

1976

The use of counselor selection instruments and measures of creativity in the construction of prediction equations for counselor trainee selection

Lenard Joseph Wright
College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wright, Lenard Joseph, "The use of counselor selection instruments and measures of creativity in the construction of prediction equations for counselor trainee selection" (1976). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539618878.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-fbc0-ag18>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-4989

WRIGHT, Lenard Joseph, 1947-
THE USE OF COUNSELOR SELECTION INSTRUMENTS
AND MEASURES OF CREATIVITY IN THE CONSTRUCTION
OF PREDICTION EQUATIONS FOR COUNSELOR TRAINEE
SELECTION.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia,
Ed.D., 1976
Education, guidance and counseling

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THE USE OF COUNSELOR SELECTION INSTRUMENTS
AND MEASURES OF CREATIVITY IN THE
CONSTRUCTION OF PREDICTION
EQUATIONS FOR COUNSELOR
TRAINEE SELECTION

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Faculty of the School of Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Lenard Joseph Wright

August 1976

APPROVAL SHEET

We the undersigned do certify that we have read this dissertation and that in our individual opinions it is acceptable in both scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Accepted July 1976 by

Charles O. Matthews

Charles O. Matthews, Ph.D., Chairman

Fred L. Adair

Fred L. Adair, Ph. D.

Kevin E. Geoffroy

Kevin E. Geoffroy, Ed.D.

ABSTRACT

THE USE OF COUNSELOR SELECTION INSTRUMENTS AND MEASURES OF CREATIVITY IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF PREDICTION EQUATIONS FOR COUNSELOR TRAINEE SELECTION

WRIGHT, LENARD J., Ed.D.
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA, 1976

CHAIRMAN: DR. CHARLES O. MATTHEWS

Counselor selection procedures have come under increasing scrutiny, and the continued use of intellectual techniques questioned (Menne, 1973). The purpose of this study was, therefore, to develop a personality based prediction methodology for counselor trainee selection.

There were two personality based counselor trainee selection instruments used, the Counselor Selection Scale (CSS) and the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS). There were two different methods of measuring the personality construct of creativity used. First, Welsh's (1975) two-dimensional model of personality and creativity employing Origence (ORIG) and Intellectence (INT) was implemented. Second, Davis's (1975) How Do You Think -B (HDYT-B) was chosen.

Practicum students of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia ($N = 9$), Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia ($N = 22$), and Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia ($N = 4$), formed the study group. There were two statistical methods used. First, a Pearson Product-moment Correlation was used to investigate the relationship among predictor and criterion variables. Second,

six stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the relative importance and relationship of the predictor variables to each of the criterion variables. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence.

The findings indicate that, first, the personality construct of creativity is related to what is measured by the personality based counselor selection instruments used in the study and to counselor effectiveness. Second, the results lend strong support to the use of the WROS and the CSS in counselor trainee selection. Of all the predictor variables in the study, the WROS showed the strongest correlations with all criterion measures and proved to account for most of the variance in each prediction equation that was constructed for the individual criterion measures.

Finally, the findings of this investigation suggest that personality based criterion measures, such as the WROS and CSS, be used in the counselor trainee selection process. Further study is strongly indicated using personality based selection criterion measures together with the presently used intellectual methods. Possibly more of the variance in the selection process could be accounted for by using both intellectual and nonintellectual criteria together in developing more complete prediction equations.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Matthews, my chairman, and Dr. Adair and Dr. Geoffroy for their support and encouragement during the past several years.

Special thanks must be given to James Deaton, Terri Byrne, Robert Baker, Jean Rochelle, and my sister Rosanne Wright. Dr. William Cox is due many thanks for giving time and help when needed.

Finally, I want to extend my most deep-felt thanks and love to my wife Sara and daughter Elizabeth for their patience and for sharing me with this undertaking.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	iii
List of Tables	vii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	2
General Contemporary Perspective	3
Perspective on Creativity	7
Contemporary Perspective	15
Statement of the Problem	17
Hypotheses	17
Definition of Terms	18
Creativity	18
Counselor Effectiveness	18
Limitations of the Investigation	19
Plan of Presentation	19
2. Review of Research	20
Counselor Descriptions Using Personality	
(Nonintellective) Instruments	20
Comparisons of Effective and Ineffective	
Counselors	26
Research Based on Hypothesized Characteristics	
of Effective Counselors	39

	Research Relevant to Creativity as a	
	Counselor Variable	47
	Research on Counselor Selection	53
	Summary	59
3.	Methodology	63
	Population	63
	Instruments	63
	Predictor Measures	64
	Criterion Measures	69
	Procedures	71
	Data Collection	71
	Rater Training Wisconsin Relationship	
	Orientation Scale	71
	Carkhuff Scales	72
	Treatment of the Data	73
	Statistical Methods	74
4.	Analysis of Data	76
	Hypothesis 1	76
	Hypothesis 2	77
	Hypothesis 3	79
	Hypothesis 4	81
5.	Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	94
	Summary	94
	Conclusions	96

Hypothesis 1	96
Hypothesis 2	97
Hypothesis 3	98
Hypothesis 4	99
Recommendations	100
Appendix	
A. How Do You Think? (Form B)	104
B. Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale	111
C. Carkhuff Scales	114
D. Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale	119
E. Letter to Practicum Supervisors Explaining Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale	122
F. Summary of Variables Entered into Predictive Equations at Each Step for the Criterion Variables	124
References	143

List of Tables

Table	Page
<p>1. Intercorrelations of the Predictor Variables Origence, Intellectence, How Do You Think-B, Counselor Selection Scale, and the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale</p>	66
<p>2. Intercorrelations of the Criterion Variables Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale</p>	78
<p>3. Intercorrelations of Predictor Variables with Criterion Variables</p>	80
<p>4. Multiple Regression Summary Table for Criterion Variable Empathy</p>	83
<p>5. Multiple Regression Summary Table for Criterion Variable Respect</p>	85
<p>6. Multiple Regression Summary Table for Criterion Variable Concreteness</p>	87
<p>7. Multiple Regression Summary Table for Criterion Variable Genuineness</p>	89
<p>8. Multiple Regression Summary Table for Criterion Variable Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness</p>	90

9.	Multiple Regression Summary Table for Criterion Variable Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale	92
10.	Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at Each Step for Criterion Variable Empathy	125
11.	Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at Each Step for Criterion Variable Respect	128
12.	Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at Each Step for Criterion Variable Concreteness	131
13.	Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at Each Step for Criterion Variable Genuineness	134
14.	Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at Each Step for Criterion Variable Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness	137
15.	Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at Each Step for Criterion Variable Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale	140

**The Use of Counselor Selection Instruments
and Measures of Creativity in the
Construction of Prediction
Equations for Counselor
Trainee Selection**

Chapter 1

Introduction

The concept of accountability has counselor educators seeking to improve the effectiveness of counselors. Many counselor educators have sought to augment their programs by determining what roles and functions the counselor trainees will be required to fill after graduation (Sprinthall & Erickson, 1973). Brammer and Springer (1971) have argued, similarly, that counselor training programs will have to become performance based in order to train more facilitative and effective counselors.

In another approach to improving counselor effectiveness, the American Personnel and Guidance Association (1965), the American Psychological Association (1954), and the American School Counselor Association (1965) have all emphasized the need to develop specific criteria for the selection of counselor trainees. Yet, in spite of the evident need, Patterson (1967) found: "The research on the selection of counseling students is surprisingly sparse [p. 76]." The findings have been supported by other and more recent reviews of the literature (Lewis, 1973; Paranojoti, 1972; Shertzer & Stone, 1968; Whitley, Sprinthall, Mosher, & Donaghy, 1967). As a result, Ohlsen (1970) has emphasized that counselor educators must ask themselves some simple questions: "What can we do to improve our counselor selection techniques? How can we identify better facilitators of change [p. 248]?"

General Contemporary Perspective

Part of the literature on counseling has recently been directly concerned with the problem of counselor trainee selection and the methods presently employed to do that selection. Gimmestad and Goldsmith (1973) reported that while research is being conducted in counselor trainee selection, few of the findings have been utilized, rather:

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 minimum score on the Graduate Record Examination or another test of academic aptitude, . . . personal interviews, written personal statements, letters of recommendation [p. 177].

These results support the findings of Hill (1961), Hill and Green (1960), and Sweeney (1966).

The need for nonintellective (personality) measures of counselor selection has been recognized in the literature for nearly 30 years. Nevertheless, intellective methods of counselor selection continue to be used, even though there is a growing body of research to indicate that these selections criteria are of little value in predicting anything more than academic success of the counselor trainee (Arbuckle, 1968; Bergin & Solomon, 1963; Blocker, 1963; Carkhuff, 1969; Linden, Stone, & Shertzer, 1965; Ohlsen, 1970; Wittmer & Lister, 1971).

As indicated, one part of the research in counselor trainee selection and counselor effectiveness has centered on the important task of identifying the personality characteristics of effective counselors and successful counselor trainees. This research has become increasingly important because the findings have indicated that the interpersonal functioning of the counselor trainee changes very little after admission to a counselor training program (Bergin & Solomon, 1963; Carkhuff, 1966; Farwell, 1975; Munger, Myers, & Brown, 1963; Rochester, 1967). Counselor training programs are designed to impart the knowledge necessary to be an effective counselor and aid the trainee in the acquisition and shaping of the necessary counseling skills. The counselor education programs are not designed to bring about qualitative interpersonal and personality changes. They are not therapeutic programs; rather, they are designed to aid the counselor trainee in becoming a therapeutic change agent. The work of Carkhuff (1969) has pointed out graphically that the counselor's own interpersonal level of functioning is critical to his effectiveness and as impervious to improvement as any client's without therapeutic intervention.

There are many different techniques and standardized personality instruments available to the researcher in his efforts to identify counselors and counselor trainees and their characteristics. Shertzer and Stone (1968) found the following to be the main personality instruments used to study effective counselors and their characteristics: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory

(MMPI), the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Organization Scale (FIRO-B), the Rorschach, the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF), the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), Q-sort technique, the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), the Adjective Check List (ACL), the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), and the Guilford-Zimmermann Temperament Survey (GZTS).

With this vast array of potential instruments at the researchers' disposal, it is not surprising that there have been few consistent results (Arbuckle, 1975). Shertzer and Stone (1971) suggested:

An overriding conclusion to be drawn from a review of the literature pertaining to interests and personality characteristics and counseling effectiveness is that the findings so far have been inconclusive and often conflicting and that additional research is needed [p. 158].

Much of the research on counselor effectiveness and characteristics and counselor trainee selection has been done with a fairly standard set of personality instruments and techniques. The tendency has been to describe the effective counselor or trainee by the use of the standard scales of the various instruments. The research has also tended to look for a similar set of personality characteristics, mostly inspired by the statements of the various professional organizations and Rogers's (1957) early emphasis on the states of empathy, accurate understanding, congruence, and unconditional positive regard.

Lewis (1973) approached the problem in a different manner. He used a standard personality measurement instrument, the CPI, and developed a new scale, by analyzing the responses of practicing counselors and counselor trainees. The subjects were divided into quartiles based on ratings by their supervisors as to their effectiveness. The supervisors rated the counselors on the basis of definitions of the "most" and "least" effective counselor drawn from definitions of Empathy, Positive Regard, and Self-Congruence by Truax (1964). This scale, termed "the Counselor Selection Scale" (CSS) is potentially useful in helping distinguish between effective and ineffective counselor trainees when used with other criteria.

In another approach, the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS) was developed as a completely new nonintellective measurement instrument, to aid in the counselor trainee selection process at the University of Wisconsin. The potential counselor trainees are asked to respond to various possible counseling situations. The responses are judged by nonprofessional raters as to the rater's degree of willingness to enter into a counseling relationship with the responder. The WROS has been found to distinguish between those applicants who successfully complete the University of Wisconsin's counselor education program and those who do not (Farwell, 1975). Although the CSS and the WROS instruments are personality based and draw strength from the fact that they approach the selection problem via different methods, both purport to measure the success or effectiveness potential of the counselor trainee.

Perspective on Creativity

Researchers in counselor trainee selection and counselor effectiveness have also studied specific personality traits and characteristics. A potentially important personality characteristic pertaining to counselor effectiveness and counselor trainee selection, which has only recently begun to be explored is creativity.

The impetus to seriously consider creativity as a personality variable seems to have evolved from the concern over the great changes taking place so frequently and rapidly in the world today. In Future Shock, Toffler (1971) graphically raised the issues of whether man can adapt to the escalating series of changes occurring today and what will be the psychological toll on the human organism. Toffler (1975), later, citing the same changes and uncertainties in our society, stressed the importance of the need for greater creativity as a necessary ingredient for personal survival.

Koenig (1973) strongly agreed with the views of Toffler: Confronted with a pluralistic, multifaceted, changing system, the individual is left to his own devices to discern his own way of being and becoming fully in this world of flux. He can no longer depend on ideologies, which become obsolete, but must actualize his own creative resources to enable him to move dynamically and flexibly with the times while still maintaining some personal gyroscope to guide him [p. 1].

The idea of the need for creativity for psychological health

is not new or recent. As early as 1961, Rogers had linked creativity to his fully functioning person as Toffler (1975) and Koenig (1973) have:

I believe it will be clear that a person who is involved in the directional process which I have termed "the good life" is a creative person. With his sensitive openness to his world, his trust of his own ability to form new relationships with his environment, he would be the type of person from whom creative products and creative living emerge. . . . Such a person would, I believe, be recognized by the student of evolution as the type most likely to adapt and survive conditions. He would be able creatively to make sound adjustments to new as well as old conditions [Rogers, 1961, pp. 193-194].

A major implication of Rogers's theory of the fully functioning, or integrated, man being creative is to link creativity and psychological health. Speaking specifically of creativity and its relationship to the self-actualized or fully integrated individual, Rogers (1961) said:

It has been found that when the individual is "open" to all of his experience, then his behavior will be creative, and his creativity may be trusted to be essentially constructive . . . that as the individual becomes more open to, more aware of, all aspects of his experience, he is increasingly likely to act in a manner we would term

socialized. If he can be aware of his hostile impulses, but also of his desire for friendship and acceptance; . . . equally aware of his own purposes; aware of his selfish desire, but also aware of his tender and sensitive concern for another, then he behaves in a fashion which is harmonious, integrated, constructive [pp. 352-353].

Self-actualization, according to Rogers (1961) is a process. He viewed this process a creative process. All during this process the individual was uncovering, drawing out, and coming in touch with who he is. The self-actualization process is a lifelong one, in which some people need help in order to continue moving toward self-actualization, particularly in today's world. One aim of therapy or the therapeutic process may be said to be to aid individuals in the process of self-actualization, a creative process. The therapist must set up certain conditions in the therapeutic setting that permit self-actualization.

My experience in psychotherapy leads me to believe that by setting up conditions of psychological safety and freedom, we maximize the likelihood of an emergence of constructive creativity [Rogers, 1961, p. 375].

Here Rogers seems to have used the term "constructive creativity" for self-actualization, or integration, or psychological health.

Koenig (1973) pointed out vividly the similarities between Rogers's (1957) fully functioning person and creativity by describing the conditions fostering full functioning as

1) unconditional positive regard, 2) empathetic understanding, and 3) congruence. Similarly, the conditions facilitative of creativity are described as: 1) psychological safety (which includes acceptance of the individual as of unconditional worth, providing a climate in which external evaluation is absent, and understanding empathetically), and 2) psychological freedom (i.e., permitting the individual complete freedom of symbolic expression) [p. 16].

It can be argued, then, that Rogers considered the processes of self-actualization, creativity, and therapy to be intimately related processes.

Recently, Rogers (1975) made a very strong statement concerning self-actualization and integration as they apply to the counselor or therapist and his effectiveness. He stated:

Personality disturbance in the therapist goes along with a lower empathic understanding, but when he is free from discomfort and confident in interpersonal relationships, he offers more of understanding. As I have considered this evidence, and also my own experience in the training of therapists, I come to the somewhat uncomfortable conclusion that the more psychologically mature and integrated the therapist is as a person, the more helpful is the relationship he provides. This puts a heavy demand on the therapist as a person [p. 9].

This conclusion is strongly supported by the works of Carkhuff and

Berenson (1967) and Carkhuff (1969, 1971).

Never did Rogers (1959) state that the counselor must be creative or that creativity is a personality component of the effective counselor. However, integration and self-actualization are firmly linked in this thinking. As Rogers (1961) earlier linked creativity intimately to integration and self-actualization, it could be argued that creativity is a necessary counselor characteristic. It has been shown that self-actualization and therapy are creative. The end products of these processes are "constructive creativity." With Rogers's own statements and the work of Carkhuff (1969) to suggest that the client will move to the counselor's level of functioning, be that up or down, one can logically conclude that a self-actualized counselor will draw the client to his level of functioning, and that the self-actualized counselor is also constructively creative.

Maslow (1968) took a similar view to that of Rogers (1961, 1975). He found:

SA [self actualizing] creativeness is hard to define because it sometimes seems to be synonymous with health itself . . . since self-actualization or health must be ultimately defined as the coming to pass of the fullest humanness [p. 145].

Maslow linked mental health to self-actualization and creativity, much as Rogers did. Maslow (1971) viewed the therapeutic process as "uncovering" and "unleashing" the creative potential of each individual

in much the same manner as Rogers.

Torrance (1962) felt that creativity is an integral part of the therapeutic relationship, a necessary counselor characteristic for effectiveness:

one must enter imaginatively into the thinking and feeling experiences of another. Only by doing this can one participate completely in another's communicating, keeping his comments in line with what the other is trying to say, understand his feelings, follow his line of thought, and share his feelings [p. 165].

This commentary is strongly reminiscent of the statements of Rogers (cited in Koch, 1961) concerning his facilitative conditions and necessary therapeutic conditions.

Recently, Frey (1975) and Mayer (1975) have drawn the attention of a large audience to creativity as a counselor dimension. Frey contended that creativity is a necessary personality component of an effective counselor in the world today:

we cannot rely on technical skill alone but have to turn to our inventiveness and creativity. In fact, the interface between counseling action and creativeness increases in surface as persons change and society moves from one period to another. Creativity is perhaps the major tool we have in times of great change [p. 23].

Frey seems to have taken the statements of Toffler (1975) and Rogers (1961) and applied them directly to the counselor as a facilitator of

change. Mayer, in answer to Frey, was much more guarded in his enthusiasm. Still, he agreed that creativity is a counselor dimension that should be explored.

Torrance (1962) and Frey (1975) have gone much farther than Rogers (1961) or Maslow (1971) in identifying creativity as a necessary and vital counselor characteristic. Even so, it is only recently that research has begun into the relationship of creativity and counselor effectiveness.

A problem arises in how to measure creativity as a counselor personality variable. Davis and Belcher (1971) and Welsh (1975) cited research which indicated many of the tests that purport to measure creativity correlate very highly with measures of intelligence. A major aim of this paper is to measure creativity from a nonintellective approach. Immediately, many measures of creativity are eliminated. The strongest nonintellective or personality measure of creativity and one of the best validated (Davis, 1975) appears to be Welsh's.

Welsh (1975) has developed a two-dimensional model of personality and creativity to describe an individual. The two dimensions are not correlated, but do interact. The first personality dimension is the "creative" dimension, measured originally by the Revised Art (RA) Scale of the Welsh Figure Preference Test (WFPT), and has been termed "Origence" (ORIG). The second personality dimension is the "intellectual" dimension, measured originally by Terman's (1956) Concept Mastery Test (CMT), and has been termed

"Intellectence" (INT). Welsh developed scales for the ACL, SVIB, CPI, MMPI, and the WEPT to measure ORIG and INT. He pointed out that it is best to use more than one of the instruments when obtaining measures of the ORIG and INT.

Welsh (1975) used his two-dimensional personality model of ORIG and INT to study the personality and temperamental characteristics of those possessing the two qualities to varying degrees. Welsh has found that he can adequately describe a person's creativity by assessing where the person falls on his two-dimensional model.

Whiting (1974) emphasized the importance of biographical data in studying and measuring creativity. Davis (1975) has developed a personality measure of creativity, the How Do You Think (HDYT-B) inventory which includes biographical data. Concerning his test, Davis stated: "The HDYT inventory assesses attitudes, motivations, interests, values, beliefs, and other personality-based measures like Welsh's [p. 76]." It has been included as a second measure of the counselor trainees' creativity because it adds a dimension unexplored by Welsh (1975), that of biographical data.

The aim of this paper is to construct a prediction equation capable of aiding in the selection of counselor trainees. Creativity is a personality variable that counseling theory points to, but which has resulted in very little research. Therefore, creativity will be a specific nonintellective factor considered for this prediction equation.

Contemporary Perspective

Shertzer and Stone (1968) have indicated that many of the researchers in counselor trainee selection have begun to use multiple personality (nonintellective) measures together in correlational analysis, which is the approach of choice for this study. This approach has been an attempt to counter the inconsistent and conflicting results referred to earlier. More recently, Shertzer and Stone (1971) indicated that possibly the problem did not lie so much in the characteristics or traits being studied as the criterion measures of those variables.

Ratings by supervisors, by expert judges, by peers, and client ratings are the usual criterion measures used. Client ratings are used with least frequency, while supervisor ratings are the most common. Much of the research on counselor effectiveness and counselor trainee selection using these criteria seems to suffer from a common ailment, namely, that the meaning of effectiveness varies from one piece of research to the next, and from one person to the next. In short, there has been little standardizing of criteria. This lack of standardization, agreeing on a common baseline of effectiveness, has made much of the research impossible to duplicate and so to revalidate.

However, at present, if one agrees with the facilitative conditions of Rogers (1957), one can find standardized instruments for client rating, supervisor's rating and expert judges' rating.

Truax (1967) developed a scale for client rating called the

Relationship Questionnaire. It measured the client's perceptions of the facilitative conditions offered by the therapist based on Rogers's theory (1957). Similarly, Carkhuff (1969) published seven scales, based partially on Rogers's facilitative conditions, which can be used by supervisors or expert judges as criterion measures. Myrick and Kelly (1971) introduced the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) which was a standardized instrument to be used by the supervisor and rated the counselor trainee on his performance in counseling and in the supervisory relationship. These instruments are mentioned because they have generated research in different settings that gave credence to their validity.

It would seem then that the necessary techniques and instruments are available if one follows the suggestions of Shertzer and Stone (1968, 1971). Starting with the criteria, they suggest specific and standardized criteria. The Carkhuff Scales provide a well-researched instrument for experts rating, while the CERS provides an adequate instrument for a standardized supervisor's rating. While there is some overlap in what the two scales measure, both make unique contributions that tend to complement each other. The only other major method of evaluating counselor trainee effectiveness would be the client's evaluation; however, Shertzer and Stone have pointed out the potentially intractable difficulties of this method.

If, then, counselor effectiveness can be ascertained, it will be possible to investigate the possibility that creativity is a dependent variable of counselor effectiveness. Further, if counselor

effectiveness can be ascertained it will be possible to study the possibility of building a useful, parsimonious prediction equation, using other counselor selection instruments (WROS and CSS) as dependent variables along with creativity.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to construct a useful non-intellective prediction equation to aid in the selection of counselor trainees. In search of the literature, two impressive nonintellective measures were found that were designed specifically to aid in the selection of counselor trainees: The Counselor Selection Scale and the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale.

Recently, the attention of the counseling profession has been turned to the personality variable of creativity. Over the years, the literature has provided repeated and varied allusions to creativity as a necessary element of the counseling process and as a potential counselor trait. Many theories of counseling consistently support creativity as an important counselor variable. It is proposed that a prediction equation will be created using the CSS and the WROS and appropriate measures of creativity.

Hypotheses

Statistical treatment is proposed as follows, with the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Subjects' scores on ORIG, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will be significantly correlated with each other.

Hypothesis 2. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and

WROS will be significantly correlated with ratings on Empathy, Respect, Genuineness, Concreteness, Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS.

Hypothesis 3. Subjects' ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness, will be significantly correlated with each other.

Hypothesis 4. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will contribute significantly to the variance of their ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness and the CERS, permitting the construction of personality-based prediction equations.

Definition of Terms

To ensure consistency of interpretation, the following terms have been defined.

Creativity

Creativity is operationally defined as a personality variable measured by the sum of the two scores obtained for ORIG and INT from the WFPT and the CPI and the score obtained on the HDYT-B.

Counselor Effectiveness

Counselor effectiveness is operationally defined as the set of skills, competencies, and behaviors measured by the Carkhuff (1969a, 1969b) Scales, scored by independent raters, and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale, scored by the practicum supervisors.

Limitations of the Investigation

The following limitations of the investigation were determined:

1. In reference to the criterion measures, counselor effectiveness can only be explained and interpreted in terms of the Carkhuff (1969a, 1969b) Scales and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

2. Generalizations made from the findings of this research can only be made in terms of the study population which was drawn from the Tidewater, Virginia, area.

3. In reference to the criterion measures, errors due to leniency of raters, severity of raters, and the theory of central tendency must affect the reliability of the ratings.

Plan of Presentation

The presentation of the investigation has been organized into five sequential parts which have been designated as chapters. The present chapter had served as an introduction to the area to be investigated. It has also served to establish the theoretical framework for the study, to define terms, and to discuss the limitations of the study. The next four chapters will be presented as follows: (a) a review of relevant research, (b) research methodology, (c) results, and (d) summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter 2

Review of Research

This chapter contains a review of the research pertaining to the personality of the counselor and counselor selection. In the interest of clarity and convenience, the chapter is divided into the following sections:

1. Counselor descriptions using personality (nonintellective instruments)
2. Comparisons of effective and ineffective counselors
3. Research based on hypothesized characteristics of effective counselors
4. Research relevant to creativity as a counselor variable
5. Research on counselor selection
6. A summary.

Counselor Descriptions Using Personality

(Nonintellective) Instruments

Wrenn (1952) was one of the earliest researchers to use personality instruments to describe counselors. He felt that it would aid in the selection process if he could develop a counselor profile using personality instruments and an intellective instrument. He administered the MMPI, the SVIB, the GZTS, the Millers' (1960) Analogies Test (MAT), and the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey (1931) Study of Values (AVLSV). On the MMPI, Wrenn found that counselors (men and women) scored above the mean on the K (Defensiveness scale), Ma

(Hypomania) and Mf (Masculinity-Femininity) scales and below the mean on the Si (Social Introversion-Extroversion) scale. However, only K was significant. There were no significant results from the SVIB. On the GZTS, counselors scored higher than average on Restraint, Emotional Stability, Friendliness, Objectivity, and Personal Relations scales. The counselors obtained scores in the 80th percentile on the MAT, which were fairly high overall. The AVLSV showed counselors scoring high on the Theoretical and Religion scales. Wrenn drew no strong conclusions from his findings since the results did not carry strong significance levels.

Cottle and Lewis (1954) used the MMPI and the GZTS in an attempt to distinguish between a group of 65 male college counselors and a group of 65 male college students undergoing counseling. Using the t test to test the means of the two groups on each scale, they found that the male counselors scored significantly higher on the K and Si scales of the MMPI and lower on the Ma and L (Lie) scales. The male counselors exhibited higher scores on the Restraint, Sociability, Emotional Stability, Objectivity, Friendliness, Personal Relations, and Masculinity scales of the GZTS. Since the research was conducted with male college students undergoing counseling in the various counseling centers, the impact of these findings is considerably diminished and the findings must be carefully considered.

Patterson (1962) attempted to develop a profile for rehabilitation counselors. Using 550 National Defense Education Act (NDEA) summer trainees from around the country, he administered the EPPS,

the MMPI, the SVIB, and the Kerr-Speroff (1954) Empathy Test (KSET), and the MAT. As did Wrenn (1952), Patterson found the counseling students scored around the 80th percentile on the MAT. Female counseling students were found to score higher on the Intraception scale of the EPPS and lower on the abasement scale. Male counseling students scored higher on the Intraception scale also, and on the Deference and Nurturance scales of the EPPS. All counseling students showed elevated scores on the MMPI on the K (Defensiveness) scale, Mf (Masculinity-Femininity) scale, Ma (Hypomania) scale, D (Depression) scale, and Hs (Hypochondriasis) scale, and lower scores on the Si (Social Introversion-Extroversion) scale than the norm group. The counseling students exhibited KSET scores that placed them above the mean, but not at a significant level. Patterson did not indicate whether the differences were statistically significant.

Administering the EPPS, the SVIB, and the Kuder (1956) Preference Test to a group of counselors, Palmontier (1966) found that the counselors differed from the norm groups of people in general. The counselors were found to score higher on the Nurturance and Affiliation scales of the EPPS. On the Social Welfare scale of the SVIB, the counselors scored significantly higher than adults in general. Elevated scale scores were obtained in the social service, persuasive, literacy and scientific types on the Kuder Preference Test. Generally, the counselor was able to perceive himself and others realistically, to be empathetic, emotionally stable, and

self expressive (pp. 93).

Mahan and Wicas (1964) attempted to assess a wide variety of personality variables using three instruments. The Ways of Life (consisting of 13 scales, in paragraph form, describing different philosophies of life), Self-Description (a forced choice adjective check list measuring dominance, inducement, submission, and compliance), and the Structured Objective Rorschach Test (SORT) were administered to 25 advanced counseling students in a NDEA institute. After comparing the mean scores to the normative people in general, Mahan and Wicas characterized the students 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 much given to introspection or self-analysis [p. 55].

Given the above results, the researchers expressed doubts concerning the ability of such counselors to effectively deal with the emotional problems of their clients.

Moredock and Patterson (1965) used the Rokeach (1960) Dogmatism (Form D) and Opinionation (Form C) scales, and six scales of the CPI, the Sociability (Sy), Social Presence (Sp), Self-acceptance (Sa), Tolerance (To), Intellectual Efficiency (Ie), and Flexibility scales (Fx), to study groups of counseling students, at four different levels of preparation. The instruments were administered at the beginning of the 8-week summer session and at the

end. No significant differences were noted in the scores taken at the beginning of the summer session when compared to the scores at the end. On the six CPI scales, the mean scores for the two groups at the first two levels of preparation did not significantly differ from the norm people in general. The mean scores for the group with highest level of preparation, the practicum group, obtained a standard score of approximately 60, or one standard deviation above the norm people in general on the six CPI scales. Scores on the Rokeach (1960) Dogmatism scale tended to decrease as the amount of professional preparation rose, but only fell below that of the norm group when the students reached the highest level of preparation. No differences were noted between the various levels of preparation on the Rokeach Opinionation scale. However, the mean scores for all levels was below that of the norm people in general, though not to a significant degree. It was noted that the authors could not conclude that differences in the mean scores of the three groups was a result of increased preparation, especially since the scores did not change over the summer. Moredock and Patterson did suggest that the changes might be due to a process of self-selection that goes on as the students choose whether or not to continue in the program.

Patterson (1967), testing a group of NDEA institute students, a group of regular counseling students, and a noncounseling group of students, used the Sa (Self-acceptance), the Wb (Well-being), To (Tolerance), and Py (Psychological-Mindedness) scales of the CPI along with the Baron (1967) Ego Strength Scale (ESS) and the

California F (Authoritarianism) scale. No significant differences were found between the mean scores of the NDEA institute students and the regular counseling students at the beginning of the year or at the end. The standard scores on the CPI for the combined counseling group were approximately 60 for the Sa, To, and Py scales, and 55 for Wb. These scores did not significantly change from fall to spring. The combined counseling group scored above the mean on the Baron (1967) ESS and significantly higher than the noncounseling group who scored below the mean. The mean scores of the combined counseling group did increase significantly, while the mean scores of the noncounseling group did not. The mean scores of the noncounseling group was significantly higher on the F scale in the fall, with both groups' mean scores decreasing significantly from the first testing to the second.

Patterson (1967), reviewing the research on counselor personality description, concluded:

- (1) the differences, though statistically significant, are so small as to be of little practical significance or use;
- (2) when compared to the scores of other college graduate students on some of the instruments, such as the MMPI, the scores of counseling students are little different;
- (3) although it is suggested that scores of students at the advanced practicum level of training are higher than the scores of beginning students, probably through a process of selection, it cannot be assumed that these students are

better counselors, or better potential counselors, than the beginning counselors; (4) there is some evidence . . . that some counseling students do not appear to possess characteristics usually considered desirable in counselors [p. 72].

Comparisons of Effective and

Ineffective Counselors

Arbuckle (1956) had 70 students in a counseling course choose what other students in the class they would be most likely to go to for counseling and those they would be least likely to go to. Using "six highly selected" and "six rejected" he compared them to the remaining students in the class using the MMPI, the Heston (1956) Personality Inventory (HPI) and the Kuder (1956) Vocational Preference Record. The selected students scored lower, closer to the mean, though not significantly, on the Hs (Hypochondriasis), D (Depression), Pa (Paranoia), Hy (Hysteria), Pt (Psychasthenia), Sc (Schizophrenia), Si (Social Introversion-Extroversion), and Ma (Hypomania) scales of the MMPI, than the rejected students. On the HPI, the selected group scored significantly higher on Confidence and Home Satisfaction. The selected group scored higher on the Kuder Social Service, Persuasive, Literacy, and Scientific scale areas.

Brams (1957) conducted two pieces of research to study the relationship between the counselor trainee's personality characteristics and his ability to communicate with the client. In the first, Brams administered each trainee the SVIB, the MAT, the MMPI, the Berkeley Public Opinion Questionnaire (BPOQ), the Bills (1957)

Index of Adjustment and Values (BIAV), the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (TMAS). For the study, Brams divided the counselors into two groups, effective counselors and ineffective counselors, on the basis of the trainees' performance as judged by the supervisors. Only one variable was found to significantly distinguish between the two groups, Tolerance for Ambiguity, from the BPOQ.

Brams (1961), in a second and similar study, administered the MMPI, the TMAS, the BIAV, and the BPOQ. He used 27 1st-semester counselor practicum students. To obtain a standardized score of effectiveness, Brams had the trainees rate each other and themselves on the Communication Rating Scale (CRS). In addition, they were rated by two independent judges (supervisors). Correlations among the peer rating ranged from .81 to .95, and correlations between independent judges ratings and the peer ratings was .73, both scores being significant. Correlations between self-ratings and peer and judges ratings was only .21 to .22 and not significant. None of the correlations between the criterion ratings and the MMPI, the TMAS, the BIAV was significant. However, a negative correlation of $-.36$ was obtained for the Tolerance of Ambiguity which was significant at the .06 level. Brams suggested that Tolerance for Ambiguity is related to counselor effectiveness. Concerning the lack of significant relationships on the other instruments, Brams concluded: "the available objective instruments are not suitable for personality measurement of test-sophisticated students in the area of counseling . . . [pp. 29-30]."

Kazienko and Neidt (1962), using the Bennett (1956) Polydiagnostic Index (BPI), investigated the personality characteristics of students from 25 NDEA summer institutes. There were 124 male counselors who were identified by their supervisors as being in the upper 25% of their institutes, and 115 male counselors were identified as being in the bottom 25%. On the BPI, the trainees were asked to rate themselves in terms of self-concept, motivating forces, values, feelings about others. In terms of self-concept, the good counselor viewed himself as serious, understanding, sympathetic, gentle, one who makes mistakes, patient, soft spoken, self-centered and domestic. As regards to motivation, the good counselor preferred some sense of security and did not express a need for riches, while the poor counselor expressed no concern either for or against. In terms of values, the good counselor did not value cunningness and shrewdness, values the right to be different, and placed little value in severity and strictness. Poor counselors placed value on conformity and strict adherence to rules. The good counselor saw people as being intellectually capable and self-centered, while the poor counselor saw people in the opposite manner.

Stefflre, King, and Leafgren (1962) used 40 NDEA summer institute trainees to study counselor effectiveness. The students rated one another at the end of the summer in terms of which members of the group they would go to for counseling if they were students in the school where the member was a counselor. Interrater reliability was reported at .96. These ratings established a group of effective

counselors and a group of ineffective counselors. The two groups were administered the MAT, the GTZS, the EPPS, and the Rokeach (1960) Dogmatism Scale (RDS). The t test was used to determine significant differences between the means of the two groups. The designated effective counselors scored significantly higher on the Deference and Order scales and lower on the Abasement and Aggression scales of the EPPS. The scores on the RDS were significantly lower for the effective counselors.

Combs and Soper (1963) ranked 29 NDEA institute counselor trainees according to the rank order preference in hiring them as counselors by their 14 instructors. The counselor trainees responded to four human relations incidents, and their reactions were rated by four trained graduate assistants. These scores were also rank ordered. The correlations were found to be significant at better than the .05 level of confidence. The effective counselor was described as having a more internal frame of reference, being more oriented toward people than things, saw people as being able rather than unable, dependable as opposed to undependable, friendly as opposed to unfriendly, worthy rather than unworthy, saw himself as identified, revealing, freeing as opposed to controlling, and altruistic.

Dole (1964) used principals' ratings and staff ratings to create a group of effective counselors and a group of ineffective counselors in a group of NDEA counselor trainees. Both groups of counselor trainees were administered the Minnesota Teaching Attitude Inventory, the MAT, the RDS, the SVIB, and the Gordon (1961) Personal

Profile. In addition, each trainee underwent a role-playing situation and received ratings for it, received peer ratings, completed a self-description, and gave demographic data. From all this data collected and correlated with staff and principals' ratings, only the self-description and undergraduate Gordon Personal Profile proved to be significant predictors of counselor effectiveness.

Using three practicum supervisors to rate 30 students in a NDEA summer institute, Demos and Zuwayliff (1966) divided the counselor trainees in half, one group the effective counselors, the other group ineffective. All the trainees were administered the AVLSV, the Kuder (1956) Personal Preference Survey, and the EPPS. Although no significant results were found on the AVLSV or the Kuder, the effective group scored significantly higher than the ineffective on the Nurturance and Affiliation scales of the EPPS, and significantly lower on the Autonomy, Abasement, and Aggression scales. Based on these results, the authors suggested that the EPPS be considered as a counselor-selection instrument. This study was included here and not in a later section on counselor selection because of a later reevaluation of the data by Mills and Menke (1967). Weaknesses in design were pointed out, but the most damaging were errors in calculation of data. When the data were recalculated, only the significant higher score on the Affiliation scale and the significantly lower score on the Autonomy scale remained, calling into question the use of the EPPS as a counselor-selection instrument.

Wicas and Mahan (1966) used instructor ratings to establish

effective and ineffective groups from the same group of NDEA summer institute students reported on earlier (Mahan & Wicas, 1964), using the same data developed from The Ways of Life, Self-Description and SORT. Significant differences were found only in the SORT. The group termed effective was described as more anxious and conforming, less consistent, and exhibiting less emotional responsiveness.

Milliken and Patterson (1967) investigated the relationship of dogmatism and prejudice to counselor effectiveness. There were 30 NDEA institute enrollees who were rated as to their effectiveness by a client trained to do so and an instructor, both filling out a 16-item counselor effectiveness scale. The counselors were administered the RDS and the Bogardus (1967) Ethnic Distance Scale (BEDS). Only the overall instructor's rating was able to distinguish between the effective group of counselors and the ineffective group. Milliken and Patterson found that the effective counselors scored significantly lower on both the RDS and BEDS, concluding that effective counselors show less prejudice and are more open-minded. Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, and Stone (1967) investigated the question "What measured nonintellective variables appear to be associated with judged counseling effectiveness?" Some 69 male and 30 female NDEA summer trainees took part in the study, and were administered the GPI, the EPPS, the GZTS, the MMPI, and the SVIB. After the final counseling session, the clients rated the trainees using the Counselor Rating Scale, a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 23 statements referring to the counseling experience. The trainees also used

a Q-sort technique to rate themselves and the other trainees. The practicum grade was used as the supervisor's ratings. The five scales proved to be significantly discriminatory, two for the males and three for the females. The Architect scale of the SVIB and the Well-Being scale of the CPI were found to be positively associated as male predictors, and the Sc (Schizophrenia) scale of the MMPI, the Friendliness scale of the GZTS and Dentist scale of the SVIB were negatively associated as female predictors. Peer ratings of counselor effectiveness and practicum grades correlated at .71 which indicated a high degree of agreement between peers and supervisors in judging counselor effectiveness. The authors concluded that:

It appears that all [supervisors, peers, and clients] responded favorably to affability, friendliness, amiability, self-confidence, and satisfaction in males, and to efficiency, self-confidence, assertiveness, and outgoingness in females [Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, & Stone, 1967, p. 302].

The research presented by the authors is extremely important because data on female counselor trainees were included, where before they had generally been excluded.

In an attempt to study the personality differences between effective and ineffective counselors, McClain (1968) pointed out the importance of studying both the male and female counselors. He administered the 16 PF to 91 male and 46 female NDEA institute trainees at the beginning of the institute. The practicum supervisors grades provided the criterion measure. There were three

factors which were found to be negatively correlated with male trainee effectiveness, and five positively. For the female trainees, ten scales were found to be negatively correlated to their effectiveness. McClain concluded from the results that the "personality characteristics relevant to success in counseling are not the same for men and women [p. 495]." Successful male trainees were characterized "as more outgoing, assertive, happy-go-lucky, venturesome and liberal, while the successful women in comparison with the unsuccessful were characterized as more reserved, humble, softer, shy and conservative [p. 495]." McClain found that the descriptions of the successful male seemed to fit the popular stereotype for masculinity, and the successful females seemed to fit the popular stereotype for femininity.

Donnan, Harlan, and Thompson (1969) also found the 16 PF to be able to discriminate between high and low functioning counselors. The Relationship Inventory (RI), which was a client rating of empathy, congruence, trust, and positive regard, was the criterion measure. Though the authors reported the number of male and female counselors taking part in the study, the results were reported only in terms of high and low functioning groups. In contrast to the findings of McClain (1968), only four scales were found to discriminate significantly between the high and low functioning groups. The authors found:

the counselor who was outgoing, warmhearted, and easy going was more likely to be perceived as offering a higher degree of unconditional positive regard. However, counselors

with higher scores on the mature, calm factor were less likely to be rated as congruent. The counselor who was venturesome, uninhibited, and spontaneous was likely to behave in a way perceived as more trustworthy. The counselor who was tender-minded and sensitive was more likely to be congruent as perceived by the clients.

Counselors rated high and low on congruence had significantly different average scores on Factors Q-1 and Q-2, indicating that the former were more experimental, critical, analytical, resourceful, and self-sufficient. The higher-functioning empathetic understanding group also had significantly higher scores on factor H which suggests they were more venturesome, socially bold, uninhibited, and spontaneous. The counselor group rated high on trust had significantly higher scores on Factor G indicating they were more conscientious. Conversely, the low trust group scored higher on Factor Q indicating they were relatively apprehensive, worrying, depressive, and troubled [p. 484].

Swenson (1970) used the 16 PF to study counselor level of functioning. The Truax (1964) Scales for Congruence, Empathy, and Positive Regard were employed as criterion measures. The ratings on the three Truax Scales were found to be significantly correlated. The author found:

High counseling performance was associated with counselors who were neither extremely Aloof (reserved) nor extremely

Sociable (outgoing), who tended to be somewhat Casual (expedient) in manner, who were neither extremely Conservative (respecting established ideas) nor extremely Experimenting (analytical) in approach, and who were neither extremely Lax (follows own urges) nor were extremely Controlled (self-disciplined) [p. 1027A].

In conclusion, Swenson suggested that the 16 PF be considered as a possible selection instrument because of the correlations found between counselor performance and certain personality factors on the 16 PF.

The relationship between intellectual and nonintellectual variables and counseling competence was investigated by comparing female students in the top 25% and those in the bottom 25% of a trainee evaluation seminar (Jansen, Robb, & Bonk, 1970). There was one criterion measure used to rate taped counseling sessions which was a 7-point Semantic Differential scale measuring Self-Concept, Openness, Empathy, Enthusiasm, Poise, Flexibility, Warmth, and Appropriateness of reflections, interpretations, and information. The director of the program also gave an overall effectiveness rating. Chronological age, the Ohio State University Psychological Test raw scores, Cooperative English Test raw scores, GZTS raw scores, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory raw scores, the counseling practicum grade and the cumulative grade point average of each trainee was available. The results showed the high-rated counselors to be younger than the low-rated counselors. The high-rated counselors appeared to

have greater scholastic aptitude, better mean practicum grades, and better grade point averages than the low-rated counselors. The GZTS indicated that the high-rated counselors appeared to be more sociable, more emotionally stable, less ego-involved, more restrained and more serious. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory suggested that the high-rated counselors "were more likely to maintain a state of harmonious and cooperative relationship in the classroom than those counselors who were rated low [p. 167]."

Wittmer and Lister (1971) used the 16 PF in studying the relationship between personality factors, intellective factors, and counselor effectiveness. The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale was used as the criterion measure. No significant correlations were formed between the criterion measure and the intellective measure, the Graduate Record Exam (GRE). A correlation of .41, which was significant at better than the .01 level, was reported between the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing 16 PF regression equation for counseling effectiveness and the CERS total score.

Jansen, Robb, and Bonk (1972) investigated the applicability of using the practicum grade ("A," "B," and "C") as a measure of counselor effectiveness. The predictor variables were the same variables used by the authors (Jansen, Robb, & Bonk, 1970) in the research on female counselors previously cited. The authors found significant intellective, nonintellective, and achievement differences among the male students receiving "A," "B," or "C."

Those in the A group emerged as more objective and less

hypersensitive than their B and C counterparts. The A males were also more accepting of weakness and shortcomings in others and appeared to be more understanding of people than males in other categories, to a significant degree. Furthermore, those male counselors in training who received an A grade in practicum proved to have, on the average, significantly greater scholastic aptitude and a significantly better cumulative grade point average than either B or C males. C male students in practicum were older, less emotionally stable and less objective than other grade types. They also had significantly poorer academic achievement than A or B males [pp. 28-29].

The results of the study with the males tended to support the earlier results with the female trainees, indicating potentially significant demographic, intellectual, and nonintellectual counselor traits associated with effectiveness.

Paranojoti (1972) studied the relationship between counselor effectiveness and the personality variables measured by the CPI. Peer and supervisor ratings were used as criteria measures of effectiveness, and were shown to be significantly correlated to one another. The Sy (Sociability), Ac (Achievement via Conformance), Ai (Achievement via Independence), and Py (Psychological Mindedness), scales of the CPI were significantly associated with the supervisor's ratings of effectiveness, and Sy and Ac scales were significantly associated with peer ratings of effectiveness.

Shelton (1973) studied the use of the 16 PF as a predictor of male and female counselor effectiveness with practicing counselors with two populations of male students, one from upper socioeconomic backgrounds and the other from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. She used the Counselor Evaluation Inventory, a client rating of effectiveness, as the criterion measure. The data from the 16 PF suggested that the male counselors rated effective with both populations would be more likely to be more emotionally mature, headstrong, competitive, frank, friendly, and considerate. Those rated effective by the disadvantaged population would tend to be more gregarious, accepting of criticism, more likely to experiment, and more tolerant of inconvenience. Female counselors rated as more effective with both populations would tend to be more submissive, accommodating, trusting, tolerant, and adaptable than their less effective counterparts. The results, indicating the usual female stereotype, concerning the effective female counselor seem to suggest that the male clients were seeking a female in the more traditional female role.

It should be noted that much of the results of the research presented in this section has been inconclusive or even contradictory. Investigators have used a myriad of instruments in the personality testing. Even when the same instruments were reported used, another problem intruded to cloud the results. Each investigator had a different definition of effectiveness and measured it in differing ways. This criterion problem makes difficult drawing any firm conclusions.

Research Based on Hypothesized
Characteristics of Effective
Counselors

Feidler (1950) hypothesized that experts from differing therapeutic orientations (Nondirective, Psychoanalytic, and Adlerian) would be more likely to create a therapeutic relationship resembling Rogers's (1942) Concept of the Ideal Therapeutic Relationship than nonexpert or inexperienced therapists. There were ten therapists in client interviews who were recorded for the study. Of these, five were experts of national reputation in their various theoretical orientations, and five were novices of the same orientations. Expert judges using a Q-sort technique provided the criterion measures. From the results of the study, the following conclusions were made:

1. Expert psychotherapists of any of the three schools create a relationship more closely approximating the Ideal Therapeutic Relationship than relationships created by non-experts.
2. The therapeutic relationship created by experts of one school resembles more closely that created by experts of other schools than it resembles relationships created by nonexperts within the same school.
3. The most important dimension (of those measured) which differentiates experts from nonexperts is related to the therapeutic ability to understand, to communicate with, and to maintain rapport with the patient [p. 444].

Seeking to understand the effects of the therapist's anxiety on his effectiveness, Bandura (1956) first turned the attention away from the client to the therapist and his functioning. There were 42 psychotherapists who were studied as to their anxiety and their insight in the counseling process. Anxiety and insight measures were obtained in three critical areas: (a) dependency, (b) hostility, and (c) sexuality. There were self, peer, and supervisors' ratings which were used as criterion measures. No significant results were obtained from the self or peer ratings. However, using the supervisors' ratings, it was found concerning the three critical areas "that anxious therapists were rated to be less competent psychotherapists than therapists who were of low anxiety [p. 336]." No conclusions could be drawn concerning the relationship of insight to rated competence levels.

Kemp (1962) investigated the relationship of dogmatism to counselor effectiveness. Among 50 graduate students, a control group and an experimental group were administered the RDS and Porter's (1962) Test of Counselor Attitudes (PTCA) at the beginning and end of the semester. The PTCA is made up of 10 situations and enables differentiation on (a) the evaluative or value setting, (b) interpretive or teaching responses, (c) understanding responses, (d) supportive responses, and (e) probing or diagnostic responses. In addition, responses from the experimental practicum group were randomly selected from their counseling interviews, and rated by independent raters according to the PTCA. Kemp found:

In the actual counseling situations, the group high in dogmatism (closed belief system) changed significantly, in the character of their responses from the hypothetical to the actual situation. The direction of the change was toward fewer understanding and supportive responses and toward more evaluative, interpretive, and probing or diagnostic responses [p. 156].

Counselors lower on dogmatism tended to be more supportive and understanding in their responses. Kemp warned that his results suggest that those trainees who scored higher in dogmatism would be likely to simulate change according to the expectations of the supervisor.

Russo, Kelz, and Hudson (1964) also used the RDS to study the relationship of open-mindedness to counselor effectiveness. The Counselor Performance Rating Scale, an 8-category instrument, developed by Kelz (1964), was used as the criterion measure. There were 12 items of the RDS which were formed to discriminate between those counselors judged effective and those judged ineffective. Based on these results, the authors suggested that open-mindedness is an important counselor quality.

Petty (1971) studied the relationship of dogmatism to counselor trainee effectiveness. Independent raters and supervisors rating of effectiveness were the criterion measures used. The RDS was administered at the beginning of the school year and again at the end. The results showed a significant overall decrease in the scores of the RDS over the period of the school year. Despite the drop in scores on the

RDS, the test was not able to distinguish between those trainees judged effective and those judged ineffective.

Mezzano (1969) sought to determine the effect of dogmatism on counselor trainee effectiveness. Supervisors rated the trainee on a 3-item form, each item having six levels.

- a. Understanding, defined as the counselor's ability to view the counselee's world as the counselee sees it.
- b. Congruence, defined as the counselor's ability to be genuine in the counseling relationship.
- c. Acceptance, defined as the ability of the counselor to convey feelings of regard and liking for the counselee

[p. 64].

Counselor open-mindedness as measured by the RDS correlated significantly with effectiveness as measured by supervisors on Understanding (.05 level), Congruence and Acceptance (.01 level). These results tended to support those of Russo, Kelz, and Hudson (1964), and their suggestion that open-mindedness be considered a counselor personality variable.

The concept of cognitive flexibility was introduced in 1966 (Sprinthall, Whiteley, & Mosher) as a possible counselor variable linked to effectiveness. Whiteley, Sprinthall, Mosher, and Donaghy (1967) first investigated its relationship to counselor effectiveness. Cognitive flexibility was defined as:

an ability or capacity to think and act simultaneously and appropriately in a given situation. It refers to the

dimensions of open-mindedness, adaptability, and a resistance to premature closure in perception and cognition. Applied specifically to counselor effectiveness, the flexible counselor . . . can respond easily to both the content of what the client says and his feelings [p. 227].

A counselor practicum class of 19 trainees took part in the study, and were administered the Rorschach, TAT, the Personal Differentiation Test (PDT), a nonprojective measure of cognitive flexibility, and responded to two case studies. The supervisors' ratings of cognitive flexibility served as the criterion measures. Cognitive flexibility as predicted by the projective tests correlated .78 with the criterion, and the responses to the critical-incidents case study correlated .73 with the criterion. The authors concluded that measures of cognitive flexibility should be studied further as they relate to later effectiveness on the job.

Gruberg (1967) studied the effectiveness of counselor responses and their relationship to tolerance of ambiguity. There were 25 practicing counselors who were administered the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) and the scores on the Complexity scale formed the measure of tolerance of ambiguity. There were five counselors educators who made the judgments of effectiveness for the criterion measures. Counselors rated as more tolerant of ambiguity according to their scores on the Complexity scale of the OPI used more nondirective leads; counselors having a high measured tolerance of ambiguity spend significantly less time talking in the counseling

interviews than those scoring low; the counselor educators rated the high scores on tolerance of ambiguity as more effective in dealing with the clients' statements. Gruberg (1969) used the complexity scale of the OPI again to study the relationship of tolerance of ambiguity to counselor effectiveness. The same methods were employed as in the previous study. The results led to the following conclusions concerning counselors rated most effective and scoring high on tolerance of ambiguity:

The counselor educators judged that high tolerance counselors were more effective than low tolerance counselors in (a) responding to client needs; (b) responding to client feeling cues; (c) responding to client feelings and behavior; (d) meaningfully communicating with the client; (e) using a more appropriate level of terminology with the client; (f) encouraging the client to talk freely; (g) centering the responsibility for the course of the interview on the client; and (h) avoiding the imposition of their own values on the client [p. 122].

Jackson and Thompson (1971) explored both cognitive flexibility and tolerance of ambiguity with practicing counselors, and predicted that those scoring high on those factors and judged most effective by their supervisors would have more positive attitudes toward self, most people, most clients, and counseling. Unlike previous research findings, the results did not show counselor effectiveness to be related to either measured tolerance of ambiguity or

cognitive flexibility. However, counselor effectiveness was found to be related to more positive attitudes toward self, most clients, and counseling, as judged on the Semantic Differential.

Eberlein and Park (1971) hypothesized that congruence between the self-concept and ideal self-concept was related to counselor effectiveness. Self-concept and the ideal self-concept were both measured by the Interpersonal Check List (ICL) at the beginning and at the end of their training year. There were 20 female and 49 male trainees who took part in the study. Supervisors rated the effectiveness of the trainees on the Counsellor Practicum Evaluation Form. The results suggested that:

counselors who are highly congruent may be rigid personalities who see little need for self-change. In contrast to this inflexibility, counselors with high discrepancies, have poor self-concepts with lofty ideals, both of which are unrealistic. A balance is suggested for persons who desire higher supervisor ratings. Whether such moderation makes for the best counselor poses an entirely different issue [p. 132].

Self-Disclosure and Self-Concept were also investigated (Thomas, 1968) as to their relationship to counselor effectiveness. Some 30 NDEA trainees responded to the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire by Jourard and Lasakow (1972), and completed a Q sort designed to measure the discrepancy between self-concept and ideal self-concept, with supervisors ratings forming the criterion.

Although counseling effectiveness was not shown to be related to self-disclosure, self-disclosure was shown to increase significantly over the year. Changes in self-concept were shown to be related to the measure of effectiveness in the study. There was no report concerning discrepancies between self-concept and ideal self-concept.

The concept of Relationship Orientation (RO) was investigated by Dilby and Tierney (1969). It was hypothesized that RO would be related to counselor trainee effectiveness. Out of 30 trainees, six counselor trainees were rated high and six were rated low using the WROS to measure RO. Counseling responses were rated according to verbosity, fluency, judgmentalness, counselor focus, assumptiveness, and flexibility. The high RO group differed significantly from the low RO group on judgmentalness, counselee focus, and flexibility. While counselee focus and flexibility appear to be consistent with research and theory, the high positive correlation (.01) level of judgmentalness to RO seems to be inconsistent

In considering the research on hypothesized counselor personality factors related to effectiveness, it must be noted that the results, even when the same instruments were used, in many cases were inconsistent and at variance. Certainly, one factor that should be considered as instrumental in the inconsistency of the results is the lack of standardization or agreement on the criterion measures and their meanings. However, the main factor in considering the research on hypothesized characteristics related to effectiveness centers on the fact that there appear to be so many varying strands of research.

There appear to have been few efforts to follow a single strand through consistently over time.

Research Relevant to Creativity as
a Counselor Variable

Gaylin (1966) reported a study investigating client "success" or psychological health and its relationship to creativity as measured by the Rorschach. Using a "Function Score," derived from Rorschach determinants commonly associated with creativity, a "success" group of clients were differentiated from three unsuccessful groups. The determinants that composed the function score were M (number of movement responses), O (original responses), 2-W (organizational minus whole responses), Con (number of content categories of responses), Non F% (percentage of responses with determinants other than form), R (total number of responses), EA (sum of scored color responses plus sum of scored movement responses). There were two criteria measures employed: The Butler-Haigh (1954) 100-item Q sort, which yielded a Self-Ideal Self score; and a nine-point therapists' rating scale measuring client success through the course of 20 therapy sessions. It was concluded that the function scores were "effective in differentiating change in level of psychological health or psychotherapy [p. 500]." It was further suggested that, since the various determinants of the "Function Score" had been linked to creativity by other investigators, there was a relationship between creativeness and psychological health.

In another study investigating the relationship between

improvement of mental health in therapy and creativity, Garfield (1967) used a sample consisting of 47 male underachieving college students and a control group. All the students had been required to undergo therapy due to their poor academic performance, and attended two 1-hour sessions a week. The author indicated that all subjects had been tested as to creativity and mental health before undergoing therapy and again after. The measures of creativity were the Uses for Things Test and the Barron (1952) Welsh Art Scale. After therapy the subjects were rated psychologically improved or unimproved, based on therapists' ratings and a Q sort by the client on self-concept. While the Uses for Things Test was not correlated significantly to ratings of mental health, the Barron Welsh Art Scale did show significant correlations. The improved group showed significantly greater gains in scores on the Barron Welsh Art Scale than either the unimproved or control group.

Cicirelli and Cicirelli (1970) investigated whether creativity and positive attitude were related to counseling effectiveness. Mednick's (1959) Remote Associates Test (RAT) and the Torrance (1962) Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) were used as the measures of creativity. Verbal fluency, flexibility and originality (uncommonness of response) were measured by the TTCT and originality (unusual responses) by the RAT. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) provided the measure of positive attitude. There was one interview tape by each counselor analyzed by raters as the criterion measure. The tapes were rated on the percentage of verbal behavior in

each of 10 categories:

Counselor talk--Indirect influence

- a. Accepts counselee's feelings
- b. Praises or encourages counselee behavior
- c. Accepts or uses ideas of counselee
- d. Asks questions

Counselor talk--Direct influence

- a. Gives information or opinion
- b. Gives directions or orders
- c. Criticizes or justifies authority

Counselee talk

- a. Counselee talk in response to counselor
- b. Counselee talk which he initiates

Other

- a. Silence

Verbal fluency and flexibility scores on the counselors from the TTCT were shown to be significantly negatively correlated to the amount of silence during the interview and positively correlated to the amount of counselee talk. Positive attitude scores from the MTAI were shown to be significantly correlated to the amount of praise and encouragement given by the counselor. No significant correlations were found for originality as measured by the TTCT or the RAT. The authors suggested that the lack of correlation between creativity and the criterion measure could lie in the problem of identifying the meaning of creativity, or the fact that creativity could best be

measured by process scales rather than the quality scales employed.

Carluccio (1972) hypothesized that there was a relationship between the lifestyles of creative artists and counseling professionals. Separate groups of counseling psychologists, counselor educators, counselors, and creative artists all were administered Morris's (1972) Life Style Value Structure (LSVS). The LSVS measured five areas (scales) of internal values:

A = Social Control and Self-
Restraint

B = Enjoyment and Progress in Action

C = Withdrawal and Self-Sufficiency

D = Receptivity and Sympathetic
Concern

E = Self-Indulgence

Some differences in life style as measured by the LSVS were noted between counseling psychologists on the one hand and counselor educators on the other, with the counselors being most similar to the creative artists. However, general counseling professionals all indicated a life style as measured by the LSVS similar to that of creative artists. Carluccio described the life style of the four groups as:

characterized by relatively low social control and self-restraint, high self-indulgence, relatively high enjoyment and progress in action, and medium withdrawal and self-sufficiency, as well as receptivity and sympathetic concern

[p. 71].

The relationship of counselor and counselee creativity to progress in counseling was the focus of a study by Hughes (1973). The TTCT was used as the measure for creativity, and five scales of the ACL, the lability, need for exhibitionism, need for autonomy, need for aggression, and need for change scales were used as personality measures shown to be linked to creativity. Each group (counselor, counselee) was divided in half, one designated as creative, the other uncreative. Several findings were made. There was a positive relationship for the counselors between the measure of creativity and the scales of the ACL used, while this did not prove true for the clients. Highly creative clients tended to undergo more self-exploration than their less creative counterparts, but only when the analysis was done with members of both client groups being in counseling with highly creative counselors. No such relationship was formed for the two groups of clients seeing the less creative counselors. There were two implications drawn from the results. First, the findings suggest that possibly counselors and clients should be matched, especially with the highly creative clients being matched to highly creative counselors. Second, since all groups experienced more self-exploration with the highly creative counselors, the results suggested that we choose the more creative individuals to be counselors.

Partin (1975) investigated the relationship between counselor effectiveness, counselor self-actualization, and counselor creativity.

Noting that many measures of creativity are highly correlated to Intelligence Quotient (IQ) test scores, the author chose two measures of creativity that were personality based, the M (Human Movement) scale of the Rorschach, and the Revised Art (RA) scale of the WFPT. Additionally, Partin hypothesized that counselors would be located in quadrant II (high origence-high intelligence) of Welsh's (1975) two-dimensional personality model. The RA scale measured the dimension Origence (ORIG) and the Terman (1956) Concept Mastery Test (CMT) measured the other dimension, Intellectence (INT). Counselor self-actualization was measured by the Inner-directed Scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The criterion measures were the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ), which was a measure of Rogers's facilitative conditions, and the Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI). Both these instruments were counselee measures of counselor effectiveness. Human Movement and Origence and Human Movement and Self-actualization were found to be significantly correlated. Human Movement, Origence, and Intellectence contributed significantly to the variance of the criterion variable measured by the RQ. Finally, counselors did score higher than the general population on ORIG and INT.

The results presented in this section of research are quite mixed. A probable cause lies in the small amount of research done on the relationship of creativity to counselor or counseling success. The criterion measures of success are all different and in cases vague. A further problem might lie with the measures of

creativity themselves. Some measures of creativity were personality based, while others were more closely correlated to IQ measures.

In spite of some of the difficulties in this new area of research, the findings do suggest that:

1. Creativity is linked to mental health,
 2. Counselors are more creative than the general population,
- and
3. Creativity is linked to counselor effectiveness.

Since the results are so tenuous at this point, there seems to be a need for further research, particularly using personality based measures of creativity.

Research on Counselor Selection

Cottle, Lewis, and Penney (1954) reported one of the earliest attempts at constructing a personality counselor selection process. Using 111 items from the MMPI and the GZTS shown in a previous study (Cottle & Lewis, 1954) to distinguish between counselors and non-counselors, the authors revised these items and added 39 items adapted from the Counseling Psychologist Scale of the SVIB. These 150 items formed the experimental scale employed in the study. There were 60 counselors and 60 college students who formed the two study populations. The results showed that the experimental scale was able to distinguish between the two groups with the counselor group scoring significantly higher than the college students. On the experimental scale, 55 items discriminated at the .05 level, while 38 did so at the .01 level.

Blocker (1963) felt some method of selection and retention of counselor trainees was necessary due to the increased number of applicants. There were four staff members who rated trainees on the "level of predicted performance as a school counselor [p. 20]." Interrater reliabilities ranged from .64 to .83. Peer ratings were used as a predictor variable with each member of the class ranking all the others on the same criterion as the staff. In addition, the NDEA Comprehensive Examination: Counseling and Guidance (CECG), the Kuder (1956) Personal Preference Record, and grades were used as predictor variables. In the analysis of data, it was found that peer rankings, the Kuder, and the NDEA examination accounted for 77% of the variance. It was suggested that peer rankings and the Kuder scores provided information which was an effective supplement to measures of academic achievement. The difficulty with peer rankings is that they can only be obtained after admission into a program. Therefore, peer rankings could be effectively used when determining who would be permitted to enter the practicum programs.

Academic predictors were used as the variables in a study of counselor selection by Callis and Prediger (1964). The relative effectiveness of commonly used academic aptitude instruments in predicting counselor trainee success in school was investigated. The following aptitude tests were administered to three consecutive year-long counselor trainee institutes:

1. The Ohio State University Psychological Test (OSUPT)
2. The MAT

3. The Cooperative English Test--Reading Comprehension.

In addition, the student grade point average (GPA) was used as the criterion. Of the three predictors, the Reading Comprehension score was the most effective in predicting trainee GPA. However, the increase of prediction strength was not significantly increased when the other academic aptitude measures were added.

Wasson (1965) reported an important study in counselor trainee selection. There were 30 NDEA students investigated, using peer ratings, staff ratings, and ratings of taped segments of practicum interviews. Each enrollee took the MMPI, EPPS, MAT, OSUPT, SVIB, and the NDEA Comprehensive Examination in Guidance and Counseling. Each trainee was also rated on responses to eight hypothetical counseling situations made before the institute according to the WROS. Using the t test, the top 10 students on the basis of the criteria were compared to the bottom 10 on the various tests taken. There were six scores which were found to significantly discriminate between the two groups: the MMPI Sc scale (correlated .51) with staff ratings; the EPPS Nurturance scale with counseling segments, .47; EPPS Heterosexuality, with peer ratings, .39; NDEA Comprehensive Examination with counseling segments, .42; SVIB Artists scale with counseling segments, .36, and staff ratings, .38. The total WROS score correlated .61 with counseling segments, .54 with staff ratings, and .61 with peer ratings. Additionally, the WROS score did not significantly correlate with any other test score. The WROS which was a relatively new instrument proved to be the best predictor with

all three criteria, and apparently measured something not measured by the other personality instruments or academic instruments.

McGreevy (1967) investigated the types of data commonly gathered in the counselor trainee selection process using a factor analysis approach. Biographical and educational data together with scores on the MMPI, EPPS, and MAT were used as predictor variables for 86 NDEA institute trainees. The first semester GPA, instructors' ratings, and scores on the NDEA Comprehensive Examination were used as criterion variables. Results indicated that high performance in effectiveness during practicum seemed to be inversely related to the attainment of high grades; that there was need to arrange and classify; there was a need for freedom or independence from other people; there was a personal type connected with asserting one's self cognitively. Also, it was noted the more successful candidate appeared to be male, married, have children, and have some experience as a teacher or counselor. The MAT was shown to be an adequate predictor of academic success. However, none of the criteria or combination of criteria adequately isolated a special quality of counselor personality for use in the selection of trainees.

The 16 PF has been previously reported in research on counselor effectiveness. Myrick, Kelly, and Wittmer (1972) investigated using the 16 PF as a counselor trainee selection device. From 55 student counselors, 20 were designated effective and 20 ineffective, with 19 being males and 21 females. The CERS was used as the criterion measure. The data was analyzed to determine

differentiation between effective and ineffective counselors, again on the basis of sex, and using the interaction effect of the two factors. Using the data comparing effective to ineffective counselors, 4 of 16 factors differentiated between the two groups at the .05 level or better. At .05 level, Factors E (Humble, Conforming vs. Assertive, Aggressive) and I (Tough-minded) were significant. At the .01 level, Factors A (Reserved, Detached vs. Warm, Sociable) and H (Shy, Restrained vs. Venturesome, Socially bold) were significant. Differences in sex, significant at the .10 level were found on Factors G and M (Practical vs. Imaginative). An interaction effect, positive and significant at the .05 level, was found for Factor N (Forthright vs. Shrewd, Calculating). The authors noted that while some of their findings support some of the findings of previous researchers, other data contradict previous findings. They were led to suggest that the 16 PF may have some value in helping select potentially successful counselor trainees, but more research was needed.

Anthony, Gormally, and Miller (1974), concerned that academic selection procedures were still being used, investigated the relationship between counselor trainee success and a trainability index and the academic predictors. The academic predictors were GPA, GRE-Verbal, GRE-Quantitative, and MAT. The nontraditional selection predictors were a precommunication index, a trainability index-communication, and a trainability index-self-discrimination. The trainability index consists of the subject's having read a brief

explanation of empathy, along with examples of helper responses rated according to Carkhuff's (1969) 5-point Empathy Scale. The subject is asked to add his own response and then rate all helper responses including his own, which when compared to responses of trained judges gave the self-discrimination rating. A trained judge's mark gave the communication score. Performance in an interview at the beginning of training gave the precommunication score. Better than 65% of the total variance was accounted by the two trainability indexes. None of the academic predictors accounted for significant portion of the variances. The results led the authors to question the continued use of the academic instruments in counselor trainee selection.

Palmer (1975) surveyed the literature concerning counselor effectiveness and counselor trainee success and attempted to investigate the use of the most commonly reported nonintellective instruments in choosing counselor trainees. Having found the EPPS, the 16 PF, and the RDS among the most commonly reported instruments, she administered them to a group of counselor trainees. Standardized criterion instruments were found in five of the Carkhuff-Berenson (1967) (C-B) Scales:

1. Empathetic Understanding
2. Concreteness
3. Respect
4. Facilitative Genuineness
5. Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal

Functioning.

The CERS was also used as a standardized criterion measure, along with the grade earned in the practicum and recommendation for a counseling position. When the C-B scales were used the more effective counselor trainees showed lower needs for achievement (EPPS-ACH), more imaginativeness (16 PF-M), and fewer years of teaching experience, with the females being more effective. When the CERS was the criterion of effectiveness, the more successful trainees showed lower needs for endurance (EPPS-End), more autonomy (EPPS-Aut), more self-sufficiency and resourcefulness (16 PF-Q₂), more self-assurance and confidence (16 PF-O), and fewer years of teaching experience. When the grade earned in practicum was used, the counselors showed more self-sufficiency and resourcefulness (16 PF-Q₂), more self-assurance and confidence (16 PF-O), and fewer years of teaching experience. Using the recommendation for a counseling position, the successful trainee showed more self-assurance and confidence (16 PF-O) and fewer years of teaching experience. The RDS showed no correlation with any of the criteria.

Summary

While the American Personnel and Guidance Association (1965), the American Psychological Association (1947, 1954), the American School Counselor Association (1965), and the National Vocational Guidance Association (1949) have all urged for specific selection criteria in choosing counselor trainees, little effective research has actually been done on the problem. Much literature has been

generated on speculated counselor characteristics similar to the statements of the professional organizations. A step beyond this approach has been to administer a battery of personality instruments to counselors, usually trainees, and then describe the group according to dominant characteristics. Numerous instruments have been used including the RDS, CPI, AVLSV, Kuder, EPPS, MMPI, SVIB, GZTS, Ways of Life, SORT, and others (Menne, 1975).

A next step in the process has been the comparison of effective and ineffective counselor groups (trainees), using the previously named instruments, usually based on some criterion of success or effectiveness. Most commonly, the criteria are judged ratings by supervisors, peers, clients, self, or a combination of the four. Recently, more standardized instruments have come to be used such as the Relationship Questionnaire, the Counselor Evaluation Inventory, the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale, and Carkhuff's (1969) Scales. These standardized evaluation instruments all seem to have a common origin in Rogers's (in Koch, 1971) facilitative conditions. Despite the advent of standardized criterion instruments, the results of the research are still far from conclusive (Arbuckle, 1975; Shertzer & Stone, 1968).

As a further step, still hampered by the criterion problem, there have been investigations seeking to construct counselor selection scales from standardized personality instruments and those seeking to construct new instruments specifically for counselor selection. Early attempts were made with the MMPI and GZTS (Cottle &

Lewis, 1954; Cottle, Lewis, & Penney, 1954). More recently, the CPI (Lewis, 1973) and the 16 PF (Myrick, Kelly, & Wittmer, 1972) have been used to develop counselor selection scales or multiple regression equations using the existing scales. Strep (1963) developed a completely new selection instrument, the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale, which seems to hold promise (Ohlsen, 1970; Shertzer & Stone, 1968; Wasson, 1965).

There has been one hypothesized characteristic--creativity--which has found increasing emphasis recently (Frey, 1975; Mayer, 1975). In different sections of this study both the theoretical basis of creativity as a potential personality trait of successful counselors, and the research generated have been presented.

The research on counselor selection has shown:

1. Intellective instruments of counselor selection have not been effective in distinguishing anything other than trainee academic success.
2. The research on counselor personality has been both inconclusive and inconsistent.
3. Creativity is a potentially important counselor variable, important to the outcome of the counseling process.
4. Although there have been no universally used criterion, the standardized instruments based on Rogers's (in Koch, 1971) facilitative conditions seem to hold the greatest promise.
5. There are some special counselor selection instruments that seem to hold promise but are in need of further validation.

It is a combination of these findings on counselor personality and selection that has given impetus to the present research.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Chapter 3 presents a detailed description of the research procedures and methods utilized in the present investigation. Descriptions of the following are included: (a) population, (b) instruments, (c) procedures, and (d) statistical methods.

Population

Subjects in the study were master level counselor trainees in practicum programs during the Spring semester, 1976. There were nine practicum students from the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia; 23 practicum students from Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia (ODU); and four practicum students from Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia (HI).

Instruments

There were five predictor and two criterion measures used in this study. The first was the summed score for each individual on the Origence (ORIG) scales of the Welsh Figure Preference Test (WFPT) and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI); the second was the summed score for each individual on the Intellectence (INT) scales of the WFPT and the CPI; the third was the total score for each individual obtained on the How Do You Think-B (HDYT-B); the fourth was the score for the Counselor Selection Scale (CSS) of the CPI; the fifth was the summed score of two raters obtained on the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS). The criterion

measures were made up of five of the Carkhuff (1969) Scales and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

Predictor Measures

As suggested by Welsh (1975), two instruments were used to measure ORIG and INT. The first of these instruments was the WFPT. Welsh (1959), in the Manual, described the WFPT:

The WFPT consists of 400 black and white figures for each of which the subject is asked to decide whether he likes or does not like it The figures range from simple geometric forms to complex and diverse patterns and designs . . . to include differences in line quality, shape, content and other aspects of the figure [p. 5].

Many scales have been developed from the WFPT, of which the Revised Art Scale (RA) is probably the best researched. The test-retest reliabilities for the RA scale have ranged from .94 to .90 over 1-week intervals. The ORIG scale is highly correlated to the RA scale (Welsh, 1976) with correlations ranging in the high .90s. The RA and ORIG scales for the subjects of this study correlated .98.

The present ORIG and INT scales of the WFPT were empirically developed using the responses of the original Governor's School students in North Carolina. These were the same population and responses reported in the original development study (Welsh, 1969). The original data and protocols were used to construct the ORIG and INT scales which had been developed for the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), and

Adjective Check List (ACL). Evidence bearing on the construct validity presented in cross-validated studies indicated that the scales do indeed discriminate between creative and noncreative gifted students, architects, mathematicians and research scientists (Welsh, 1975).

The present WFPT ORIG scale consists of the 93 items, 44 like and 49 dislike. The INT of the WFPT consists of 69 items, 34 like and 35 dislike. The two scales are statistically uncorrelated (Welsh, 1976), as can be seen in Table 1.

The CPI is a standard personality measurement instrument intended for use with a "normal" population. According to the Manual (Gough, 1957) it is addressed to personality characteristics "important for social living and social interaction [p. 5]." The CPI is composed of 480 items which are responded to either true or false. While the WFPT ORIG and INT scales could be derived from the original pool of data used to develop the scales for the SVIB, MMPI, and ACL, Welsh (1975) was not able to do so for the CPI, since the original subjects had not taken the CPI. Therefore, using the well-validated ORIG and INT scales for the SVIB, ACL, and MMPI, Welsh administered the four tests to classes in test and measurements at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, and derived the ORIG and INT scales for the CPI by comparison with the SVIB, ACL, and MMPI ORIG and INT scores.

Test-retest reliability for the 18 scales in the CPI Manual (Gough, 1957) are reported ranging from .53 to .90 over a 4-week

Table 1
 Intercorrelations of the Predictor Variables
 Origence, Intellectence, How Do You Think-B,
 Counselor Selection Scale, and the
 Wisconsin Relationship
 Orientation Scale

	Intellectence	How Do You Think-B	Counselor Selection Scale	Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale
Origence	0.0077	0.1998	0.3917**	0.4431**
Intellectence		0.3739*	0.2712	0.4502**
How Do You Think-B			0.4678**	0.5230***
Counselor Selection Scale				0.6288***

Note. $n = 35$ for all correlations.

* Significant at $p < .05$.

** Significant at $p < .01$.

*** Significant at $p < .001$.

interval and .57 and .72 over a 1-year period (Megargee, 1972). Support for the validity of the ORIG and INT scales of the CPI lies in their empirical development from other established and well-validated ORIG and INT scales (Welsh, 1975).

The third predictor variable was the HDYT-B developed by Davis (1975), as a personality measure of creativity. The HDYT-B was developed from items the author felt to combine the best personality indicators of creativity, and then criterion referenced. Validation studies were conducted on college junior and senior education majors at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, over a period of several years. Each of the students took the HDYT-B at the beginning of the semester class in creative teaching. During the class, the students were to produce some "creative" product. The creativeness of each product was judged by experts in the appropriate fields. Validity ratings based on these findings was statistically significant ranging from the .05 level of confidence to the .01 level of confidence. Internal reliability scores were reported ranging from .941 to .811. The HDYT-B was included because it purported to measure some dimensions of the personality construct of creativity not touched on by Welsh's (1975) model, particularly that of biographical data.

The fourth predictor variable of the Counselor Selection Scale was also developed from the CPI (Lewis, 1973). The CPI was administered to groups of counselors rated effective and ineffective. Of the 480 items, 32 were found to discriminate at least at

the .10 level of confidence or better. The Counselor Selection Scale was administered to two validating groups of counselor trainees. Again, it was able to successfully discriminate between the top and bottom quartiles of the two validating groups. Further validating studies have not been done.

The fifth predictor measure was the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS). The prospective counselor is given eight hypothetical situations a counselor is likely to encounter in a school or possibly an agency setting. A recorded interview situation is used to give and tape the prospective trainees' responses. Recording via a telephone interview is suggested and was used in the present study. The responses are rated according to a 5-point Likert-type scale, indicating the rater's degree of willingness to seek assistance from the person being rated.

Streph (1963) reported the WROS to be an excellent predictor of counselor trainee success. Using peer and supervisors' ratings as criterion measures, he reported correlations ranging from .50 to .82. Wasson (1965) found the WROS to effectively predict trainee success and to provide information beyond the intelligence, interest and personality variables of the counselor trainee. Only one hour or less of instruction to psychologically unsophisticated raters on using the WROS was sufficient to produce high interrater reliability of .75 or better (Stoadt, 1969). Mowsesian (1966) reported that educational level of the raters had no significant effects on the ratings. Farwell (1975) reported over 10 years of

successful use of the WROS at the University of Wisconsin.

Criterion Measures

The first criterion measure of counselor trainee effectiveness was five of the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales:

1. Empathic Understanding
2. Communication of Respect
3. Personally Relevant Concreteness
4. Facilitative Genuineness
5. Gross Rating of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning.

The Carkhuff Scales were developed from the original work of Rogers (1959, 1961). Each scale is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale, utilizing half steps. The ratings go from 1.0, which indicates a lack of the conditions on the counselor's part, to 3.0 which indicates the condition is offered at minimally facilitative level by the counselor, to 5.0 which indicates that the counselor is communicating the condition fully. A complete description of the 5-point rating system is given in the Appendix C and D.

Interrater reliabilities for the five Scales has been reported ranging from .77 to .99 and intrarater reliabilities from .79 to .96. (Alexils & Carkhuff, 1967; Banks, Berenson, & Carkhuff, 1966; Cannon & Carkhuff, 1969; Carkhuff & Alexils, 1967; Friel, Koratochvil, & Carkhuff, 1968). The research quoted suggests strongly that the Carkhuff Scales do indeed measure what they purport to measure. With properly trained raters, Hefele and Hurst (1972) indicate that correlations between the counselor offered

condition and positive reaction on the client's part are significant at the .05 level or better.

The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) was the second criterion measure used. The CERS was introduced specifically to provide a further standardized rating of counselor trainee effectiveness in addition to the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales. The CERS was not meant to evaluate the same dimensions as the Carkhuff Scales. The Carkhuff Scales measured counselor behavior during the interview, while the CERS measured behaviors leading up to the interview as well as during and after, specifically time spent with the supervisor in evaluation. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Shertzer and Stone (1968) found supervisors' ratings to be the main method of evaluating effectiveness. In the research cited in Chapter 2, supervisors' ratings was the most frequent method mentioned.

Myrick and Kelly (1971), noting the problem of lack of standardization of supervisors' ratings, introduced the CERS to systematically evaluate the trainee in his practicum experience. It is a 27-item instrument of which items deal specifically with behavior in the supervisory relationship. The items are scored on a 7-point Likert system from the highest +3 to the lowest -3. To guard against a response set, nine items were randomly chosen to be stated in a negative manner. The only reliability study reported is the original study which reported test-retest reliabilities of .94 and .95. The validity is substantiated as face validity, developed from the literature on the facilitative behaviors of counselor and

revised during use in a practicum course at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Procedures

The following procedures were used to complete this investigation.

Data Collection

The investigator visited the practicum classes during one of the first classes and asked for volunteers in the study. All volunteers were given the WFPT, the CPI, and the HDYT-B. The WROS was given over the phone to the volunteers, and this was explained at the time the investigator came into the class. The volunteers agreed to allow two of their practicum tapes from the second half of the practicum to be rated, in confidence, by two independent raters.

The practicum supervisors agreed to rate the two tapes to be rated by the independent judges also. The independent judges rated the tapes using the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales. A time sampling method was used rating three 4-minute segments from each tape, one segment from the beginning, middle, and end of the tape as recommended. The supervisors used the CERS for their rating of the tapes. There were two raters also trained to rate the WROS.

Rater Training Wisconsin

Relationship Orientation Scales

As indicated by the research, two nonprofessional judges were used to rate the WROS. There were two college sophomores, one male and one female, trained to do the rating. The basic

instructions can be found in Appendix B. The raters were asked to listen to each response and then to place themselves in the client's place. Based on that, the raters were to determine the degree to which they would be willing to enter into a counseling relationship with the counselor. There was a 5-point scale of degree of willingness to enter into a counseling relationship which the raters used in their rating. Level one, the lowest, judged the potential relationship thus: "I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person." Level five, the highest, stated: "I have the feeling that I could probably talk with this person about almost anything." Emphasis was given to rater personal reaction to the counselor. There were three tapes of trainees not in the study used for practice. Using a Pearson Product-moment Correlation, an interrater reliability of .92 was obtained for the three tapes suggesting that the raters were indeed rating similar aspects. An interrater reliability of .94 was obtained by the raters on the 35 study tapes.

Carkhuff Scales

There were two raters, one male and one female, both graduate students, used as the independent judges. Rater training for the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales involved 15 hours of preparatory work. The two raters had both recently completed a graduate course in Values Clarification which emphasized and gave practice in Gazda's (1973) communication model. Gazda's Human relations development (1973) was the text the two raters were familiar with and from which their

classroom training in communication had been developed.

The two raters were trained according to a Gazda (1973)--Carkhuff (1969a) model. Training for the two raters lasted approximately 20 hours. Before and after training, Carkhuff's Index of Discrimination was administered to ascertain the raters' level of discriminative functioning. The preratings compared to Carkhuff's findings for the ratings of beginning psychology students and experienced counselors not systematically trained (according to Carkhuff's method). The postratings compared to those of counselors systematically trained.

The raters obtained interrater reliabilities of .95 for Empathy, .94 for Respect, .95 for Concreteness, .96 for Genuineness, and .96 for the Gross Rating for Facilitative Genuineness for the 70 study tapes. These ratings were all in the middle .90s and were considered to be quite adequate for the purposes of this investigation.

Treatment of the Data

The ORIG and INT scores were obtained by summing the raw scores of the individual scales for each from the WFPT and the CPI. These summed ORIG and INT scores formed the first two variables of the set of two obtained. The next variable was the raw score obtained from the HDYT-B. The raw score of the CSS scale of the CPI formed the fourth variable used. The summed raw scores obtained by the two raters of the WROS, for each participant, formed the fifth variable and final predictor variable.

The participants all turned in two tapes for judging by the independent raters, producing two ratings for each tape and four ratings for each participant. The independent judges each rated three segments of each tape according to the five Carkhuff (1969a) Scales. Therefore, three scores for each scale for each tape by each rater was obtained (see Appendix D). The 12 separate scores for each scale were then summed and that summed score was used as the score entered for that variable. This procedure was carried out for the Carkhuff Scales.

The last variable was the summed score of the two CERS forms completed by each supervisor for each of the two tapes rated by the independent judges. The summed CERS was also a raw score.

All scores used were raw scores. Where more than one instrument was used to obtain the score or more than one rater judged, the obtained raw scores were summed. All instruments were hand scored with summing done with the aid of a desk calculator. All sums were checked twice.

The interrater correlations were calculated by a Pearson Correlation on a Marchant Cogito 1016PR computer, in which the data were entered via a keyboard. The remaining data were punched in computer cards and processed using the SPSS system of data analysis by the College of William and Mary Computer Center, Williamsburg, Virginia, on the IBM 360/50 digital computer.

Statistical Methods

The statistical methods employed in the treatment of the data

were designed to determine if:

1. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will be significantly correlated with each other

2. Subjects' ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness and the CERS will be significantly correlated with each other

3. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will be significantly correlated with the subjects' ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and the CERS

4. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will contribute significantly to the variance of their ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and the CERS, permitting the construction of personality based prediction equations.

There were two statistical methods used. First, a Pearson Product-moment Correlation was used to investigate the relationship among the variables ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, WROS, EMPATHY, RESPECT, CONCRETENESS, GENUINENESS, CERS, GROSS RATING OF FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS. The SPSS subprogram PEARCORR was used. Second, six stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the relative importance and relationship of the predictor variables to each of the criterion variables. The SPSS subprogram REGRESSION was used.

Chapter 4

Analysis of Data

The results of the present investigation are presented in Chapter 4 by hypotheses. Appropriate comparisons and remarks are presented as the final part of each presentation.

Hypothesis 1

It was hypothesized that subjects' scores on Origence (ORIG), Intellectence (INT), How Do You Think (HDYT-B), Counselor Selection Scale (CSS), and Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS) will be significantly correlated with each other. Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the variables are presented in Table 1.

The WROS was found to be significantly correlated to ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, and CSS at beyond the .05 level of confidence. The scores on the CSS were significantly correlated at the .05 level to ORIG, HDYT-B, and the WROS, while the correlation with INT approached significance ($p < .06$). The CSS and the WROS, the two counselor selection instruments, exhibited a high correlation coefficient .63, and their correlation was significant at beyond the .05 level of confidence. In fact, it was shown to be significant at the .001 level of confidence.

As indicated in Table 1, the scores on the HDYT-B were not significantly correlated to ORIG, one of the dimensions of Welsh's (1975) model of personality and creativity. However, it was significantly correlated to the other dimension, INT ($p < .05$), as well

as CSS and WROS. The two dimensions of Welsh's personality model, ORIG and INT, were not correlated, with a correlation coefficient of only .0077. This finding was in keeping with the statements of Welsh (1975), and were as expected.

In summary, Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Only CSS and WROS significantly correlated with all the predictor variables, with WROS having the strongest correlations with the other variables. INT and HDYT-B were both nonsignificantly correlated with ORIG. ORIG was correlated with only two other predictor variables, CSS and WROS.

Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that subjects' ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS will be significantly correlated with each other. Pearson Correlation Coefficients are presented in Table 2.

As was expected, the correlation coefficients for the first five variables, the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales are very high, in the middle to upper .90s. The correlation coefficients range from .96 to .99. All the correlation coefficients for the five Carkhuff Scales (Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, and Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness) were significant at beyond the .05 level of confidence ($p < .001$).

The correlation coefficients for the sixth criterion variable, CERS with the five Carkhuff (1969a) Scales, ranged from .41 to .50. While these correlation coefficients are high, they are, as expected, not as high as the intercorrelations of the Carkhuff Scales

Table 2
 Intercorrelations of the Criterion Variables Empathy,
 Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating
 of Facilitative Genuineness, and Counselor
 Evaluation Rating Scale

	Respect	Concrete- ness	Genuine- ness	Gross Rating of Counselor Facili- tative Genuine- ness	Evalua- tion Rating Scale
Empathy	0.9584**	0.9700**	0.9584**	0.9872**	0.4110*
Respect		0.9615**	0.9751**	0.9792**	0.4716*
Concreteness			0.9657**	0.9839**	0.4646*
Genuineness				0.9803**	0.4955**
Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness					0.4604*

Note. $n = 35$ for all correlations.

* Significant at $p < .01$.

** Significant at $p < .001$.

themselves. The differences are reflected in reduced significant levels for the intercorrelation of the Carkhuff Scales with the CERS. The CERS was significantly correlated at beyond the .05 level of confidence ($p < .01$) to Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, and Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness.

In summary, Hypothesis 2 was accepted at the .05 level, as all the criterion variables are significantly intercorrelated. The very high and significant intercorrelations among the five Carkhuff (1969a) Scales were as expected. While the intercorrelations among the five Carkhuff Scales with the CERS were high and significant, they were lower, as expected. While the instruments were designed to measure approximately the same phenomenon (counselor trainee effectiveness), they were designed to measure from a different vantage point and to measure some different aspects of effectiveness.

Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will be significantly correlated with the subjects' ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS. Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the variables are presented in Table 3.

Only two of the predictor variables were correlated with any of the first five criterion variables. The WROS was significantly correlated with all six of the criterion variables at beyond the .05 ($p < .001$) level of confidence. The correlation coefficients ranged from .64 to .69.

Table 3

Intercorrelations of Predictor Variables with Criterion Variables

Predictor variables	Empathy	Respect	Concreteness	Genuineness	Facilitative	Gross Rating
Origence	0.3524*	0.3535*	0.3994**	0.4238**	0.3681*	0.3734*
Intellectence	0.1103	0.1846	0.0838	0.1205	0.1295	0.3141*
How Do You Think-B	0.1070	0.2175	0.1317	0.2063	0.1600	0.4515*
Counselor Selection Scale	0.2223	0.2687	0.1893	0.2540	0.2346	0.5006***
Wisconsin Relationship						
Orientation Scale	0.6356***	0.6883***	0.6543***	0.6581***	0.6630***	0.6464***

Note. $n = 35$ for all correlations.

* Significant at $p < .05$.

** Significant at $p < .01$.

*** Significant at $p < .001$.

ORIG was also found to be significantly correlated to all six of the criterion measures. ORIG significantly correlated with Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS at beyond the .05 level of confidence. No significant correlations were found between INT, HDYT-B, and CSS and any of the first five criterion variables. However, INT, HDYT-B, and CSS were significantly correlated to the variable CERS at the .05 level of confidence.

In summary, Hypothesis 3 was rejected. INT, HDYT-B, and CSS were not found to be significantly correlated with any of the first five criterion variables. However, two of the predictor variables, ORIG and WROS, showed significant correlations with all six criterion variables, with the WROS correlations all significant at the .001 level of confidence, and ORIG at the .01 level of confidence. The findings of ORIG and WROS were in the expected directions.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis was that subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will contribute significantly to the variance of their ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS, thus permitting the construction of personality based prediction equations. If subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS contributed sufficiently to the variance in the criterion variables Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS, then individual prediction equations could be developed for

the predictor variables on each criterion variable. Therefore, six forward stepwise inclusion regression analyses were performed.

The SPSS subprogram REGRESSION was used with the forward stepwise inclusion optional method. Forward stepwise inclusion regression analysis reexamines each of the variables in the regression equation at each step of the regression. Each variable is examined to determine if it is the best possible variable to enter at that step. The forward stepwise inclusion option of REGRESSION permits the computer to determine the order of inclusion. It chooses the variable that accounts for the greatest amount of variance first, and the variable that explains the greatest amount of variance, not explained by the variable(s) already included will be entered next and so on.

Regression analysis was performed first on the criterion, Empathy, the first of the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales. R^2 measures the percent of the total variation in the criterion variable accounted for by the regression. In Table 4, the last R^2 variable entered shows that the combination of predictor variables for the criterion variable Empathy explained 53.55% of the total variation. R^2 change values show that WROS, HDYT-B, and CSS accounted for most of the variance in the regression equation. ORIG accounted for less than .5% of the variance, while INT accounted for 2.6% of the variance. It should be noted that unless the change value is at least .03 or above, it will be considered as offering very little to

Table 4
Multiple Regression Summary Table for
Criterion Variable Empathy

	Multiple R ^a	R square ^b	R square change	Simple R ^a	<u>F</u> ratio
Wisconsin Relationship					
Orientation Scale	0.63556	0.40394	0.40394	0.63556	22.36324
How Do You Think-B	0.68839	0.47388	0.06994	0.10698	14.41110
Counselor Selection					
Scale	0.71067	0.50506	0.03118	0.22227	10.54456
Intellectence	0.72886	0.53124	0.02618	0.11025	8.49969
Origence	0.73175	0.53546	0.00422	0.35239	6.68539

Note. All F ratio values for each variable at each step significant at $p < .001$.

^aR--correlation coefficient.

^bR square--percentage of explained variation.

the predictive power of the equation for this investigation as regards the discussion.

The analysis of variance F ratio measures the significance of each potential predictor variable as it is entered into the regression equation. In the criterion variable, Empathy, the entry of all five predictor variables resulted in significant F values ($p < .001$) at each of the five steps of the analysis. Even though all F values for the five predictor variables were significant at the .001 level of confidence as they were entered into the equation, the R^2 change value indicates that the best regression equation for Empathy is that produced at Step 3 by WROS, HDYT-B, and CSS, and accounting for 50% of the variance.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EMP} = & 10.1256 + (1.2714 \times \text{WROS score}) \\ & + (-.0712 \times \text{HDYT-B score}) + \\ & (-.7991 \times \text{CSS score}) \end{aligned}$$

For summary of regression analysis at each step of equation formation, see Table 10 in Appendix F.

Regression analysis was next performed on the Carkhuff (1969a) Scale, Respect. In Table 5, the R^2 value entered indicates that the five predictor variables explained 55.18% of the total variance for Respect. R^2 change value show that WROS and CSS accounted for most of the variance in the equation, 51.82%.

All F ratios were significant ($p < .05$) at each step of the equation. However, INT accounted for little better than 2% of the total variance, HDYT-B accounted for 1%, and ORIG only .28%.

Table 5
Multiple Regression Summary Table for
Criterion Variable Respect

	Multiple R ^a	R square ^b	R square change	Simple R ^a	<u>F</u> ratio
Wisconsin Relationship					
Orientation Scale	0.68826	0.47370	0.47370	0.68826	29.70166
Counselor Selection					
Scale	0.71990	0.51825	0.04455	0.26865	17.21245
Intellectence	0.73415	0.53897	0.02072	0.18459	12.08021
How Do You Think-B	0.74095	0.54901	0.01004	0.21748	9.13003
Origence	0.74286	0.55184	0.00283	0.35346	7.14172

Note. All F ratio values for each variable at each step significant at $p < .001$.

^aR--correlation coefficient.

^bR square--percentage of explained variation.

Therefore, the best single regression equation for Respect was that generated in Step 2 by WROS and CSS.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RES} = & 2.1826 + (1.0269 \times \text{WROS score}) \\ & + (-.8086 \times \text{CSS score}) \end{aligned}$$

For summary of regression analysis at each step of equation formation, see Table 11 in Appendix F.

The next regression equation was performed on the Carkhuff (1969a) Scale of Concreteness. Table 6 shows that the final R^2 value entered indicated that the five predictor variables explained 60.20% of the total variance in Concreteness. R^2 change values indicate that WROS, CSS, and INT accounted for most of the variance in the equation, 56.76%.

All F ratios were significant ($p < .001$) at each step of the equation (see Table 6). Nevertheless, HDYT-B accounted for little more than 2% of the total variance, and ORIG little better than 1%. Accordingly, the best single regression equation for Concreteness was that generated at Step 3 by WROS, CSS, and INT.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CONC} = & 17.9482 + (1.3363 \times \text{WROS score}) \\ & + (-1.2282 \times \text{CSS score}) + \\ & (-.2768 \times \text{INT score}) \end{aligned}$$

For summary of regression analysis at each step of equation formation, see Table 12 in Appendix F.

Genuineness was the next Carkhuff (1969a) Scale entered into regression analysis. The five predictor variables together accounted

Table 6
 Multiple Regression Summary Table for
 Criterion Variable Concreteness

	Multiple R ^a	R square ^b	R square change	Simple R ^a	<u>F</u> ratio
Wisconsin Relationship					
Orientation Scale	0.65424	0.42803	0.42803	0.65424	24.69579
Counselor Selection					
Scale	0.71387	0.50962	0.08158	0.18930	16.62745
Intellectence	0.75345	0.56769	0.05807	0.08376	13.56917
How Do You Think-B	0.76791	0.58968	0.02199	0.13165	10.77846
Origence	0.77593	0.60206	0.01238	0.39944	8.77513

Note. All F ratio values for each variable at each step significant at $p < .001$.

^aR--correlation coefficient.

^bR square--percentage of explained variation.

for 54.12% of the total variance in Genuineness as indicated by the final R^2 value in Table 7. R^2 change values indicated that most of the total variance explained was accounted for by the WROS, CSS, and INT.

All F ratios were significant at the .001 level of confidence, at each step of the equation, as shown in Table 7. However, ORIG accounted for slightly less than 2% of the total variance and HDYT-B on .64% of the variance for Genuineness. Therefore, the equation generated at Step 3 of the regression analysis appears to be the best single regression equation for Genuineness.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GEN} = & 11.2566 + (1.2881 \text{ X WROS score}) \\ & + (-1.0313 \text{ X CSS score}) + \\ & (-.2001 \text{ X INT score}) \end{aligned}$$

For summary of regression analysis at each step of equation formation, see Table 13 in Appendix F.

Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness was the final Carkhuff (1969a) Scale submitted to regression analysis. The final R^2 value in Table 8 indicated that 55.68% of the total variance was accounted for by the five predictor variables. R^2 change values indicated that the WROS, CSS, and INT alone accounted for 53.18% of the variance.

Table 8 indicated that at each step of the equation, all F ratios were significant ($p < .001$). However, HDYT-B accounted for only 1.95% of the total variance and ORIG .54%. Accordingly,

Table 7
Multiple Regression Summary Table for
Criterion Variable Genuineness

	Multiple R ^a	R square ^b	R square change	Simple R ^a	<u>F</u> ratio
Wisconsin Relationship					
Orientation Scale	0.65809	0.43308	0.43308	0.65809	25.20930
Counselor Selection					
Scale	0.68943	0.47531	0.04223	0.25401	14.49448
Intellectence	0.71797	0.51548	0.04017	0.12049	10.99363
Origence	0.73133	0.53485	0.01937	0.42378	8.62375
How Do You Think-B	0.73571	0.54127	0.00642	0.20628	6.84355

Note. All F ratio values for each variable at each step significant at $p < .001$.

^aR--correlation coefficient.

^bR square--percentage of explained variation.

Table 8
Multiple Regression Summary Table for
Criterion Variable Gross Rating
of Facilitative Genuineness

	Multiple R ^a	R square ^b	R square change	Simple R ^a	<u>F</u> ratio
Wisconsin Relationship					
Orientation Scale	0.66298	0.43954	0.43954	0.66298	25.88006
Counselor Selection					
Scale	0.70322	0.49453	0.05499	0.23455	15.65342
Intellectence	0.72931	0.53189	0.03737	0.12948	11.74147
How Do You Think-B	0.74256	0.55139	0.01950	0.16000	9.21832
Origence	0.74620	0.55682	0.00543	0.36809	7.28713

Note. All F ratio values for each variable at each step significant at $p < .001$.

^aR--correlation coefficient.

^bR square--percentage of explained variation.

Table 13 in Appendix F indicated that the best single regression was that generated at Step 3 by WROS, CSS, and INT for Gross Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GROSS} = & 11.9682 + (1.2756 \times \text{WROS score}) \\ & + (-1.0201 \times \text{CSS score}) + \\ & (-.2248 \times \text{INT score}) \end{aligned}$$

For summary of regression analysis of each step of equation, see Table 14 in Appendix F.

The final criterion variable submitted to regression analysis was CERS. As indicated in Table 9, the five predictor variables together accounted for 45.30% of the total variance in CERS. R^2 change values indicated that the variable WROS alone accounted for most of the variance in CERS.

Significant F ratios at the .001 level of confidence were obtained at each step of the equation for the variables WROS, HDYT-B, ORIG, and CSS, with a significant F ratio of .01 being obtained at the final step of the equation for INT (see Table 9). WROS alone accounted for 41.77% of the total variance of CERS. From Table 14, R^2 change values indicated that variable HDYT-B accounted for 1.77%, ORIG for 1.05%, CSS for .61%, and INT for .07% of the variance. Accordingly, the variable WROS alone, at Step 1, generated the best single regression equation for CERS.

$$\text{CERS} = 36.8126 + (4.8489 \times \text{WROS score})$$

For summary of regression analysis at each step, see Table 15 in

Table 9
Multiple Regression Summary Table for
Criterion Variable Counselor
Evaluation Rating Scale

	Multiple R ^a	R square ^b	R square change	Simple R ^a	F ratio
Wisconsin Relationship					
Orientation Scale	0.64637	0.41779	0.41779	0.64637	23.68047*
How Do You Think-B	0.65992	0.43549	0.01770	0.45145	12.34322*
Origence	0.66787	0.44605	0.1055	0.37343	8.32044*
Counselor Selection					
Scale	0.67247	0.45222	0.00618	0.50062	6.19168*
Intellectence	0.67306	0.45301	0.00079	0.31412	4.80347**

* Significant at $p < .001$.

** Significant at $p < .005$.

^aR--correlation coefficient.

^bR square--percentage of explained variation.

Appendix F.

In summary, it must be noted that the variable WROS alone most powerfully accounted for most of the variance in the regression analysis performed on each of the six criterion variables. The next most powerful predictor appeared to be the variable CSS which was included in five of the partial regression equations considered adequate by this investigator. The variable INT was considered to have an adequate R^2 change value to be included in three of the partial regression equations and HDYT-B in one. Of the five predictor variables, ORIG alone was not considered to have had an adequate R^2 change value to be entered into any of the partial equations. Finally, it should be noted that for the criterion variable CERS, only the predictor variable WROS was considered potent according to the R^2 change scores. The hypothesis was accepted at the .05 level, as all F ratios were significant at beyond the .01 level of confidence, indicating that the predictor variables did contribute significantly to the variance in each of the criterion variables.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Chapter 5 will provide a summary of the study and interpretation of the results with conclusions and recommendations according to hypotheses. In addition, recommendations for further study will be suggested.

Summary

Counselor selection procedures have come under increasing scrutiny, and the continued use of intellective selection techniques questioned (Menne, 1973). The purpose of this study was, therefore, to develop a personality based prediction methodology for counselor trainee selection.

There were two personality based instruments designed specifically for counselor trainee selection chosen for use in this study, the Counselor Selection Scale (CSS) and the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS). A specific personality dimension that has been given increasing attention as a potential trait of effective counselors, that of creativity, was chosen for inclusion in the study. There were two different methods of measuring the personality construct of creativity used. First, Welsh's (1975) two-dimensional model of personality and creativity employing Origence (ORIG) and Intellectence (INT) was implemented. Second, Davis's (1975) How Do You Think-B (HDYT-B) was chosen as a supplement to Welsh's measures, since it contained biographical data which has been shown to be related to creativity (Whiting, 1971).

Practicum students of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia ($N = 9$), Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia ($N = 22$), and Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia ($N = 4$), formed the study group. The study group was given the testing package of predictor measures at the beginning of their practicum experience. In order to provide adequate standardized criterion measures, five of the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales (Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, and Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness) along with the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale were employed. These measures were applied to two tapes turned in by each practicum student near the end of the practicum experience.

In order to facilitate this process, the following four hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will be significantly correlated with each other.

Hypothesis 2. Subjects' ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) will be significantly correlated with each other.

Hypothesis 3. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will be significantly correlated with the subjects' ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS.

Hypothesis 4. Subjects' scores on ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, and WROS will contribute significantly to the variance of their

ratings on Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and CERS, thus permitting the construction of personality based prediction equations.

There were two statistical methods used. First, a Pearson Product-moment Correlation was used to investigate the relationship among the variables (ORIG, INT, HDYT-B, CSS, WROS, Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Gross Rating of Facilitative Genuineness, and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale). Second, six stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the relative importance and relationship of the predictor variables to each of the criterion variables. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence.

Conclusions

Conclusions concerning the relationship of creativity to counselors effectiveness, and the construction of personality based prediction equations will be presented in this section by hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 was rejected at the .05 level. Pearson Product-moment Correlation showed only the WROS to be significantly correlated to each of the other four predictor variables with significance levels of .05 or better. The WROS and the CSS, the two counselor selection instruments, had the highest correlation coefficients (.63) of the predictor variables. The two dimensions of Welsh's (1975) personality theory, ORIG and INT, had the lowest correlation coefficients (.01), and, as expected, were not significantly correlated. ORIG and HDYT-B

the two measures of the dimension of creative potential, were not significantly correlated. Both ORIG and HDYT-B were significantly correlated to CSS and WROS at beyond the .05 level of confidence.

These findings indicate that the personality variable of creativity is related to other personality based counselor selection instruments, namely the CSS and the WROS. From the strength of the correlation coefficients, it appears that much of what is measured as the personality construct, creativity, is similar to what is being measured by the personality based counselor selection instruments.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 was accepted at the .05 level. Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Hypothesis 2 indicated that the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales were all significantly correlated ($p < .001$) with correlation coefficients in the middle to upper .90s. The criterion variable CERS was also shown to be significantly correlated to the Carkhuff Scales at beyond the .05 level of confidence ($p < .01$) with correlation coefficients ranging from .4110 to .4955.

The results of Hypothesis 2 are in keeping with the findings of Hefele and Hurst (1972). The intracorrelations among the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales are very high. The correlations with the CERS with the five Carkhuff Scales support the findings of Palmer (1975) which indicate that though the Carkhuff Scales and the CERS do measure counselor effectiveness, they measure slightly different aspects of it.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 was rejected at the .05 level. Pearson Correlation Coefficients indicated only two variables to be significantly correlated to the five Carkhuff (1969a) Scales. The variables ORIG and WROS were significantly correlated with all the criterion variables, with WROS showing stronger correlations all significant at the .001 level of confidence. The variables INT, HDYT-B, and CSS were not shown to be significantly correlated with the scores for the five Carkhuff Scales, but were significantly correlated to the scores on the CERS ($p < .05$).

The results of Hypotehsis 3 are not completely clear, but they do offer support to the conclusion drawn from Hypothesis 1 that creativity is related to counselor effectiveness. Only two predictor variables were significantly correlated with all six criterion measures, the variables ORIG and WROS. There were two guarded conclusions drawn. First, the personality variable creativity does appear to be linked to counselor effectiveness as measured by the ORIG on all six criterion variables and HDYT-B on CERS. However, it must be noted that Hypothesis 1 showed ORIG and HDYT-B to measure creativity from different viewpoints, and in Hypothesis 3, HDYT-B is correlated to only one of the measures of counselor effectiveness, the CERS. Second, what is measured by the personality based counselor selection instrument WROS is highly correlated to what is measured by all six measures of counselor effectiveness. The other personality based counselor selection instrument, the CSS, was highly

correlated to what was measured by the variable CERS. However, the variable CSS did show much correlation with the Carkhuff (1969a) Scales of which only one was above the .100 level of significance.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 was accepted at beyond the .05 level. Multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 4 indicated that the variable WROS was the most potent single variable, being chosen to be entered first into each of the six regression equations. Although F ratios were significant for each predictor variable at each step of the six regression equations, R^2 change values indicated that only regression equations generated at one of the early steps of the analysis be used in each six cases rather than using all five predictor variables. As a result, the variable CSS appeared to be the next most potent in accounting for the variance, obtaining adequate R^2 change values to be included in five of the partial regression equations. The variable INT was included in three and HDYT-B in one. For the criterion variable CERS, the predictor variable WROS generated the best regression equation by itself.

It is concluded, therefore, that the six regression equations generated and the F ratios at each step in Hypothesis 4 lend strength to the indications found in Hypotheses 1 and 3 that creativity is positively related to counselor effectiveness. The findings of Brophy and Ramiriz (1972), Farwell (1975), and Wasson (1965) also find support in the fact that the WROS proved to be the single most

powerful predictor variable of counselor effectiveness in each of the six regression equations. This finding would lend support to the findings in Hypothesis 3 concerning the high correlations between the WROS and all measures of counselor effectiveness. Lewis's (1973) CSS found some further validation as to its usefulness in counselor selection also, proving to be the second most powerful predictor, and adding to the predictive power of WROS, in five of the generated regression equations.

Recommendations

Further support was found in this investigation for the theory of the positive correlation of the personality construct of creativity to the personalities of effective counselors (Garfield, 1967; Partin, 1975). The high positive correlations of ORIG and HDYT-B to the WROS and CSS indicate that there is some overlapping in the two different sets of instruments. Additionally, it must be emphasized that ORIG was highly correlated to all the criterion measures used in the study. The measures of creativity in the regression equation significantly accounted for variance for each criterion measure, suggesting that creativity is positively correlated to counselor effectiveness. However, HDYT-B was the only measure of creativity that added sufficiently to the predictive power of any of the regression equations and, therefore, was included in only three of them. There are two recommendations made for the further study of the personality variable creativity as it relates to counselor effectiveness. First, results indicate that other measures of creativity

should be explored if the researcher chooses to continue with the regression approach to data analysis with these variables. Second, in light of the fact that ORIG had high positive correlations to the WROS and to all measures of counselor effectiveness, it is suggested that research be continued to place effective counselors in Welsh's (1975) two-dimensional model of personality and creativity. A regression approach could continue to be used as well as analysis of variance with groups of most and least effective counselors.

The WROS and the CSS, which were correlated with counselor effectiveness and were the most accurate predictors of effectiveness, should be used with entering counseling students to ascertain their predictive ability over time. While this has been done with WROS at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, it has not been done for the CSS. It is further suggested that the WROS and CSS be added to present intellectual measures of counselor selection and prediction equations based on those variables being used. The present study did not take the intellectual measures used into account, but rather, showed the efficacy of using a personality based selection criterion. It is presumed that more of the total variance in some of the measures of counselor effectiveness could be accounted for in this manner, thus providing the counselor training institutions with a more effective selection criterion.

Finally, the results of the study indicate that what is measured by the WROS and the measures of creativity overlap considerably. It is, therefore, suggested that further research on other

factors the WROS measures be instituted. The present research is the first which indicates that the WROS measures a criterion other than potential counselor effectiveness. If it were known what other factors the WROS measures, it would be possible to use other, more weakly correlated factors with WROS to improve its predictive power.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

How Do You Think? (Form B)

Name _____

Code H _____

How Do You Think (?) (HYDT)

A Describe Yourself Inventory

by

Professor Gary Davis

These questions ask about your interests, attitudes, and self-perceptions. All questions are in a rating-scale form which allows you to indicate the degree to which the statement applies to you, or the degree to which you agree with or accept the statement. Mark your answers on the separate score sheet. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, just be honest.

Part A.

Indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you. Mark your answers on your score sheet according to the following scale.

- a. No
- b. To a small extent
- c. Average
- d. More than average
- e. Definitely

1. I enjoy the confusion of a big city.
2. I often think like a child.
3. I am sophisticated.

4. I am very independent.
5. I am very likely to do things on impulse.
6. I choke-up or sob in many movies
7. I would like to live and work in a foreign country.
8. When I was young, I was always building or making things.
9. I would like to learn mountain-climbing.
10. I usually value others' opinions more than my own.
11. I have a great many interests.
12. I am unconventional in many ways.
13. I would like to try sky-diving (parachute jumping).
14. I prefer to preplan and schedule vacations carefully.
15. I have done a lot of creative writing.
16. My parents participate in, or were highly interested in,
art or writing.
17. My parents were always in some form of hobbies or handi-
crafts.
18. I am a sensitive person.
19. I am very artistic.
20. I am neat and well-ordered.
21. I would like to have lived in the early unsettled days of
our American history.
22. I am quite absent-minded.
23. I worry about being considered foolish.
24. I am often inventive or ingenious.
25. I enjoy trying new approaches to problems.

26. I usually jump right into a lake or cold pool, instead of slowly getting used to it.

27. I am a risk-taker.

28. I would like to be hypnotized.

29. I like a cold, brisk day.

Part B.

Indicate the degree to which you accept or believe the seven statements below. Use the following scale.

- a. False
- b. Probably False
- c. Don't know (neutral)
- d. Might be true
- e. True

30. Many people can mentally communicate with others through extra-sensory perception (ESP).

31. Psychics truly possess a mysterious ability to know things about a person's past and future.

32. Psychics also are able to predict such things as national disasters, election results, political assassinations, et cetera.

33. Many stories of mysterious, psychical happenings are true.

34. Spirits may be contacted by mediums or others with special psychic powers.

35. Flying saucers are visitors from outer space.

36. Strong mental concentration can exert a slight physical force.

Part C.

Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the statement below. Mark your score sheet according to the following scale.

- a. Totally disagree
- b. Mostly disagree
- c. Neutral
- d. Mostly agree
- e. Totally agree

37. It is better to live life to the fullest, rather than search for peace and happiness.

38. It is important to be able to laugh at ourselves.

39. It is better to be calm and even-tempered than emotionally expressive.

40. The world would be better off if youth were disciplined more severely.

41. A good painting should give you a jolt.

42. I know what I will be doing ten years from now.

43. I would rate myself high in self-confidence.

Part D.

Indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you.

Use the following scale.

- a. No
- b. To a small extent
- c. Average
- d. More than average

e. Definitely

44. I am confident in my intellectual ability.
45. I worry about making mistakes.
46. I tend to be cynical.
47. I would like a career which involves much traveling.
48. I have a great sense of humor.
49. I have always been active in drawing or painting.
50. I prefer activities which are predictable.
51. I would like to get a pilot's license.
52. I like to explore new cities alone, even if I get lost.
53. I am a very active, energetic person.
54. I enjoy thinking of new and better ways of doing things.
55. I am very curious.
56. I tend to become childishly involved with simple things.
57. I am quite original and imaginative.
58. I have had many hobbies.
59. Some of my past or present hobbies would be considered
unusual.
60. I am very idealistic.
61. I like the nonsense forms and bright colors of modern
art.
62. I enjoy some amount of ambiguity in life.
63. My ideas are often considered "impractical" or even
"wild."
64. I would like to be considered courteous and emotionally

stable.

65. I am very concerned about what others think of me.
66. I like to play tag, hopscotch, et cetera with the kids.
67. I have a peaceful, nonenthusiastic approach to life.
68. I am very "reflective."
69. I would rate myself high in "intuition" or "insightfulness."
70. I avoid activities which are a little frightening.
71. I like some body smells.
72. I would take a college course which 50% flunk.
73. I am able to work intensely on a project for many hours.
74. I like trying new ideas and new approaches to problems.
75. I am witty.
76. I often become totally engrossed in a new idea.
77. I live in a room which is usually a mess.
78. On vacation, I prefer a good motel to camping.
79. I am absolutely against drugs which might produce hallucinations or other strange effects.
80. I would like to take up skiing.
81. I am very conscious of aesthetic considerations.
82. Most of my friends are unconventional.
83. The word "quick" describes me.
84. I try to use metaphors and analogies in my writing.
85. I am moody.
86. I could be considered a "spontaneous" person.

87. I have engaged in a lot of creative activities.
88. I take a playful approach to most things.
89. I am always open to new ideas and new activities.
90. Throughout my education, I had a lot of part-time jobs.
91. I have participated in theatrical productions.
92. I am usually outspoken in my opinions.
93. Financial success is highly important to me.
94. I often reflect on my personal values.
95. I often attend concerts.
96. My parents visit art galleries and museums.
97. I enjoy a job with unforeseeable difficulties.
98. I think it's fun to explore museums.
99. I think old attics are generally dirty and uninteresting.
100. I can sometimes "get lost" in the library for hours, just looking at interesting books.
101. Sometimes I get so interested in a new idea that I neglect what I should be doing.
102. I have taken things apart just to find out how they work.

APPENDIX B

Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale

Tape Rating Instructions: Wisconsin

Relationship Orientation

Scale (WROS)

Level 1: I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person.

Level 2: If no one else were available, I might consult this person for specific information of a factual, e.g., educational or vocational nature, but I would avoid any personal exposure.

Level 3: I would be willing to talk with this person about factual, e.g., educational or vocational concerns, and some of the personal meanings connected with these.

Level 4: I would be willing to talk with this person about many of my personal concerns.

Level 5: I have the feeling that I could probably talk with this person about almost anything.

(Half-step ratings are not permitted on this scale.)

(The material requested here will be held in strict confidence.)

Instructions for Rating

1. Listen to the segment as if you were the client. Try to experience the counselor's response as you think the client would.

As you project yourself into the role of a client, you are

asked to perceive the role insofar as you are able, in the following way:

As a client, your greatest concern is to experience in the communication of the counselor a sincere warmth, liking, and interest in you as a person. You must feel that the counselor is able to see your world as you see it without evaluating either you or your perceptions. You must sense in him a respect for you, your attitudes and values, and your capacity to integrate your experiences and arrive at your own choices and decisions.

2. On the basis of the counselor's response, indicate the degree to which you yourself would be willing to seek assistance from him in a counseling relationship.

Incidents Trainees Responded to for

WROS Rating

Now I would like to present you with a number of situations which have arisen in school settings. You are not expected to have had experience, necessarily, as a counselor although you may have. You are asked to relate everything that you see being important should you find yourself working with these individuals.

1. You have occasion to meet with a student who is not doing well in school. Often the student is called "lazy" by other students and teachers and the student agrees this is so.

2. A student comes to you and tells you that he has stolen money from another student's locker. He knows that he was seen taking

the money and he expects to be apprehended in a short time.

3. An 11th grade girl states that she is fed up with school and she wants to quit.

4. A 12th grade boy asks for help in deciding whether to go to college or to enter the military service.

5. A 10th grade girl confides to you that she is three months pregnant.

6. You learn of a student who is being "picked on" by other students.

7. A woman who quit school eight years ago stops in.

8. A 7th grade boy reveals to you a sordid tale of marital strife between his mother and dad.

Rater Sheet for WROS

Rater _____

Using the WROS rating given you please rate each of the eight segments on a 1 to 5 scale below:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

Code # _____

APPENDIX C

Carkhuff Scales

The Communication of Respect in

Interpersonal Processes

1.0 The verbal expressions of the counselor communicate a clear lack of respect for the client.

1.5

2.0 The counselor responds to the client in such a way as to communicate little respect for the feelings, experiences, and potentialities of the client.

2.5

3.0 The counselor communicates a positive respect and concern for the client's feelings, experiences, and potentialities.

3.5

4.0 The counselor communicates a deep respect and concern for the client.

4.5

5.0 The counselor communicates the very deepest respect for the client's worth as a person and his potentials as a free individual. (Carkhuff, 1969b, pp. 317-318.)

Personally Relevant Concreteness or

Specificity of Expression in

Interpersonal Process

1.0 The counselor leads or allows all discussion with the

client to deal only with vague and anonymous generalities.

1.5

2.0 The counselor frequently leads or allows even discussion of material personally relevant to the client to be dealt with only on a vague and abstract level.

2.5

3.0 The counselor at times enables the client to discuss personally relevant material in a specific and concrete terminology.

3.5

4.0 The counselor is frequently helpful in enabling the client to fully develop in concrete and specific terms almost all instances of concern.

4.5

5.0 The counselor is always helpful in guiding the discussion so that the client may discuss fluently, directly, and completely specific feelings and experiences. (Carkhuff, 1969b, pp. 323-324.)

Emphatic Understanding in

Interpersonal Process

1.0 The verbal expressions of the counselor do not attend to or detract significantly from the verbal expressions of the client in that they communicate significantly less of the client's feelings than the client has communicated.

1.5

2.0 While the counselor responds to the expressed feelings of the client, he does so in such a way that he subtracts noticeable

affect from the communications of the client.

2.5

3.0 The expressions of the counselor in response to the expressed feelings of the client are essentially interchangeable with those of the client in that they express essentially the affect and meaning.

3.5

4.0 The responses of the counselor add noticeably to the expressions of the client, in such a way as to express feelings a level deeper than the client was able to express.

4.5

5.0 The counselor's responses add significantly to the feeling and meaning of the expressions of the client in such a way as to (1) accurately express feelings levels below what the client was able to express or (2) in the event of on-going deep self-exploration on the client's part, to be fully with him in his deepest moments. (Carkhuff, 1969b, pp. 315-317.)

Facilitative Genuineness in

Interpersonal Process

1.0 The counselor's verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or his only genuine responses are negative in regard to the client's and appear to have a totally destructive effect upon the client.

1.5

2.0 The counselor's verbalizations are slightly unrelated to

what he is feeling at the moment, or when his responses are genuine they are negative in regard to the client; the counselor does not appear to know how to employ his negative reactions constructively as a basis for inquiry into the relationship.

2.5

3.0 The counselor provides no "negative" cues between what he says and what he feels, but he provides no positive cues to indicate a really genuine response to the client.

3.5

4.0 The counselor presents some positive cues indicating a genuine response (whether positive or negative) in a nondestructive manner to the client.

4.5

5.0 The counselor is freely and deeply in a nonexploitative relationship with the client. (Carkhuff, 1969b, pp. 319-320.)

Gross Ratings of Facilitative

Interpersonal Functioning

The counselor is a person who is living effectively himself and who discloses himself in a genuine and constructive fashion in response to others. He communicates an accurate emphatic understanding and a respect for all the specific feelings of other persons and guides discussions with those persons into specific feelings and experiences, he communicates confidence in what he is doing and is spontaneous and intense. In addition, while he is open and flexible in

his relations with others, in his commitment to the welfare of the other person he is quite capable of active, assertive, and even confronting behavior when it is appropriate.

1.0 None of these conditions are communicated to any noticeable degree.

1.5

2.0 Some of the conditions are communicated and some are not.

2.5

3.0 All of the conditions are communicated at a minimally facilitative level.

3.5

4.0 All of the conditions are communicated, and some are communicated fully.

4.5

5.0 All of the conditions are communicated simultaneously and continually. (Carkhuff, 1969a, p. 115.)

Rater Form for Carkhuff Scales

Rater _____

Please rate the three segments of each counseling session in the appropriate space below according to the scales you have been given.

Empathy Respect Concreteness Genuineness Cross

1.

2.

3.

Code # _____

APPENDIX D

Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale

Name of Counselor. Code #.

Level of Experience. Date:

Below are listed some statements which are related to evaluation in supervising a counseling experience. Please consider each statement with reference to your knowledge of the counselor rated.

Mark each statement in the left hand blank according to how strongly you agree or disagree. Do not mark in parentheses. Please mark every statement. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to represent the following:

- | | | | |
|----|------------------|----|---------------------|
| +3 | I strongly agree | -1 | I slightly disagree |
| +2 | I agree | -2 | I disagree |
| +1 | I slightly agree | -3 | I strongly disagree |

()....1. Demonstrates an interest in client's problems.

()....2. Tends to approach clients in a mechanical, perfunctory manner.

()....3. Lacks sensitivity to dynamics of self in supervisory relationship.

()....4. Seeks and considers professional opinion of supervisors and other counselors when the need arises.

()....5. Tends to talk more than client during counseling.

()....6. Is sensitive to dynamics of self in counseling relationships.

- ()....7. Cannot accept constructive criticism.
- ()....8. Is genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the counseling session.
- ()....9. Is aware of both content and feeling in counseling sessions.
- ()...10. Keeps appointments on time and completes supervisory assignments.
- ()...11. Can deal with content and feeling during supervision.
- ()...12. Tends to be rigid in counseling behavior.
- ()...13. Lectures and moralizes in counseling.
- ()...14. Can critique counseling tapes and gain insights with minimum help from supervisor.
- ()...15. Is genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the supervisory session.
- ()...16. Works well with other professional personnel (e.g., teachers, counselors, et cetera).
- ()...17. Can be spontaneous in counseling, but behavior is relevant.
- ()...18. Lacks self-confidence in establishing counseling relationships.
- ()...19. Can explain what is involved in counseling and discuss intelligently its objectives.
- ()...20. Is open to self-examination during supervision.

- ()...21. Can express thoughts and feelings clearly in counseling.
- ()...22. Verbal behavior in counseling is appropriately flexible and varied, according to the situation.
- ()...23. Lacks basic knowledge of fundamental counseling principles and methodology.
- ()...24. Participates actively and willingly in supervisory sessions.
- ()...25. Is indifferent to personal development and professional growth.
- ()...26. Applies a consistent rationale of human behavior to counseling.
- ()...27. Can be recommended for a counseling position without reservation.

Recommend Grade--

Comments:

APPENDIX E

Letter to Practicum Supervisors Explaining
Counselor Evaluation
Rating Scale

6102-A Lexington Court
Virginia Beach, Virginia
23462
Telephone: 424-4417
March, 1976

Dear Practicum Supervisor:

First, let me thank you for your assistance and continued support in my dissertation project. The first phase of the data collection is nearly over. The second phase, centered around the two practicum tapes, has already begun.

Please find enclosed copies of the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS). These are the forms that I earlier requested that you fill out on the two tapes the students would be turning in to you which would also be rated by my independent raters.

I would like to clarify one point of procedure. It does not matter if you go over the tape with the student, fill out the CERS, then turn the tape over to me, or turn the tape over to me first, go over it with the student, and then fill out the CERS. The important point is that the two tapes you fill out the CERS on are also the two tapes handed over to me for my independent raters.

The tapes you turn over to me will be out of your hands for no more than one week and in most cases only several days. If there is any way that I can be of further assistance to you, please don't hesitate to let me know.

Very sincerely,

s/s Lenard J. Wright

Lenard J. Wright

Graduate Student

College of William and Mary

Appendix F

Summary of Variables Entered into Predictive
Equations at Each Step for the
Criterion Variables

Table 10
 Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at
 Each Step for Criterion Variable Empathy

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Variables in equation at step 1				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	0.87772	0.63556	0.18561	22.363
Constant	-10.97387			
Variables in equation at step 2				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.10182	0.79783	0.20776	28.126
How Do You Think-B	- 0.08316	-0.31028	0.04032	4.254
Constant	3.75071			
Variables in equation at step 3				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.27143	0.92064	0.23800	28.539
How Do You Think-B	- 0.07125	-0.26585	0.04064	3.074

Table 10 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	F ratio
Counselor Selection Scale	0.79916	-0.23226	0.57184	1.953
Constant	10.12561			
Variables in equation at step 4				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.36974	0.99183	0.24739	30.655
How Do You Think-B	- 0.06119	-0.22832	0.04095	2.234
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.84131	-0.24452	0.56665	2.204
Intellectence	- 0.19764	-0.18460	0.15268	1.676
Constant	19.54483			
Variables in equation at step 5				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.32310	0.95806	0.26647	24.654
How Do You Think-B	- 0.06046	-0.22557	0.04148	2.124
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.89097	-0.25895	0.58184	2.345
Intellectence	- 0.17889	-0.16709	0.15885	1.268
Origence	0.04418	0.07566	0.08612	0.263

Table 10 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Constant	17.95996			

^aB--unstandardized regression coefficient.

^bBeta--standardized regression coefficient.

Table 11
 Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at
 Each Step for Criterion Variable Respect

Variable	B^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Variables in equation at step 1				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	0.82282	0.68826	0.15098	29.702
Constant	- 6.40064			
Variables in equation at step 2				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.02689	0.85896	0.18865	29.631
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.80856	-0.27146	0.47000	2.960
Constant	2.18261			
Variables in equation at step 3				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.11604	0.93353	0.20214	30.482
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.81799	-0.27463	0.46721	3.065

Table 11 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Intelligence	- 0.14942	-0.16122	0.12660	1.393
Constant	10.41212			
Variables in equation at step 4				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.15945	0.96984	0.21006	30.465
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.73289	-0.24606	0.48114	2.320
Intelligence	- 0.12931	-0.13952	0.12964	0.995
How Do You Think-B	- 0.02841	-0.12245	0.03477	0.668
Constant	13.44534			
Variables in equation at step 5				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.12638	0.94218	0.22657	24.715
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.76810	-0.25788	0.49472	2.410
Intelligence	- 0.11602	-0.12518	0.13507	0.738
How Do You Think-B	- 0.02789	-0.12020	0.03527	0.625
Origence	0.03133	0.06197	0.07323	0.183

Table 11 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Constant	12.32163			

^aB--unstandardized regression coefficient.

^bBeta--standardized regression coefficient.

Table 12
 Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at
 Each Step for Criterion Variable
 Concreteness

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Variables in equation at step 1				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	0.86553	0.65424	0.17417	24.696
Constant	-10.15171			
Variables in equation at step 2				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.17111	0.88522	0.21062	30.916
Counselor Selection Scale	- 1.21074	-0.36733	0.52475	5.324
Constant	2.70082			
Variables in equation at step 3				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.33628	1.01008	0.21661	38.056
Counselor Selection Scale	- 1.22821	-0.37263	0.50065	6.018

Table 12 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	F ratio
Intellectence	- 0.27684	-0.26992	0.13566	4.164
Constant	17.94820			
Variables in equation at step 4				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.40738	1.06382	0.22172	40.290
Counselor Selection Scale	- 1.08882	-0.33034	0.50786	4.597
Intellectence	- 0.24391	-0.23781	0.13684	3.177
How Do You Think-B	- 0.04653	-0.18124	0.03670	1.608
Constant	22.91618			
Variables in equation at step 5				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.33082	1.00595	0.23626	31.730
Counselor Selection Scale	- 1.17034	-0.35507	0.51587	5.147
Intellectence	- 0.21314	-0.20781	0.14084	2.290
How Do You Think-B	- 0.04532	-0.17653	0.03678	1.519
Origence	0.07253	0.12965	0.07636	0.902

Table 12 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Constant	20.31449			

^aB--unstandardized regression coefficient.

^bBeta--standardized regression coefficient.

Table 13
 Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at
 Each Step for Criterion Variable
 Genuineness

Variable	B^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Variables in equation at step 1				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	0.91338	0.65809	0.18192	25.209
Constant	-11.74863			
Variables in equation at step 2				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.14405	0.82428	0.22856	25.054
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.91394	-0.26430	0.56945	2.576
Constant	-2.04676			
Variables in equation at step 3				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.28817	0.92812	0.24058	28.669
Counselor Selection Scale	-0.92918	-0.26871	0.55606	2.792

Table 13 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Intellectence	- 0.24155	-0.22448	0.15068	2.570
Constant	11.25662			

Variables in equation at step 4

Wisconsin Relationship

Orientation Scale	1.19020	0.85753	0.25515	21.759
Counselor Selection Scale	- 1.03133	-0.29825	0.56133	3.376
Intellectence	- 0.20007	-0.18593	0.15460	1.675
Origence	0.09512	0.16206	0.08511	1.249
Constant	8.01411			

Variables in equation at step 5

Wisconsin Relationship

Orientation Scale	1.23248	0.88799	0.26612	21.448
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.95024	-0.27480	0.58109	2.674
Intellectence	- 0.18221	-0.16934	0.15865	1.319
Origence	0.09322	0.15883	0.08601	1.175
How Do You Think-B	- 0.02639	-0.09799	0.04143	0.406

Table 13 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Constant	10.89655			

^aB--unstandardized regression coefficient.

^bBeta--standardized regression coefficient.

Table 14
 Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at
 Each Step for Criterion Variable Gross
 Rating of Facilitative Genuineness

Variable	B^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Variables in equation at step 1				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	0.88764	0.66298	0.17448	25.880
Constant	-11.08889			
Variables in equation at step 2				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.14153	0.85261	0.21641	27.824
Counselor Selection Scale	- 1.00596	-0.30157	0.53917	3.481
Constant	- 0.41017			
Variables in equation at step 3				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.27563	0.95277	0.22811	31.271
Counselor Selection Scale	- 1.02014	-0.30583	0.52724	3.744

Table 14 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Intellectence	- 0.22475	-0.21653	0.14287	2.475
Constant	11.96816			
Variables in equation at step 4				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.34337	1.00336	0.23463	32.781
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.88733	-0.26601	0.53741	2.726
Intellectence	- 0.19337	-0.18629	0.14480	1.783
How Do You Think-B	- 0.04434	-0.17064	0.03883	1.304
Constant	16.70189			
Variables in equation at step 5				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	1.29208	0.96505	0.25233	26.221
Counselor Selection Scale	- 0.94194	-0.28238	0.55096	2.923
Intellectence	- 0.17275	-0.16643	0.15042	1.319
How Do You Think-B	- 0.04353	-0.16752	0.03928	1.228
Origence	0.04860	0.08583	0.08155	0.355

Table 14 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Constant	14.95876			

^aB--unstandardized regression coefficient.

^bBeta--standardized regression coefficient.

Table 15
 Summary of Variables Entered into Equation at
 Each Step for Criterion Variable Counselor
 Evaluation Rating Scale

Variable	B^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Variables in equation at step 1				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	4.84880	0.64637	0.99641	23.680
Constant	36.81255			
Variables in equation at step 2				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	4.23638	0.56473	1.16897	13.134
How Do You Think-B	0.22726	0.15610	0.22687	1.003
Constant	- 3.42687			
Variables in equation at step 3				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	3.83536	0.51127	1.28704	8.880
How Do You Think-B	0.23460	0.16114	0.22853	1.054

Table 15 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	F ratio
Origence	0.36386	0.11470	0.47344	0.591
Constant	-12.64518			
Variables in equation at step 4				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	3.47343	0.46302	1.44218	5.801
How Do You Think-B	0.20436	0.14037	0.23679	0.745
Origence	0.31440	0.09911	0.48608	0.418
Counselor Selection Scale	1.96218	0.10499	3.37386	0.338
Constant	-27.04445			
Variables in equation at step 5				
Wisconsin Relationship				
Orientation Scale	3.35813	0.44765	1.57066	4.571
How Do You Think-B	0.19554	0.13431	0.24451	0.640
Origence	0.33826	0.10663	0.50764	0.444
Counselor Selection Scale	1.97400	0.10562	3.42956	0.331
Intellectence	0.19130	0.03289	0.93632	0.042

Table 15 (continued)

Variable	B ^a	Beta ^b	Standard Error B	<u>F</u> ratio
Constant	-36.53481			

^aB--unstandardized regression coefficient.

^bBeta--standardized regression coefficient.

References

References

- Alexik, M., & Carkhuff, R. R. The effects of the manipulation of client depth of self-exploration upon high and low functioning counselors. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 210-212.
- Allport, C., Vernon, P., & Lindsey, G. Study of values. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association. The counselor: Professional preparation and role. In J. W. Loughary, R. O. Stripling, & P. W. Fitzgerald (Eds.), Counseling: A growing profession. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.
- American Psychological Association Committee on Training in Clinical Psychology. Recommended graduate training program in clinical psychology. American Psychologist, 1947, 2, 539-558.
- American Psychological Association Subcommittee on Counselor Trainee Selection, Division of Counseling Psychology. An analysis of practices in counselor trainee selection. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 174-179.
- American School Counselor Association. Statement of policy for secondary school counselors. In J. W. Loughary, R. O. Stripling, & P. W. Fitzgerald (Eds.), Counseling: A growing profession. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

- Anthony, W. A., Gormally, J. F., & Miller, H. K. Prediction of human relations training outcome by traditional and nontraditional selection indices. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1974, 14, 105-114.
- Arbuckle, D. S. Client perception of counselor personality. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1956, 3, 93-96.
- Arbuckle, D. S. Counseling and psychotherapy: An existential-humanistic view. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, 1975.
- Arbuckle, D. S. Counseling effectiveness and related issues. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 430-435.
- Bandura, A. Psychotherapists anxiety level, self-insight and psychotherapeutic competence. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1956, 52, 333-337.
- Banks, G., Berenson, B. G., & Carkhuff, R. R. The effects of counselor race and training upon the counseling process with Negro clients in initial interviews. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 23, 70-72.
- Bennett, Edward M. The polydiagnostic method: A technique for multivariate social and clinical research. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 42, 207-215.
- Bergin, A., & Solomon S. Personality and performance correlates of empathetic understanding in psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 393.

- Bills, R. E., Vance, E. L., & McLean, O. S. An index of adjustment and values. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 252-261.
- Blocker, D. H. A multiple regression approach to predicting success in a counselor education program. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1963, 3, 19-22.
- Borman, C. A., & Ramirez, C. Evaluating counseling practicum students. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 15, 48-54.
- Brammer, L. M., & Springer, H. C. A radical change in counselor education and certification. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 48, 803-808.
- Brams, J. M. Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 25-30.
- Brams, J. M. Effective communication and counselor characteristics. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 95-98.
- Brophy, E. B. Relationships among Wisconsin education selection interview ratings and student counselor behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1973.
- Butler, J. M., & Haigh, G. V. Changes in the relation between self-concepts and ideal-concepts consequent upon client-centered counseling. In C. R. Rogers & Rosalind F. Dymond (Eds.), Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Callis, R., & Prediger, D. J. Predictors of achievement in counseling and guidance. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 63-69.

- Cannon, J., & Carkhuff, R. R. Effects of rater level of functioning and experience upon the discrimination of facilitative conditions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 189-194.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and human relations: A primer for lay and professional helpers (Vol. 1). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969. (a)
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and human relations: A primer for lay and professional helpers (Vol. 2). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1969. (b)
- Carkhuff, R. R. Training in counseling and therapeutic practices: Requiem or reveille? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 360-367.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Alexik, M. Effects of client depth of self-exploration upon high- and low-functioning counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 350-355.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Griffin, A. H. The selection and training of human relations specialists. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 443-450.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Truax, C. B. Training in counseling and psychotherapy: An evaluation of an integrated didactic and experiential approach. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 333-336.

- Carluccio, L. W. The life style value structure of counseling professionals as compared to creative artists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1972.
- Cicirelli, V. G., & Cicirelli, J. B. Counselor's creative ability and attitude in relation to counseling behavior with disadvantaged counselees. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 177-183.
- 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 [Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory] and GZTS [Guilford-Zimmermann Temperament Survey]. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 27-30.
- Cottle, W. C., Lewis, W. W., Jr., & Penney, M. Personal characteristics of counselors: III. An experimental scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 51-55.
- Davis, G. A. In frumious pursuit of the creative person. Journal of Creative Behavior, 1975, 9, 75-87.
- Davis G., & Belcher G. How shall creativity be measured? Journal of Creative Behavior, 1971, 5(3), 153-161.
- Demos, G. D., & Zuwayliff, F. H. Characteristics of effective counselors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 163-165.

- Dilley, J. D., & Tierney, D. E. Counselor candidate verbal behavior and relationship orientation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 93-99.
- Dole, A. A. The prediction of effectiveness in school counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 112-121.
- Donnan, H. H., Harlan, G., & Thompson, S. A. Counselor personality and level of functioning as perceived by counselees. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 482-485.
- Eberlein, L., & Park, J. Self-concept/ideal-self-concept congruence and rated effectiveness of counselor trainees. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 126-132.
- Farwell, G. F. Personal communication, December 1975. University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Feidler, F. A comparison of therapeutic relationships in psychoanalytic, nondirective and Adlerian therapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 440-448.
- Feidler, F. Factor analysis of psychoanalytic, nondirective, and Adlerian therapeutic relationships. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 32-38.
- Foley, W. J., & Proff, F. C. NDEA [National Defense Education Act] institute trainees and vocational rehabilitation counselors: A comparison of characteristics. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 154-159.
- Frey, D. H. The anatomy of an idea: Creativity in counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1975, 54, 23-27.

- Friel, T. W., Kratochvil, D., & Carkhuff, R. R. The effects of the manipulation of client depth of self-exploration upon helpers of different training and experience. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 247-249.
- Garfield, F. J. Creativity, mental health and psychotherapy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1967.
- Gaylin, N. L. Psychotherapy and psychological health. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 6, 494-500.
- Gazda, G. M., Clements, H. M., Duncan, J. A., & Martin, C. L. Response sets of neophyte counselors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 151-156.
- Gazda, G. M. Human relations development. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, 1973.
- Gimmestad, M. J., & Goldsmith, E. B. Admissions policies for graduate programs in counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 13, 172-177.
- Gough, H. G. The California psychological inventory manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1956.
- Gruberg, R. The relationship of the counselor interview style and rated effectiveness of response to counselor tolerance of ambiguity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1972.

- Gruberg, R. A significant counselor personality characteristic: Tolerance of ambiguity. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 119-123.
- Hefele, T. J., & Hurst, M. W. Interpersonal skill measurement: Precision, validity, and ability. Counseling Psychologist, 1972, 3, 62-69.
- Hill, G. E. The selection of school counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, 39, 355-360.
- Hill, G. E., & Green, D. A. The selection, preparation, and professionalization of guidance and personnel workers. Review of Educational Research, 1960, 30, 115-130.
- Hughes, D. A. Creativity, personality, and psychotherapy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1973.
- Jackson, M., & Thompson, C. L. Effective counselor: Characteristics and attitudes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 249-254.
- Jansen, D. G., Robb, G. F., & Bonk, E. C. Characteristics of high-rated and low rated- master's degree candidates in counseling and guidance. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1970, 9, 162-170.
- Jansen, D. G., Robb, G. F., & Bonk, E. C. Differences among male A, B, and C Master's degree candidates in a counseling practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 12, 24-29.

- Johnson, D., Shertzer, B., Linden, J. E., & Stone, S. The relationship of counselor candidate characteristics and counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 297-304.
- Jones, L. K. The counselor evaluation rating scale: A valid criterion for counselor effectiveness? Counselor Education and Supervision, 1974, 14, 112-116.
- Jones, J. E., & Schoch, E. W. Correlates of success in Master-level counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 7, 286-291.
- Joslin, L. G. Knowledge and counseling competence. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43, 790-795.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Kazienko, L. W., & Neidt, C. O. Self-descriptions of good and poor counselor trainees. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1962, 1, 106-123.
- Kemp, C. G. Influence of dogmatism on the training of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 155-157.
- Kerr, W. A., & Speroff, B. J. The empathy test. Chicago: Psychometrics Affiliates, 1954.
- Koenig, H. F. Creativity and the fully functioning person: A test of a proposition from Rogers's theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1973.

- Kuder, G. F. Kuder preference record. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1953.
- Lewis, W. R. The development of a counselor selection scale through an item analysis of the California psychological inventory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, 1973.
- Liechty, R. A. The effects of physical set, inquiry method, examiner person, and rater sophistication upon the Wisconsin counselor education selection interview. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.
- Linden, J. D., Stone, S. C., & Shertzer, B. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 267-276.
- McClain, E. W. 16 PF questionnaire scores and success in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 492-496.
- McGreevy, C. P. Factor analysis of measures used in the selection and evaluation of counselor education candidate. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 51-56.
- Mahan, J. W., Jr., & Wicas, E. A. Counselor personality characteristics: A preliminary exploration. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 78-83.
- Maslow, A. H. The farther reaches of human nature. New York: Viking Press, 1971.
- Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1968.

- Mayer, G. R. Creativity: Made, not born. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1975, 54, 162-163.
- Megargee, E. I. The California psychological inventory handbook. San Francisco; California: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Menne, J. M. A comprehensive set of counselor competencies. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 547-553.
- Mezzano, J. A note on dogmatism and counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 9, 64-65.
- Miller, W. S. Miller analogies test manual. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1960.
- Milliken, R. C., & Patterson, J. J. Relationship of dogmatism and prejudice to counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 125-129.
- Mills, D., & Menke, R. Characteristics of effective counselors: A reevaluation. 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.
- Mowsesian, R. The effects of educational level training and mindedness of raters upon scoring of the Wisconsin counselor education selection interview. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

- Munger, P. F., Myers, R. A., & Brown, D. F. Guidance institutes and persistence of attitudes: A progress report. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 41, 415-419.
- Myrick, R. D., & Kelly, F. D. A scale for evaluating practicum students in counseling and supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 330-336.
- Myrick, R. D., Kelly, F. D., & Wittmer, J. The sixteen personality factor questionnaire as a predictor of counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 293-301.
- National Vocational Guidance Association. Counselor preparation. Washington, D. C.: National Vocational Guidance Association, 1949.
- Nei, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jarkens, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social services (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- O'Hern, J. S., & Arbuckle, D. S. Sensitivity: A measurable concept? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 42, 572-576.
- Ohlsen, M. M. Group counseling. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.
- Palmer, C. J. Characteristics of effective counselor trainees. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1975.
- Palmontier, P. C. The personality of the counselor. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1966, 15, 90-94.

- Paranojoti, U. P. Relationship of personality characteristics to counseling success of graduate students in counseling practicum courses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972.
- Partin, B. F. The relationship of Rorschach "M," origence, and intellectence to self-actualization, Rogers facilitative conditions, and counselor effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1975.
- Patterson, C. H. The selection of counselors. In J. M. Whiteley (Ed.), Research on counseling: Evaluation and reforms. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1967.
- Patterson, C. H. Test characteristics of rehabilitation counselor trainees. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1962, 28(5), 15-16.
- Petty, J. Predicting counselor trainee success. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1970.
- Rochester, D. E. Persistence of attitudes and values of NDEA [National Defense Education Act] counselor trainees. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 535-537.
- Rogers, C. R. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin, 1942.
- Rogers, C. R. Empathic: An unappreciated way of being. Counseling Psychologist, 1975, 5, 2-9.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.

- Rogers, C. R. A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A study of a science. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959. [Vol. 3.]
- Russo, J. R., Kelz, J. W., & Hudson, G. R. Are good counselors openminded? Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 74-77.
- Sharp, N. R. A multiple regression approach to affective sensitivity in counselor trainees. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1975.
- Shelton, J. E. Counselor characteristics and effectiveness in serving economically disadvantaged and advantaged males. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 13, 129-135.
- Shertzer, B., & Stone, S. C. Fundamentals of counseling. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Sprinthall, N. A., & Erickson, V. L. The systems approach: Plus change, plus c'est le meme. Counseling Psychologist, 1973, 4, 120-123.
- Sprinthall, N. A., Whiteley, J. M., & Mosher, R. L. Cognitive flexibility: A focus for research on counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 188-197.
- Steffle, B., King, P., & Leafgren, F. Characteristics of counselors judged effective by their peers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 335-340.

- Stoudt, C. L. The comparative effects of sensitivity training, didactic training and no training on the rating of responses to the Wisconsin counselor education selection interview. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969.
- Streph, J. A. Responses to hypothetical counseling situations as a predictor of relationship orientation in school counselors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963.
- Swanson, C. D. The relationship between certain personality traits of advanced counselor trainees and their ability to express congruence, empathy, and positive regard. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1970.
- Sweeney, T. J. The school counselor as perceived by school counselors and their principals. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 844-849.
- Terman, L. W. Concept mastery test. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1956.
- Thomas, I. An investigation of the relationship among self-disclosure, self-concept and counseling effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29(1A), 130-131.
- Toffler, A. The eco-spasm report. New York: Bantam Books, 1975.
- Toffler, A. Future shock. New York: Bantam, 1971.
- Torrance, E. P. Guidaing creative talent. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- Torrance, E. P. Test of creative thinking: Norms technical manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Personnel Press, 1966.

- Truax, C. B. Effective ingredients in psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 256-263.
- Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. The old and the new: Theory and research in counseling and psychotherapy. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 42, 860-866.
- Wasson, R. M. The Wisconsin relationship orientation scale as a unique variable in the assessment of applicants for counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 89-92.
- Welsh, G. S. Creativity and intelligence: A personality approach. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1975.
- Welsh, G. S. Gifted adolescents: A handbook of test results. Greensboro, North Carolina: Prediction Press, 1969.
- Welsh, G. S. The Welsh figure preference test (Manual research ed.). Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1959. [Booklet.]
- Welsh, G. S. Personal communication. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, University of North Carolina, May 1976.
- Whiteley, J. M., Sprinthall, N. A., Mosher, R. L., & Donaghy, R. T. Selection and evaluation of counselor effectiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 226-233.
- Whiting, B. C. How to predict creativity from biographical data. Journal of Creative Behavior, 1974, 7, 201-207.

Wicas, E. A., & Mahan, T. W. Characteristics of counselors 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.

VITA

Lenard Joseph Wright

Born in Patuxent River, Maryland, May 16, 1947.

Educational Experience

- 1969 B.A. in English, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia
- 1972 M.Ed. in Counseling, The College of William and Mary in
Virginia, Williamsburg
- 1976 C.A.S. in Counseling, The College of William and Mary in
Virginia, Williamsburg
- 1976 Ed.D. in Counseling, The College of William and Mary in
Virginia, Williamsburg

Work Experience

- September 1969 through June 1971--English teacher, Portsmouth Catholic
High School, Portsmouth, Virginia
- September 1971 through June 1973--Director of Guidance, Portsmouth
Catholic High School, Portsmouth, Virginia
- June to September 1973--Intern with psychological services staff,
Human Resources Institute, Norfolk, Virginia
- September 1973 through February 1975--Family counseling therapist,
Portsmouth Psychiatric Center, Portsmouth, Virginia
- September 1973 to Present--Counselor, Chesapeake Public Schools,
Chesapeake, Virginia