1962

The IPAT Sixteen Personality Factor Test and the IPAT Humor Test of Personality as Devices for Assessing Counselors in Training

Phillip Morris Heggen
Central Washington University

THE IPAT SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR TEST AND THE IPAT HUMOR TEST OF PERSONALITY AS DEVICES FOR ASSESSING COUNSELORS IN TRAINING

A Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfullment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

by

Philip Morris Heggen

August 1962

[redacted]

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

Eldon E. Jacobsen, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

Gerald Gage

_____

H. B. Robinson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Eldon E. Jacobsen for his advice and encouragement in directing the writing of this paper and to Dr. Theodor Naumann and Dr. Gerald Gage for helpful suggestions.

Further acknowledgment is extended to Mr. Clifford P. Wolfsehr, Reference Librarian, for generous assistance in obtaining the information needed to complete this investigation.

Special mention and thanks are due Dr. Jacobsen, Dr. Gage, and Mr. H. B. Robinson for the many hours spent in judging the taped interviews used in this study. Their willingness to perform this tedious task made this study feasible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. INTRODUCTION

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 showed a national concern for the conservation of human resources. Congress at that time was convinced that the location of talent would depend upon effective secondary school counseling. Central Washington State College (CWSC) and other training institutions under contract with the United States Office of Education as authorized by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 consequently set up short term Guidance and Counseling Institutes to improve secondary school counselors' knowledge, skills, and effectiveness. These training institutions, as a consequence, are concerned with the problem of what constitutes effective counseling and what traits of counselors are associated with effective counseling. This paper will concern itself with the above problem.

There is little information regarding the personal characteristics of high school counselors, or indeed, of counselors in general. Statements of desirable characteristics are the result of many subjective studies, and it is not known whether those characteristics coincide with the actual characteristics of those entering the field of coun-

seling.

There are, of course, many portraits of the competent counselor. One such statement appears in a publication developed by the New York State Counselors Association:

> The counselor needs to be an individual with special personal qualifications. He must be a person with a better than average mental alertness and enjoy dealing with personal problems; yet his personal sympathy must not overshadow sound judgement and objectivity in weighing facts. The counselor must be able to analyze and arrange ideas and materials systematically, these qualities are for the most part native endowments. Beyond these the counselor needs a good general education, special training, and broad experience (12:217).

Professional personnel workers in general agree that although professional training and experience are essential to effective counseling, adequately trained persons sometimes fail as counselors for lack of certain personality factors. The question of why certain counselors perform more adequately in a counseling relationship than other counselors has often been pondered. This variation in the quality of performance is particularly apparent among beginning counselors. Differerences in personality traits have been hypothesized in answering this question.

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to investigate possible significant relationships between personal characteristics of counseling trainees and their

performance in counseling interviews. In the event that such relationships do exist, training institutions will have better means of selecting and screening counselor trainees.

The personality characteristics of the trainees tested for this study were identified through the use of the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing (IPAT) Sixteen Personality Factor Test and the IPAT Humor Test of Personality. The criterion for measuring performance was the ratings of three members of the CWSC psychology staff and two graduate students in Psychology. A 46 item rating scale was utilized which was designed to measure performance in an interview situation. Two hypotheses were investigated. The first, with rationale, is:

Counselors in training as a group show a distinctive and recognizable configuration of personality characteristics. Specifically, on mean counselor test scores, certain personality factors as defined in the IPAT Sixteen Personality Factor Test Manual are significantly different from test standardization group means for 604 American college students. Since the IPAT personality tests have become available, several group personality configurations have been identified by users of these tests. These findings suggest that a similar configuration might be determined for counselor trainees as a group.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Test is now supported by a large amount of factor analytic research. Research publications indicate that the IPAT Tests provide a very broad sampling of the area of personality responses. The traits which have been isolated have been standardized on a variety of groups. Utilizing these tests, it was predicted that a relationship would be discovered to exist between the trainees scores on the IPAT Tests and the judged ratings of taped counselor interviews.

The second hypothesis of this study was that certain personality factors are significantly related to ratings of counselor performance.

The breadth and comprehensiveness of the factors utilized by these tests provide a personality assessment well suited to a study of this kind.

Importance of the study. Are counselors with certain measured organizations of personality traits more effective in counseling than others? If so, what are the characteristics of these people? These questions have long been asked by writers in the counseling and guidance field, but the answers have largely been in terms of an ideal beyond the reach of all but a very few counselors.

The notion that certain personal characteristics are desirable for counselors has generally been conceded. The

controversy centers around the identification of those qualities. Smith has stated that the greatest difficulty encountered in settling upon a list of qualities stems from a lack of instruments for measuring, with some degree of objectivity, those qualities. Above average intelligence, good physical health, and others can be measured, but emotional maturity and ability to work with others effectively must be measured by less objective methods.

Wrenn has suggested that only measurable traits should be listed as important characteristics of an effective counselor. Three have been suggested: (1) academic intelligence, (2) a consistent interest in working with people, and (3) emotional stability and objectivity.

Others dealing with the matter of personality question the assumption that there are certain combinations of personal characteristics best for effective counseling and suggest that there might not be one standard relationship in every case nor one type of person who is the ideal counselor. A new perspective of the role the counselor's personality traits play in an effective counseling relationship was offered by Arbuckle. He feels that the counselor who must play a role in the counseling interview, that is, who is radically different in the counseling interview than in other situations, cannot be effective in helping a client. One reason for this is that the relationship established between

the counselor and client is affected by the true personality of the counselor. Arbuckle maintains that since the counselor's true self shows in the counseling relationship, it is necessary for the counselor to understand his own personality dynamics. Even though there are no conclusive answers to those questions presented earlier in this section, it is nevertheless important to keep them in mind.

Hahn realized the need for further research in this area. In his retiring address as President of the Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association, he stressed the need for further research along the lines of personality, attitude, interest, and value judgement measures of counselors.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Counseling. Counseling will be considered in this investigation in terms of the definition given by Adams:

> An interacting relationship between two individuals where one, the counselor, is attempting to help the other, the counselee, to better understand himself in relationship to his present and future problems (1:Ch. I).

Performance in counseling interviews. Performance in the counseling interviews will refer to the degree to which the client relates himself effectively with the counselor, talks openly about his feelings, seems to take responsibility for himself, and as a result of the session gets a new per-

spective and ideas for action.

Limitations of the study. The limitations of the study are these: (1) it is limited to the participants of the Guidance and Counseling Institute sponsored by the National Defense Education Act conducted at Central Washington State College during the summer of 1961; (2) the criterion measure of performance in the counseling interview is a rating scale (see Appendix) devised at Ohio State University which was made available by a staff member of Central Washington State College; and (3) as the sample is small, the relationships found cannot be taken as definitive but suggest hypotheses for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In reviewing the literature pertaining to the personal characteristics of counselors, one should consider Cottle's statement that "any attempt at identification of personal characteristics of counselors needs to consider those characteristics which are essential for effective service at each level of counseling and in each kind of counseling" (4:445-50). But to neglect all literature not directly applicable to the high school counselor might omit material which could have value because of similarities existing in the nature of the allied fields of work.

Cottle says that "it seems necessary to identify clearly each area and level of counseling because it is not apparent whether the characteristics of counselors in each area and at each level within an area are the same or different" (4:445-50). With this point of view in mind, the writer has attempted to so organize the review as to use only materials pertaining to various aspects of the counselors' characteristics which might be justifiably linked with all kinds of counselors. It would appear from the findings of various studies in personality characteristics of different types of personnel workers that this procedure could have value.

Source materials for information regarding this investigation have included opinions of authorities in the field, statements by professional organizations, and the results of studies on the subject at state and national levels.

The review is organized in the following manner:

(1) Mental Abilities

(2) Work Experience

(3) Attitudes

(4) Interests

(5) Other Personality Factors

I. MENTAL ABILITIES

Before considering the mental abilities of prospective counselors and counselors, it might be considered appropriate to examine the demands on mental ability that such work now requires. In 1940, Bailey found that the movement toward special certification of counselors was still in the beginning stages throughout the states, with only 4 states requiring special counseling certificates. By 1951, Kremen learned that 23 states had adopted school counselor certification plans. Nine other states were in varying stages of contemplation or study of certification plans for counselors. A teaching certificate, experience in teaching, and work experience other than teaching were almost univers-

ally required. In regard to specialized study, the requirements in the 23 states ranged from 12 to 48 semester hours, with a median of 20 and one-half semester hours.

Since states are going to make demands in the area of mental achievement, one might consider what various authorities in the field feel is necessary for such work in high school counseling. Dugan has phrased it in this manner:

> Because the counselor deals primarily with human beings, his preparation must include extensive study in psychology. For example, it must include study of the individual, the dynamic pattern of characteristics that make up a human personality, and the growth and the development of the individual and personnel procedures of appraisal and therapy both group and individual.
>
> Training must include also a study of the environment. In schools or in industry, knowledge of educational and vocational requirements loom large in the equipment of any counselor.
>
> He must know organizational principles and structure and must see where his function fits into the larger picture of the total personnel program and into the total organization of the school, industry or agency.
>
> The training provided must involve practice as well as theory.... Any training program that does not provide for the practice of procedures under supervision is inadequate.
>
> How much of such training? The basic understanding of psychology, sociology, economics, philosophy and statistics can be secured in undergraduate years, but the professional understandings and procedures of counseling must be acquired at the graduate level.... One year of graduate work is the minimum even for a temporary certificate of counseling and two years of graduate work including at least three months of supervised experience or internship is basic to a

> professional status.... A master's degree or work to that level is minimal. When full time professional counseling is envisaged, work considerably beyond this minimum is desirable with a years internship as in medicine and clinical psychology (6:62-63).

Robinson would concur with this view, saying that:

> The student counselor must have thorough training in psychology, sociology, economics, and education if he is to understand the many factors which influence client behavior. He must also have a thorough training in the technical skills of counseling if he is to obtain diagnostic information and put across remedial suggestions (13:Ch. II).

Bailey describes a jury composed of 147 persons, including employers, certifying agencies, professors of education, and experienced workers who made the following recommendations for academic standards for personnel work:

> The bachelor's degree should be a minimum requirement for all types of personnel workers. The master's degree is highly desirable, particularly for such functionaries as deans and general advisors (4:94-98).

Various studies of "successful" and/or practicing counselors have found these mental accomplishments in evidence. In Martinson's study of 100 California elementry school counselors in 1949, 44 per cent reported that they held degrees beyond the bachelor's.

Hamrin and Paulson describe another study in which Graver found that of the 91 counselors covered in the study, only one did not possess a bachelor's degree, 74 per cent held a master's degree and 5 per cent had a Ph.D.

The scope of the necessary mental achievement and the

demonstrated achievements of practicing counselors would seem to bear out the thinking of Patterson, Schneidler, and Williamson in their 1938 text, Student Guidance Techniques. They state that the counselor or student counselor should have "scholastic competence and intellect above the median of college seniors in a first class university." A more recent opinion is expressed by Tyler:

> We know, of course, from the analyses of the material to be mastered during the training program--statistical concepts, psychological theory and so forth--that a person undertaking it needs to be above the college average in intellectual level, like those in other areas of advanced graduate study. It seems likely also that high intelligence is an asset in the understanding of complex emotional attitudes and personal relationships which is an essential part of the counselor's work (15:153).

Wrenn also suggests that the future counselor should have sufficient academic intelligence for at least two years of graduate work in a recognized university professional training program. He adds that:

> This capacity is measured by undergraduate record, scores on a high level scholastic aptitude test for which there are adequate norms, and a possession of a motivation for graduate work based upon a realistic understanding of the requirements of the profession and of the training program leading to it (16:9-14).

Little work has been done in establishing norms of mental ability for graduate students in this field. Usually, the procedure of admittance into the program (as far as mental ability is concerned) has been governed by the same standards as the regular graduate school entrance requirements.

One study was made by Wrenn, who administered a scholastic aptitude test to a group of his students. The group studied, some thirty advanced M.A. and Ph.D. candidates in educational psychology (student personnel) at the University of Minnesota, took the Miller Analogies Test, Form G, and were found to be scholastically able with a median raw score on the test in the middle seventies.

Stoughton has suggested that good scholarship is important but does not guarantee good counseling ability. There are little available data concerning the level of academic ability needed in order to complete successfully any one of the many types of training programs for counselors and personnel workers. Yet heavy emphasis is placed on the applicant's academic record and often on tests of academic ability. Tyler suggested as one justification for this emphasis the probability that those selected will be "persons who need not feel overly anxious about their abilities, defensive about their performance or too conscious of competition (15:126).

II. WORK EXPERIENCE

Work experience is considered a desirable characteristic for counselors by most authorities. Dugan says:

> Experience is closely related to training: one complements the other. The best trained but inexperienced person is usually not as competent as the person who

> has pertinent experience in addition to systematic training. Experience in the type of organization in which the counselor expects to be employed is desirable. This means school experience for the school counselor. This experience may logically be secured after training but before undertaking counseling responsibility. Some graduate schools, however, require experience before giving training. This is because it is believed that training will be more effective if imposed upon even a short period of experience.
>
> A second kind of experience is desirable for certain types of counselors. This is non-counseling experience. For example, counselors who counsel on vocational problems should have some taste of business or industrial work. Those dealing with adults should have had some school or social work experience. The amount of such experience is uncertain, but it should be long enough to acquire the necessary understandings (6:62-63).

Not only do most authorities agree on the necessity of work experience in the school environment for school counselors, but, as Hamrin and Paulson say:

> Authorities seem to be in agreement that the counselor should have had successful experience in the school in which he is to counsel. Thus, a secondary school counselor must have had successful secondary school teaching experience, preferably in the school where he will do counseling (8:Ch. III).

Also, according to Hamrin and Paulson:

> The majority of administrative officers surveyed in a number of recent studies insist, further, in some work experience other than teaching as preparation for counseling. This recommendation is in harmony with the laws of those states which certify school counselors (8:Ch. III).

Kitch and McCreary stress the value of both teaching experience and other work experience. Teaching experience, they say, is necessary for the would-be counselor to famil-

iarize himself with his future subjects and the setting; work experience is frequently essential because the background experience of the counselor trainee may be inadequate in relation to social and economic factors in the environment of his subjects.

All authorities do not agree on the amount or character of either type of work experience, but according to the New York State Counselors Association, as voiced in the Practical Handbook for Counselors:

> The counselor should have a minimum of at least two years experience in classroom instruction. It is desirable that this experience be acquired in at least two different schools, preferably in different parts of the country. There is some justification for encouraging the counselor, after appointment to a guidance position, to continue teaching at least one class in order that he may enlarge his understanding of teacher's problems and be accepted by them on an equal footing. Some counselors may have had prepared for teaching but have not actually taught. If this occurs, it is especially desirable to allow them to satisfy state teaching requirements during the first five years of their counseling experience (12:140).

Furthermore, in reference to "outside" work experience, the Association feels that the:

> Candidate for counselor should have at least four or more years of related work experience, including at least two years outside the armed services. He should have demonstrated ability to work with others and win respect of fellow workers, subordinates and supervisors (12:141).

Bailey's jury recommends that a minimum of three years of previous teaching experience should be required of

all personnel workers. The jury also recommends experience in fields other than teaching. Working with the public and with youth out of the school situation should be a basic certification requirement for all types of personnel workers. The jury further suggested that two years experience in such fields as social case work and business be required of general advisors and three years of such fields as industry, business, and business personnel be a requirement for certification for vocational counselors.

Most studies of counselor groups have discovered that work experience is not lacking as a group characteristic. Of the 100 counselors studied by Cox, over 50 per cent have 15 years or more of teaching experience. All but two have had a year or more of teaching experience. It was also found in Cox's study that 78 per cent of the counselors had had experience in business and industry. According to Cox, "the list of the kinds of work these 78 per cent had done is an impressive one, suggesting a varied and colorful background for their counseling" (5:91).

III. ATTITUDES

Counselor's attitudes, assuming that attitudes are those factors pertaining to the value system of the counselor or to his personal approach to problems requiring action, have not been well defined. Many subjective state-

ments concerning desirable personal characteristics of counselors have included mention of what might be classed as attitudes. Rather than separate such items from the context of the complete script, however, the whole statement will be left intact to be reported in the final section of this review. Karraker, though, does attempt to distinguish attitudes from other personal characteristics and lists them from A to Z (9:104):

Attitudes	Jovial	Sincere
Business like	King	Tactful
Confidential	Logical	Understanding
Democratic	Mannerly	Vigorous
Enthusiastic	Natural	Worldly-wise
Friendly	Objective	Exact
Gracious	Patient	Youthful
Helpful	Qualified	Zealous
Impartial	Resourceful	

Wrenn, in his use of the Allport Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values found a few clues to the possible distinctiveness of counselors or future counselors. In his previously mentioned experiment, the group of thirty advanced M.A. and Ph.D. candidates stood highest on the Theoretical and Religious Scales (on the T Scale men's scores averaged 48 and women's 42; on the R Scale men averaged 39 while women averaged 49). According to Wrenn, "the men of this group are

significantly higher on the Theoretical Scale than the norm groups of 900 undergraduate men and 54 graduate male students in education (published norms in the manual of the test). The women are significantly higher on the Religious Scale in the norm group of 900 undergraduate women. The women are lower on the Economic Scale and men on the Aesthetic Scale in the corresponding norm groups." Wrenn found also in his experiment with the 39 graduate students that the use of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey gave five clearly high patterns for the group. Wrenn says:

> The high scales, labeled by the authors as Restraint, Emotional Stability, Friendliness, Objectivity and Personal Relations gave median scores for this group that are all above the seventy-fifth percentile of the published norms for the men and the ninetieth percentile for women. The other scales, General Activity, Ascendance, Thoughtfulness (introversion), Sociability and Masculinity, gave medians that ranged from the seventieth to the thirtieth percentiles of the published norms (16:9-14).

IV. INTERESTS

The interests of the counselors, as a subdivision of his whole personality, appear to be a factor that can be objectively defined and also an area in which there is some general agreement, both of opinion and research results. Wrenn considers interests a measurable characteristic and suggests that the prospective counselor should have a "consistent interest in working with people and a pattern of

interests characteristic of those who are engaged in personal contact and human relations vocations" (17:9-14).

Beardsley concurs with Wrenn, saying that the counselor should be interested in people. He adds that the counselor should be interested in the scientific study of personality.

"A genuine interest in and love of children" is Ruth Strang's comment on this phase of the counselor's personality (14:196). Erickson and Smith state that the counselor should be a person who has "a genuine interest in education as a career, a genuine interest in people, and an interest in psychology, sociology, philosophy, and education, and an interest in research" (7:175). "An interest and curiosity concerning the community, its social and economic organization, and its problems" are desirable characteristics suggested by Kitch and McCreary (10:15).

A number of studies of the interest patterns of counselors has been done. Kriedt, in the process of constructing a new psychologists' key for the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, found that guidance workers had a stronger preference than other psychologists for interviewing, service to others, personnel work, and writing. Kriedt used a population of 1,048 Ph.D. graduates who had graduated previous to 1943.

V. OTHER PERSONALITY FACTORS

Many subjective studies have been made of the personal characteristics of the counselor in which no special effort was made to distinguish those traits that might be objectively measured. These studies or lists of personality characteristics do, however, suggest areas for objective measurement. Included in the lists are materials pertinent to the interests, attitudes, personality adjustment, and other character traits of the counselor. (The writer has felt, for the most part, that the studies should be included as a whole if their listing is to represent fairly the views of their respective authors). Kitch and McCreary suggest that the following characteristics are especially desirable in persons assigned as counselors (10:10-11):

1) Ability to work cooperatively with others

2) Mature personal adjustment

3) Ability to maintain objectivity in human relationships

4) Capacity for inspiring confidence and establishing rapport readily

5) Acceptance of the principles of individual differences and of symptomatic nature of behavior

6) Adaptability

7) Reliable practical judgement

8) Sense of humor, enthusiasm, and faith in the improvibility of human beings

9) Interest and curiosity concering the community, its social and economic organization and its problems

10) High interests in continuous professional improvement

11) Willingness to work "beyond the call of duty."

Erickson and Smith in their description of the personal characteristics of the counselor, state: "the counselor should be a person who has (7:76-77):

a. An outstanding degree of personal adjustment

b. The ability to be effective in face-to-face relationships with pupils

c. A genuine interest in education as a career

d. A genuine interest in people

e. A genuine interest in psychology, sociology, philosophy and education

f. Reasonable freedom from biases and prejudices

g. The desire to help each person develop the ability to help himself

h. An interest in research

i. Some occupational experience in fields other than teaching

j. A background in successful teaching

Ruth Strang suggests:

> Perhaps the personal qualities that have been mentioned most frequently as being desirable in teacher-counselors are a genuine interest and love of children, good health and personal adjustment, emotional maturity and a combination of sympathy and objectivity. These qualities, to be sure, will be manifested in diverse ways in equally successful personalities (14:221).

Of interest here would be an effort by Jones to draw together the descriptions of several writers through the use of a chart listing areas of agreement. Jones comments that such a device is limited in value because there may be more general agreement than that expressed due to the terminology involved and because some assumed character traits which others expressed.

Wrenn, who would limit his description to measurable characteristics, states:

> Following are qualifications of both an essential and a measurable nature (17:324):
>
> 1. Academic intelligence sufficient for at least two years of graduate work in a recognized university professional training program
> 2. A consistent interest in working with people and a pattern of interests characteristic of those who are engaged in personal contact in human relations vocations
> 3. Emotional stability and objectivity

According to Hamrin and Paulson:

> A study of the lists of personal traits of the competent counselor reveals emphasis upon those traits which are of prime importance in getting along with people. The counselor, to be successful, must work well with many different groups of persons: students, teachers, administrative officials, parents and townspeople (8:263).

There have been more objective attempts to describe the traits of the counselor. Cox, in her study at the University of Pennsylvania, approached the problem of appraising successful counselors at the secondary level through a case

study technique. From a group of 100 counselors selected on the basis of success and service in the field, Cox has indentified the following 24 characteristics (5:196):

1. Fairness
2. Sincerity
3. "Personality"
4. Good character and wholesome philosophy
5. Common sense
6. Health
7. Emotional stability
8. Approachability
9. Ability to get along with people
10. Sympathetic understanding of youth
11. Interest in people
12. Understanding people different from self
13. Flexibility and adaptability
14. Intelligence and mental alertness
15. Social culture
16. Broad knowledge and interests
17. Leadership
18. Awareness of one's own limitations
19. Professional attitude
20. Sense of mission
21. Interest in guidance and personnel work
22. Understanding of classroom conditions

23. Understanding of working conditions

24. Understanding of social and economic conditions

Snyder administered the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory to 423 students in classes in Introduction to Clinical Psychology. Several semesters later, he obtained prediction ratings from four psychology professors on each of these students. Attempts to construct a valid MMPI scale which would differentiate between the good and poor groups were unsuccessful. Snyder found that good students were more aggressive, independent, and social, and were less religious. Poor students tended to have feelings of inadequacy and neurotic concerns. The nature of some of the differentiating characteristics suggests that cliches regarding desirable counselor characteristics need to be subjected to penetrating research.

Cottle, Cottle, and Lewis, investigated the personal characteristics of counselors. In an effort to construct a scale which would differentiate between counselors and other workers in education and psychology, the investigators studied results from a group of 65 male counselors in college counseling centers in contrast to test scores of 65 college students. The inventories used were the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (G-ZTS).

The counselor group had a median education of 60 hours

of graduate work. Cottle suggests that this might be a factor relative to the manner in which they respond to the tests. The college groups ranged from freshmen to graduate students, the highest proportion being freshmen (N=35). The median age for the counselor group was 32; for the college group, 19. Profiles showing patterns of abnormality on the MMPI were not found on either group.

Cottle and Lewis found that according to MMPI, counselors could be described as more pessimistic, more interested in activities dealing with people, and more extroverted than the general population norm group.

On the G-ZTS the counselors tended to score one standard deviation above the norm group on the Emotional Stability, Objectivity, Friendliness, and Personal Relations scales. The authors interpret this as showing that they are more stable emotionally, more objective in their outlook, and having more successful personal relations than do the G-ZTS published norm group.

Cottle and Lewis found a number of significant differences between the counslor group and the college students. The college group tends to score close to the mean for published norms while the counselor group secured the higher or better adjusted mean score on the G-ZTS for scales Restraint, Sociability, Emotional Stability, Objectivity, Friendliness, Personal Relations, and Masculinity. On the MMPI the coun-

selor got a lower Lie score, a higher K score, and a lower M score and were more socially extroverted.

Through the use of a sociometric scale, Arbuckle found that students who were chosen by their fellows as individuals whom they would like to have as counselors showed a higher degree of confidence (as measured by the Heston Personality Inventory) than those who chose them. They were more normal in that they scored lower on the Hypochondriasis, Depression, Paranoia, Hysteria, Schizophrenia, Social I. E., and Psychasthenia scales (as measured by the MMPI). They showed a higher degree of interest in such areas as social service, persuasive, literary, and scientific activities (as measured by the Kuder Preference Record).

Conversely, students who were rejected by their fellows as individuals whom they would like to have as counselors indicated less in the way of home satisfaction (as measured by the Heston Personality Inventory). They were more abnormal in that they scored higher on the Hypochondriasis, Paranoia, Hysteria, Schizophrenia, Psychopathic Deviate and Hypomania scales (as measured by the MMPI).

There were no significant differences in interest areas (as indicated by the Kuder Preference Record) between students and those whom they rejected as counselors.

In summary, it appears that very little research has been done on the relationships emphasized in this study.

The researcher have studied some associated conditions, but no research has been concerned with the actual relationship of the personality variables used in this study as they relate to performance in the counseling interviews. By studying these relationships, the present investigator hopes possibly to point up the personal characteristics which influence the counselor's performance in an interview situation.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT AND PROCEDURES

I. THE RATING SCALE

In order to reduce the subjective element in this study, it was necessary to devise a method for measuring objectively the counselors' performance in the counseling situation. A rating scale was suggested as a helpful device in evaluating the tape recorded interviews. Fortunately, a CWSC Psychology Staff member had obtained a rating scale from an unpublished doctoral dissertation by D. J. Brown at Ohio State University and offered it for use in the present investigation. A facsimile of this rating scale appears in the Appendix. It is a 46 item scale scored according to the instructions preceding the scale.

One of the first researchers to attempt to classify counselor remarks in the counseling interview was Porter (11:128-135). He devised 24 categories which were placed in four groups. These were (1) defining the interview situation, (2) bringing out and developing the problem situation, (3) developing the counselee's insight and understanding, and (4) sponsoring the counselee's activity and fostering decision making. The rating scale of

D. J. Brown utilized in this study shows evidence of being influenced by Porter's earlier organization of counselor performance in the counseling interview. Brown's scale presents a group of 46 possible occurrences rated on a five point continuum ranging from "never" through "occasionally" to "always." Since this approach allows a comparatively objective total numerical score to be calculated indicating the degree of proficiency of each rated counselor, it is well suited to the purposes of this study. Brown's rating scale has been used without modification except that the scoring procedure has been somewhat simplified. The five point continuum has been reduced to a three point scale ranging from "infrequently" through "occasionally" to "frequently." This was done to facilitate the scoring process.

II. SAMPLES

The subjects used in this study were graduate students enrolled in the Guidance and Counseling Institute (sponsored by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 at CWSC in the Summer of 1961). The Institute emphasized the improvement of secondary school counselors' knowledge and skills with specific stress on test interpretation, career information, identification of able students, and counseling theory and techniques. The graduate students

were selected for the Institute on the basis of their previous academic record, recommendations of superintendents and principals, and teaching experience. In addition, those selected presented evidence that they would be engaged in counseling and guidance activities in their schools during the 1961-1962 school year.

The clients were high school students from the local community who had volunteered to participate in the counseling sessions.

Twenty-nine counselor trainees of both sexes were utilized in this study for norm comparison and 21 for correlation with the IPAT Tests (only this many had usable tapes). Their ages ranged from 25 years to 57 years, averaging 37 and one half years.

The norm group consisted of 604 American college students of both sexes. Their ages ranged from 17 to 32 years, averaging 21 years.

III. THE JUDGES

Five judges were utilized in rating the tape recorded interviews for this study. Three of the judges are on the CWSC Psychology Staff and have extensive experience in counseling. Two of the judges were graduate students in psychology at CWSC and have had training and some practical experience in the technique of counseling.

IV. PROCEDURES

The following procedures were used in this study. The 16 P.F. Test was administered to all of the counselor trainees during the course of the training program. They were not informed at that time of the nature of the study. The completed tests were given to the writer, who scored all of the collected data. During the training program tape recordings of counselor interviews with high school students were made. Using the Performance Rating Scale referred to above, each of the counselor trainee's interviews was independently rated by two of the judges utilized for this study. The judges identified themselves on the rating scales. The rating scales were then collected and a total rating score was computed for each trainee. The two ratings on each of the taped interviews were correlationally compared to determine the reliability of the judges' ratings. The mean 16 P.F. Test scores on each of the 16 factors for the counselor trainees as a group were compared with the mean 16 P.F. Test scores on each of the 16 factors for the norm group to determine the significance of difference of the personal characteristics between the two groups. Correlations were computed between the counselor ratings and each personality factor of the 16 P.F. Test to determine whether certain factors were significant-

ly related to rated counselor performance. Finally, a correlational comparison was made between the counselor ratings and each humor factor of the IPAT Humor Test of Personality to determine whether certain humor factors are significantly related to rated counselor performance.

V. ANALYSIS OF DATA

In dealing with research where relationships between variables are important, a major concern is the determination of whether or not these observed relationships are of sufficient magnitude to be considered truly significant.

The present study was designed to examine the relationship of certain personal characteristics of counselor trainees' performance in counseling interviews. Because the sample was small, the relationships found cannot be taken as definitive but only as suggestive hypotheses for further research. The 5 per cent level of confidence was taken as indicating a relationship worth further study.

An analysis of difference between the means (*t*-test) was made to determine the significance of difference between the counselors' scores on the 16 P.F. Test and norms on this test for 604 American college students.

The formulae used in the calculation of *t*-differences are as follows:

$$\underline{t} = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sigma \text{ difference}}$$

when σ difference $= \sqrt{\sigma M_1^2 + \sigma M_2^2}$

and $$\sigma M = \frac{\sigma}{N-1}$$

and $$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma X^2}{N} - M^2}$$

An average was taken for the ratings of interviews made early and late in the training program and for both judges of each counselor trainee to obtain an overall interview rating score for each trainee.

Correlation coefficients were calculated between these trainee ratings and the personality and humor factors of the IPAT tests utilized in this study. The following raw score formulation of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient equation was applied to facilitate use of the calculator:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\Sigma XY - \frac{(\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{N}}{\sqrt{\left[\Sigma X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{N}\right]\left[\Sigma Y^2 - \frac{(\Sigma Y)^2}{N}\right]}}$$

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

The findings presented in this chapter will relate to the hypotheses presented in Chapter I.

I. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF COUNSELOR TRAINEES

The sample used in this analysis was comprised of 29 counselor trainees participating in the Guidance and Counseling Institute. A composite picture of the significant differences between trainee personality characteristics and the personality characteristics of the norm group as suggested by the 16 P.F. Test is presented in Table I. Counselors as a group scored significantly higher than the norm group on Factor A. This factor (Cyclothymia vs. schizothymia) is described in the test manual as loaded most highly in the following traits:

(A+)		(A-)
Good Natured, Easy Going	vs.	Aggressive, Grasping, Critical
Ready to Cooperate	vs.	Obstructive
Attentive to People	vs.	Cool, Aloof
Soft Hearted, Kindly	vs.	Hard, Precise
Trustful	vs.	Suspicious

TABLE I.

A COMPARISON OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS SUGGESTED BY THE IPAT 16 P.F. TEST BETWEEN COUNSELOR TRAINEES AND THE NORM GROUP

FACTORS	NORM GROUP MEANS	TRAINEE GROUP MEANS	MEAN DIFFERENCE	STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEANS	t-DIFFERENCE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE*
A	9.3	10.5	1.2	.523	2.29	631	5 per cent
B	8.5	9.1	.6	.713	1.13	631	
C	16.9	18.3	1.4	.526	2.66	631	1 per cent
E	13.9	13.4	.5	.677	.74	631	
F	14.6	13.8	.8	.474	1.68	631	
G	12.1	11.2	.9	.836	1.61	631	
H	12.9	12.7	.2	.636	.31	631	
I	10.3	9.3	1.0	.491	1.84	631	
L	7.6	6.3	1.3	.674	2.37	631	5 per cent
M	11.5	10.5	1.0	.638	1.56	631	
N	9.7	8.8	.9	.837	1.07	631	
O	9.6	9.0	.6	.787	.76	631	
Q_1	9.7	10.6	.9	.634	1.41	631	
Q_2	9.4	8.4	1.0	.730	1.36	631	
Q_3	9.5	10.3	.8	.266	1.60	631	
Q_4	12.1	11.1	1.0	.777	1.28	631	

*2.58 t-difference required for 1 per cent level of confidence.

1.96 t-difference required for 5 per cent level of confidence.

Adaptable	vs.	Rigid
Warm Hearted	vs.	Cold

The manual describes further the A+ individual as having marked preference for occupations dealing with people and being generally willing to go along with expediency. There is experimental proof that they are more generous in personality relationships, less afraid of criticism, better able to remember names of people, but probably less dependable in precision work and in exactly meeting obligations.

Factor C showed the greatest difference from the norm group for counselors as a group. The difference in the positive direction on this scale was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. The manual describes Factor C (Ego Strength vs. Dissatisfied Emotionality) as most highly loaded in the following traits:

(C+)		(C-)
Emotionally Mature	vs.	Lacking in Frustration Tolerance
Emotionally Stable	vs.	Changeable (in attitudes)
Calm, Phlegmatic	vs.	Showing General Emotionality
Realistic about Life	vs.	Evasive (on awkward issues)
Absence of Neurotic Fatigue	vs.	Neurotically Fatigued
Placid	vs.	Worrying

This factor in its positive sense seems to be what psychoanalysts are attempting to describe by the notion of ego strength. Clinically, the outstanding observation is that most disorders show low C scores. In general, this factor is one of integration and maturity as opposed to general emotionality.

The L Factor (Protension vs. Relaxed Security) showed a significant t-difference toward the negative side of the scale for the counselor group. This factor is described as follows:

(L+)		(L-)
Jealous	vs.	Accepting
Self-sufficient	vs.	Outgoing
Suspicious	vs.	Trustful
Withdrawn, Brooding	vs.	Open, Ready to Take a Chance
Tyrannical	vs.	Understanding and Permissive
Hard	vs.	Soft Hearted
Irritable	vs.	Composed and Cheerful

In group dynamics experiments, persons with low L scores are significantly more cohesive.

The remaining 13 factors of this test did not reach the 5 per cent level of confidence in t-difference between counselor trainees and the norm group.

II. RELATION BETWEEN TESTS AND INTERVIEW RATINGS

The sample used in this analysis was comprised of 21 counselor trainees participating in the Guidance and Counseling Institute. The degree of relationship between trainee personal characteristics scores on the 16 P.F. Test and trainee interview ratings expressed in the form of correlation coefficients is shown in Table II. As the Table shows, there were no relationships found within the 5 per cent level of confidence in this analysis.

The degree of relationship between the Humor Factors of the IPAT Humor Test of Personality and trainee interview performance ratings expressed in the form of correlation coefficients is shown in Table III. Only 1 of the 10 Humor Factors showed a relationship to trainee interview performance within the 5 per cent level of confidence. This Factor (Whimsical Retort vs. Damaging Retort) showed a relationship on the positive side with the higher rated interviews. The Humor Test Manual describes the jokes selected by this factor as mostly quick retorts, which suggest that the dynamic factor is one appearing principally in ego relations. On the positive side there is surprise -- a whimsical unexpectedness. On the negative side the response is more expected and is more uniformly

TABLE II

PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
SUGGESTED BY THE IPAT 16 P.F. TEST
AND THE CRITERION OF INTERVIEW PERFORMANCE

16 P.F. Factors	Correlation Coefficients (r)	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
A	-.0014	19	Not sig.
B	-.0081	19	Not sig.
C	+.0019	19	Not sig.
E	+.0128	19	Not sig.
F	+.0034	19	Not sig.
G	+.0005	19	Not sig.
H	+.0079	19	Not sig.
I	+.0014	19	Not sig.
L	+.0422	19	Not sig.
M	+.0322	19	Not sig.
N	+.0189	19	Not sig.
O	+.0111	19	Not sig.
Q_1	-.0068	19	Not sig.
Q_2	-.0015	19	Not sig.
Q_3	-.0958	19	Not sig.
Q_4	-.0500	19	Not sig.

TABLE III.

PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
SUGGESTED BY THE IPAT HUMOR TEST OF PERSONALITY
AND THE CRITERION OF INTERVIEW PERFORMANCE

Humor Factors	Correlation Coefficients (r)	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
1	-.2472	19	Not sig.
2	-.0051	19	Not sig.
3	+.1602	19	Not sig.
4	-.1876	19	Not sig.
5	+.1328	19	Not sig.
6	+.3086	19	Not sig.
7	+.1977	19	Not sig.
8	+.0287	19	Not sig.
9	+.5436	19	5 per cent
10	+.2401	19	Not sig.

one of aggression, especially a wanton aggression, damaging to someone's self-regard.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The three factors on the 16 P.F. Test found to be significantly different for counselor trainees from the norm group appear to be mutually related and complementary. A brief comparison makes this readily apparent:

(A+) Good Natured, Easy Going

(C+) Emotional Stability

(L-) Relaxed Security

In Chapter IV these three factors have been described in detail and there the distinctiveness of each factor is clear, especially when the total range from positive to negative pole is considered for each factor.

The first hypothesis that counselors in training as a group show a distinctive configuration of personality characteristics is supported by the above findings. These results suggest that persons with the above characteristics seem to pick counseling as a vocation as compared to an unselected college student group.

The prediction that significant relationships would be found between scores on the 16 P.F. Test and ratings of counselor trainee interviews was not confirmed by statistical analysis of the test results and the interview rating scores.

The failure to find significant relationships between any of the 16 P.F. Test Factors and interview ratings suggests an examination of the structure of the interviews considered in this study as possibly contributing to the lack of positive results in this dimension. The bulk of the counselees had two interviews, one early and one late in the training period. The second interview sometimes involved discussion with the counselee's parents. When this occurred, the structure of the interview was somewhat changed, which in turn tended to force the counselor to be more informative and directive.

It was noted that the characteristics of a counselor in a given interview seemed to be markedly affected by and a function of the client's behavior and response pattern.

It was noted further by one of the judges that some counselors seemed to be as changed from the first to the last part of the same interview, as one could expect over a period of months of training. This situation caused some difficulty in making a decision "characterizing" the counselor in <u>one</u> interview.

These observations lead one to suspect the criterion of counselor effectiveness as being a key factor in the lower relationships with personality factors. Where "effective counseling" is such a <u>general</u> factor and when some judges doubt that one or two counseling sessions gives a valid sample of counselor effectiveness, the criterion becomes

as suspect as the predictors in accounting for low relationships.

The Performance Rating Scale, however, appeared to be an adequate if not accurate measure of performance in the counseling interviews used in this study. The range of the judges' ratings on the Scale was found to be from 27 to 79. This suggests that there was considerable variation among the trainees in regard to their ability to perform adequately. The fact that the reliability between the judges' ratings (.738 correlation coefficient) on the Scale was found to be substantial indicates that the judges were able to discriminate rather consistently regarding each trainee's respective ability to perform effectively in counseling interviews.

Since "good" counseling cannot yet be clearly or adequately defined, it may well be that a rating scale designed and scored in a reference frame more closely approximating that of the test would have greater reliability than the one used in this study. Since test factors such as those in the IPAT tests are more clearly defined by way of their being well founded on factor analytic research than are descriptive statements as found in the Performance Rating Scale used in this study, the above point would seem to have real merit.

The prediction that significant relationships would

be found between scores on the IPAT Humor Test of Personality and judged ratings of counselor trainee interviews was supported by the discovery of only 1 out of 10 Humor Factors being significantly related with the trainee ratings. This is barely confirmatory in regard to the second hypothesis made in Chapter I. The correlation between Humor Factor 9 and the higher interview ratings suggests that students or trainees who achieve a high score on this factor are more likely to choose counseling as a vocation than would an unselected group of students. A larger number of correlations, however, between humor factors and trainee ratings would have been desirable for more substantial support of this hypothesis.

A rating scale utilizing factors approaching the parameters of those on the Humor Test or the 16 P.F. Test might well have increased the objectivity and improved the comparableness of the two variables.

Further investigation between some of the above relationships which approached significance more closely than did others may be warranted, especially if rater reliability can be raised by a more clearly factored scale.

Also, further research as to the nature of the relation between personality and effective interview performance would be warranted with instruments other than

the ones used in this investigation.

Finally, a more detailed investigation of the relationships discovered by this study might well prove fruitful.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between the personality characteristics of counseling trainees and those of a norm group of college students, and the relationships between the personality characteristics of counseling trainees and their performance in counseling interviews. The instruments used to identify personal characteristics were the IPAT Sixteen Personality Factor Test and the IPAT Humor Test of Personality.

Performance in counseling interviews was herein defined as the degree to which the client relates himself effectively with the counselor, talks openly about his feelings, seems to take responsibility for himself, and as a result of the session gets a new perspective and ideas for action. A Performance Rating Scale, as rated by five judges, was the criterion measure of effective performance.

Twenty-nine trainees, were used as subjects in this study while they were enrolled in the Guidance and Counseling Institute sponsored by the National Defense Education Act at Central Washington State College in the summer of 1961. All of the interviews the counseling trainees had with high school students were tape-recorded and rated by the judges.

Three personality factors on the 16 P.F. Test (A+: Good Natured, Easy Going, C+: Emotional Stability, and L-: Relaxed Security) were found to be significantly different for counselor trainees from the norm group of 604 American college students.

No significant relationship was found between scores on the 16 P.F. Test and counselor trainee ratings.

One factor of the IPAT Humor Test of Personality was discovered to be significantly related within the 5 per cent level of confidence to counselor trainee ratings. This was Factor 9(Whimsical Retort vs. Damaging Retort) and was related on the positive side with the higher rated interviews.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, James F. Problems in Counseling. New York: Macmillan Company, 1962.

2. Bailey, Richard J. "State Certification of School Counselors," Occupations, 19:94-98, 1940.

3. Brown, D. J. "An Investigation of the Relationships Between Personal Characteristics of Guidance Counselors and Performance in Supervised Counseling Interviews." Ohio State University, 1960.

4. Cottle, William C. "Personal Characteristics of Counselors: Part I," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 35:445-50, June, 1953.

5. Cox, Rachel D. Counselors and Their Work. Harrisburg: Archives Press, 1945. 246 pp.

6. Dugan, Willis E. "The Counselor and His Relationships," The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 35:62-63, 1951.

7. Erickson, Clifford and Glenn E. Smith. Organization and Administration of Guidance Services. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1947. 276 pp.

8. Hamrin, Shirley A. and Blanche B. Paulson. Counseling Adolescents. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1950. 371 pp.

9. Karraker, William J. "Desirable Counselor Attitudes," Occupations, 29:1-605, May, 1951.

10. Kitch, Donald E. and William H. McCreary. "The School Counselor: His Work and Training," Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, 20:pp. 44, 1951.

11. Porter, Elias H. "The Development and Evaluation of a Measurement of Counseling Interview Procedure," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 3:128-35, July, 1947.

12. Practical Handbook for Counselors. Chicago: Science Research Association, 1945. 217 pp.

13. Robinson, Francis P. Principles and Procedures in Student Counseling. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. 321 pp.

14. Strang, Ruth. Pupil Personnel and Guidance. New York: The McMillan Company, 1941. 556 pp.

15. Tyler, Leona E. The Work of the Counselor. New York: Appleton Century Crofts Book Company, 1953. 323 pp.

16. Wrenn, C. Gilbert. "The Selection and Education of Student Personnel Workers," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 31:9-14, October, 1952.

17. _____. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: The Ronald Press, 1951. 589 pp.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE INSTRUCTIONS

The following is a rating scale which has been designed to evaluate the counselor's performance in counseling interviews. You are asked to rate each counseling trainee of this scale. It presents a group of possible occurrences which are to be rated on a five point continuum, ranging from "never" through "occasionally" to "always". Please follow these directions in rating each counseling trainee.

Respond to the rating scale by circling the number that corresponds to your choice for each item. The meaning of the numbers are as follows:

1) "never" or "not characteristic" of the interviews of the counseling trainee.

2) "rarely."

3) "occasionally."

4) "often."

5) "always" or "very characteristic" of the interviews of the counseling trainee.

Please be as frank as possible in your ratings. All of the answers are confidential.

Counselor_____

Judge_____

Date_____

Score_____

Note. This rating scale may be scored as follows:

0 point value for items with negative interpretations.

1 point value for items with neutral interpretations.

2 point value for items with positive interpretations.

1.	The counselor has established rapport with the client.	1 2 3 4 5
2.	The counselor's questions are too specific.	1 2 3 4 5
3.	The counselor gives incorrect information.	1 2 3 4 5
4.	The counselor gives the client support (assurance, approval).	1 2 3 4 5
5.	The counselor becomes involved in arguments with the client.	1 2 3 4 5
6.	The counselor and client participate in the solving of the problem(s).	1 2 3 4 5
7.	The counselor structures the interview periodically.	1 2 3 4 5
8.	The counselor does not allow the client enough responsibility.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	The counselor uses silences as a counseling technique.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	The counselor is aware of the stage the client is at in thinking through the problem.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	The counselor responds to "content" instead of "feeling" in the interviews.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	The counselor misses cues in the interview.	1 2 3 4 5
13.	The counselor leads too much.	1 2 3 4 5
14.	The counselor gives information and/or advice when asked.	1 2 3 4 5
15.	The counselor is pulling the client along too fast.	1 2 3 4 5
16.	The counselor's responses are clear to the client.	1 2 3 4 5
17.	The counselor has assumed too much responsibility in the interview.	1 2 3 4 5
18.	The counselor needs to develop discussion units more.	1 2 3 4 5

19.	The counselor is aware of the client's problem.	1 2 3 4 5
20.	The counselor rejects the client.	1 2 3 4 5
21.	The counselor permits the interview to wander.	1 2 3 4 5
22.	The counselor has a good analysis of the client's problem.	1 2 3 4 5
23.	The counselor uses tentative analysis and general leads.	1 2 3 4 5
24.	The counselor is aware of the role the client expects him to take.	1 2 3 4 5
25.	The counselor tends to be possessive of the client.	1 2 3 4 5
26.	The interview needs a summary.	1 2 3 4 5
27.	The counselor uses interpretive statements.	1 2 3 4 5
28.	The counselor fails to diagnose the client's problem deep enough.	1 2 3 4 5
29.	The counselor has accepted the client.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	The counselor talks too much.	1 2 3 4 5
31.	The counselor asks for clarification.	1 2 3 4 5
32.	The counselor attempts to get the client to analyze the problem(s).	1 2 3 4 5
33.	The counselor leads too little.	1 2 3 4 5
34.	The counselor misses the core of the client's remark.	1 2 3 4 5
35.	The counselor's responses are vague.	1 2 3 4 5
36.	The counselor needs to make plans for the next interview (or time between).	1 2 3 4 5
37.	The discussion in the interview is related to the client's problem.	1 2 3 4 5

38.	The counselor uses summary clarifications.	1 2 3 4 5
39.	The counselor fails to go deeper into the problem.	1 2 3 4 5
40.	Too much responsibility for the interview on the client.	1 2 3 4 5
41.	The counselor reflects the client's feeling.	1 2 3 4 5
42.	The client accepts the counselor's lead.	1 2 3 4 5
43.	The counselor is aware of the client's motivation in solving his problem.	1 2 3 4 5
44.	The counselor engages in personal valuing.	1 2 3 4 5
45.	The counselor breaks in on the client.	1 2 3 4 5
46.	The conference is smooth moving (moving toward goal).	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX B

COUNSELOR TRAINEE INTERVIEW RATINGS USED FOR RELIABILITY CHECK

Counselors	Judges									
	A		B		C		D		E	
	e*	l**	e	l	e	l	e	l	e	l
1	62	88					58	76		
2	41	37					55	49		
3	74	73					65	76		
4	27	44					27	51		
5	78	88					66	78		
6			45	51			47	59		
7			49	71			44	64		
8			59	72					71	71
9			33	55					60	67
10					59	57			56	56
11					54	34			60	41
12					79	78			73	75
13					52	57			62	65
14					71	70			59	66

*Interviews <u>early</u> in the training period

**Interviews <u>late</u> in the training period

Correlation coefficient of rater reliability: .738

INDEPENDENT COUNSELOR TRAINEE INTERVIEW RATINGS

Counselors	Judge E
15	51
16	63
17	69
18	57
19	44
20	37
21	61
22	45
23	60
24	50
25	62
26	50