

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.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-21,439

KITE, John Leon, Jr., 1944-
PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE
REHABILITATION COUNSELORS IN A COUNSELOR
TRAINING PROGRAM AND IN A STATE
REHABILITATION AGENCY.

The University of Arizona, Ph.D., 1976
Education, vocational

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

**PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE REHABILITATION
COUNSELORS IN A COUNSELOR TRAINING PROGRAM AND IN A
STATE REHABILITATION AGENCY**

by

John Leon Kite

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
REHABILITATION CENTER**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA**

1976

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my
direction by John Leon Kite
entitled PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE REHABILITATION
COUNSELORS IN A COUNSELOR TRAINING PROGRAM AND IN A
STATE REHABILITATION AGENCY
be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Paul
Dissertation Director

8/28/74
Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the
following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in
its approval and recommend its acceptance:*

Paul
J.E. Cronquist
Dr. J. J. ...
Antala P. Mishra

8/28/74
8/28/74
8/28/74
8-28-74

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's
adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the
final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into
the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory
performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: John L. Kite

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the members of his advisory committee for their assistance and encouragement in the preparation of this study. Appreciation is extended to Dr. Paul Leung, who served as advisor of the study, and to Dr. Jim Organist and Dr. Bob Johnson for their editorial assistance.

A special note of thanks is due to Dr. Dan Blaine, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Hawaii, for his invaluable assistance in furnishing research consultation.

In addition, the author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Tim Gust, Chairman, Department of Guidance and Counseling Psychology, University of Hawaii, for his encouragement and support during the final stages of this study.

To my wife, whose devotion and encouragement were a constant stimulus toward the completion of this goal, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	6
Statement of Problem	8
Hypotheses	9
Limitations	10
Summary	11
II. METHOD AND PROCEDURE	12
Subjects	12
Data Collection	14
Statistical Procedures	19
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	20
Hypothesis I	20
Hypothesis II	24
Hypothesis III	24
Discussion	31
Conclusion	39
IV. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	41
Implications	44
APPENDIX A: COURSE OUTLINE SUPERVISED PRACTICE IN REHABILITATION	46
APPENDIX B: VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SPECIALIST III	49
APPENDIX C: THE SIXTEEN FACTORS OF THE 16PF	50
APPENDIX D: THE TWENTY-SIX QUESTIONS OF THE C E R S	53
REFERENCES:	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Correlations Between Effectiveness Ratings and 16PF Sten Scores: Students	21
2. Distribution of Effectiveness Ratings: Students	22
3. Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences Between Effective and Noneffective Rehabilitation Counselors: Students	23
4. Correlations Between Effectiveness Ratings and 16PF Sten Scores: State	25
5. Distribution of Effectiveness Ratings: State	26
6. Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences Between Effective and Noneffective Rehabilitation Counselors: State	27
7. Comparisons of Correlations Between Effectiveness Ratings and STEN Scores on the 16PF for Student and State Rehabilitation Counselors	29
8. Correlations Between Effectiveness Ratings and STEN Scores on the 16PF for Student and State Counselors Combined	30
9. Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences Between Effective and Noneffective Rehabilitation Counselors: State and Students	30
10. Differences Between Effective and Noneffective Counselors on Factors with Correlations of .25 and Above: Students	32
11. Differences Between Effective and Noneffective Counselors on Factors with Correlations of .25 and Above: State	34
12. Differences Between Effective and Noneffective Counselors on Factors with Correlations of .20 and Above: Student and State	36

ABSTRACT

Along with the increasing demand for counselors to meet the needs of the population have come concerns about the effectiveness of counselors. Research into the variables related to counselor effectiveness has resulted in dissatisfaction with the use of cognitive factors, such as test scores and academic grades, for predicting effectiveness.

Investigations exploring the relationship between noncognitive factors and counselor effectiveness have produced promising results. Specifically, various personality characteristics have been demonstrated to have significant relationships with effectiveness in counseling.

Previous studies in the area of counselor effectiveness have, for the most part, limited their investigations to students enrolled in a general guidance and counseling program. This study was designed to investigate the relationship between personality characteristics and counseling effectiveness utilizing student rehabilitation counselor trainees and employed counselors in the field of rehabilitation.

The following hypotheses were advanced:

1. Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective graduate students in a rehabilitation counselor training program.
2. Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors employed by a state division of vocational rehabilitation.

3. Personality characteristics that can differentiate between effective and noneffective student counselors are not significantly different from those that can differentiate between effective and noneffective state division of vocational rehabilitation counselors.

The subjects used for this study were twenty-two students enrolled in a graduate rehabilitation counselor training program and twenty-two counselors employed by a state division of vocational rehabilitation. All subjects were individually administered the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) and were rated for counseling effectiveness by their supervisors using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS).

Effective student counselors were compared to noneffective student counselors, effective state counselors were compared to noneffective state counselors, and effective counselors from both groups were compared to noneffective counselors from both groups. Each comparison involved obtaining correlations between the personality factors and counselor effectiveness by means of multiple regression analysis. Next a specification equation was developed for each comparison and applied to those counselors rated effective and noneffective in each group. The differences between effective and noneffective counselors in each group were analyzed by means of the Mann-Whitney U Test. In addition, differences between the correlations obtained by the students and state counselors were analyzed with F-tests.

The results of the investigation supported the acceptance of all three of the hypotheses. Results were significant beyond the

p. 05 level in all three comparisons. None of the F-tests were significant beyond the p. 05 level.

The results of this study indicate that consideration should be given to including personality characteristics as part of the criteria used in selecting applicants for both a graduate rehabilitation counselor training program and a state division of vocational rehabilitation.

Further research into the relationship between counselor effectiveness and personality factors using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale is strongly encouraged. Future investigations should employ a larger N to allow greater flexibility for statistical analysis.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The task of selecting individuals for preparation as counselors has been a concern of the counseling profession for many years. At first, such concern took the form of general statements urging institutions to accept the responsibility for admitting only those students for whom there was some evidence they would succeed (Wrenn 1952). Soon professional organizations such as the American Psychological Association (1954), the American Personnel and Guidance Association (1965), and the American School Counselor Association (1965) began stressing the need for training programs to recognize potential in counselor candidates. As a result, researchers began to attempt to find ways for specifying selection criteria. Because there are many different kinds of counselors, each with their own unique characteristics, research has been conducted on specific kinds of counselors according to the researcher's area of interest, i.e., school counselors, veterans counselors, and employment counselors to name a few. This study will focus on the rehabilitation counselor.

The importance of selecting those counselors with the greatest potential of becoming the most effective practitioners is underscored by the increasing demand for services due to the rapidly expanding population. Advances in medical science have resulted in individuals living longer and surviving misfortunes which previously resulted in

fatalities. The availability of counseling service to meet the needs of these people depends upon the number of effective counselors that training institutions are able to produce (Walton and Sweeny 1969). Effectiveness, however, is a product not only of training but of the selection of individuals for training (Wrenn 1952; Burnett 1954; Stefflre, King and Leafgren 1962; Polmantier 1966).

In order to select potentially effective counselors, the first step should be to define counseling and effectiveness. To arrive at a single, encompassing definition of counseling is a difficult task. There are many counseling theories, each with its adherents and supportive research (Patterson 1967). In addition, there are many specialties within the field of counseling, each having different philosophies and working with different types of clients. Therefore, instead of attempting to define counseling, many researchers have concentrated on trying to identify effectiveness in counselors. Their approach has been to attempt to discover if certain personal characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors. The rationale for this approach is the belief that all effective counselors, regardless of their training or theoretical belief, have certain identifiable characteristics which distinguish them from their non-effective peers.

Traditionally, the personal characteristics used most often to screen prospective counselor candidates have been cognitive factors such as the Graduate Record Examination and undergraduate grade point average (Hill and Green 1960; Hurst and Fenner 1969; Santavicca 1959).

Although some investigations (Dole 1964; Jansen, Robb and Bonk 1970; Felker 1973) have found some relationships between counselor effectiveness and intellectual ability, other studies have shown that intellectual ability has little or no correlation with counselor effectiveness (Arbuckle 1968; Bergin and Solomon 1963; Myrick and Kelly 1971; Wittmer and Lister 1971). Wittmer and Lister summed up the dissatisfaction with intellectual criteria by the following: (1971, p. 293)

While academic aptitude measures can reasonably be expected to identify students who can survive the intellectual rigors of graduate school, it is increasingly apparent that they provide little assistance in identifying those students who, once admitted to a counselor education program, will become effective counselors.

Several approaches to the selection of potential counselors have been pursued on the basis of noncognitive criteria. One such approach is espoused by those who feel that the roles of the counselor must be analyzed. They suggest that for selection of counselors to be meaningful, the function of the counselor must be investigated more thoroughly (Cash and Munger 1966; Hill and Green 1960). Problems are encountered, however, in attempting to delineate the role of the counselor. Lewis and Lewis (1971) speak of the counselor role in terms of ideal role versus real role within the limits of the work setting. Muthard and Salomone (1969) state that the role and function of the counselor is seen from at least three positions--the supervisor-administrator, the educator, and the counselor himself. One might add to this list the role of the counselor as seen by his peers, his clients, and the community.

Other researchers have attempted to identify specific non-cognitive characteristics related to counselor effectiveness. Cahoon (1962), Kemp (1962), Steffire et al. (1962), and Russo, Keltz and Hudson (1964) all found that low levels of dogmatism distinguished between most effective and least effective counselors. Brams (1957) and McDaniel (1967) found that a tolerance for ambiguity was related to effectiveness in counseling. Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) have emphasized such interpersonal traits as empathy, warmth, and genuineness as being necessary traits for a counselor to be effective. Hahn and MacLean (1955) have even suggested that a student be accepted into a counselor training program on a conditional basis until it is determined that the student has no personality characteristics which might distort his relationship with clients. Because the noncognitive approach has shown considerable promise, it is the approach that will be used in this study.

Various traits have been identified as being able to distinguish effective from noneffective counselors through the use of such instruments as the Kuder Preference Record (Blocher 1963), the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (Steffire et al. 1962), Edwards Personal Preference Test (Steffire et al. 1962), Study of Values (Coutts 1962), the Therapists Orientation Questionnaire (Cahoon 1962), the Counselor Potential Scale (Dole 1964), the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (Sattler 1964), and the Minnesota Test of Creative Thinking (Kemp 1962). Obviously, non-intellectual personal characteristics seem to be a fruitful area to investigate for use in identifying potentially effective counselors.

However, there has been contradictory research involving most of the aforementioned tests (Brams 1957; Stefflre at al. 1962; Demos and Zuwaylif 1966).

Purpose

Because the literature suggests that certain noncognitive factors play an important role in determining whether or not a counselor is effective, this study was undertaken to try to identify those specific noncognitive factors which might differentiate effective rehabilitation counselors from noneffective rehabilitation counselors. The results could be used as part of the criteria to select those individuals with the most potential for becoming effective counselors.

Thompson (1972) has summed up the importance of selection in the process of training counselors when he states that, "Current screening practices have been judged inadequate and the development of new methods has been advocated. Two possible criteria have been proposed for study as selectors: (1) the identification and measuring of the behaviors of counselor trainees, and (2) the identification of nonintellective traits of counselor trainees."

Patterson (1964), Whitlay (1967), Richardson and Obermann (1973), and Shelton (1973) criticize the tendency of many researchers to limit their subjects to counselor trainees when examining the question of counselor effectiveness. They suggest that investigations into the noncognitive characteristics of effective counselors be expanded to include the successfully employed counselor. In addition, most rehabilitation counselor training programs have been established with the help of federal funds primarily to provide counselors for state and federal agencies. Therefore, it can theoretically be assumed that if a person is judged to be effective in a university training program, he should be equally as effective as a rehabilitation counselor in a state

agency setting. Consequently, two groups of counselors have been examined in this study. One group consists of graduate rehabilitation counseling students and the other consists of state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation counselors. Comparisons will be made between effective and noneffective counselors within the two groups. By using the same instruments to examine both groups, it is also possible to make some comparisons between the two groups.

Statement of Problem

This study is designed to determine if personality characteristics, as measured by the 16PF, can differentiate between effective and noneffective rehabilitation counselor trainees and effective and noneffective employed rehabilitation counselors. Two groups of subjects will be utilized in this study. One group will be composed of graduate students enrolled in a graduate Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program, and the other group will be composed of counselors employed by a state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Every subject will be administered the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Every subject will also be evaluated as to his effectiveness by the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS). The CERS will be filled out by each counselor's immediate supervisor.

This study will pose the following questions:

1. Are there certain personality characteristics, as measured by the 16PF, which can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselor trainees enrolled in a graduate Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program?
2. Are there certain personality characteristics, as measured by the 16PF, which can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors employed by a state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation agency?
3. Is there any difference between the personality characteristics of effective student rehabilitation counselors and the personality characteristics of effective state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation counselors?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are advanced:

1. Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective graduate students in a Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program.
2. Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors employed by a state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.
3. Personality characteristics that can differentiate between effective and noneffective student counselors are not significantly different from those that can differentiate between effective and noneffective state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation counselors.

Limitations

Several limitations are inherent in this study:

1. Because of the small number of subjects employed in this study, the results cannot be meaningfully generalized to populations outside the parameters of this investigation.
2. A larger sample size would have reduced the risk of accepting the null hypotheses when the null hypotheses were false.
3. Finally, McClain (1968) and Myrick, Kelly and Wittmer (1972) suggest that personality characteristics of effective female counselors may differ significantly from those of effective male counselors. There were not sufficient numbers of female subjects available to test this hypothesis.

Summary

This study was designed to explore the relationship between specific personality factors and the effectiveness of rehabilitation counselors in training as well as those employed by a state agency. Identification of personality characteristics which can differentiate between effective and noneffective rehabilitation counselors will hopefully provide some answers to the questions currently raised by various admissions directors of counselor training programs and recruitment personnel of service-oriented agencies. In addition, this study will investigate the degree to which personality characteristics that can differentiate effective from noneffective student counselors differ from those that can differentiate between effective and noneffective state agency counselors. The results of this investigation may suggest some valid criteria which can be used to improve training programs, select potential counselors, and minimize the misapplication of training effects.

CHAPTER II

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

The subjects (Ss) of this study were twenty-two university counselor trainees and twenty-two state agency rehabilitation counselors.

The trainee group (T) consisted of 13 male and 9 female graduate students who were enrolled in the Rehabilitation Counselor Education Program at The University of Arizona during the academic year 1973-1974. The Rehabilitation Counselor Education Program at The University of Arizona is a fifty-four credit hour graduate program leading to a master's degree in vocational rehabilitation. As part of the curriculum, each trainee is required to take two semesters of practicum involving counseling clients of various rehabilitation agencies. These practicums are supervised by representatives of the faculty in rehabilitation counseling through audio and/or video tape critiques, observation, individual feedback and group seminars. See Appendix A for a description of the practicum. Each of the trainees in this study were enrolled in their second semester of practicum.

The state rehabilitation counselor group (E) consisted of 9 male and 13 female counselors employed by the Department of Social Services and Housing, Vocational Rehabilitation and Services for the Blind Division, Oahu Branch, State of Hawaii. These individuals ranged

in experience as rehabilitation counselors from eight to ten years.

See Appendix B for a description of their job.

Data Collection

Measures of personality characteristics for each S in both the T group and the E group were obtained individually through the administration of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). Effectiveness ratings of each S in both groups were obtained by having each Ss supervisor complete the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

Test Instruments

"The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire is a multidimensional set of sixteen questionnaire scales, arranged in omnibus form. It is designed to make available, in a practicable testing time, information about an individual's standing on the majority of primary personality factors (Cattell, Eber and Tatsvoka 1970)." The test was developed by Raymond Cattell and first published in 1949. Appendix C contains a description of the 16 factors.

The 16PF was selected for this study because of its comprehensiveness of personality dimensions and its focus for organization of predictive information. In addition, the 16PF has consistently been able to differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors (McClain 1968; Donnan and Harlan 1968; Wittmer and Lister 1971; Penn 1971; Myrick, Kelly and Wittmer 1972; Shelton 1973; Wher and Wittmer 1973).

Cattell describes the 16PF by stating that:

The central feature of the 16PF which distinguished it from most other adult questionnaires is that it is firmly based on the personality sphere concept - a design to insure initial item coverage for all the behavior that commonly enters ratings and the dictionary description of personality. Thus, it has

not been built up only by factoring of questionnaire material. but is part of the general structuring research on personality in everyday life rating data, objective tests, etc. (Cattell et al. 1970, p.6).

The predictive utility of the 16PF has been augmented by investigations establishing the stability of the 16PF traits across cultures and throughout the developmental sequence (Cattell et al. 1970). This allows for comparison of individuals of different ages and different cultures on the same personality traits.

Although there are four forms of the 16PF, Cattell recommends using form A or B for research and use with most university students (Cattell et al. 1970). The test-retest reliability coefficients for each factor of form A are:

A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O
.81	.58	.78	.80	.79	.81	.83	.77	.75	.70	.61	.79
Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q ₄								
.73	.73	.62	.81								

An analytic statement of direct validities for each factor scale of form A is:

A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O
.79	.35	.70	.63	.83	.67	.92	.70	.49	.44	.41	.71
Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q ₄								
.62	.70	.68	.57								

Previous utilization of the 16PF in counseling research is relatively sparse due to its comparatively recent development. McClain (1968) used the 16PF to differentiate various levels of coun-

selor competence in high school counselors. He was able to differentiate levels of competence in four out of six cases through the application of a specification equation. Donnan and Harlan (1968) found that five factors on the 16PF were significantly different between counseling students and administration students enrolled in a university (Factors C, G, I, L, and N).

In attempting to relate various factors on the 16PF with levels of interpersonal skill scores, Penn (1971) found that counselors with a highly rated level of regard scored lower on factor B and higher on Factors E, H, and F than did lower rated counselors. In addition, counselors rated higher on congruence scored higher on Factors F and H. Wittmer and Lister (1971) examined the relationship between counselor effectiveness and scores on the Graduate Record Examination and the 16PF. They found no evidence that the GRE could identify potentially effective counselors but their research did support the relevance of personality variables to counseling performance. In 1972, Myrick, Kelly, and Wittmer followed the lead of McClain (1968) and found that eight factors on the 16PF (A, C, E, F, G, H, I, L) were able to distinguish between effective and ineffective counselors. They state that the 16PF should be given consideration as an instrument for aiding in the selection of students for admission to counselor education programs. A survey of the literature resulted in only one reference involving research with the 16PF and rehabilitation counselors (Richardson and Obermann 1973).

The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale was developed by Myrick and Kelly in 1971 because, in previous research, "the criterion measures

for determining counselor effectiveness were not clearly defined" (Myrick and Kelly 1971, p.330). Traditionally, there have been three major ways of measuring counselor effectiveness - grades, client ratings and supervisor ratings. It has already been mentioned that grades and academic achievement have little correlation with counselor effectiveness. The importance of the client's perception of the counselor is undeniable. However, self-reports by clients have been consistently suspect as valid appraisal tools (Goodstein and Grigg 1959; Patterson 1959). Therefore, it appears that supervisory ratings of counselor effectiveness offers the most promise for use as criterion of counselor effectiveness at this time. The CERS was designed to be used in research so that comparisons could be made between programs using the CERS as the criterion of counselor effectiveness.

The CERS has twenty-six items with thirteen items referring to counseling per se and thirteen dealing with supervisory relationships. An optional item concerning employment recommendation was not used in this study. Separate scores can be obtained for counseling and supervision with a composite score of overall effectiveness. A Likert-type scale (-3 to +3) is used to rate the counselors with -3 indicating the rater strongly disagrees with the statement, while +3 indicates strong agreement. A scaled score of 1 is given to a raw score of -3, while a raw score of +3 is given a scaled score of +7. No response or a response of "uncertain" is given a scaled score of 4.

Using split-half reliability (Spearman-Brown correction), a coefficient of .95 was found by the authors. Test-retest after a period

of at least four weeks produced a product moment reliability of .94. A correlation coefficient of .86 was found when the thirteen counseling items were compared to the thirteen supervisory items.

A measure of validity was obtained for the CERS through the method of its development. The items which comprise the scale were obtained through a review of the professional literature. After evaluation by the students and faculty of the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Florida, twenty-six of the items were selected to comprise the CERS. Thus, the scale has face validity although no other measures of validity are reported. The twenty-six items used in CERS are listed in Appendix D.

Statistical Procedures

To determine whether personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective student rehabilitation counselors, correlations between effectiveness ratings and the STEN scores of the 16PF were obtained by means of multiple-regression analysis. According to Cooley and Lohnes (1962) this is the best known method of multivariate analysis used in examining the relationship between a dependent variable and two or more independent variables. The obtained correlations of .25 and above were used as weights and employed in a specification equation to determine the best estimate of the relative contribution of the independent variables. The students were then ranked according to their effectiveness ratings. The Mann-Whitney U Test (Siegel 1956) was used to analyze the differences between the eight lowest rated students and the eight highest rated students using the weighted scores. This procedure was also followed for analyzing the data on state counselors.

The weighted scores of the lowest rated student counselors and the lowest rated state counselors were then combined, as were the weighted scores of the highest rated counselors in both groups. The Mann-Whitney U Test was then employed to analyze the differences between these groups to determine whether there was a significant difference between effective and noneffective student counselors and those that differentiate between effective and noneffective state counselors.

In all three comparisons, any difference which reached the .05 level of significance was accepted as representing a reliable difference.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the statistical analysis are presented following the statement of each individual hypothesis. A discussion of the results and conclusions are also presented.

Hypothesis I

Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective graduate students in a rehabilitation counselor training program.

To determine whether the 16 personality factors as measured by the 16PF could differentiate between effective and noneffective student rehabilitation counselors, correlations between scores on the CERS and the STEN scores for each factor were obtained by means of multiple regression analysis (McNemar 1960) (Table 1). Next, the students were ranked according to their effectiveness ratings as measured by the CERS (Table 2). The students with the eight highest scores were designated as effective while the students with the eight lowest scores were considered noneffective. To obtain the best estimate of the criterion for each subject in the two groups, a specification equation was constructed using the factors with correlations of .25 and above. Since the 16 factors are essentially uncorrelated, the obtained correlations themselves were used as weights with their corresponding STEN scores

TABLE 1
 .CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS AND 16PF STEN SCORES:
 STUDENTS

Factor	r	Factor	r
A	.10	L	.15
B	-.24	M	-.12
C	-.09	N	-.26
E	.45	O	.21
F	-.10	Q ₁	.38
G	-.26	Q ₂	.31
H	.02	Q ₃	-.31
I	-.15	Q ₄	.07

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS:
STUDENTS

Rating	Frequency	Percentage
67	1	5
93	1	5
107	1	5
113	1	5
121	1	5
122	1	5
123	1	5
125	1	5
128	1	5
136	2	10
140	1	5
142	2	10
144	2	10
147	1	5
162	2	10
164	1	5
173	1	5
177	1	5

(Cattell et al. 1957), which resulted in the following specification equation:

$$.45(E) + .26(11-G) + .26(11-N) + .38(Q_1) + .31(Q_2) + .31(Q_3)$$

Factors G, N, and Q_2 were subtracted from 11 due to their negative correlations which has the effect of reversing the bipolar label for those factors. The Mann-Whitney U Test (Siegel 1956) was then used to test the significance of difference between the two groups (Table 3). The results were significant beyond the .05 level of significance, indicating that effective student rehabilitation counselors can be differentiated from their noneffective peers on the basis of personality factors. Therefore, Hypothesis I was accepted.

TABLE 3

MANN-WHITNEY U TEST FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE
AND NONEFFECTIVE REHABILITATION COUNSELORS:
STUDENTS

Source	Sum of Ranks		U	Z
	High	Low		
Specification Scores	47	89	53	2.21*

*p < .05

Hypothesis II

Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors employed by a state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

The same procedure used to test Hypothesis I was employed to test Hypothesis II. Table 4 contains the correlations between effectiveness and personality characteristics for state counselors while Table 5 indicates effectiveness rankings from the CERS. Factors A, E, F, H and I had correlation coefficients of .25 or above and were used as weights in the following specification equation:

$$.33(A) + .49(E) + .39(F) + .44(H) + .30(I)$$

After ranking the state counselors according to their effectiveness rating, the Mann-Whitney U Test (McNemar 1960) was used to test for differences between the eight lowest rated counselors (noneffective) and the eight highest rated counselors (effective) (Table 6). The results were significant beyond the p. 05 level leading to the acceptance of Hypothesis II.

Hypothesis III

There is no significant difference between those personality characteristics that differentiate between effective and noneffective student counselors and those that differentiate between effective and noneffective state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation counselors.

The results of the F-test comparing the correlations of student and state counselors on all the factors which were utilized in the specification equations for testing Hypotheses I and II indicate that there are no significant differences between the 16PF scores of effective

TABLE 4
 CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS AND 16PF STEN SCORES:
 STATE

Factor	r	Factor	r
A	.33	L	.07
B	.21	M	.23
C	-.12	N	-.23
E	.49	O	-.20
F	.39	Q ₁	-.11
G	-.18	Q ₂	.23
H	.44	Q ₃	-.13
I	.30	Q ₄	.01

TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS:
STATE

Rating	Frequency	Percentage
78	1	5
95	1	5
98	1	5
101	1	5
106	1	5
107	1	5
120	1	5
124	1	5
127	1	5
129	1	5
131	2	10
136	2	10
143	1	5
149	1	5
154	1	5
156	1	5
161	1	5
162	1	5
171	2	10

TABLE 6
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE AND
NONEFFECTIVE REHABILITATION COUNSELORS:
STATE

Source	Sum of Ranks		U	Z
	High	Low		
Specification Scores	42	94	58	2.73*

*p < .05

and noneffective student counselors and those of effective and noneffective state counselors (Table 7). However, closer examination of the results indicates that Factors B, F, I, and Q_1 tend to approach significance at the .15 level. (Table 7).

To be consistent with the analyses of Hypotheses I and II, correlations between effectiveness and STEN scores on the 16PF were obtained for student and state counselors combined by means of regression analysis. If personality factors can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors when the groups are combined, the results would add support to accepting Hypothesis III. These results are contained in Table 8. Using those correlations of .20 and above as weights resulted in the following specification equation:

$$.23(A) + .46(E) + .23(11-G) + .24(H) + .23(11-N) + .20(11-O) \\ + .26(Q_2) + .20(11-Q_3)$$

This equation was applied to the STEN scores of the 16 lowest rated counselors and the 16 highest rated counselors and the results analyzed by the Mann-Whitney U Test (McNemar 1960). The results of the analysis demonstrates that there is a significant difference between the effective and noneffective counselors (Table 9). Hypothesis III was accepted on the basis of the results.

TABLE 7

COMPARISONS OF CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS
AND STEN SCORES ON THE 16PF FOR STUDENT AND STATE
REHABILITATION COUNSELORS

Factor	r's		F-Ratio	P
	Student	State		
A	.10	.33	.50	.51
B	-.24	.21	2.17	.15
C	-.09	-.12	.00	.97
E	.45	.49	.00	.95
F	-.10	.39	2.88	.09
G	-.26	-.18	.04	.84
H	.02	.44	2.00	.17
I	-.15	.30	2.09	.15
L	.15	.07	.05	.83
M	-.12	.23	1.10	.30
N	-.26	-.23	.28	.60
O	-.21	-.20	.00	.96
Q ₁	.38	-.11	2.74	.10
Q ₂	.31	.23	.01	.91
Q ₃	-.31	-.13	.49	.50
Q ₄	.07	.01	.04	.84

TABLE 8
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS AND STEN SCORES
ON THE 16PF FOR STUDENT AND STATE COUNSELORS COMBINED

Factor	r	Factor	r
A	.23	L	.12
B	.02	M	.09
C	.07	N	-.23
E	.46	O	-.20
F	.14	Q ₁	.12
G	-.23	Q ₂	.26
H	.24	Q ₃	-.20
I	.09	Q ₄	.03

TABLE 9
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE
AND NONEFFECTIVE REHABILITATION COUNSELORS:
STATE AND STUDENTS

Source	Sum of Ranks		U	Z
	High	Low		
Specification Scores	183	345	209	2.68*

*p < .05

Discussion

Table 10 indicates the relative relationships between student counselor effectiveness and personality factors. The factor with the highest correlation (.45) was E. Noneffective counselors scored only slightly above the norm on this factor while effective counselors scored considerably above the norm for the adult population. According to the 16PF manual, high scores on factor E are associated with dominance and are described by such terms as assertive, aggressive, competitive and stubborn. The factor with the next highest correlation was factor Q_1 (.38). The high rated counselors scored very close to the norm on this factor while the low rated counselors scored below the norm which indicated noneffective counselors are more conservative in their temperament. On factor Q_2 (.31), the high rated counselors scored above the norm while low rated counselors scored very close to the norm. High scores on factor Q_2 are related to self-sufficiency and resourcefulness. The next highest correlation was on factor Q_3 (-.31). The low rated counselors were more precise and controlled than the high rated counselors although both groups scored above the norm. The results suggest that average self-control is important in the effective student rehabilitation counselor, but not when carried to the extent of compulsiveness. Low scores on factor G (-.26) are associated with expediency and a disregard for rules. The high rated students scored below the norm while the low rated students scored at the norm. Low scores on factor N (-.26) indicate forthrightness and unpretentiousness. Both groups scored very low on this factor with effective counselors scoring below the noneffective counselors.

TABLE 10
 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE AND NONEFFECTIVE COUNSELORS ON
 FACTORS WITH CORRELATIONS OF .25 AND ABOVE:
 STUDENTS

Factor	r	STEN Means	
		High Rated	Low Rated
E	.45	8.36	6.13
G	-.26	4.13	5.38
N	-.26	1.38	2.50
Q ₁	.38	5.75	4.13
Q ₂	.31	6.13	5.75
Q ₃	-.31	6.25	7.00

To summarize, this study indicates that effective rehabilitation counselors in a graduate training program tend to be more dominant (factor E) and less conservative (factor Q₁) than noneffective counselors. In addition, the high rated counselors are more resourceful (factor Q₂), less compulsive (factor Q₃), more expedient (factor G) and more unpretentious (factor N) than the low rated counselors. The analysis of the data indicates that effective graduate students in a rehabilitation counselor training program can be differentiated from noneffective students in the same program.

Table 11 illustrates the relative importance of specific personality factors for counseling effectiveness in state rehabilitation counselors. The highest correlation was observed for factor E (.49). The high rated counselors scored above the norm while the low rated counselors scored below the norm, indicating that effective state counselors are more dominant when compared to the adult population while the noneffective state counselors are more submissive than the norm. The next highest correlation was with factor H (.44). Individuals scoring high on this factor are described as adventurous, thick skinned, and socially bold, while low scores are associated with shyness and restraint. Again, the effective group scored above the norm while the noneffective group scored below the norm. On factor F (.39) the high rated group scored right at the norm while the low rated group scored below it. Low scores on this factor indicate a serious and taciturn nature. Effective state counselors scored above the norm on factor A (.33) which denotes an individual who is easy going and warmhearted.

TABLE 11
 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE AND NONEFFECTIVE COUNSELORS ON
 FACTORS WITH CORRELATIONS OF .25 AND ABOVE:
 STATE

Factor	r	\bar{X} 's	
		High Rated	Low Rated
A	.33	6.25	3.86
E	.49	6.38	4.13
F	.39	5.50	3.86
H	.44	6.13	4.38
I	.30	8.38	6.75

The noneffective group scored below the norm and tended toward aloofness and a reserved manner. Both groups scored above the norm on factor I (.30) with the high rated counselors scoring above the low rated counselors. High scores on this factor are associated with sensitiveness and overprotection.

The data indicates that effective counselors employed by a state rehabilitation agency are characterized as being dominant rather than submissive (factor E), adventurous rather than timid (factor H), enthusiastic rather than taciturn (factor F), outgoing rather than reserved (factor A), and more sensitive (factor I) than their noneffective peers. Utilizing these personality characteristics, it was demonstrated that there is a significant difference between effective and noneffective counselors employed by a state vocational rehabilitation agency.

From the data in Table 12, only factor E (.46) and factor Q_2 (.26) had correlation coefficients of .25 or above which was the cut-off point for inclusion in the specification equations used in testing Hypothesis I and II. Therefore, factors having correlations of .20 and above were used in the specification equation to test Hypothesis III in order to exploit the factor scores as fully as possible.

The differences between the scores of effective and noneffective counselors are presented in Table 11. High scores on factor E are associated with dominate tendencies while high scores on factor Q_2 indicate self-sufficiency. On factor Q_2 , both groups scored above the norm with effective counselors scoring slightly above noneffective counselors. On factor E, the high rated group scored considerably above the norm while

TABLE 12

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE AND NONEFFECTIVE COUNSELORS ON
FACTORS WITH CORRELATIONS OF .20 AND ABOVE:
STUDENT AND STATE

Factor	r	\bar{X} 's	
		High Rated	Low Rated
A	.23	6.00	4.19
E	.46	7.38	5.13
G	-.23	4.13	5.19
H	.24	6.38	5.06
N	-.23	2.88	3.88
O	-.20	4.13	4.69
Q ₂	.26	6.69	6.06
Q ₃	-.20	5.69	6.81

the low rated group scored slightly below the norm. The next highest correlation was observed for factor H (.24). High scores on this factor are characterized by such adjectives as adventurous, thick-skinned and socially bold. Effective counselors scored above the norm on this factor while the noneffective counselors scored below the norm and tended to be more timid and restrained. Factors A, G and N all had correlations of $\pm .23$. Factor A showed that the high rated counselors scored above the norm and tended to be outgoing and warmhearted, while the noneffective group scored below the norm and were more critical and reserved. Both groups scored below the norm on Factor G with the effective counselors tending to be more expedient than the noneffective group. A low score on Factor N indicates unpretentiousness and forthrightness. Both groups scored considerably below the norm with the higher rated counselors scoring below the lower rated. Self-assured, complacent, and secure characterize low scores on Factor O (-.20). Effective counselors scored slightly below noneffective counselors on this factor with both groups scoring below the norm. On factor Q_3 (-.20), the high rated group scored close to the norm while the low rated group scored above the norm. High scores on factor Q_3 are associated with high strength of self-sentiment.

When the data from both groups is combined, the effective rehabilitation counselor is described as being dominate, adventurous and warmhearted. He is also more self sufficient, more expedient, more forthright, less compulsive, and more self-assured than this noneffective counterparts.

In this study, factors E, G, N, Q₁, Q₂, and Q₃ were found to be viable in differentiating effective from noneffective student rehabilitation counselors. In a comparable study, Myrick et al. (1972) found that factors A, H, E, and I could differentiate between effective and noneffective student counselors in a general counseling and guidance program at the .05 level of significance. In addition, they found that factors C, F, G, and L differentiated effectiveness at the .10 level of confidence. It would appear that the continuum of Submissive to Dominant and Low Superego Strength to Superego Strength are factors significantly related to counselor effectiveness in both student rehabilitation counselors and student counselors in a general program. However, there is no agreement on 9 other factors, implying student rehabilitation counselors may differ substantially from their counterparts in a general counseling and guidance program.

Using subjects employed as school counselors, McClain (1968) found that factors A, E, F, H, and Q₁ were significantly related to counselor effectiveness, while Donnan, Harlan and Thompson (1969) using similar subjects, found counselor effectiveness was related to factors A, C, H, and I. In this study, employed rehabilitation counselors were differentiated in terms of effectiveness by using factors A, E, F, H, and I. Apparently, most of the same factors can be used to differentiate effective from noneffective employed counselors whether they are working in rehabilitation agencies or in schools.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are tempered by the limitations presented in Chapter 1. In addition, the definitions of counselor effectiveness and personality characteristics have been limited by the use of the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire as measuring devices. Utilization of different criteria could possibly lead to different results.

With these limitations, the following conclusions are presented:

1. On the basis of personality factors, student rehabilitation counselors rated as effective by their supervisors can be differentiated from student rehabilitation counselors rated as noneffective by their supervisors.

2. Effective state rehabilitation counselors can be differentiated from noneffective state rehabilitation counselors through the use of personality factors.

3. The personality factors that differentiate between effective and noneffective student rehabilitation counselors are not significantly different from those personality factors which differentiate between effective and noneffective state rehabilitation counselors.

4. There appears to be a definite relationship between certain personality factors and the effectiveness of both student and state agency rehabilitation counselors.

5. Although there is no significant difference between those personality characteristics which differentiate between effective and noneffective student rehabilitation counselors and those that

differentiate between effective and noneffective state agency rehabilitation counselors, comparisons between four of the factors approached significance. Therefore, further study of the possible differences is indicated using expanded samples.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The traditional method of selecting potential counselors for a graduate training program on the basis of cognitive factors has been demonstrated to have little relationship to the students' subsequent ratings as effective counselors. Increasingly, the literature has suggested that specific personal characteristics are necessary, if not sufficient, for counselors to be effective in their work. Previous authors have addressed themselves to this issue utilizing subjects from the general field of counseling and guidance. This study was undertaken, in part, to try and identify which, if any, personal characteristics could be used to differentiate effective student rehabilitation counselors from noneffective student rehabilitation counselors.

Most state rehabilitation agencies employ counselors on the basis of cognitive criteria such as experience, education, or scores on a civil service examination. The possibility of the effectiveness of state agency rehabilitation counselors being related to specific personal characteristics was an extension of the study related to student rehabilitation counselors.

The purpose for establishing graduate training programs in rehabilitation counseling is primarily to supply state rehabilitation agencies with minimally effective counselors. Therefore, the question arose in the mind of this investigator as to whether the same personal characteristic

would be equally related to effectiveness in both student counselors and state counselors.

Specifically, the following hypotheses were advanced:

1. Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective graduate students in a Rehabilitation Counselor Training program.
2. Personality characteristics can differentiate between effective and noneffective counselors employed by a state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.
3. Personality characteristics that can differentiate between effective and noneffective student counselors are not significantly different from those than can differentiate between effective and noneffective state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation counselors.

The student Ss used in this study were thirteen male and nine female enrollees in a graduate rehabilitation counselor training program at The University of Arizona. All the student Ss were in their second semester of practicum work.

The nine male and thirteen female counselors from the state rehabilitation agency were employed by the Hawaii Department of Social Services and Housing, Vocational Rehabilitation and Services for the Blind Division.

All the Ss were administered the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. In addition, each counselor's effectiveness was assessed by his supervisor using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

The statistical procedure involved obtaining correlations between effectiveness ratings and personality factors on the 16PF for the student group, the state group, and the two groups combined by means of

regression analysis. In all three groups, effective and noneffective counselors were identified by ranking the counselors according to their supervisors' ratings on the CERS. Specification equations were developed for each group and applied to the 16PF STEN scores of each effective and noneffective counselor. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to test for significant differences between the effective and noneffective counselors in each group. In all three comparisons, scores of effective counselors were found to be significantly different from scores of noneffective counselors.

In addition, comparisons were made between those factors used to differentiate effective from noneffective student counselors and those used to differentiate effective from noneffective state counselors. No significant differences were found in these comparisons.

Implications

1. The finding that effective and noneffective student rehabilitation counselor trainees can be differentiated on the basis of personality characteristics could lead to the inclusion of the 16PF as part of the selection criteria for admitting prospective students to a graduate training program. Rochester (1967) has reported that personality characteristics of students in a counselor training program usually remain stable over the course of their program. Of those who change, most revert back to pre-training results following training.

It is not suggested that personality measures be the sole criterion for accepting or rejecting prospective students. However, in light of the findings of this study and the poor predictive powers of other criteria reported in Chapter I, it would seem that further exploration into the utilization of personality factors as a part of university admissions procedures for rehabilitation counselor applicants is warranted.

2. The 16PF also proved useful in differentiating effective and noneffective counselors in a state rehabilitation agency. It appears reasonable that personality assessment could be used, along with other criteria, for selecting potential counselors for vocational rehabilitation agencies.

3. Although there was no statistical difference between the correlations of effective student counselors and effective state counselors on the same personality factors, some correlations were sufficiently different, and in opposite directions in some cases, to warrant

further comparisons with larger samples. Providing the correlations remained the same, an N of 35 in each group would have resulted in significant differences. It is also possible that sampling fluctuations could result in completely different data. However, if different personality characteristics are related to counselor effectiveness in the two settings, it would appear that a re-examination of the assumption that universities train rehabilitation counselors primarily for state agencies is in order. The implication would be that the state agencies may be looking for different personality "types" than universities are producing.

4. The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale may prove useful in further research on evaluating the effectiveness of rehabilitation counselor trainees in graduate programs. With the trend in some parts of the country to establish competency based counseling programs, there is a need for more objective methods of determining counselor effectiveness that would be common to the majority of programs. Along with accreditation of the programs themselves, prospective employers of rehabilitation counselors across the country could be reasonably assured of at least minimum qualifications of rehabilitation counselor graduates regardless from which program they graduated. More research needs to be done with the CERS and similar instruments, however, to establish their reliability and validity.

APPENDIX A

COURSE OUTLINE SUPERVISED PRACTICE IN REHABILITATION*

1. Weekly meetings of a practicum section
 - a. discussion of the application of theory to practice in rehabilitation by the supervisor
 - b. discussion of current problems experienced by students in their practicum setting
 - c. listening to specific tapes of individual sessions made by students in the practicum section
 - d. listening and discussing tapes made by experts in the field
 - e. listening to lectures presented by practicing rehabilitation counselors
 - f. group interaction with rehabilitation counselors from local agencies
2. Individual tape evaluation and feedback sessions
 - a. each student will present a tape at least once each week to the supervisor for one to one discussion and critique
 - b. when possible the supervisor will observe the student by utilizing video equipment or a one way mirror
 - c. objectives for the student's client will be discussed by the student and a developmental plan will be established and implemented
3. Student Assessment and Evaluation
 - a. the supervisor will assess and evaluate the students through listening to the audio tapes

* Rehabilitation Center, The University of Arizona, 1973.

- b. the supervisor will assess and evaluate the student by observing the function via video equipment and one way mirrors
- c. the supervisor will assess and evaluate the student on the basis of his maintenance of required paper work
- d. the supervisor will assess and evaluate the student on the basis of the student's participation and interaction with his peers
- e. the supervisor will assess and evaluate the student on the basis of the student's participation in the agency setting
- f. the supervisor will assess and evaluate the student on the basis of the student's competencies as listed under section 1 above

4. Specific assignments to meet the general course objectives

- a. a minimum of three continuing clients (a continuing client is one seen on a weekly basis for at least five weeks) during the semester
- b. a minimum of one tape per week for critique
- c. one initial interview
- d. a minimum of three tapes with a given client with one made during the first or second interview, one during a middle session and one made during the final (or close to the terminal) session
- e. up to date interview notes on each counseling session to be given the supervisor on Monday of each week
- f. interview notes will constitute approximately one-half page of typed material and will state the objectives of the session and explain how the objectives were met or why they were not accomplished, e.g., interview notes will describe what client behaviors are to be changed and how, and will describe any changes observed
- g. a student must demonstrate change in accordance with stated objectives in at least one client (e.g., by case notes, audio tape or direct observation) in order to earn a minimal passing grade
- h. to earn a "one" or "a" grade a student must demonstrate change in client behavior, in accordance with stated objectives in each of his clients; carry a case load of more

than three continuing clients; maintain adequate case notes and comply with the supervisor's course requirements in every respect

- i. a book review on each of the references listed below is a course requirement
- j. each review will state briefly the following items:
 - (1) the basic presentation of the publication
 - (2) the two items of primary importance to the reviewer
 - (3) a summary of what the material has added to the reader's counseling skills
- k. book reviews are due as completed but in no case later than one week prior to the final day of the semester

APPENDIX B

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SPECIALIST III*

Duties and Responsibilities

- A. Medical and related specialties
 - 1. Evaluation
 - 2. Confer with consultants
 - 3. Restoration and post restoration

- B. Psychology
 - 1. Interview
 - 2. Administer vocational appraisal tests
 - 3. Consult with psychologist
 - 4. Utilize full potential of client

- C. Counseling and Guidance
 - 1. Counsel and guide
 - 2. Interpret tests
 - 3. Vocational analysis of client
 - 4. Prepare client for job interviews
 - 5. Prepare client for demands of job
 - 6. Prepare client to be responsible worker

- D. Education and Vocational Training
 - 1. Based of all information guide client to training
 - 2. Determine level of achievement and optimum entry level
 - 3. Maintain contact with training personnel
 - 4. Assure client success

- E. Job Development and Selective Placement
 - 1. Maintain and develop relationship with employer
 - 2. Conduct job analysis

- F. Supporting Services
 - 1. Maintain case records
 - 2. Interpret agency policy to other interested organizations
 - 3. Develop program
 - 4. Supervise VRS I or II
 - 5. Maintain and utilize control devices for management of caseload
 - 6. Participate in staff development

*Department of Social Services and Housing, Vocational Rehabilitation and Services for the Blind Division, 1974.

APPENDIX C

THE SIXTEEN FACTORS OF THE 16PF

Each factor has two labels, one for the low score and one for the high score. The labels underlined are the technical names used for each factor. Under each technical name are the common names used to describe the factor.

LOW SCORE

HIGH SCORE

FACTOR A

SIZTHYMIA
Reserved, Detached, Critical,
Aloof, Stiff

AFFECTOTHYMIA
Warm hearted, Outgoing, Easy-
going, Participating

FACTOR B

LOW INTELLIGENCE
Crystallized, Power Measure,
Dull

HIGH INTELLIGENCE
Crystallized, Power Measure,
Bright

FACTOR C

EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY
EGO WEAKNESS
Affected by Feelings, Emotion-
ally Less Stable, Easily Upset,
Changeable

HIGHER EGO STRENGTH
Emotionally Stable, Mature,
Faces Reality, Calm

FACTOR E

SUBMISSIVE
Obedient, Mild, Easily Led,
Docile, Accommodating

DOMINANCE
Assertive, Aggressive, Com-
petitive, Stubborn

FACTOR F

DE SURGENCY
Sober, Taciturn, Serious

SURGENCY
Enthusiastic, Heedless, Happy-go-lucky

FACTOR G

LOW SUPEREGO STRENGTH
LACK OF ACCEPTANCE OF
GROUP MORAL STANDARDS
Disregards Rules, Expedient

SUPEREGO STRENGTH
OR CHARACTER
Conscientious, Persistent,
Moralistic, Staid

FACTOR H

THRECTIA
Shy, Timid, Restrained,
Threat-Sensitive

PARMIA
Adventurous, Thick-skinned,
Socially Bold

FACTOR I

HARRIA
Tough Minded, Rejects Illusions

PREMSIA
Tender Minded, Sensitive, De-
pendent, Over Protected

FACTOR L

ALAXIA
Trusting, Accepting Conditions

PROTENSION
Suspecting, Jealous

FACTOR M

PRAXERMIA
Practical, Has "Down to Earth"
Concern

AUTIA
Imaginative, Bohemian, Absent-
Minded

FACTOR N

NAIVETE
Fortright, Unpretentious

SHREWDNESS
Astute, Worldly

FACTOR Q 0

UNTRoubLED, ADEQUACY

Self Assured, Placid, Secure,
Complacent

GUILT PRONESS

Apprehensive, Self Reproaching,
Insecure, Worrying, Troubled

FACTOR Q 1

CONSERVATION OF TEMPERAMENT

Conservative, Respecting,
Established Ideas, Tolerant of
Traditional Difficulties

RADICALISM

Experimenting, Liberal,
Analytical, Free Thinking

FACTOR Q 2

GROUP DEPENDENCY

Sociably Group Dependent, A
Joiner and Sound Follower

SELF SUFFICIENCY

Self Sufficient, Resourceful,
Prefers Own Decisions

FACTOR Q 3

LOW SELF-SENTIMENT
INTEGRATION

Uncontrolled, Lax, Follows Own
Urges, Careless of Social Rules

HIGH STRENGTH OF
SELF-SENTIMENT

Controlled, Exacting, Willpower,
Socially Precise, Compulsive,
Follows Self Image

FACTOR Q 4

LOW ERGIC TENSION

Relaxed, Tranquil, Torpid,
Unfrustrated, Composed

HIGH ERGIC TENSION

Tense, Frustrated, Driven,
Overwrought, Fretfull

APPENDIX D

THE TWENTY-SIX QUESTIONS OF THE C E R S

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, etc.)
17. Can be spontaneous in counseling, yet 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

REFERENCES

- American Personnel and Guidance Association. The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role. In J. W. Loughary, R. O. Stripling, and P. W. Fitzgerald (Eds.), Counseling: A Growing Profession. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.
- American Psychological Association, Subcommittee on Counselor Trainee Selection, Counselor Training Committee, Division of Counseling Psychology. "An Analysis of Practice 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, and P. W. Fitzgerald (Eds.), Counseling: A Growing Profession. Washington, D. C. : American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.
- Arbuckle, D. S. "Counselor Effectiveness and Related Issues." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 430-435.
- Bergin, A. and Solomon, S. "Personality and Performance Correlates of Empathic Understanding in Psychotherapy." American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 393.
- Blocher, D. H. "A Multiple Regression Approach to Predicting Success in a Counselor Education Program." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1963, 3, 19-22.
- Brams, J. M. "The Relationship Between Personal Characteristics of Counseling Trainees and Effective Communication in Counseling." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri, 1957.
- Burnett, C. W. "Selection and Training of School and College Personnel Workers." Review of Educational Research, 1954, 24, 121-133.
- Cahoon, R. A. "Some Counselor Attitudes and Characteristics Related to the Counseling Relationship." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Carkhuff, R. and Berenson, B. Beyond Counseling and Psychotherapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Cash, W. and Munger, P. "Counselors and Their Preparation." Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36, 256-263.

- Cattell, R., Eber, H. and Tatsvoka, M. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Illinois Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.
- Cooley, W. and Lohnes, P. Multivariate Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Coutts, R. L. "Selected Characteristics of Counselor Candidates in Relation to Levels and Types of Competency in the Counseling Practicum." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1962.
- Demos, G. and Zuwaylif, F. "Characteristics of Effective Counselors." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 163-165.
- Dole, A. A. "The Prediction of Effectiveness in School Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 112-121.
- Donnan, H. and Harlan, G. "Personality of Counselors and Administrators." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 228-232.
- Donnan, H., Harlan G. and Thompson, S. "Counselor Personality and Level of Functioning as Perceived by Counselees." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 482-485.
- Felker, S. "Intellectual Ability and Counseling Effectiveness: Another View." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 13, 146-150.
- Goodstein, L. and Grigg, A. "Client Satisfaction, Counselors, and the Counseling Process." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 38, 19-24.
- Hahn, M. and MacLean, M. Counseling Psychology. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- Hill, G. and Green, D. "The Selection, Preparation and Professionalization of Guidance and Personnel Workers." Review of Educational Research, 1960, 30, 115-130.
- Hurst, J. and Fenner, R. "Extended Session Group as a Predictive Technique for Counselor Training." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 358-360.
- Jansen, D., Robb, G., and Bonk, E. "Characteristics of High-Rated and Low-Rated Master's Degree Candidates in Counseling and Guidance." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1970, 9, 162-171.
- Kemp, C. "Influence of Dogmatism on the Training of Counselors." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 155-157.

- Lewis, M. and Lewis, J. "Counselor Education: Training for a New Alternative." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 49, 754-758.
- McClain, E. "Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire Scores and Success in Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 492-496.
- McDaniel, W. "Counselor Selection: an Evaluation of Instruments." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 142-144.
- McNemar, Q. Psychological Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960.
- Muthard, J. and Salomone, P. "Rehabilitation Counselor Roles and Functions: Implications for Preparation and Practice." The Profession, Functions, Roles and Practices of the Rehabilitation Counselor. Muthard, Dumas and Salomone, eds. Sept. 1969, 3-20.
- Myrick, R. and Kelly, D. "A Scale for Evaluating Practicum Students in Counseling and Supervision." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 330-336.
- Myrick, R., Kelly, D. and Wittmer, J. "The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire as a Predictor of Counselor Effectiveness." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 6, 293-301.
- Patterson, C. H. "Comments on Client Satisfaction, Counselors, and the Counseling Process." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 39, 25.
- Patterson, C. H. "A note on the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Counseling and Psychotherapy." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 129-132.
- Patterson, C. H. "The Selection of Counselors." Research in Counseling. J. Whitely, ed. Columbia: Charles E. Merrill, 1967.
- Penn, L. "Relationships Between Levels of Interpersonal Skill Scores of Counselors as Rated by Their Couselees and Personality Questionnaire Scores." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 32, 1971.
- Polmantier, P. C. "The Personality of the Counselor." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1966, 15, 95-100.
- Richardson, B. and Obermann, C. "Relationship of Rehabilitation Counselor Characteristics to Supervisors' Ratings." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 13, 94-104.

- Rochester, D. "Persistence of Attitudes and Values of NDEA Counselor Trainees." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 535-537.
- Russo, J., Keltz, J. and Hudson, G. "Are Counselors Open-Minded?" Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 74-77.
- Santavicca, G. G. "Supervised Experience and Selection of Counselor Trainees." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 38, 195-198.
- Sattler, J. M. "Counselor Competence, Interest, and Time Perspective." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 357-360.
- Shelton, J. "Counselor Characteristics and Effectiveness in Serving Economically Disadvantaged and Advantaged Males." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 13, 129-136.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. York, Pa.: The Maple Press Company, 1956.
- Stefflre, B., King, P. and Leafgren, F. "Characteristics of Counselors Judged Effective by Their Peers." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 335-340.
- Thompson, J. "Personality Traits and Interest Characteristics of Graduate Students in a Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arizona, 1972.
- Walton, F. and Sweeny, T. "Useful Predictors of Counseling Effectiveness." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 32-38.
- Wher, M. and Wittmer, J. "Paraprofessional Trainees and Counselor Education Students: A Comparison of Personality and Predicted Counseling Effectiveness." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 12, 255-262.
- Whitlay, J. (Ed.) Research in Counseling. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1967.
- Wittmer, J. and Lister, J. "The Graduate Record Examination, 16PF Questionnaire, and Counseling Effectiveness." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 293.
- Wrenn, C. G. "The Selection and Education of Student Personnel Workers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1952, 31, 9-14.



