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This study was designed to examine the relationship between selected Adlerian personality constructs and counselor effectiveness in a master's level practicum. In addition, the relationship between counselor age and counselor effectiveness was examined.

Self-report measures assessing the Adlerian constructs of perceived early childhood family influence, established life style, and social interest were completed by counselors-in-training. In addition, the participants completed a demographic data sheet providing their birth order position and age. Doctoral-level counseling practicum supervisors assessed the effectiveness of the participants using a counselor evaluation rating instrument. It was hypothesized that no significant relationship would be found between any of the self-report measures or demographics and the results on the counselor evaluation measure.

Two of the five null hypotheses were rejected. First, there were significant relationships found between two of the scales measuring established life style and results on
the counselor evaluation measure. Second, there was a significant relationship found between counselor age and counselor effectiveness. The findings supported the null position for the remaining three hypotheses. No significant relationship was found between perceived early childhood family influence, birth order position, or social interest and results on the counselor evaluation measure.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Interest in the Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler has revived over the past few decades and, consequently, Adler's enormous influence upon and contributions to counseling and psychotherapy have been increasingly recognized (Allen, 1971; Ansbacher, 1979; Mosak, 1989; Watkins, 1982). A major criticism of Adlerian psychological theory, however, has been the lack of substantiating research validating the theory's constructs (Allen, 1971; Mosak, 1989; Rotter, 1962; Thorne, 1975; Watkins, 1982). Manaster and Corsini (1982) calculated that "Adlerian literature amounts to well over 10,000 articles, tests, books, and book reviews....Of these, perhaps only about 250 fall into the area of nomothetic empirical research studies" (p. 288). Watkins (1982) contended that with the renaissance of interest in Adlerian theory, the body of research supporting and extending the theory must grow as well.

Contemporary Adlerians have exerted substantial effort to test the underpinnings of Individual Psychology and the
amount of research on Adlerian psychological theory has grown substantially in recent years. Watkins (1986) noted that research studies tend to address four main constructs of Adlerian theory: birth order, early recollections, social interest, and lifestyle. Birth order and early recollections encompass the majority of the studies.

Purpose of the Study

Research substantiating fundamental Adlerian tenets has grown substantially in recent years. In reviewing the Adlerian research literature over the past twenty years, however, the present author noted that only one study had been undertaken examining Adlerian theory and its relationship to counselor effectiveness. Zarski, Sweeney, and Barcikowski (1977) investigated the relationship between counselor social interest and the client's perception of counselor effectiveness. The authors tested the hypothesis that persons with higher measures of social interest would facilitate the development of social interest in others by being effective models. The authors reported a positive correlation between the counselor's level of social interest and both the client's satisfaction with counseling and attitudinal measurements of the client's self-acceptance and sociability. In discussing the results in terms of substantiation of their hypothesis, the researchers stated, "though [the authors' hypothesis] is only tentatively indicated by our validation of one aspect of Adler's theory,
it seems to merit consideration as a source of further study" (p. 3).

There appears to be a paucity of research literature examining the relationship between Adlerian theoretical constructs and counselor effectiveness. This study, therefore, seeks to offer a needed addition to the literature.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between selected Adlerian personality constructs and counselor effectiveness as assessed by self-report instruments. The Adlerian personality constructs selected for the study are perceived early childhood family influence, lifestyle, and social interest.

Review of the Literature

The following literature review provides exploration of selected Adlerian personality constructs as well as a discussion of formal measures of counselor effectiveness. One important note must preface the review. Traditionally, the Adlerian literature has discussed family constellation and family atmosphere separately. Chandler (1986), in the validation of the Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale (PECFIS), noted that the concepts of family constellation and family atmosphere are "closely related and interact by projecting the same kinds of influences on the individual" (p. 14). Consequently, Chandler used "family influence" to include the components traditionally ascribed
to both family constellation and family atmosphere. The present author will use "family influence" in the same manner.

**Family Influence**

According to Shulman and Nixelly (1971), the family constellation describes the sociopsychological configuration of a family group. Manaster and Corsini (1982) stated that the family constellation is "the structure of parental relationships to the children in general and the relationship of the children to the parents and to each other" (p. 81). Factors in the family constellation include the personality characteristics of each family member, emotional bonds between family members, birth order, the dominance or submission of the various members, their age differences, gender of the siblings, and the size of the family (Dreikurs & Soltz, 1964).

It is important to note that the dynamics of the family constellation have been undergoing phenomenal change in recent decades. Dreikurs (1967) noted that our civilization is undergoing a slow transition from an autocratic society to a democracy. The approachment of equality for all persons increases among individuals. Value distinctions based on gender, ethnicity, and the like, are primarily social rather than biological in nature. These socially-based attitudes come from fears of being dominated. For example, men may try to subjugate women because the
potential power of women is construed as a threat to perceived male superiority.

Adler (1978) was one the first major psychological theorists to address the "equality of women" issue. We have no reason to oppose the present goals of the women's movement of freedom and equal rights. Rather, we must actively support them, because ultimate happiness and joy in the life of all humanity will depend on the creation of conditions that will enable women to become reconciled with their feminine role, and how men will answer the problem of their relationship to women. (p. 24)

Realizing the inherent harmfulness of male dominance and female submission, Adler noted that "men continuously strive for superiority over women, while women are constantly dissatisfied with male privileges" (Manaster & Corsini, 1982, p. 59). This continuous "struggle for power" results in a psychological climate that impedes the development and maintenance of social interest.

These changing perspectives on equality obviously have generated conflict in marital relationships. Dreikurs (1946) noted that women are increasingly less inclined to acquiesce to male dominance in the marital relationship. The struggle continues today. Women are dissatisfied with being treated as less than equal partners in marital relationships while men struggle with relinquishing the
traditional "superior" male role. Adler (1962) almost prophetically stated, "unless we truly have the feeling that men and women are equal...we shall have a very great obstacle to the success of marriage" (p. 275).

The changing perspective on equality has also impacted how persons view their roles and functions as parents. Many individuals are confused about how to rear their children as they find the parenting style of their parents inadequate for today's democratic environment. The struggle between parents over styles of parenting and family values and rules can produce substantial friction within the family and greatly impact the parent-child interaction.

The fundamental notion regarding family constellation is that individuals want to belong, to have a place in their primary social environment--the family. The family is the primary social situation for the growing child. Normally, members of the family are the first people with whom the infant interacts, who impact the child during the important early years of life. The family is the primary agent of socialization for the child. In the day-to-day course of living, older members of a family teach younger members, both formally and informally, how to behave (Manaster & Corsini, 1982).

Each family has its own unique configuration, and the role each individual chooses to play in that configuration is influenced most by the way the person perceives his or
her position in the family. While exceptions exist, each child generally tends to select different roles, behaviors, and interests in striving to find a place within the family. One factor in this choice is the child's birth position in relation to siblings. Dreikurs and Soltz (1964) noted five distinct positions children may take in the family: the only child, the first-born, the second child, the middle child, and the "baby." Further, Shulman and Mosak (1977) identified specific characteristics relate to the unique early experience of each position:

1. Only child - never had a rival. Peers tend to be curiosities rather than competitors. However, he may have been pampered and never learned to share.

2. First-born - he once had it all to himself and would still prefer to be first and foremost. He tends to feel entitled to rank.

3. Second child - started late and has to catch up. Someone always seems to be ahead of him, a standard bearer against whom he measures himself.

4. Middle child - there is a standard bearer in front and a pursuer in the rear. He is surrounded by competitors. He may feel squeezed into a small area in his search for significance.

5. Youngest child - the trail is well broken and the guidelines are clear. He is never dethroned, on the other hand, he has a lot of ground to cover in order to
catch up. (p. 115)

In addition to the characteristics listed above, Shulman and Mosak (1977) noted certain adult traits often associated with each of these ordinal positions.

The first-born....tends to be conservative toward change, somewhat elitist in his views. The second child is a "runner," looking for some area of success, more revolutionary in outlook, more willing to follow another's lead. The middle child tends to be sensitive to mistreatment or unfairness. He is afraid he will miss out on his share. The youngest sets out to catch up to the others, and will be very ambitious. If he has decided not to pursue, he continues in a dependent role. The only child is usually congenial and charming. His social behavior is intended to please rather than to out do. (pp. 115-116)

What matters most, however, in the personality development of the individual is not so much the child's position in the family but the child's interpretation of that position.

While the family constellation describes the interaction between members of the family, family atmosphere or climate describes the characteristic pattern established by parents and presented to their children as a standard for social living. This pattern is another influence on the child's choice of role in the family (Dewey, 1971).

In his relationship with his parents the child
experiences society at large. The parents establish a
definite family atmosphere; through them the child
experiences the economic, racial, religious, and social
influences in his environment. He absorbs the family
values, mores, and conventions, and tries to fit within
the pattern, or the standards, set by the
parents....The relationship between the parents sets
the pattern for all the relationships within the
family. If the parents are warm, friendly, and
cooperative, the same relationship may possibly develop
between children and parents and between the children
themselves. Cooperation can become a family standard.
If the parents are hostile and compete with each other
for dominance, the same pattern usually develops among
the children.....Keen competition between parents can
make competition the family standard. Whatever trait
all children of a family have in common is an
expression of the family atmosphere established by the
parents. (Dreikurs & Soltz, 1964, pp. 19-20)

Dewey (1971) described thirteen prevalent "family
atmospheres."

1. Rejective. Some parents have difficulty showing love
and have difficulty separating the "deed" from the "doer."
Love is expressed conditionally and children are likely to
feel unloved and unaccepted in this atmosphere.

2. Authoritarian. Some parents require unquestioned
obedience from their children. Children may develop high levels of anxiety and low levels of courage or may develop rebellious responses such as lying and stealing.

3. Martyrdom. "Martyrs" are pessimistic parents who have low self-esteem and attempt to elevate themselves by self-righteousness and demonstration of suffering endured. Children in this atmosphere may conclude that life is inherently unfair and people are not trustworthy.

4. Inconsistent. In this atmosphere, discipline is erratic and routines are nonexistent. Children do not know what to expect of others or what is expected of them. Children from inconsistent atmospheres may develop difficulties with self-control, self-motivation, and self-centeredness.

5. Suppressive. Parents in this atmosphere do not permit children to express their thoughts and feelings and close relationships are not encouraged. Children may have difficulty expressing emotions appropriately outside the home and may develop interpersonal difficulties.

6. Hopeless. Discouraged parents are usually unable to encourage their children. That is, discouragement is contagious. Children from this atmosphere may make hopelessness a part of their life perception as well.

7. Overprotective. Overprotective or indulgent parents impede the growing and learning process by denying children opportunities to cope with difficult situations or by protecting them from the consequences of their behavior.
Overprotection by parents may lead to feelings of helplessness and dependency in children.

8. Pitying. Parents with a handicapped child may surround a child with a pitying atmosphere. Children may learn to feel sorry for themselves, be discouraged, or become dependent on others.

9. High Standards. Children in this atmosphere may develop the belief that they are only loved when they meet parental standards. Fear of failure may lead to "perfectionism" and concomitant high levels of stress.

10. Materialistic. In this atmosphere, children learn that a person's worth is determined by wealth and possessions. Consequently, later in life these children may have difficulty with financial management and interpersonal relationships.

11. Competitive. This atmosphere stresses "success" and family members strive to outdo each other. While competition is a necessary experience in childhood, this atmosphere may foster feelings of anxiety and apprehension in children. Children may consider themselves as failures unless they are "the best."

12. Disparaging. In this atmosphere there is frequent criticism. Sometimes one child becomes the "scapegoat" for the entire family. Children from disparaging atmospheres may become cynical and critical pessimists who trust no one and enjoy nothing.
13. Inharmonious. Frequent quarreling and fighting is the hallmark of the inharmonious atmosphere. Children learn it is important to be in control and avoid being controlled by others. Power becomes a primary motive.

The environment that facilitates the development of a healthy, well-adjusted, cooperative lifestyle in children might be called the "encouraging" family atmosphere. Every child needs continuous encouragement to grow, develop, and gain a sense of belonging. Children who are able to overcome the normal human feelings of inadequacy have usually been encouraged to try new things, develop new skills, and not give up easily. According to Dinkmeyer and McKay (1976), encouragement is the process whereby parents and other family members focus on the assets and strengths of children to build their self-confidence and self-esteem. "Encouragement helps... children believe in themselves and their abilities. Parents who encourage help their children develop the courage to be imperfect" (p. 33).

Measurement of Early Childhood Family Influence

Until recently, no instrument objectively measured the Adlerian construct of perceived early childhood family influence. Chandler (1986), however, filled this void with the development of the Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale (PECFIS). The PECFIS is a 124 item scale addressing five major areas of early childhood family influences: the parents' relationship, mother's influence,
father's influence, a description of the client as a child, and a description of the siblings and their interactions. Items are randomly distributed and assigned a six-level Likert-type response format.

**Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence and Counselor Effectiveness**

A literature review over the past twenty years found only one study remotely resembling the investigation of perceived early childhood family influence and counselor effectiveness. Wilcoxon, Walker, and Hovestadt (1989) investigated the relationship between counselor effectiveness and family-of-origin experiences. The researchers, however, used graduate-level subjects who had no prior counseling course work or counseling experience and defined counselor effectiveness only in terms of basic listening skills.

**Life Style**

Life Style is clearly a core construct in the Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler. Adler (1956) stated:

Very early in my work I found man to be a unity. The foremost task of Individual Psychology is to prove this unity in each individual--his thinking, feeling, acting, in his so-called conscious and unconscious, in every expression of his personality. This unity we call the "life style" of the individual. (p. 175)

According to Manaster and Corsini (1982), life-style
has at least two levels of meaning.

At the highest level, life style is the totality of the individual expressed "in all its parts;" all behaviors, emotions, and thoughts moving in a unified direction. The unity of the individual's movement is the individual's life style....The other meaning of life style is cognitive organization: what a person thinks. This determines the direction of movement toward his/her goals. (p. 78)

Mosak (1989) stated that life style is a conscious-oriented, cognitive "life-map" containing the person's unique and individually created convictions, long-range goals, and personal beliefs regarding what one must do in order to attain security and significance. Every individual has a unique life style that encompasses all human functioning in the life tasks: work, society, love, self, and spirituality.

For Adler, the term life style denoted the fundamental premises upon which a person predicates his movement through the world. It is a set of ideas, schemata, and not as in common parlance, habitual modes of behaving. Schematically, the life style may be seen as a syllogism:

1. "I am..."
2. "The world is..."
3. "Therefore..."
It is in terms of the proposition which follows the "therefore" that the person thinks, feels, perceives, dreams, recollects, emotes, behaves, etc. (Allen, 1971, p. 5)

According to Adler (1956), the life style is established by age four or five as the child's creative and compensatory response to environmental and genetic influences. Adler noted: "Do not forget the most important fact that not heredity and not environment are determining factors.--Both are giving only the frame and the influences which are answered by the individual in regard to his styled creative power" (p. xxiv).

In the process of becoming socialized human beings children form conclusions on the basis on their subjective experiences. Because judgement and logical processes are not highly developed in young children, many of their growing convictions contain errors or only partial "truths." Nevertheless, they accept these conclusions about themselves and others "as if" they were true...They are subjective evaluations, biased apperceptions of themselves and of the world, rather than objective "reality." (Mosak, 1989, p. 78)

Mosak (1989) divided life-style convictions into four groups:

1. The self-concept--the convictions I have about who I am.
2. The self-ideal—the convictions of what I should be or am obliged to be to have a place.
3. The "Weltbild," or "picture of the world"—convictions about the not-self (world, people, nature, and so on) and what the world demands of me.
4. The ethical convictions—the personal "right-wrong" code. (Mosak, p. 78)

According to Mosak (1971), life-style may be either constructive or nonconstructive. Prediction of behavior within a given life-style is tenuous at best, but one may speak of more or less probable selections of behavior. Probable behaviors associated with commonly observed life-styles include:

1. The "getter" exploits and manipulates life and others by actively or passively putting others into his service...
2. The "driver" is the man in motion. His overconscientiousness and his dedication to his goals rarely permit him to rest...
3. The "controller" is either a person who wishes to control life or one who wishes to ensure that life will not control him...
4. The person who needs to be right elevates himself over others whom he arranges to perceive as being wrong...
5. The person who needs to be superior may refuse to
enter a life arena where he will not be seen as the "center" or the "best"...

6. The person who needs to be liked feels required to please everyone all the time...

7. The person who needs to be "good" prefers to live by higher moral standards than his contemporaries...

8. The person who opposed everything life demands or expects of him rarely possesses a positive program in which he stands for something...

9. Everything befalls the "victim," sometimes called the "schlimazel (schliemiel)"

10. The "martyr" is, in some respects, similar to the "victim." The "martyr" also suffers, but whereas the "victim" merely "dies," the "martyr" dies for a cause or for a principle...

11. The "baby" finds his place in life through charm, cuteness, and the exploitation of others...

12. The inadequate person acts as if he cannot do anything right...

13. The person who avoids feeling may fear his own spontaneity which might move him in directions for which he has not preplanned...

14. The "excitement seeker" despises routine and repetitive activities, seeks novel experiences, and revels in commotion... (Mosak, 1971, pp. 77-80)

"Since the individual is holistic, his lifestyle may be
assessed at any point—through either past or current behavior—and through a variety of behavioral manifestations, gestures, language, early recollections, or life narrative" (Mosak, 1971, p. 80).

Measurements of Established Life Style

At present there are only two quantitative measures for determining the established life-style. One is Kern's (1982) Lifestyle Scale and the other is the Life Style Analysis developed by Thorne (1975).

The Lifestyle Scale (Kern, 1982) is a 35-item questionnaire with a Likert-type response format. Responses are classified under five scales that define the life-style: 1) Control; 2) Perfectionism; 3) Need to Please; 4) Victim; and 5) Martyr. Sufficient reliability and validity data have not been forthcoming on this scale and Kern (personal communication, February, 15, 1993) stated that the scale is in the process of being completely revised and tested.

The Life Style Analysis (LSA) (Thorne, 1975) is a true-false format instrument designed to measure life-style patterns. The original 200-item version of the instrument was factor analyzed (Thorne & Pishkin, 1975) and reduced to 80 items designed to measure five major life-styles: 1) aggressive-domineering; 2) conforming; 3) defensive-withdrawal; 4) amoral-sociopathy; and 5) resistive-defiant.

The aggressive-domineering life style scale depicts an
aggressive, domineering style of life, one that is characterized by being in competition with one's fellow human beings. The items contained in the conforming life style scale reflect an awareness of socially desirable behavior and/or a style of life striving toward conformity, albeit on primarily a verbal level. That is, the scale represents an acceptance of the values presented by significant others and/or values commonly held by society in general. The defensive-withdrawal life style scale is descriptive of a person with insufficient ego strength and a concomitant style of life that commonly practices the safeguarding mechanisms known as defensive rationalization and withdrawal. The amoral sociopathy life style scale reflects the style of life of unsocialized egocentrics who strive to always get their way and refuse to cooperate with authority. The resistant-defiant life style scale depicts an aggressive style of life in which persons strive in a hostile rather than competitive manner. These persons commonly rebuke others, ignore responsibilities, and, in a defiant and exploitive manner, do as they please.

While Thorne has provided an objective mode for classifying an individual's life-style, the LSA lacks the necessary information for understanding the development of the life-pattern from early childhood. Chandler's (1986) Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale used in conjunction with the LSA will alleviate this problem.
Life Style and Counselor Effectiveness

A literature search over the past twenty years produced no studies investigating the relationship between the counselor's established life style and effectiveness as a counselor.

Social Interest

The original German word for social interest, "gemeinschaftsgefühl," has been troublesome for translators. Ansbacher (1956) noted that the following translations have been used: social feeling, community feeling, communal feeling, fellow feeling, sense of solidarity, social sense, communal intuition, community interest, and, finally, social interest. Social interest was the English translation Adler preferred.

According to Ansbacher (1991), Adler did not begin using the concept of social interest until after World War I. In 1918, he presented social interest as an innate counterforce which sets limits on the expansion tendency, aggression drive, and lust for power, "unless throttled by outer or inner forces" (p. 64). By 1928, and for the remainder of Adler's life, the mature Adlerian position viewed social interest as a cognitive function, an innate aptitude to be consciously developed.

Adler (1956) likened social interest to identification and empathy: "to see with the eyes of another, to hear with
the ears of another, to feel with the heart of another" (p. 135). But, for Adler, social interest was more than a feeling of empathy. Rather it was also a positive, evaluative understanding toward the entirety of life, innate in potentiality, but a potential that had to be consciously developed by significant others and the individual (Adler, 1956). According to Adler (1979), well-developed social interest enables persons to identify with others, to feel part of the whole, and to see life through the spectacles of reason or "common sense." Thus, social interest became Adler's criterion for mental health.

In Adler's usage of social interest, three different kinds of processes, which can be arranged in three developmental steps, are evident.

In Step 1, social interest is an assumed aptitude for cooperation and social living which can be developed through training.

In Step 2, this aptitude has been developed into the objective abilities of cooperating and contributing, as well as understanding others, empathizing with them, and exercising reason along the lines of "common sense."

In Step 3, social interest is a subjective evaluative attitude toward life. That is, persons have a... sense of identification and belongingness with and a genuine interest in their fellow human beings and the universe
Various prominent Adlerians have expanded and elucidated the meaning and implications of social interest. Dreikurs stated that a feeling of belonging was only one part of social interest.

The ideal expression of social interest is the ability to play the game [of life] with existing demands for cooperation and to help the group to which one belongs in its evolution closer toward a perfect form of social living. (in Manaster & Corsini, 1982, p. 45)

Social interest, according to Way, has both immediate and ideal qualities.

The usual English translation of the term "Gemeinshaftsgefühl" as "social feeling" is not fully adequate to convey Adler's meaning. The feeling for the "Gemeinschaft" is wider than the term society suggests. It embraces the sense of relatedness, not only to the human community, but to the whole of life,... Social feeling is the ideal Goal of Perfection, the goal at which all religions and moralities aim. (in Manaster & Corsini, 1982, pp. 45-46)

Kazan (1978) stated that Meyeroff's description of "caring" connotes both the implicit and explicit nuances of Adler's meaning of social interest.

Caring is a process through which one helps another grow and to actualize himself. In addition to caring
for people, one may also care for many things, thereby helping them to grow. Caring gives meaning and order to life. When one's caring is comprehensive and inclusive, there is a basic stability in one's life. (p. 8)

Ansbacher (1983) succinctly stated, "social interest actually means not merely an interest in others but an interest in the interests of others" (p. 85). Mosak (1989) presented the Biblical mandate to love one's neighbor as oneself as a parsimonious illustration of social interest. He continued, "if we regard ourselves as fellow human beings with fellow feelings (social interest), we are socially contributive people interested in the common welfare and, by Adler's pragmatic definition of normality, mentally healthy" (p. 67). Following Mosak's lead, Watts (1992) discussed the strong parallel between social interest and the biblical use of the Greek word "agape." Agape is the highest form of love and is primarily volitional and self-giving rather than emotional and self-centered. The behavioral characteristics of agape—perseverance, benevolence, trustworthiness, humility, altruism, unselfishness, optimism—are remarkably similar to Adlerian descriptions of social interest.

**Measurements of Social Interest**

Three objective measures of social interest are the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest (SSSI), developed by Sulliman (1973), the Social Interest Scale (SIS), developed
by Crandall (1975), and the Social Interest Index (SII), developed by Greever, Tseng, and Friedland (1973). The SSSI consists of 50 true or false items seeking to measure the respondent's concern for and trust in others as well as self-confidence and optimism in one's perception of the world.

The SIS is a 24 item, forced-choice instrument presented as a measure of values (Crandall, 1975). Scale validity was established by the relationship to cooperative and altruistic behavior, peer ratings, measures of interpersonal attraction, and norm group differences (Crandall, 1980).

The SII has thirty-two Likert-type items equally distributed among the four subscales of friendship, love, work, and self-significance. According to Chandler (1986), the SII has undergone more rigorous validation with a number of well-established psychometric instruments than other objective measures of social interest. The SII has been correlated with the following personality inventories: California Psychological Inventory (Bubenzer, Zarski, & Walter, 1979; Greever, Tseng, and Friedland, 1973), the Personal Orientation Inventory and Rotter's Locus of Control Scale (Hjelle, 1975), and the MMPI (Mozdzierz & Semych, 1980).

**Social Interest and Counselor Effectiveness**

A search of the literature over the past twenty years
produced only one study examining the relationship between social interest and counselor effectiveness (Zarski, Sweeney, & Barchkowski, 1977). The study investigated the relationship between the counselor's level of social interest and the client's perception of counselor effectiveness. Myrick and Kelly (1971), however, found that client evaluations of counselor effectiveness are suspect. A survey of the literature produced no study investigating counselor social interest and counselor effectiveness as evaluated by a professional supervisor.

Formal Evaluation of Counselors

Formal evaluation of counselors is often the sole responsibility of the individual supervisor and is one of four activities—consultation, counseling, teaching, evaluation—comprising the counselor supervision function (Bradley, 1989). Borders and Leddick (1987) stated that counselors are generally assessed from three perspectives. The three include: 1) basic performance skills; 2) conceptualization and interventions skills; and 3) developmental level across a number of skill and professional issue domains.

Counseling performance skills refer to what counselors do during a session or their counseling behaviors. Included are the basic helping or facilitative skills, procedural and session maintenance skills, and those skills salient to specific client issues (Borders & Leddick, 1987; Cormier &
Conceptualization and intervention skills refer to how counselors think about or "conceptualize" clients and concomitantly select therapeutic interventions. Beginning counselors have difficulty developing these skills and the process of intervention and conceptualization skill development has received minimal attention in counselor education literature (Clairborne & Dixon, 1982; Fugua, Johnson, Anderson, & Newman, 1984; Loganbill & Stoltenberg, 1983).

Developmental models of counseling supervision (e.g., Littrell, Lee-Borden, & Lorenz, 1979; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981) describe a generic process of counselor development regardless of counselor theoretical orientation. These models depict the growth of counselors as a process through a series of developmental stages across a number of personal and professional issue domains. Issue domains include: basic skill, technique, & procedural competence; self-awareness, autonomy, and differentiation of self; theoretical consistency and competence; respect and appreciation for individual differences; client conceptualization and treatment planning; personal motivation and integrity; and legal and ethical issues.

In the process of evaluating counselors, many supervisors provide written formal evaluations that include
unstructured descriptions of the counselor's behaviors or characteristics and/or standardized rating scales (Tyler & Weaver, 1981). The published objective evaluation scales differ in terms of who serves as the rater (e.g., supervisor, counselor, client, observer), whether the focus is the counseling or supervision sessions, and the theoretical base of the scale. Further, the scales differ in terms of the purpose of the evaluation, that is, the aspect of the counselor's performance being evaluated (Ponterotto & Furlong, 1985). Most of this literature, however, focuses solely on the core facilitative conditions of empathy, unconditional positive regard, and congruence. In addition, the majority of frequently used counselor rating scales were developed with a client-as-rater format. These scales focus on the client's experience in counseling and/or the client's perception of the basic facilitative conditions of effective counseling provided by the counselor (Ponterotto & Furlong, 1985).

Measurements of Counselor Effectiveness

What follows is a brief review of the more frequently used counselor rating scales (Borders & Leddick, 1987; Ponterotto & Furlong, 1985).

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) (Barrett-Lennard, 1968) was developed to examine the client's evaluation of his or her counselor's facilitative responses. The BLRI originally consisted of 85 statements
about the counselor evaluating five facilitative response dimensions: level of regard; empathic understanding; congruence; unconditionality; and willingness to be known. Using a 6-point Likert scale, each response category generates a subscale score and the combined scores a total score. Subsequent modifications of the BLRI have served to lower the number of items in the inventory (Claireborn, Crawford, & Hackman, 1983).

The Counselor Evaluation Inventory (CEI) (Linden, Stone, & Shertzer, 1965) was developed to obtain client ratings of counselor effectiveness in terms of counselor-client rapport. The CEI consists of 21 randomly ordered items composed of three factors and uses a 5-point Likert scale. The three factors are counseling climate, counselor comfort, and client satisfaction. A subscale score for each is tabulated as well as a total score.

The Counselor Effectiveness Scale (CES) (Ivey & Authier, 1978) is a general measure of counselor effectiveness and has been used primarily to measure the attitude of clients regarding counselors. Consisting of two parallel forms, the CES addresses general counselor facilitative behaviors using 25 seven-point semantic differential items. The CES is analyzed using the total score.

The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) (Barak & LaCross, 1975) was developed to measure the client's perception of
counselor effectiveness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness as dimensions of the influence of counselors with clients. The CRF is a list of 36 bi-polar adjectives using a 7-point Likert scale producing a subscale score for each of the three dimensions.

The Counselor Rating Form—Short Version (CRF-S) (Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983) measures the same client perception dimensions as the longer version described above. The 12 items of the CRF-S consist of those items that possessed high factor loading from previous factor analyses of the CRF. The CRF-S retained the 7-point Likert scale but presents the items randomly rather than by specific dimension.

The Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale (CERS) (Atkinson & Carskaddon, 1975) was initially developed to measure client perception of counselor competence. The current CERS (Atkinson & Wampold, 1982) consists of three semantic differential items to assess the client's perceptions of the counselor's level of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Additionally, there is one semantic differential item addressing the client's perception of counselor utility. The CERS uses a 7-point bi-polar subscale score for each dimension as well as a score range for the first three.

The Carkhuff Rating Scales (CRS) (Carkhuff, 1969) were developed to assess the level of counselor effectiveness
across the basic facilitative or helping skills. The CRS are descriptive scales for assessing the following skills: empathic understanding; communication of respect; genuineness; self-disclosure; concreteness or specificity of expression; confrontation; immediacy; and helpee self-exploration. Each scale consists of descriptions of five levels (low-to-high) of counselor effectiveness. To use the CRS, judges must be selected and trained to effectively discriminate between the levels of counselor effectiveness for each scale.

The Hill Counselor Verbal Response Category System (Hill, 1978) assesses frequency of counselor verbal response behavior across the following 14 basic facilitative verbal response categories: minimal encouragers; approval-reassurance; information; direct guidance; closed question; open question; restatement; reflection; nonverbal referent; interpretation; confrontation; self-disclosure; silence; and "other." To use Hill's system, judges must be selected and trained to identify the responses according to the category definitions.

The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) (Myrick & Kelly, 1971) is an instrument used to evaluate a counselor's behavior during both counseling and supervision sessions in a practicum setting. The CERS consists of 27 items using a 7-point Likert scale. Thirteen items address counseling skills, while another 13 address the counselor's supervision
behaviors. The final item ("Can be recommended for a
counseling position without reservation") is added to the
counseling and supervision scores to obtain a total score
indicating the counselor's overall performance. The
uniqueness of this instrument is two-fold. First, it was
developed primarily to be used by supervisors in the
evaluation of counselors in a practicum or internship
setting. Second, it addresses the dual importance of the
counselor's functioning in counseling and supervision.
CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Definition of Terms

The meanings attributed to the concepts of social interest, perceived early child family influence, lifestyle, and counselor effectiveness have been discussed in Chapter One. The subsequent definitions are, therefore, related directly to the methods and procedures of the present study.

Perceived early childhood family influence is, for the purposes of this study, defined as the subject's score on the Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale as developed by Chandler (1986).

Lifestyle is, for the purposes of this study, defined as the subject's score on the Lifestyle Analysis as developed by Thorne (1975).

Social interest is, for the purposes of this study, defined as the subject's score on the Social Interest Index as developed by Greever, Tseng, and Friedland (1973).

Counselor effectiveness is, for the purposes of this study, defined as the subject's score on the Counselor.
Evaluation Rating Scale as developed by Myrick and Kelly (1971).

Hypotheses

The first four hypotheses below were tested for the purpose of examining the relationship between selected Adlerian personality constructs and counselor effectiveness in a supervised master's-level practicum.

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant relationship between results of the Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant relationship between results on any of the scales of the Life Style Analysis and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant relationship between results of the Social Interest Index and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant difference between birth order position and results of the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

Ancillary Hypothesis 5. There will be no significant relationship between age and results of the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.

Data Collection

The subjects' written consent was obtained before
beginning the study (see appendix A). Additionally, approval from the Graduate School, University of North Texas, for use of human subjects was secured before collection of data began.

The Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale (PECFIS) (Appendix C), Life Style Analysis (LSA) (Appendix D), and Social Interest Index (SII) (Appendix E) were administered to fifty-four participating counselors-in-training in master's-level practica in the Department of Counseling, Development, and Higher Education, College of Education, University of North Texas. Additionally, subjects were asked to complete a demographic sheet addressing their birth-order, gender, age, and area of counseling specialization (Appendix B). A packet of materials containing all the instruments for the study was given to each subject by the present researcher. Professors leading the practica graciously provided time for completion of instruments during the "seminar" time of each practicum. No participant was allowed to remove the packet of materials from the practicum classroom.

Near the end of the practica, each practicum professor was given a packet containing copies of the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS). Practicum professors were asked to complete a CERS form for each counseling student under their supervision. The CERS forms were completed at the professors' convenience and returned to the researcher.
Design

Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 5 were tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient ($r$). If no correlational significance was found, a t-test for difference between means was conducted for each hypothesis. Based on previous studies using the CERS (Myrick & Kelly, 1971; Myrick, Kelly, & Wittmer, 1972; Wittmer, Sword, & Loesch, 1971), counselors scoring in the upper one third on the CERS were designated as "most effective" and counselors scoring in the lower one third were designated as "least effective." The t-test was conducted testing the difference between means of the upper and lower CERS groups on the instrument measuring the variable specified in the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4 was tested using a one-way analysis of variance. The ANOVA tested for significant difference between means of the four birth order groups (first born, middle-born, youngest born, only born).

The various statistical tests were computed according to appropriate formulas from Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988). A minimum significance level of $p<.05$ was set for the study prior to collecting and analyzing the data.

Subjects

The subjects used in the present study were counselors-in-training in supervised master's-level practica that are part of the counseling program of the Department of
Counseling, Development, and Higher Education, College of Education, University of North Texas. Of a total of 60 practicum students, 54 agreed to participate, four immediately chose not to participate, and two chose to withdraw during data collection. Table 1 presents a frequency distribution of the subjects by gender and area of counseling specialization.

Table 1
Frequency Distributions of Subjects by Age and Counseling Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling Specialization</th>
<th>Agency Counseling</th>
<th>School Counseling</th>
<th>College Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 54

The subjects were supervised in the practica by professors in the counseling program of the Department of Counseling, Development, and Higher Education. The counseling program of the Department of Counseling, Development, and Higher Education, University of North Texas, is nationally accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational
Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale

The PECFIS (Chandler, 1986) is a 124-item, Likert-type scale designed to measure the influence of an individual's perceived early childhood family environment. Subjects are asked to respond to the items on the instrument as if they were 10 years of age or younger. An approximately even number of positively and negatively-worded items are included in the scale. In addition to the total score, five individual factor scores may be computed. Higher scores on the PECFIS reflect perceptions of a more positive early childhood family influence.

Factor analysis indicated the existence of five factors that contributed significantly to the variance explained on the instrument. The factors include:

- Parent's relationship/Parent-child relationship;
- Mother's characterization;
- Father's characterization;
- Sibling interrelationship;
- Subject's childhood characterization.

Chandler stated that the factors cannot be considered mutually exclusive, however, because some items loaded on more than one factor.

Chandler and Willingham (1986) reported factorial and construct validity coefficients ranging from .85 to .97. In
addition, the reported reliability coefficient for the PECFIS was .97. Thus, the PECFIS was determined to be both valid and reliable for measuring subjects' perceptions of early childhood family influence.

Chandler (1986) reported that scale score differences existed by gender (males scored lower than females) and by age (scores decreased as age increased). No differences were found to exist by birth order, however.

**Life Style Analysis**

The LSA (Thorne & Pishkin, 1975) is an 80-item, true-false format instrument designed to measure five life-style patterns:

- aggressive-domineering,
- conforming,
- defensive-withdrawal,
- amoral-sociopathy,
- resistant-defiant.

The instrument is structured so that "true" answers correspond to the subject's agreement with the particular life style characterization the items represent. The highest numbers of "true" answers define the particular life style.

Factorial validity for the five major life styles was reported by Pishkin and Thorne (1975) in regard to the following specific populations: incarcerated felons, persons committed for the treatment of alcoholism, college
students, unmarried mothers, and chronic undifferentiated schizophrenics. Reported factorial validity coefficients ranged from .32 to .86. No reliability coefficient was reported for the LSA (Pishkin & Thorne, 1975; Thorne, 1975; Thorne & Pishkin, 1975). Chandler (1986) noted, however, that the LSA is an objective measure for determining the established life style.

Social Interest Index

The SII (Greever, Tseng, & Freidland, 1973) is a 32-item, Likert-type scale designed to measure four areas contributing to the level of social interest: 1) friendship; 2) love; 3) work; and 4) self significance. Higher scores on the SII reflect a higher degree of social interest.

Chandler (1986) stated that the SII has undergone rigorous validation with a number of well-established psychometric instruments. These include the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), Rotter's Locus of Control Scale (RLOCS), and the MMPI. Statistically significant correlations between the SII and the CPI ranged from .37 to .59 (Bubenzer, Zarski, & Walter, 1979; Greever, Tseng, & Friedland, 1973). An ANOVA examining three levels of SII scores and the POI yielded a statistically significant F value of 10.97 (Hjelle, 1975). Mozdzierz and Semyck (1980) reported a statistically significant correlation of -.17
between the SII and the RLOCS. In addition, they reported low but significant correlations ranging from -.16 to .37 between the SII and MMPI.

Greever, Tseng, and Freidland (1973) reported test-retest reliability to be .79 for the total score and .65 to .81 for the subscales. Coefficient Alpha was used to determine internal consistency and was reported to be .81 for the total score. The SSI, therefore, appears to be a valid and reliable measure of the subjects' levels of social interest.

**Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale**

The CERS (Myrick & Kelly, 1971) is a 27 item Likert-type instrument designed to help supervisors evaluate the performance of counselors-in-training in a practicum or internship setting. The scale generates three scores: (a) counseling, (b) supervision, and (c) total score (overall supervised counseling effectiveness). The items are representative of the counselor's understanding of a counseling rationale, counseling practice with counselees, and exploration of self and counseling relationships with a supervisor.

Loesch and Rucker (1977) factor analyzed the CERS and stated that six major factors existed:

- General Counseling Performance;
- Professional Attitude;
- Counseling Behavior;
Counseling Knowledge; Supervision Attitude; Supervision Behavior.

Loesch and Rucker reported significant factorial validity coefficients for the CERS ranging from .36 to .78. The authors stated their results indicate that the three scores generated by the CERS have adequate validity, with the total score appearing to be the most valid of all the scores. In a subsequent factor analysis of the CERS, Benshoff and Thomas (1992) confirmed the validity findings of Loesch and Rucker (1977) with one major qualification. Benshoff and Thomas (1992) reported factorial validity coefficients ranging from .35 to .74. The authors stated that their findings suggest the CERS has sufficient validity only when professional supervisors are rating the counselors-in-training. Their results call into question the usefulness of the CERS when used by counselors-in-training as a self-rating instrument.

Using the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability correction procedure, Myrick and Kelly (1971) reported reliability coefficients of .95 and .86. To test the stability of the instrument over time, a test-retest reliability procedure was used. Myrick and Kelly reported a .94 test-retest reliability coefficient. It appears, therefore, that the CERS has sufficient validity and reliability for measuring the overall supervised counseling
effectiveness of counselors-in-training in a practicum or internship setting when completed by professional supervisors.

Assumptions

It is assumed that the professional supervisors used in this study, all of whom are professors in the nationally accredited Counselor Education program at the University of North Texas, have sufficient expertise and experience to accurately discriminate levels of counselor effectiveness. It is further assumed that the instruments to be used in this study provide valid measures of subjects' characteristics and behaviors for which they were developed.

Limitations

Because of the correlational design, this study is limited to investigating the potentiality of relationships existing between selected Adlerian personality constructs (social interest, perceived early childhood influence, lifestyle) and counselor effectiveness. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988), no statement may be made regarding cause and effect from a correlational study.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis and includes a discussion based on the research findings.

Analysis of Data

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no significant relationship between the results of the Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale (PECFIS) and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS). Table 2 presents the results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) used to test this hypothesis.

Table 2

Pearson r for PECFIS and CERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PECFIS</td>
<td>500.89</td>
<td>82.87</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  Note. n = 54

The results in Table 2 indicate that there was no
significant correlation between the PECFIS and the CERS. To further test hypothesis 1, CERS scores were divided into upper and lower third groups and a t-test for difference between means was performed on the two groups' PECFIS scores. Table 3 presents the results on this t-test.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>Upper Third Mean</th>
<th>Upper Third S.D.</th>
<th>Lower Third Mean</th>
<th>Lower Third S.D.</th>
<th>Upper-Lower t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>488.67</td>
<td>61.23</td>
<td>506.94</td>
<td>105.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

The results in Table 3 demonstrate that there was no significant difference between the means of the two groups on the PECFIS. Based on the result indicated in Tables 2 and 3, hypothesis 1 was retained.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no significant relationship between results on any of the scales of the Life Style Analysis (LSA) and the CERS. Table 4 presents the results of the Pearson r used to test this hypothesis.

Table 4

Pearson r for LSA Scales and CERS

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LSA Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-domineering</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive-withdrawal</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoral Sociopathy</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistive-defiant</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01  *p<.05  Note. n = 54**

The results in Table 4 demonstrate that low but significant positive correlations were found between two LSA scales and the CERS. The Pearson r between the LSA Aggressive-domineering scale and the CERS was significant at the .01 level. The Pearson r between the LSA Amoral Sociopathy scale and the CERS was significant at the .05 level. There were no significant correlations found between the CERS and any remaining LSA scales. Hypothesis 2, therefore, was rejected; a small but significant relationship between two LSA scales and the CERS was discovered.

According to hypothesis 3, no significant relationship would be found between the results of the Social Interest Index (SII) and the CERS. Table 5 presents the results of the Pearson r used to test this hypothesis.
Table 5

**Pearson r for SII and CERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SII</td>
<td>131.56</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  Note. n = 54

The results in Table 5 indicate that no significant correlation between the SII and the CERS was found. To further test hypothesis 3, CERS scores were divided into upper and lower third groups and a t-test for difference between means was performed on the two groups' SII scores. Table 6 presents the results of this t-test.

Table 6

**t-test for Upper-Lower Third CERS Groups and SII Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Upper CERS</th>
<th>Lower CERS</th>
<th>Upper-Lower t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SII</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>132.22</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>130.67 33.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table 6 demonstrates that no significant difference was
found between the means of two groups on the SII. Based on the results indicated in Tables 5 and 6, hypothesis 3 was retained.

Hypothesis 4 stated that no significant difference would be found between reported birth order position and results on the CERS. Table 7 presents the results of the one-way analysis of variance used to test this hypothesis.

Table 7
One-Way ANOVA for Birth Order Position and CERS Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Order Positions</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Youngest</th>
<th>Only</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>3,50</td>
<td>169.29</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>161.65</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>158.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

The findings in Table 7 indicate that the F value of the ANOVA is not significant. In other words, no significant difference between four birth order groups on the CERS was evident. Thus, hypothesis 4 was retained.

According to hypothesis 5, no significant relationship between reported age and results on the CERS would be found. Table 8 presents the results of the Pearson r used to test this hypothesis.
Table 8

Pearson r for Age and CERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01  Note.  N = 54.

Table 8 demonstrates that a low but significant positive correlation was found. The Pearson r between counselor age and the CERS was significant at the .01 level. Therefore, hypothesis 5 was rejected. Table 9 presents a frequency table for counselor age (in decade intervals) across three levels of counselor effectiveness based upon the CERS scores.

Table 9

Frequency Table for Counselor Ages Across Three Levels of Counselor Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Age Intervals</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CERS Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
The data in Table 9 appear to indicate that, while there is a statistically significant positive correlation between age and the CERS, a leveling effect in decade 30-39 occurs as scores on the CERS reach the upper level. The mean ages of all three levels are in close proximity. However, in comparing the upper level with the lower two, it appears that the age distributions producing those means are somewhat different. The majority of counselors in the upper level (56%) were located in decade 30-39, the decade the mean age also occurred. The majority of counselors in both the middle and lower levels (78%) were located in decades either higher or lower than the decade that the level's mean age occurred.

Discussion

This study was conducted in an attempt to investigate the relationship between selected Adlerian personality constructs and counselor effectiveness. A literature review over the past twenty years produced only one remotely similar study specifically using Adler's theory: an investigation of the relationship between counselors' social interest and clients' satisfaction of counseling, self-acceptance, and sociability (Zarski, Sweeney, & Barcikowski,
The present study sought to investigate the relationship between several Adlerian personality constructs (as assessed by self-report instruments) and the effectiveness of counselors-in-training (as assessed by an evaluation instrument completed by doctoral-level professional supervisors).

As a result of the data analysis, two of the five null hypotheses were rejected. First, the findings indicated a significant relationship between two scales on the Life Style Analysis (LSA) and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS). Both the LSA "Aggressive-domineering" scale and the LSA "Amoral Sociopathy" scale demonstrated small, but statistically significant, positive correlations with the CERS at the p<.01 and p<.05 levels, respectively. However, the highest mean score for all five scales, across all levels of counselor effectiveness, was the "Conforming" scale. The results may suggest that effective counselors participating in the present study are less reticent regarding respectfully assertive behavior, are self-motivated, and are somewhat less inclined to acquiesce to social convention. The findings appear to be in accord with Adler's (1979) description of the socially useful and contributive life style. According to Adler, mere social conformity, when not in the best interest of one's fellow human beings, is not socially useful behavior. Persons with socially useful life styles seek to do what is best for
other persons, not merely what social convention prescribes. Future researchers may want to examine the variables of counselor assertiveness and social conformity and their relationship to and impact on counselor effectiveness.

One ancillary note regarding the LSA seems worthy of mention. While the "Conforming" scale had consistently the highest mean score across all levels of counselor effectiveness, the scale means may have been even higher without, what appears to this researcher, an antiquated bias equating socially conforming behavior with religiosity. Three of the seventeen items on the scale have the word "religious" or "Bible" in the item. Participants in the study may have construed "religious" in its increasingly pejorative sense or may have little appreciation for the primary document of Judeo-Christian theology. Future revisors of the LSA might consider (a) eliminating references to specific theological documents and (b) replacing the word "religious" with the more contemporary term, "spiritual," if the transcendent aspect of socially conforming behavior is addressed at all.

Second, the findings indicated a significant relationship between counselor age and the CERS. There was a small, but statistically significant, positive correlation between age and the CERS at the p<.01 level. One possible explanation for the significant correlation may be that, at least for participants in this study, life experience plays
an important role in the development and subsequent effectiveness of counselors-in-training. However, an apparent leveling effect occurred as counselor age increased beyond decade interval 30-39. Table 9 indicated that the majority of the most effective counselors reported their age to be in decade 30-39. One possible explanation for this occurrence is what may be called a "cohort effect." This effect suggests that environmental factors salient only to one specific group within a study produces biases in research results (Borg & Gall, 1989). Therefore, the majority of the most effective counselors may have clustered in decade 30-39 due to a cohort effect. A second possible explanation, and one preferred by the present researcher, is simply that the data in Table 9 may indicate that life experience prior to graduate-level training in counseling reaches a point of diminishing returns. Thus, while there is a significant relationship between life experience and counselor effectiveness for master's level counselors-in-training, there appears to be a point where life experience prior to graduate-level training ceases to be of benefit and may even become an obstacle to subsequent counselor development and effectiveness. Future studies might take random samples from various age intervals to see if any difference in counselor effectiveness among master's-level counselors-in-training is demonstrated. Gender and ethnicity are variables, in conjunction with age, that may
merit research consideration regarding counselor effectiveness.

The data analysis supported the null position for the remaining three hypotheses. The statistically nonsignificant findings for all three hypotheses may be explained, globally, by subject homogeneity. That is, the participants in the present study comprise a rather homogeneous group. Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988) noted that as the homogeneity of a group increases, variance decreases. Therefore, the likelihood of finding statistical significance when studying a homogeneous group is limited.

The remaining possible explanations for the statistically nonsignificant findings will address each hypothesis on an individual basis. First, no significant relationship was indicated between perceived early childhood family influence and counselor effectiveness. A Pearson r was computed and no significant correlation was found between the PECFIS and the CERS. In addition, a t-test for difference between means indicated no significant difference between upper and lower third CERS groups on the PECFIS. In other words, the manner—positively or negatively—that participants in this study recalled their early childhood family environment apparently had little significant relation to their effectiveness as counselors in master's level practica. One possible explanation for this finding is the Adlerian position regarding the uniqueness and
creativity of human beings. Adler (1956) stated,

The important thing is not what one is born with, but what one makes of the equipment...As to the influences of the environment, who can say that the same environmental influences are apprehended, worked over, digested, and responded to by any two individuals the same way?...Every individual represents both a unity of personality and the individual fashioning of that unity. The individual is thus both the picture and the artist. He is the artist of his own personality. (pp. 176-177)

The nonsignificant findings may suggest that, in agreement with Adler, how the participants in the study presently recall their early childhood family environment is more important than the environment, or their perceptions of it, alone.

Second, no significant relationship was found between reported birth order position and counselor effectiveness. A one-way ANOVA demonstrated no statistically significant F value for the birth order position groups and results on the CERS. A nonsignificant finding may be explained by the emphasis Adlerian Psychology puts on "psychological birth order." Adler (1956), in discussing the importance of birth order, noted, "it is not the child's number in the order of successive births which influences his character, but the situation into which he is born and the way in which he
interprets it" (p. 377). According to Manaster and Corsini (1982), individuals do not necessarily demonstrate traits or patterns usually associated with persons of a specific ordinal position simply by virtue of birth order position. The psychological position of the person is of greater importance. Furthermore, gender and spacing of children in the family and the family atmosphere are all influential variables in the choice of position one will occupy. A weakness of the present study is that participants were asked to report their actual birth order position. Future studies might attempt to investigate psychological birth order and its relationship to and impact on counselor effectiveness.

Finally, no significant relationship was found between social interest and counselor effectiveness. A Pearson r was computed and no statistically significant correlation was indicated between the SII and the CERS. In addition, a t-test for difference between means found no significant difference between upper and lower CERS groups on the SII. In other words, there was apparently no significant difference between the most effective and least effective counselors in terms of level of social interest. The first of two possible explanations for this finding to be presented addresses potential inadequacies in current social interest instruments. That is, no significant finding was forthcoming in the present study because the SII may have
limited utility. While current measures of social interest appear to have at least a modest degree of construct validity, they appear to be measuring different aspects of the more global construct of social interest (Leak, Millard, Perry, & Williams, 1985; Leak & Williams, 1991). Therefore, a factor analysis of the three major measures of social interest (Crandall, 1975; Greever, Tseng, & Friedland, 1973; Sulliman, 1973) is suggested as a future research study. The factor analytic study may generate an even more valid and comprehensive measure of social interest. The resulting instrument might be subsequently used to further investigate, among other things, the role social interest plays in counselor effectiveness.

A second possible explanation for the nonsignificant finding regarding social interest and counselor effectiveness addresses the participants in the study. The research results may indicate that the least effective counselors in the present study, while tending to agree with the self-reported social interest statements at an intellectual level, demonstrated difficulty in behaviorally operationalizing social interest in their counseling. Conversely, the nonsignificant findings regarding the relationship between social interest and counselor effectiveness may indicate that the more effective counselors in the present study not only tended to agree with the self-reported social interest statements at an
intellectual level but, also, demonstrated a greater facility for operationalizing behaviors characteristic of social interest in their interactions with clients.

Adler's (1956; 1979) varied descriptions of how one manifests social interest in human interaction are remarkably similar to many of the core facilitative counseling behaviors and skills discussed in the literature by non-Adlerians and Adlerians alike (e.g., Carkhuff, 1969; Cormier & Cormier, 1985; Dinkmeyer, Dinkmeyer, & Sperry, 1987; Dreikurs, 1967; Rogers, 1989). Adler (1956; 1979) stated that social interest must be consciously developed or trained. The basic facilitative counseling behaviors and skills must be consciously developed or trained as well. Thus, the present researcher suggests that as counselor educators strive to help counselors-in-training understand and develop the core facilitative elements of counseling, they may also be providing their trainees a form of "social interest education." From this perspective, helping counseling students develop their facilitative skills might take on even greater meaning and significance for counselor educators. Future research might investigate variables that may be hindering less effective counselors from behaviorally operationalizing social interest; for example, a study examining the relationship between social interest, irrational beliefs, and counselor effectiveness.
Appendix A

Informed Consent Statement
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to have Richard E. Watts, a doctoral candidate in Counseling at the University of North Texas, include the data I provide in his dissertation research on the relationship between selected Adlerian personality constructs and counselor effectiveness. I understand that the information gathered will be included with that of others in the reporting and that my identity will be kept completely confidential. I understand that should I have any questions concerning the procedures, they will be addressed by asking the investigator who can be contacted at the address and phone number below. I also understand that I am free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty or prejudice.

I have read and understand the above information and agree to participate in the study.

Signature

Date

Principal Investigator's name, address, and telephone

Richard E. Watts
119C Matthews Hall
University of North Texas
(817) 565-4407
Appendix B

Demographic Sheet
NAME: __________________________________________________________

AGE: __________

GENDER: Male       Female   (circle one)

BIRTH ORDER: Please denote the order in which you were born relative to your brothers and sisters (circle one).

Only child    First-born    Middle child    Youngest-born

COUNSELING MAJOR: (circle one)

Administration
Agency Counseling
School Counseling (either Elementary or Secondary)
College Counseling
Appendix C

Perceived Early Childhood Family Influence Scale
Instructions: The items on the following pages concern memories from your early childhood. Please respond to each statement as you remember it to have been when you were about ten years of age and younger.

NOTE:

If you did not have a mother or father, then answer questions that refer to your mother or father in relation to the most significant female or male adult figure or figures in your life, for example: your grandmother/grandfather, aunt/uncle, or another adult.

If you did not have any brothers or sisters, then answer questions that refer to your brothers or sisters in relation to your childhood peers, for example: your schoolmates, friends, or child relatives.

Mark each statement on the following pages in the answer space provided according to how much you agree or disagree with it. DO NOT SKIP ANY ITEMS. Mark every one. Write the number that corresponds to how you feel in each case. Do not write your name anywhere on this scale.

Example:

6 - Agree Strongly  3 - Tend to Disagree
5 - Agree  2 - Disagree
4 - Tend to Agree  1 - Disagree Strongly

If you "tend to agree" with the statement below, you will place a "4" in the space to the left.

When I was about ten years of age and younger:

____ 1. My mother and father had about the same level of education.

Please go on to the next page.
When I was about ten years of age and younger:

1. My mother and father discussed their work and interests together.
2. My parents were more different than alike in their interests and hobbies.
3. Sometimes my mother would get mad and become physical with one of the children.
4. My father tried to put my mother down.
5. My father encouraged me to try new things.
6. My father tried to help me when I asked him to.
7. My mother was strict.
8. My mother was loud and demanding.
9. I felt like my mother trusted me.
10. I was a selfish child.
11. My parents spent a lot of time together.
12. My father and I got along with one another.
13. My father was easygoing.
14. My mother wanted things done her way most of the time.
15. The children in my family had more good times together than bad times.
16. My parents encouraged activities that involved the whole family.
17. My father was very critical of me.
18. My father was too busy to spend time with me.

Please go on to the next page.
When I was about ten years of age and younger:

19. My mother let me choose my own friends.

20. My mother cared very little about anyone except herself.

21. I felt like my father trusted me.

22. My father wanted to be left alone most of the time.

23. The children in my family did not get along with one another.

24. The children in my family liked to play together.

25. The children in my family supported each other in interests and activities.

26. My mother openly showed affection for me.

27. My parents did not like each other.

28. My parents would argue openly.

29. The children in my family respected each other.

30. The children in my family had a lot of similar interests.

31. I was a bossy child.

32. My mother encouraged me to do what I wanted to do.

33. My parents' disagreements would sometimes disrupt the whole family.

34. My mother listened to me.

35. My parents would become physical during their arguments.

36. As a child, I would try to make trouble.

Please go on to the next page.
6 - Agree Strongly   3 - Tend to Disagree
5 - Agree  2 - Disagree
4 - Tend to Agree  1 - Disagree Strongly

When I was about ten years of age and younger:

37. I got along well with everyone in my family.
38. I tried to deceive my parents.
39. My father listened to me.
40. The children in my family would share equally.
41. The children in my family were jealous of one another.
42. My parents had so many problems with each other that there was seldom time spent with the children.
43. I frequently got into fights with other family members.
44. My mother was understanding of people's feelings.
45. My mother showed interest in what I was doing.
46. My mother was hard to please.
47. My mother was very critical of me.
48. My mother tended to get mad.
49. My mother was sick a lot.
50. The children in my family tried to avoid having problems with one another.
51. The children in my family openly showed affection for one another.
52. My mother was too busy to spend time with me.
53. My mother felt like I could not do anything right.
54. My father tended to get mad.
55. My mother expected too much of others.

Please go on to the next page.
When I was about ten years of age and younger:

56. Sometimes I felt like I was a burden to my father.

57. In their relationship, my parents were openly affectionate towards each other.

58. My father tried to avoid having problems with my mother.

59. My parents would disagree more than they would agree.

60. The children in my family spent a lot of time together.

61. My parents were in agreement on issues such as religion, politics, children's education, and family matters.

62. My parents would get involved in each other's interests and activities.

63. In my family, I was considered to be the "good child."

64. My parents did not give each other a lot of support.

65. I preferred to be by myself rather than with the family, most of the time.

66. My parents treated each other with respect.

67. My parents would give to each other equally.

68. My father was hard to please.

69. My mother tried to help me when I asked her to.

70. My father encouraged me to be social and outgoing.

71. My father tried to dominate me.

72. My father was strict.

73. My father controlled my mother.

74. My father encouraged me to do what I wanted to do.
When I was about ten years of age and younger:

75. All of the children in my family were fairly happy most of the time.
76. As a child, I always tried to do as I was told.
77. My father was understanding of peoples's feelings.
78. I frequently refused to do what my parents wanted me to do.
79. My parents would argue very often.
80. As a child, it was important to me to obey the law.
81. My parents agreed on child-rearing procedures.
82. My mother and I got along with one another.
83. My mother was easygoing.
84. As a child, I had a bad temper.
85. It was easy for the children in my family to talk to one another.
86. My parents would encourage each other to pursue individual interests and ideas.
87. My father showed interest in what I was doing.
88. The children in my family tried to please each other.
89. The children in my family tended to go their own separate ways.
90. My father was a hard worker.
91. My mother controlled my father.
92. My mother did not compliment me.
93. The children in my family tried to put each other down.

Please go on to the next page.
6 - Agree Strongly  3 - Tend to Disagree
5 - Agree  2 - Disagree
4 - Tend to Agree  1 - Disagree Strongly

When I was about ten years of age and younger:

94. My father wanted things done his way most of the time.
95. My father tried to please my mother.
96. My father cared very little about anyone except himself.
97. My mother tried to please my father.
98. My father did not compliment me.
99. My father expected too much of others.
100. My father felt like I could not do anything right.
101. My mother tried to put my father down.
102. On the whole, the children in my family were all high achievers.
103. The children in my family were well cared for by my parents.
104. In my family, I was considered the "clown" or "show-off."
105. My mother encouraged me to try new things.
106. My parents did a number of fun things together.
107. The children in my family looked out for one another.
108. The children in my family would argue a lot.
109. I tried to stay away from home as much as possible.
110. I was a rebellious child.
111. As a child, I tried very hard to please others.

Please go on to the next page.
6 - Agree Strongly  
5 - Agree  
4 - Tend to Agree  
3 - Tend to Disagree  
2 - Disagree  
1 - Disagree Strongly

When I was about ten years of age and younger:

___ 112. My parents encouraged family meetings where every family member was given a chance to talk.

___ 113. The children in my family did not like each other.

___ 114. I enjoyed doing things with the family.

___ 115. My parents had more good times with each other than bad times.

___ 116. My father openly showed affection for me.

___ 117. Sometimes I felt like I was a burden to my mother.

___ 118. I felt at ease and comfortable in my family.

___ 119. As a child, I was considerate of other people.

___ 120. In my family, I was considered the "bad child."

___ 121. I was a happy child.

___ 122. My mother tried to dominate me.

___ 123. My father was loud and demanding.

___ 124. I was a stubborn child.

___ 125. My mother wanted to be left alone most of the time.

___ 126. I was always open and up front with my parents.

Please go on to the next page.
Appendix D

Life Style Analysis
Instructions: The following items concern your current life-style. Please respond to each item with either "True" or "False," depending upon how it relates to you. DO NOT SKIP ANY ITEMS. Mark every one. Do not write your name anywhere on this scale.

Mark T for True and F for False in the space provided.

1. Often I try to pull strings to get my own way.  
2. I would go a long way to avoid trouble.  
3. I like to get the "jump" on other people.  
4. I like to take charge of things and tell others what to do.  
5. It tickles me to outsmart somebody else.  
6. I like to get people in my power.  
7. I don't want to take anything I haven't earned.  
8. I like to get my own way.  
9. What other people think does not concern me.  
10. It is alright to take advantage of suckers.  
11. I believe in easy divorce.  
12. As a child, I used to "talk back" if someone corrected me.  
13. I enjoy being the center of attention.  
14. I like to be in positions of authority.  
15. I often wish I had someone to protect me.  
16. I always try to rationalize my failures by giving excuses.  
17. I try to hide my weaknesses from others.  
18. I always try to be neat and orderly.  
19. I go out of my way to protect a person from getting bullied.

Please go on to the next page.
Mark T for True and F for False in the space provided.

20. I argue a lot to win other people over to my ideas.

21. I don't open my bills.

22. I often tell people to go to hell.

23. I used to throw temper tantrums to get my own way.

24. I usually do what I damn please.

25. I have been called a bully.

26. I would go out of my way to help a wounded animal.

27. As a child, I was always a leader of the group.

28. I have a need to be dominant over other people.

29. I spend a lot of time playing games.

30. I hate to have anybody get the best of me.

31. I often feel the impulse to get away from everything.

32. I don't get much fun out of life.

33. I am very concerned about keeping my health.

34. I always struggle hard to correct my weaknesses.

35. It bothers me to see anything in a mess.

36. I always try to follow the letter of the law.

37. I feel more comfortable being with religious people.

38. I often try to get people to do things my way.

39. I like to use my wits to get ahead of other people.

40. I enjoy performing in front of other people.

41. I don't like to be obligated to other people.

42. I am quite an "operator" when it comes to getting things done.

Please go on to the next page.
Mark T for True and F for False in the space provided.

43. I always try to give an excuse if I do something wrong.
44. I give up too easily after a setback.
45. I spend too much time brooding over defeats or humiliation.
46. I never let defeat discourage me.
47. I have no one who really understands me.
48. I am very careful to follow the rules and do things right.
49. I don't like other people to discover my weaknesses.
50. I think that religious confessionals are very valuable.
51. I like to have my things neat and tidy.
52. I get a real thrill out of aesthetic experiences.
53. I like to shock people by being different.
54. I understand beatniks (hippies).
55. I get a kick out of fooling other people.
56. I have a strong need to be my own master.
57. I often try to impress other people with my ability.
58. I always try to do what the Bible says is right.
59. I consider myself a humble person.
60. I like to help others by giving them advice.
61. I always admit frankly if I make a mistake.
62. I am very careful not to get into trouble with the law.
63. If I fail in something, I will always try until I succeed.
64. I am not easily discouraged when things don't go right.

Please go on to the next page.
Mark T for True and F for False in the space provided.

___ 65. I can't take criticism.

___ 66. I don't take teasing well.

___ 67. I am very sensitive about disapproval from others.

___ 68. I often let things go until the last minute.

___ 69. I have trouble getting rid of salesmen who want to sell me something I don't want to buy.

___ 70. I usually try to conform to the ruling power.

___ 71. I always did what my parents wanted me to.

___ 72. People have called me a chiseler.

___ 73. I used to cheat on examinations if I got a chance.

___ 74. I often tell people just what I think of them.

___ 75. I used to get away with a lot when I was a child.

___ 76. I drink to relieve my tensions.

___ 77. I just overlook what I don't want to see.

___ 78. I always try to get even if someone gets the better of me.

___ 79. People often tell me to mind my own business.

___ 80. People have called me a "show-off."
Appendix E

Social Interest Index
Here are a number of statements people might make about themselves. Read the statements and rate them on the "1" to "5" scale, depending on how much the statement applies to you. For example, if a statement does not apply at all to you, circle a "1"; if the statement is not very much like you, circle a "2"; if a statement is very much like you, circle a "5". Read each statement carefully enough to understand it, then rate it on the "1" to "5" scale and go on to the next statement. Don't spend a long time thinking about the rating; give your first impression as soon as you are sure you understand the statement. If you are in doubt, pick the number that seems most accurate. Be sure to circle your rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have many friends-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am usually nominated for things at school-----------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I usually like people I have just met----------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My friends are very important to me--------------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I enjoy being in clubs--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I don't mind helping out friends-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am often turned to for advice------------------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel rules are necessary----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am generally satisfied with my decisions------------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Once I decide something I find a way to do it--------------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My plans generally turn out the way I want them to---------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am sometimes concerned with philosophical questions------------------</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please go on to the next page.
13. I seldom feel the need to make excuses for my behavior——— 1 2 3 4 5

14. I feel I have a place in the world——— 1 2 3 4 5

15. I do my best most of the time 1 2 3 4 5

16. I seldom feel limited in my abilities——— 1 2 3 4 5

17. I can overlook faults in the people I date——— 1 2 3 4 5

18. My parents did the best they could in raising me——— 1 2 3 4 5

19. I believe a man and a woman can be both lovers and friends——— 1 2 3 4 5

20. I feel a man and a woman have equally important roles in marriage——— 1 2 3 4 5

21. I am looking forward to getting married——— 1 2 3 4 5

22. I have warm relationships with some people——— 1 2 3 4 5

23. I feel family decisions need to be made jointly——— 1 2 3 4 5

24. As far as I am concerned, marriage is for life——— 1 2 3 4 5

25. I believe liking your work is more important than the salary——— 1 2 3 4 5

26. I feel jobs are important because they make you take an active part in the community——— 1 2 3 4 5

Please go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>School to me is more than just facts from books</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I prefer doing things with other people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Finishing a job is a real challenge to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I'm considered a hard worker</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I enjoy music and literature</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I wonder if I will be able to do all I want in my lifetime</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please go on to the next page.
Appendix F

Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale
COUNSELOR EVALUATION RATING SCALE

Name of Practicum Student:

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

Mark each statement in the blank provided according to how strongly you agree or disagree. Please mark every statement. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to represent the following:

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

Items on which you are uncertain or were not able to judge, place an "X" in the blank. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Demonstrates an interest in client's problems.
2. Approaches 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. Talks 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 counseling sessions.
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. Is rigid in counseling behavior.
13. Lectures and moralizes in counseling.
14. Can critique counseling tapes and gain insights with minimum help from the 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.
21. Can express thoughts and feelings clearly in counseling.
22. Verbal behavior in counseling is appropriately flexible and varied, according to the situation.
23. Lacks basic knowledge of fundamental counseling principles and methodology.
24. Participates actively and willingly in supervisory sessions.
25. Is indifferent to personal development and professional growth.
26. Applies a consistent rationale of human behavior to counseling.
27. Can be recommended for a counseling position without reservation.
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