted for use with audiotapes by Wedeking (1973) by omitting scale 3, Consistency of Communication Between Verbal and Nonverbal Behavior. This adaptation together with further adaptations were used in the present study.

In the original use of the instrument, for each of the five scales, the judges viewed a counseling segment, responded to a list of from 14-35 questions pertaining to the counseling behaviors of the particular scale, and then rated the counseling segment on a one to nine point summary sheet. From these five summary sheet ratings an overall assessment of counseling effectiveness was made on a one to nine point scale. This procedure required a judge to re-run the counseling segment at least once for each scale prior to answering the related questions and making a rating.

In the present study the specific questions pertaining to the counseling behaviors of each scale were kept available for reference but were not responded to for each counseling segment. Each judge was made thoroughly familiar with these questions as well as Blocher's (1968) theoretical constructs and the design of the instrument. With this information, a rating was made on each of the four scales immediately after listening to a counseling segment. An overall assessment



of counselor effectiveness was made by applying a clinical judgment criterion to the data.

#### Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Cattell and Eber, 1962; Cattell, Eber, and Tatswoka, 1970) provides an objective measure of sixteen independently functioning personality traits of the individual. Coverage of personality is insured through sixteen functionally-independent and psychologically-meaningful dimensions isolated by over twenty years of factor analytic research on normal and clinical groups (Cattell and Eber, 1962). The descriptions of the scales and studies of reliability and validity are presented in detail in the Handbook. Form A & B which was used in the present study takes approximately two hours to complete.

Test-retest reliability coefficients for a six day period ranged from .76 to .93 and for a two month period ranged from .63 to .88.

Construct validity was reported as follows. The mean correlation between all single items with the factors they represent was .37 and the mean intercorrelation between the items was .10. The mean correlation between each group of items and the factor it represents was .85. The last was referred to as concept validity. Validity coefficients of individual scales ranged from .74 to .92 (Cattell et al., 1970).

#### Judges

The ratings of counselor effectiveness was made by three judges. These judges hold doctors degrees in counseling and guidance and are practicing counselors in the field.

One of the judges is a thirty-seven year old staff member of the University of North Dakota Counseling Center. He holds an Ed.D. in Counseling and Guidance and has six years' experience as a full time college counselor. The second judge is also a staff member at the Counseling Center of the University of North Dakota. He is thirty-six years old, holds an Ed.D. in Counseling and Guidance and has been a full time college counselor for nine years. The third judge is a counselor for the Vocational Adjustment Department of the University of North Dakota Rehabilitation Hospital. He is thirty-three years old, holds a Ph.D. in Counseling and Guidance and has been a counselor with the Vocational Adjustment Bureau for six years.

Once the judges became familiar with Blocher's Scale several meetings were held for them to practice using the instrument. At the end of these practice sessions several counseling segments were presented to the judges to test for inter-rater reliability. Those Pearson coefficients were .82 for Role Adaptation, .67 for Cognitive Flexibility, .74 for Perceptual Sensitivity, .82 for involvement with Client, and .76 for the overall rating.

#### Procedures

During the early part of the spring term of 1974, the subjects were asked to participate in the study. Each subject was requested to complete the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the Affective Sensitivity Scale. Each subject was also requested to submit an audio tape recording of what he regarded as one of his better counseling efforts of his practicum experience.

From the tape each subject submitted, three segments of three minutes each were transcribed and placed in random order on a master

tape. The three segments were taken from the first third, middle third, and last third of each tape. Each segment was coded for identification by the researcher. The master tapes were then submitted to the judges for their ratings of counselor effectiveness. The judges' ratings yielded nine ratings for each of the five counselor effectiveness variables. Eleven subjects received eight ratings due to one judge's inability to rate a segment because of poor audio quality of the tape. The ratings were averaged and each subject received one score for each of the five counselor effectiveness variables.

#### Statistical Analyses

The data were analyzed by several statistical methods. Correlations were found between the 16 factors of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the counselor effectiveness ratings and between the Affective Sensitivity Scale scores and the counselor effectiveness ratings. Correlations were also found between the 16 factors of the 16PF and the Affective Sensitivity Scale scores. A backwards stepwise multiple linear regression was utilized to identify the most important predictors of counselor effectiveness. Finally, the subjects were divided equally into two groups based on their overall rating scores. Those judged to be more effective counselors had overall rating scores of 4.33 or higher. Subjects judged to be less effective had overall scores of 4.22 or below. Independent t tests were applied to the 16PF and the Affective Sensitivity Scale data to determine if the two counselor effectiveness groups differed significantly.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This chapter organizes the results according to the research questions presented in Chapter I now restated in null hypothesis form. The raw data are reported in Appendix A for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Appendix B for the Affective Sensitivity Scale, and Appendix C for Blocher's Scale.

#### Hypothesis Testing

Null hypothesis 1: There are no relationships between personality characteristics and counselor effectiveness.

Table 1 presents the correlations between the 16 personality factors and the counselor effectiveness ratings. Examination of Table 1 reveals 14 r values significant at the .05 level. Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing) correlated  $-.35$  with Role Adaptation and  $-.34$  with Involvement with Client. Factor G (Expedient vs Conscientious) correlated  $-.33$  with Perceptual Sensitivity. Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) correlated  $.30$  with Cognitive Flexibility,  $.35$  with Perceptual Sensitivity, and  $.36$  with Overall Rating of counselor effectiveness. Factor O (Placid vs Apprehensive) correlated  $.32$  with Cognitive Flexibility,  $.36$  with Perceptual Sensitivity,  $.37$  with Involvement with Client, and  $.32$  with Overall Rating of counselor effectiveness. Factor Q<sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled) correlated  $-.36$  with

TABLE 1

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND  
COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS (N=34)

Personality Characteristics	Counselor Effectiveness Ratings					Overall Rating
	Role Adaptation	Cognitive Flexibility	Perceptual Sensitivity	Involvement with Client		
A (Reserved vs Outgoing)	-.35 <sup>a</sup>	-.26	-.27	-.34 <sup>a</sup>	-.28	
B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	.02	.07	.11	.07	.11	
C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	-.06	-.13	-.15	-.27	-.16	
E (Humble vs Assertive)	-.16	-.05	.02	.03	-.03	
F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	-.22	.02	.00	.02	-.05	
G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	-.14	-.20	-.33 <sup>a</sup>	-.18	-.16	
H (Shy vs Venturesome)	-.14	-.06	.01	-.03	-.05	
I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	-.05	-.06	.15	-.03	.05	
L (Trusting vs Suspicious)	.26	.30 <sup>a</sup>	.35 <sup>a</sup>	.26	.36 <sup>a</sup>	
M (Practical vs Imaginative)	.10	.06	.06	.04	.11	
N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	-.13	-.16	-.22	-.20	-.17	
O (Placid vs Apprehensive)	.22	.32 <sup>a</sup>	.36 <sup>a</sup>	.37 <sup>a</sup>	.32 <sup>a</sup>	
Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	.06	.13	.14	.04	.14	
Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self-sufficient)	.11	-.03	.02	-.09	.02	
Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	-.09	-.23	-.36 <sup>a</sup>	-.31 <sup>a</sup>	-.22	
Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	.19	.25	.26	.32 <sup>a</sup>	.29 <sup>a</sup>	

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level

Perceptual Sensitivity and  $-.31$  with Involvement with Client. Factor Q<sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense) correlated  $.32$  with Involvement with Client and  $.29$  with Overall Rating of counselor effectiveness.

On the basis of these findings, null hypothesis 1 is rejected; this study has found significant relationships between personality and counselor effectiveness.

Null hypothesis 2: There are no relationships between empathy levels and counselor effectiveness.

Table 2 reports the correlations between empathy and counselor effectiveness. Three correlations are significant at the  $.05$  level. Empathy levels (Affective Sensitivity Scale scores) correlated  $.29$  with Cognitive Flexibility,  $.36$  with Perceptual Sensitivity and  $.30$  with Overall Rating of counselor effectiveness.

Therefore, null hypothesis 2 is rejected; apparently there is a significant relationship between empathic ability and counselor effectiveness.

TABLE 2

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN EMPATHY LEVELS AND COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS (N=34)

Counselor Effectiveness Ratings	Empathy Levels
Role Adaptation	.23
Cognitive Flexibility	.29 <sup>a</sup>
Perceptual Sensitivity	.36 <sup>a</sup>
Involvement with Client	.20
Overall Rating	.30 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at  $.05$  level

Null hypothesis 3: There are no relationships between personality characteristics and empathy levels.

Table 3 reveals no significant  $r$  values for these two variables, therefore, null hypothesis 3 is retained.

Null hypothesis 4: There are no differences in personality characteristics and empathy levels between groups of counselors identified less effective and more effective.

Table 4 presents the  $t$  values between the less effective counselors and more effective counselors. Three  $t$  values were found to be significant, one at the .05 level and two at the .10 level. The more effective counselors scored lower on Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing) and higher on Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) and Factor O (Placid vs Apprehensive). Because of the liberal significance level on two of the  $t$  values, null hypothesis 4 is rejected, but with caution.

#### Stepwise Backward Elimination Procedures

Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 summarize the data for stepwise backward elimination procedures for the 16 factors of the 16PF and the scores of Affective Sensitivity Scales with each of the five measures of counselor effectiveness.

The results with Role Adaptation as the criterion are presented in Table 5. Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing) was the last variable eliminated accounting for 12.1 per cent of the variance in common with the criterion. This variable had an  $F$  value of 4.350, significant at the .05 level. The remaining variables did not reach significance as predictors. All 17 variables accounted for 43.1 per cent of the variance in common with Role Adaptation.

TABLE 3

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS  
AND EMPATHY LEVELS (N=34)

Personality Characteristics	Empathy Levels
A (Reserved vs Outgoing)	-.14
B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	.22
C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	-.01
E (Humble vs Assertive)	-.10
F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	.02
G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	.09
H (Shy vs Venturesome)	.05
I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	.24
L (Trusting vs Suspicious)	-.07
M (Practical vs Imaginative)	-.10
N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	.05
O (Placid vs Apprehensive)	.02
Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	.12
Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self-sufficient)	-.09
Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	-.17
Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	.16



TABLE 4

t VALUES BETWEEN LESS EFFECTIVE COUNSELORS AND MORE EFFECTIVE COUNSELORS FOR  
PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND EMPATHY LEVELS

Personality Characteristics and Empathy Levels	t Values	Means	
		Less Effective Counselors (N=17)	More Effective Counselors (N=17)
Personality Characteristics			
A (Reserved vs Outgoing)	2.201 <sup>a</sup>	25.706	21.824
B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	-1.470	17.706	19.059
C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	0.259	33.647	33.000
E (Humble vs Assertive)	0.327	25.941	25.353
F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	0.077	31.647	31.471
G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	0.858	24.755	22.941
H (Shy vs Venturesome)	-0.224	29.235	30.000
I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	-1.552	23.882	25.882
L (Trusting vs Suspicious)	-1.825 <sup>b</sup>	11.941	15.059
M (Practical vs Imaginative)	-1.156	25.755	27.588
N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	0.329	17.882	17.412
O (Placid vs Apprehensive)	-1.925 <sup>b</sup>	15.882	20.588
Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	-0.905	21.706	23.059
Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self-sufficient)	0.785	16.647	15.118
Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	0.752	21.529	20.353
Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	-1.193	22.059	25.176
Empathy Levels	-1.606	36.941	41.118

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level

<sup>b</sup>Significant at .10 level

TABLE 5

STEPWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PERSONALITY  
CHARACTERISTICS AND EMPATHY LEVELS WITH ROLE ADAPTATION  
AS THE CRITERION

Step	Variable Eliminated	Multiple Correlation (R)	R <sup>2</sup>	F
1	None	.657	.413	.714
2	B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	.657	.431	.806
3	O (Placid vs Apprehensive)	.656	.431	.907
4	H (Shy vs Venturesome)	.653	.427	1.011
5	M (Practical vs Imaginative)	.649	.421	1.118
6	I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	.643	.413	1.233
7	F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	.634	.402	1.347
8	Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	.614	.377	1.393
9	C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	.606	.358	1.550
10	Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self- sufficient)	.589	.347	1.658
11	Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	.571	.326	1.793
12	G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	.554	.306	1.989
13	N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	.530	.281	2.189
14	Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	.510	.260	2.548
15	Affective Sensitivity Scale	.474	.225	2.896
16	E (Humble vs Assertive)	.409	.167	3.111
17	L (Trusting vs Suspicious)	.346	.120	4.350 <sup>a</sup>
18	A (Reserved vs Outgoing)			

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level

Table 6 shows the results with Cognitive Flexibility as the criterion. None of the variables reached significance and in total they accounted for 39.7 per cent of the variance in common with the criterion.

Table 7 presents the results with Perceptual Sensitivity as the criterion. The Affective Sensitivity Scale score was the last variable eliminated accounting for 13.1 per cent of the variance in common with the criterion and having an F value of 4.808, significant at the .05 level. The next to last variable eliminated was Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) with an F value of 5.801 significant at the .01 level. When combined with the Affective Sensitivity Scale variable the variance accounted for in common with the criterion was 27.2 per cent. The elimination procedure continued for Factors G, E, H, O, A, Q<sub>3</sub>, I, Q<sub>1</sub>, and N all significant at the .05 or .01 level as indicated. These 11 significant predictors accounted for a total of 53.6 per cent of the variance in common with Perceptual Sensitivity. All the variables accounted for 55 per cent of the variance in common with the criterion.

The results with Involvement with Client as the criterion are summarized in Table 8. The last variable eliminated was Factor O (Placid vs Apprehensive) accounting for 14 per cent of the variance in common with the criterion and having an F value of 5.197, significant at the .05 level. Other significant variables were Factors A, H, and E. The significant variables accounted for 28.4 per cent of the variance in common with the criterion. All variables accounted for 42.5 per cent of the common variance.

TABLE 6

STEPWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PERSONALITY  
CHARACTERISTICS AND EMPATHY LEVELS WITH COGNITIVE  
FLEXIBILITY AS THE CRITERION

Step	Variable Eliminated	Multiple Correlation (R)	R <sup>2</sup>	F
1	None	.630	.397	.620
2	M (Practical vs Imaginative)	.630	.397	.700
3	B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	.630	.397	.790
4	Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	.629	.396	.889
5	N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	.628	.394	1.002
6	Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	.627	.393	1.131
7	Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self-sufficient)	.623	.388	1.269
8	F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	.615	.379	1.401
9	Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	.604	.365	1.534
10	C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	.599	.359	1.752
11	I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	.589	.347	1.977
12	G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	.566	.321	2.123
13	Affective Sensitivity Scale	.525	.276	2.134
14	L (Trusting vs Suspicious)	.466	.217	2.013
15	A (Reserved vs Outgoing)	.403	.162	1.936
16	H (Shy vs Venturesome)	.364	.132	2.372
17	E (Humble vs Assertive)	.320	.102	3.648
18	O (Placid vs Apprehensive)			

TABLE 7

STEPWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PERSONALITY  
CHARACTERISTICS AND EMPATHY LEVELS WITH PERCEPTUAL  
SENSITIVITY AS THE CRITERION

Step	Variable Eliminated	Multiple Correlation (R)	R <sup>2</sup>	F
1	None	.741	.550	1.149
2	F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	.741	.548	1.290
3	Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	.739	.546	1.448
4	M (Practical vs Imaginative)	.738	.545	1.626
5	C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	.736	.542	1.821
6	B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	.733	.538	2.036
7	Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self- sufficient)	.732	.536	2.306 <sup>a</sup>
8	N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	.726	.527	2.567 <sup>a</sup>
9	Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	.722	.521	2.905 <sup>b</sup>
10	I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	.714	.510	3.254 <sup>a</sup>
11	Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	.709	.502	3.745 <sup>b</sup>
12	A (Reserved vs Outgoing)	.688	.473	4.040 <sup>b</sup>
13	O (Placid vs Apprehensive)	.646	.417	4.004 <sup>b</sup>
14	H (Shy vs Venturesome)	.624	.389	4.615 <sup>b</sup>
15	E (Humble vs Assertive)	.599	.359	5.609 <sup>b</sup>
16	G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	.522	.272	5.801 <sup>b</sup>
17	L (Trusting vs Suspicious)	.361	.131	4.808 <sup>a</sup>
18	Affective Sensitivity Scale			

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level

<sup>b</sup>Significant at .01 level

TABLE 8

STEPWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PERSONALITY  
CHARACTERISTICS AND EMPATHY LEVELS WITH INVOLVEMENT WITH  
CLIENT AS THE CRITERION

Step	Variable Eliminated	Multiple Correlation (R)	R <sup>2</sup>	F
1	None	.652	.425	.697
2	G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	.652	.425	.786
3	N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	.652	.425	.886
4	Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	.651	.424	1.001
5	Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self-sufficient)	.651	.424	1.132
6	C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	.650	.423	1.283
7	Affective Sensitivity Scale	.650	.422	1.460
8	Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	.643	.413	1.617
9	I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	.631	.399	1.767
10	B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	.617	.381	1.926
11	Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	.600	.359	2.084
12	F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	.586	.343	2.352
13	L (Trusting vs Suspicious)	.557	.311	2.525
14	M (Practical vs Imaginative)	.533	.284	2.876 <sup>a</sup>
15	E (Humble vs Assertive)	.477	.228	2.950 <sup>a</sup>
16	H (Shy vs Venturesome)	.450	.203	3.936 <sup>a</sup>
17	A (Reserved vs Outgoing)	.374	.140	5.197 <sup>a</sup>
18	O (Placid vs Apprehensive)			

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level

TABLE 9

STEPWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PERSONALITY  
CHARACTERISTICS AND EMPATHY LEVELS WITH OVERALL RATING  
AS THE CRITERION

Step	Variable Eliminated	Multiple Correlation (R)	R <sup>2</sup>	F
1	None	.644	.415	.667
2	M (Practical vs Imaginative)	.644	.414	.751
3	Q <sub>2</sub> (Group-dependent vs Self-sufficient)	.643	.414	.847
4	I (Tough-minded vs Tender-minded)	.642	.412	.951
5	F (Sober vs Happy-Go-Lucky)	.640	.410	1.069
6	B (Less Intelligent vs More Intelligent)	.639	.408	1.207
7	C (Affect by Feelings vs Emotionally Stable)	.637	.406	1.367
8	Q <sub>1</sub> (Conservative vs Experimenting)	.635	.404	1.558
9	Q <sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-conflict vs Controlled)	.632	.400	1.774
10	N (Forthright vs Shrewd)	.630	.396	2.052
11	Q <sub>4</sub> (Relaxed vs Tense)	.626	.392	2.393 <sup>a</sup>
12	G (Expedient vs Conscientious)	.617	.381	2.764 <sup>a</sup>
13	O (Placid vs Apprehensive)	.579	.336	2.828 <sup>a</sup>
14	H (Shy vs Venturesome)	.541	.293	3.003 <sup>a</sup>
15	E (Humble vs Assertive)	.529	.280	3.880 <sup>a</sup>
16	A (Reserved vs Outgoing)	.489	.239	4.870 <sup>a</sup>
17	Affective Sensitivity Scale	.360	.129	4.751 <sup>a</sup>
18	L (Trusting vs Suspicious)			

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level

Table 9 shows the results with Overall Rating as the criterion. The last variable to be eliminated was Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) accounting for 12.9 per cent of the common variance with an F value of 4.751, significant at the .05 level. Other significant variables eliminated in order were the Affective Sensitivity Scale, Factors A, E, H, O, and G. The significant variables accounted for 39.2 per cent of the common variance. All the variables accounted for 41.5 per cent of the variance in common with Overall Rating.

#### Inter-Judge Reliability

Inter-judge reliability was obtained by computing alpha coefficients for each of the five scales measuring counselor effectiveness. The alpha coefficients for Role Adaptation, Cognitive Flexibility, Perceptual Sensitivity, Involvement with Client, and Overall Rating were .61, .54, .47, .35, and .54 respectively, all significant at the .05 level. These coefficients are lower than the reliabilities achieved during the training of the judges.



## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Discussion

This study examined relationships between personality characteristics and independently judged ratings of counselor effectiveness; relationships between empathy levels and independently judged ratings of counselor effectiveness; and relationships between personality characteristics and empathy levels. This study also examined differences in personality characteristics and empathy levels between two groups of counselors, one group containing the less effective counselors and the other group containing the more effective counselors.

The correlations between the 16 factors of the 16PF and the counselor effectiveness ratings suggest at first glance that counselor effectiveness may be a function of being reserved (Factor A), expedient (Factor G), suspicious (Factor L), apprehensive (Factor O), undisciplined (Factor Q<sub>3</sub>), and tense (Factor Q<sub>4</sub>). Needless to say this description would not meet the textbook criteria of a good counselor.

Perspective is added to these findings by examining the *t* values of the significant factors and comparing their mean scores with the mean scores of the general population norms, Male & Female, Form A & B (Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970).

The significant *t* value for Factor A shows the more effective group to be more reserved than the less effective group. The mean

score for the less effective counselors was 25.71 and for the more effective counselor was 21.82. The mean score of the norms group was 21.62 with a standard deviation of 6.25. This indicates that the more effective counselors scored very close to the mean of the norms group while the less effective counselors scored .62 standard deviations above the norms group mean.

This same pattern occurs for Factor L and Factor O, the two factors showing significant t values at the .10 level. For Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) the less effective group had a mean of 11.94 and the more effective group had a mean of 15.02. The mean of the norms group was 14.42 with a standard deviation of 5.42. The less effective counselors scored .57 standard deviations below the norm group mean.

For Factor O (Placid vs Apprehensive) the mean of the less effective group was 15.88 and the mean of the more effective group was 20.9. The norms group mean was 20.39 with a standard deviation of 8.86. The less effective counselors scored .53 standard deviations below the mean of the norms group.

Rather than discriminating the less effective from the more effective counselors these results may indicate that persons less effective in counseling are being discriminated from the normal population group. The less effective group appears to be more outgoing, more trusting, and more placid than the norms group as well as the more effective group in this study. In other words it may be suggested that individuals in counseling programs who are less effective counselors may deviate from the normal population in unrealistic and naive ways.

Myrick, Kelly and Wittmer's (1972) results are in direct contrast. They examined differences in group means between 20 effective and 20 ineffective student counselors in a counseling practicum. For purpose of comparison it was assumed Form A was employed. Significant factors common to both studies were Factor A and Factor L. For Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing) Myrick et al. (1972) reported a mean of 13.80 for the effective group and 9.90 for the ineffective group. The norms group mean reported by the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing (1970) for general populations Male & Female, Form A was 10.75 with a standard deviation of 3.25. The effective group scored .94 standard deviations above the norms group mean. For Factor L (Trusting and Suspicious) the effective group had a mean 4.35 and the ineffective group had a mean of 5.81. The mean of the norms group was 6.80 with a standard deviation of 3.42. The effective group scored .72 standard deviations below the norms group mean.

Although Factor O (Placid vs Apprehensive) did not have a significant t value in the Myrick et al. (1972) study it is interesting to note that the effective group with a mean of 6.95 for this factor deviated .76 standard deviations below the mean of the norms group. The mean of the norms group was 10.09 with a standard deviation of 4.12.

To illustrate the contrast in results between the two studies the present study shows Factor A with a significant t value discriminating between less and more effective counselor groups. The less effective counselors were shown as more outgoing and scored .62 standard deviations above the general population norms group mean. The Myrick et al. (1972) study also shows Factor A with a significant t value discriminating between effective and ineffective counselor groups.

The effective counselors were shown as more outgoing and scored .94 standard deviations above the general population norms group mean.

Factor L also had a significant t value in both studies. In the present study the less effective group was more trusting and scored .57 standard deviations below the norms group mean. In the Myrick et al. (1972) study the effective group was more trusting and scored .72 standard deviations below the norms group mean.

Factor O had a significant t value in the present study and the less effective group was more placid and scored .53 standard deviations below the norms group mean. In the Myrick et al. (1972) Factor O did not reach significance but the effective group was more placid and scored .76 standard deviations below the norms group mean.

The differences in results between the present study and the Myrick et al. (1972) study may be due in part to the different sources of counselor effectiveness ratings. Myrick et al. (1972) used supervisors' ratings while the present study employed independent judges' ratings. As previously discussed, the accuracy of supervisors' ratings has been questioned by Payne and Gralinski (1968) and Wedeking (1973). An interaction effect between supervisors and their students tend to cause such ratings to be high. This interaction effect may have been operating in the Myrick et al. (1972) study.

Some caution must be employed in this interpretation however, as the inter-rater reliability coefficients obtained for the independent ratings for the present study were not high. The coefficients ranged from .37 to .61 for the five scales.

The Affective Sensitivity Scale scores correlated significantly with three of the five measures of counselor effectiveness. These

results support the findings of Campbell, Kagan, and Krathwohl (1971) who reported coefficients of .32 and .28 between Affective Sensitivity Scale scores and supervisory rankings of counseling students' sensitivity.

The scale failed to discriminate between less effective and more effective counselors. However, the more effective group scored higher than the less effective group with means of 41.12 and 36.94 respectively. The obtained t value was -1.606 whereas a t value of 1.693 is needed for significance at the .05 level for a one-tailed test. Thus the Affective Sensitivity Scale shows some promise as a discriminator between more and less effective counselor groups.

The stepwise backward elimination procedures identified several variables as significant predictors of counselor effectiveness, especially the analysis with Perceptual Sensitivity as the criterion. However, the results of this procedure are somewhat disappointing because of the large percentage of unaccounted variance in each analysis. Nevertheless, the best predictor variables were found to be Factor A (Reserved vs Outgoing) and Factor L (Trusting vs Suspicious) of the 16PF, and empathic ability as measured by the Affective Sensitivity Scale.

Significant relationships between personality and counselor effectiveness, and between empathic ability and counselor effectiveness were found with each statistical method applied: correlation, t test (empathy approached significance for a one-tailed test), and stepwise backward elimination. What is particularly noteworthy about this is that personality and empathic ability were found to be unrelated to each other.

Thus it appears that personality and empathic ability as defined in this study may be independent "factors" related to counselor effectiveness. Such a result if found to be reliable upon further investigation would have an important application to counselor selection practices. Instead of depending solely on traditional academic criteria for counselor selection, the independent dimensions of personality and empathic ability could be added to improve the selection process.

It must be emphasized that such a possibility is only suggested by the data in the present study. Further examination of the relationships between personality and counselor effectiveness, between empathic ability and counselor effectiveness, and between personality and empathic ability is strongly recommended. In addition, study of the Affective Sensitivity Scale as a predictor of counselor effectiveness is encouraged since this instrument appears to be a promising new measure of empathy.

#### Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from this study:

1. There are significant relationships between personality characteristics as measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and counselor effectiveness as measured by Blocher's Scale.
2. There are significant relationships between empathy ability as measured by the Affective Sensitivity Scale and counselor effectiveness.
3. No significant relationships exist between personality characteristics and empathic ability.

4. There are significant differences between more effective counselors and less effective counselors on personality and empathy variables. This conclusion is tentative.

APPENDIX A

SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

SCORES BY SUBJECT



TABLE 10

## SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES BY SUBJECT

Subject 1																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	23	20	41	31	44	18	43	29	04	29	19	12	26	10	18	19	
Subject 2																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	36	21	36	23	37	28	38	26	12	18	22	12	13	11	26	18	
Subject 3																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	24	16	43	21	24	21	33	25	07	24	23	12	19	23	25	11	
Subject 4																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	22	19	29	17	18	24	15	30	12	29	26	17	23	22	25	32	
Subject 5																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	19	16	36	38	35	23	46	19	17	31	11	16	23	16	15	27	
Subject 6																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	24	21	26	32	32	22	26	28	12	31	14	22	26	19	21	29	
Subject 7																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	24	20	32	23	33	30	30	27	08	35	22	12	21	09	24	17	
Subject 8																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	28	20	29	32	28	35	23	24	17	29	16	25	21	13	21	30	
Subject 9																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	28	12	38	26	34	21	38	25	07	27	20	14	20	12	26	12	
Subject 10																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	24	17	37	24	34	24	20	19	16	28	13	12	25	27	27	15	
Subject 11																	
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
Score	34	17	36	23	37	37	38	22	09	21	17	12	21	10	23	17	

TABLE 10--Continued

Subject 12																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	30	19	36	32	32	24	37	21	23	24	19	22	21	14	19	21
Subject 13																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	23	15	28	28	39	20	32	16	16	24	17	19	23	25	17	27
Subject 14																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	25	17	33	26	31	24	18	28	15	29	15	19	23	18	17	23
Subject 15																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	26	17	22	23	22	27	22	22	14	19	18	24	18	15	17	36
Subject 16																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	20	22	38	15	29	28	18	22	08	25	19	08	21	29	26	17
Subject 17																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	27	12	32	27	29	15	30	23	06	25	18	12	25	10	19	24
Subject 18																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	19	20	36	25	31	23	29	23	09	30	21	23	23	10	23	30
Subject 19																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	23	18	37	29	26	19	35	30	25	35	17	18	27	22	24	24
Subject 20																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	24	21	35	27	41	25	32	24	13	23	15	27	25	09	24	16
Subject 21																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	29	19	33	19	27	31	23	25	13	19	15	20	21	18	28	25
Subject 22																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	06	17	29	22	25	28	06	21	18	34	17	21	31	21	16	30
Subject 23																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	22	20	34	26	30	25	40	30	09	28	21	10	23	14	16	15

TABLE 10--Continued

Subject 24																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	23	19	38	13	20	32	28	23	13	27	20	16	21	09	23	20
Subject 25																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	16	17	22	25	25	23	33	26	11	32	17	28	18	11	24	24
Subject 26																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	29	20	43	25	37	34	37	31	15	24	19	15	18	09	23	23
Subject 27																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	16	21	28	27	31	13	28	26	19	23	14	26	24	18	13	31
Subject 28																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	28	15	44	26	46	14	41	24	16	19	17	11	10	13	19	12
Subject 29																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	28	15	36	22	32	18	24	25	16	30	23	13	24	18	25	18
Subject 30																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	21	17	08	28	39	18	12	21	25	36	16	34	29	11	09	46
Subject 31																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	24	24	17	34	37	11	32	28	18	29	04	41	29	17	14	30
Subject 32																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	22	20	42	28	36	27	50	34	10	31	18	10	27	15	22	26
Subject 33																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	20	22	32	28	27	26	28	24	10	24	22	14	17	22	23	31
Subject 34																
Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Agent	21	19	37	27	25	23	32	25	16	25	20	23	25	20	20	27

APPENDIX B

AFFECTIVE SENSITIVITY SCALE SCORES BY SUBJECT

TABLE 11

## AFFECTIVE SENSITIVITY SCALE SCORES BY SUBJECT

---

Subject 1	43	Subject 18	27
2	35	19	29
3	36	20	39
4	45	21	34
5	29	22	44
6	25	23	42
7	48	24	43
8	50	25	34
9	31	26	48
10	37	27	49
11	39	28	40
12	25	29	39
13	44	30	39
14	26	31	47
15	40	32	54
16	34	33	42
17	41	34	49

---

APPENDIX C

BLOCHER'S SCALE SCORES BY SUBJECT

TABLE 12  
BLOCHER'S SCALE SCORES BY SUBJECT

Subject	Role Adaptation	Cognitive Flexibility	Perceptual Sensitivity	Involvement with Client	Overall Rating
1	2.00	2.88	3.00	3.00	2.63
2	2.33	2.67	3.56	3.22	3.00
3	3.44	2.78	3.67	3.22	3.11
4	3.00	3.00	3.56	3.22	3.22
5	3.29	3.00	3.57	4.00	3.43
6	3.22	3.22	3.56	3.87	3.44
7	3.22	3.22	3.56	4.11	3.56
8	3.56	3.67	3.44	3.67	3.67
9	3.00	3.33	3.89	4.89	3.67
10	3.89	3.78	3.67	3.56	3.78
11	3.44	3.89	3.78	3.67	3.78
12	3.57	3.86	3.71	3.86	3.86
13	3.44	4.22	4.00	4.11	3.89
14	3.67	3.89	4.22	4.11	3.89
15	3.78	3.67	4.22	4.44	4.00
16	4.22	4.33	4.11	4.22	4.22
17	4.33	4.67	4.33	3.78	4.22
18	4.44	4.67	4.00	4.56	4.33
19	3.89	4.11	4.44	3.78	4.33
20	3.87	4.44	4.44	4.44	4.33
21	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.44	4.33

TABLE 12--Continued

Subject	Role Adaptation	Cognitive Flexibility	Perceptual Sensitivity	Involvement with Client	Overall Rating
22	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.38	4.38
23	3.78	4.22	4.67	4.44	4.44
24	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.50
25	4.67	4.67	4.44	4.56	4.56
26	4.11	4.67	4.56	4.56	4.56
27	4.44	4.78	4.89	5.33	4.67
28	4.78	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.78
29	4.78	4.78	4.44	4.56	4.78
30	4.11	4.89	5.00	5.11	4.89
31	4.44	4.89	5.33	4.67	4.89
32	4.67	4.44	4.89	4.56	4.89
33	4.78	5.00	4.78	5.11	5.00
34	4.78	5.33	5.44	4.89	5.22



REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association, Division of Counseling Psychology, Subcommittee on Counselor Selection, Counselor Training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 174-179.
- Anderson, R. P., & Anderson, G. V. Development of an instrument for measuring rapport. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 18-24.
- Arbuckle, D. S. Client perception of counselor personality. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1956, 3, 93-96.
- Arbuckle, D. S. Counseling effectiveness and related issues. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 430-435.
- Asa, L. F. Interview behavior and counselor personality variables. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 324-330.
- Baas, M. L. Kuder interest patterns for psychologists. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1950, 34, 115-117.
- Bergin, A. E., and Solomon, S. Personality and performance correlates of empathic understanding in psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 393.
- Bernos, E. C. Factors related to success in fifteen NDEA counseling and guidance institutes. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 94-104.
- Bishop, J. B. Another look at counselor, client, and supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 319-323.
- Blocher, D. H. A multiple regression approach to predicting success in a counselor education program. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1963, 3, 19-22.
- Blocher, D. H. A study of two types of internships for counselor training. V Project 5-327, Contract No. OE 5 10-424. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1968. ERIC ED 012 488.
- Brams, J. M. Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 25-30.
- Brown, D., & Cannaday, M. Counselor, counselee, and supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 113-118.

- Cahoon, R. A. Some counselor attitudes and characteristics related to the counseling relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Callis, R., & Prediger, D. J. Predictors of achievement in counseling and guidance. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 63-69.
- Campbell, R. J. The development and validation of a multiple choice scale to measure affective sensitivity (Empathy). Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967, Dissertation Abstracts.
- Campbell, R. J., Kagan, N., & Krathwohl, D. R. The development and validation of a scale to measure affective sensitivity (Empathy). Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 407-412.
- Canish, S. J., & Kagan, N. Measurement of affective sensitivity: Toward a valid measure of interpersonal perception. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 51-54.
- Cattell, R. B., & Eber, H. W. Manual for forms A and B Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1962.
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.
- Combs, A. W., & Soper, D. W. The perceptual organization of effective counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 222-226.
- Cottle, W. C. Personal characteristics of counselors: I. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1953, 31, 445-450.
- Cottle, W. C., & Lewis, W. W., Jr. Personality characteristics of counselors: II. Male counselor responses to the MMPI and GZTS. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 27-30.
- Cox, R. D. Counselors and their work. Harrisburg: Archives Press, 1945.
- Demos, G. D., & Zuwaylif, F. H. Characteristics of effective counselors. Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 163-165.
- Dilley, J. S. Supervisory ratings of counselor trainees in a simulated work setting as compared with peer and instructor ratings of the same trainees in an academic setting. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 70-73.
- Dilley, J. S. Rating scale statements: A useful approach to counselor evaluation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 5, 40-43.

- DiMichael, S. G. The professed and measured interest of vocational rehabilitation counselors. Educational and Psychological Measurements, 1949, 9, 59-72.
- Donnan, H. H., Harlan, G. E., & Thompson, S. A. Counselor personality and level of functioning as perceived by counselees. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 482-485.
- Foley, W. J., & Proff, F. C. NDEA institute trainees and vocational rehabilitation counselors: A comparison of characteristics. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 154-159.
- Foulds, M. L. Dogmatism and ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 11, 110-114.
- Freedman, S. A., Antenen, W. W., & Lister, J. L. Counselor behavior and personality characteristics. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 7, 26-30.
- Gimmestad, M. J., & Goldsmith, E. B. Admission policies for graduate programs in counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 12, 172-177.
- Gruberg, R. A significant counselor personality characteristics: Tolerance of ambiguity. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 119-124.
- Hansen, J. C., & Warner, R. W., Jr. Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 261-272.
- Heikkinen, C. A., & Wegner, K. W. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory studies of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 275-279.
- Hill, G. E. The selection of school counselors. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1961, 39, 355-360.
- Hill, G. E., & Green, D. A. The selection and preparation, and professionalization of guidance and personnel workers. Review of Educational Research, 1960, 30, 115-127.
- Hoover, E. B. An investigation of MMPI personality variables and rated effectiveness of public school counselors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1971.
- Horenstein, D., Houstun, B. K., & Holmes, D. S. Clients', therapists' and judges' evaluations of psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 149-153.

- Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. IPAT Tabular Supplement #1 to the 16PF Handbook. Champaign, Ill.: IPAT, 1970.
- Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. Manual for the 16PF. Champaign, Ill.: IPAT, 1972.
- Jansen, D. G., Robb, G. P., & Bonk, E. R. Peer ratings of practicum counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 333-339.
- Johnson, D., Shertzer, B., Linden, J. E., & Stone, S. C. The relationship of counselor candidate characteristics and counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 297-304.
- Jones, J. E., & Schoch, E. W. Correlates of success in MA level counselor education. Counseling Education and Supervision, 1968, 7, 286-291.
- Joslin, L. C. Knowledge and counseling competence. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43, 790-795.
- Kazienko, L. W., & Neidt, C. D. Self-descriptions of good and poor counselor trainees. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1962, 1, 106-123.
- Kemp, C. G. Counseling responses and need structures of high school principals and counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 326-328.
- Keppers, G. L. Selection (if any) of graduate students in guidance and counseling. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1961, 9, 90-94.
- Kriedt, P. H. Vocational interests of psychologists. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1949, 33, 482-493.
- Linden, J. D., Stone, S. C., & Shertzer, B. Development and evaluation of an inventory for rating counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 267-276.
- Mahan, J. W., Jr., & Wicas, E. A. Counselor personality characteristics: A preliminary exploration. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 78-83.
- McClain, E. W. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire scores and success in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 492-496.
- McDaniel, S. W. Counselor selections, an evaluation of instruments. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 142-144.
- Milliken, R. L., & Paterson, J. J. Relationship of dogmatism and prejudice to counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 125-129.

- Mills, D. H., & Mencke, R. Characteristics of effective counselor and re-evaluation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 332-334.
- Moredock, J. B., & Patterson, C. H. Personality characteristics of counseling students at various levels of training. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1965, 13, 265-269.
- Myrick, R. D., & Kelly, F. D., Jr. A scale for evaluation of practicum students in counseling and supervision. Counseling Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 330-336.
- Myrick, R. D., Kelly, F. D., Jr., & Wittmer, J. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire as a predictor of counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 293-301.
- Odell, L. M. Secondary school counseling: Past, present and future. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1973, 52, 151-155.
- Olesker, W., & Balter, L. Sex and empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 559-562.
- Osipow, S. H., & Walsh, W. B. Social intelligence and the selection of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 366-369.
- Patterson, C. H. Test characteristics of rehabilitation counselor trainees. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1962, 28, 15-25.
- Patterson, C. H. The selection of rehabilitation counseling students. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1963, 41, 318-324.
- Patterson, C. H. The selection of counselors. In J. M. Whiteley (Ed.), Research in Counseling. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1968.
- Payne, P., & Gralinski, D. Effects of supervisor style and empathy upon counselor learning. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 517-521.
- Resnikoff, A. A measure of discrimination for the prediction of counselor effects. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 464-465.
- Russo, J. R., Kelz, J. W., & Hudson, G. R. Are good counselors open-minded? Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 74-77.
- Santavicca, G. G. Supervised experience and selection of counselor trainees. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 38, 195-198.
- Stefflre, B., King, P., & Leafgren, F. Characteristics of counselor judged effective by their peers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 335-340.
- Steph, J. A. Responses to hypothetical counseling situations as a predictor of relationship orientation in school counselors. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963, Dissertation Abstracts.

- Stripling, R. O., & Lister, J. L. Selection preparation, and professionalization of specialists. Review of Educational Research, 1963, 33, 171-178.
- Tyler, L. E. The work of the counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.
- Walton, F. X., & Sweeney, T. J. Useful predictors of counseling effectiveness. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 40, 32-38.
- Wasson, R. M. The Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale in the assessment of applicants for counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 89-92.
- Wedeking, D. F. Relationships among measures of empathy, verbal content categories, and counseling competence in supervised counseling practicum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1973.
- Wehr, M., & Wittmer, J. Paraprofessional trainees and counselor education students. A comparison of personality and predicted counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 12, 255-262.
- Wellman, F. E. Selection of students for preparation in college personnel work. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1955, 34, 24-27.
- Wicas, E. A., & Mahan, T. W., Jr. Characteristics of counselor rated effective by supervisors and peers. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 50-56.
- Wittmer, J., & Lister, J. L. The Graduate Record Examination, 16 PF Questionnaire and counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 293.
- Wood, R. H. Psychobehavioral counseling and therapy. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.
- Wrenn, C. G. The selection and education of student personnel workers. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1952, 31, 9-14.