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(ABSTRACT)

The field of guidance is changing from one of providing services for students needing help to results-based guidance programs which provide knowledge, attitudes, and skills for all students. This shift in focus has resulted in different expectations of counselors who are responsible for implementing guidance programs in the schools. Some counselors who were successful in providing counseling services have been less successful in guidance programs. This study looked at selected counselor characteristics that contribute to successful results-based guidance programs. The question is
asked, "Are counselor characteristics related to the success of a results-based guidance program?"

Data on student results were collected from high school seniors and eighth-graders at eighteen secondary schools. The counselors implementing the results-based guidance programs at these schools were assessed on selected personality characteristics using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In addition, data were collected on demographic factors including sex, race, age, and length of service for each counselor. Additional qualitative data were collected from administrators, teachers, counselors, and students from a successful and less-successful school using an interview format.

Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to answer the research questions. Analysis of data included ranking schools based upon student mean scores in four guidance competency areas to differentiate successful from less-successful programs, a t-test was applied to four MBTI scores to determine significant differences between counselors implementing successful programs and those implementing less-successful programs, application of Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA test was used to analyze demographic factors and a stepwise, multiple regression was applied to personality factors to account for the amount of variance ascribed to each. Qualitative data were analyzed through the use of a cross-site, two variable descriptive matrix.
Findings indicated that the Thinking-Feeling preference on the MBTI differentiates at the $p < .01$ level between counselors implementing successful results-based programs and those implementing less-successful programs at the high school level. Using a student self-report format, it was possible to differentiate between successful and less-successful results-based guidance programs at the high school level. In an interview situation, administrators, teachers, students, and counselors articulated personality characteristics that contribute to a successful results-based guidance program in terms that related closely to the findings of the MBTI.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Chapter one includes an introduction to the trend toward the development of results-based guidance programs, a description of the characteristics of results-based programs as they differ from traditional guidance and counseling programs and the changing roles and contributions of the public school counselor related to a results-based guidance program design. The statement of the problem, the purpose of the study and research questions, the significance of the study, a definition of terms, a listing of the limitations and the organization of the study are also presented.

Trend Toward Development of Results-Based Guidance Programs

In the United States there is currently a move from traditional guidance and counseling services to results-based guidance programs (Hotchkiss & Vetter, 1987; Keirsey & Bates, 1973; Whitfield, 1986). The mandate of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 for program accountability along with provisions for more extensive guidance involvement, reflects this movement and has increased the interest in the outcomes of guidance and counseling programs (Hotchkiss & Vetter, 1987). Results-based guidance programs
provide a framework for organizing guidance around immediate, exit from school, and long-term results which are consistent with expected developmental stages of learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1982). This change in perspective from services to results redirects the focus of guidance from what counselors do, to how students are different as a result of the program activities. Although guidance services may have produced results, there has been little effort by those with a process orientation to verify how students benefit and therefore, no evidence to demonstrate results. Guidance services have traditionally validated their existence through verification of how many students received the service and/or were happy with the service. "The service concept has so dominated guidance and counseling that more basic and significant questions are not even acknowledged, let alone answered" (Sprinthall, 1971). It can be said that results-based guidance programs have grown out of the failure of process-oriented guidance services to address student results.

The move toward results-based guidance is congruent with the current emphasis in education on outcome-based programs (Eisele & Halverson, 1987; Huff, 1985). Both trends incorporate what Naisbitt (1982) refers to as the move from short-term to long-term planning. Both outcome-based education and results-based guidance programs focus on the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to prepare students for the fu-
ture. Futurists indicate that there is less emphasis today on learning facts than on assisting students to learn how-to-learn (Barnes, 1980). The changing complexity of our world necessitates that education consider the level of student competence when students complete the schooling process rather than focusing primarily on the completion of a required number of classes or units of study as the major requirement for graduation. This goal can be better addressed and evaluated if the educational program and the guidance program coordinate efforts to focus on results (outcomes) for students rather than processes (activities).

**Characteristics of Results-Based Guidance Programs as They Differ From Traditional Guidance Services**

In order to clarify the characteristics of results-based programs contrasted with traditional guidance services it is helpful to review the background of the guidance movement in the public school system. Originally guidance was provided by parents and headmasters who made decisions for students about their future. The guidance movement began essentially as vocational guidance when Frank Parsons founded the Vocations Bureau of Boston in 1908 (Brewer, 1942). The school guidance movement began when a trained guidance counselor was hired to assist students in matching their competencies with appropriate career choices. Guidance was part of the pupil
personnel department and stressed occupational selection and placement until the 1920's when the mental health movement brought a further dimension to guidance and a more personal, diagnostic, clinical orientation to individuals (Gysbers, 1978).

The change from a vocational guidance approach to a counseling approach focused attention on personal adjustment. The interest in mental health gave rise to the use of therapeutic models as the primary mode of service delivery. In addition, counselors began to spend much of their time on crises and problems. Many of the counselors now in the field were trained in the late 1950's and early 60's in guidance institutes funded through the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). A major focus of the training programs at that time was therapeutic techniques, frequently encouraging the use of Carl Roger's process of "person-centered counseling" applied to individuals and small groups (Boy & Pine, 1982).

As the guidance movement progressed, emerging concerns about developmental and accountability issues in addition to the crisis-oriented counseling issues, resulted in a technique-oriented concept of guidance. A "services" approach which defined guidance as providing orientation, counseling, placement, information, assessment and follow-up was developed (Johnson, Stefflre, & Edefelt, 1961; Miller, 1968; Rober, Smith, & Erickson, 1955). Traditionally, organizers
of a guidance program included processes associated with counseling, consulting and coordinating (Shertzer & Stone, 1981). School administrators now define guidance in terms of counselor duties, such as, counseling students, interpreting test results, consulting with parents and staff, participating in administrative meetings and updating student files (Gysbers, 1987). In the typical public school of the 1980's the guidance program is defined by a counselor role-and-function statement that has been defined, debated, studied, negotiated and changed numerous times in response to administrative and counselor input reflecting the needs and trends of the times.

Results-based guidance has evolved from the idea of students' need for a comprehensive, developmental guidance program. The difference between guidance programs and guidance services is a basic philosophic difference between offering students an opportunity to experience and benefit from guidance at their own request or providing a planned, sequential program in which counselors take responsibility for assuring that all students gain specific guidance-related competencies. This difference is articulated further through noting the differences in the management systems. Figure 1 shows the major management differences between guidance services and guidance programs.

The two disparate perspectives of management hold that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance Programs (Results-based)</th>
<th>Guidance Services (Traditional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Product is held constant, processes vary.</td>
<td>1. Process is held constant, products vary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Many different activities are provided in order for all students to learn a specific competency.</td>
<td>2. One process may be offered, resulting in only a percentage of students learning a specific competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equity guarantee. All students will learn.</td>
<td>3. Equal opportunity guarantee. All students given an opportunity to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inductive planning methods. Start with result to be achieved.</td>
<td>4. Deductive planning methods. Start with needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluated on number of students who demonstrate competencies learned.</td>
<td>5. Evaluated on number of students receiving service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Counselors success based on ability to create/select/implement processes to reach student results.</td>
<td>6. Counselor success based on completing processes listed as role-and-function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Counselors encouraged to work as a team to use individual skills and interests. Counselor assignments based on ability to deliver results in specific areas.</td>
<td>7. Counselors work individually with an assigned caseload (alpha or grade assignment). Each counselor expected to do similar tasks in all areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Differences in management concepts and practices for results-based guidance programs and traditional guidance services.
either the desired result or the process must be held constant in a program (Keirsey & Bates, 1973). In a results-based program, in order to achieve the desired program results, the result is held constant and the processes vary. Conversely, in a service-based program, the process is held constant, consequently, the results will vary. For example, if the desired result is for all students to demonstrate test taking skills, some students will learn through a basic classroom presentation. Those who cannot demonstrate the skills as the result of the first presentation may then be scheduled for a variety of other experiences which could include working with a peer tutor, going through a computer simulation exercise, small group counseling, individual counseling, parent conference or other processes until the result is accomplished. On the other hand, if the defined process is for the counselor to make classroom presentations on test taking skills, then some students will learn the skill and others will not (only the process is held constant). Guidance and counseling services organized around role-and-function statements hold the processes constant. In contrast, a results-based guidance program ensures that students gain specific guidance competencies, i.e. the results are held constant. Since we know that students learn in different ways (Dunn, 1982), it follows that a variety of processes will be necessary if all students are to gain the desired
Recent professional publications have begun to address student results as a focus in the development of future guidance programs (Campbell, Basinger, Dauner & Parks, 1986; Herr, 1982; National Career Development Association, 1985). National attention was focused on this issue as the result of a recent College Board study, *Keeping the Options Open: An Overview* (1986), which identified the need for students to gain specific skills early in their educational careers.

Research and evaluation efforts are also beginning to focus on student results of guidance programs. A comprehensive study (Hotchkiss & Vetter, 1987) completed through The National Center For Research in Vocational Education used the data base from the High School and Beyond Study (Jones, et al, 1982) for secondary analysis of the outcomes of career guidance and counseling.

In addition to High School and Beyond statistics, data were collected on 30,000 students in connection with the Consortium for the Study of Schooling Effectiveness for further analysis to determine whether schools with strong career guidance programs produce students who experience improved in-school and post-high school outcomes. These data will be used to estimate effects of career guidance and counseling on intermediate outcomes measured while respondents remain in high school and also on employment and educational outcomes.
measured after respondents leave high school (Hotchkiss & Vetter, 1987). The presence of such studies indicate an increased interest in shifting from studying what counselors do to studying how students benefit from guidance programs.

Program evaluation and counselor performance evaluations have been important elements in the change from guidance services to guidance programs. An evaluation of guidance services usually measures the number or percent of students who received a service. Statements of role-and-function assume that all counselors have similar skills and should perform all indicated functions of the job. Thus, in traditional programs counselors' evaluations are based on how the counselor's individual performance compares with a standard list of processes which are assigned to all counselors. Counseling services are generally evaluated in terms of program objectives, students needs, counselor-teacher-administrator cooperation and relationships with the parents and community (Mamarchev, 1979b). The role of the counselor is examined in terms of perceptions of students, of other school personnel, and of the counselors themselves, as well as the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of all concerned with the counseling services (Mamarchev, 1979b).

The effectiveness of a results-based guidance program is evaluated on the number of students who demonstrate the specific, pre-determined guidance-related competencies. School
board members, parents and the community want to know what results they can expect from the guidance program and are, for the most part, less concerned with the processes used to get the results (Ficklen, 1979). In a results-based program, counselors are encouraged to apply their unique strengths and abilities to reach the desired results and, if the program goals are met, counselors' evaluations reflect this successful achievement. The results-based approach to guidance does not address the issue of how a counselor functions within the guidance program but rather what student results the counselor produces. This emphasis on results focuses the evaluation of the program on student competencies (the knowledge, attitudes and skills students have acquired).

Changing Role of the Guidance Counselor

Within the context of a results-based guidance program, there is no established role-and-function statement for the counselor to follow. The purpose of the guidance program is to assure that all students gain pre-determined student competencies in guidance-related areas, i.e., educational planning (learning-to-learn), career development (learning-to-work) and personal/social growth (learning how to relate to others). The attainment of these competencies becomes a direct outcome of counselor initiative and creativity. Although the counselor may coordinate the efforts of other
staff members, parents and community members who all contribute to the student's competency-attainment, it is the counselor who is responsible to ensure that the student has reached the goal. The labor-intensive nature of guidance makes the effectiveness of the individual counselor critical to the success of the program.

Counselor characteristics which are critical to effectiveness in terms of the counseling help (one-on-one and small group) provided to clients have been the subject of extensive research (Berenson & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969; Egan, 1975; Gazda, 1972; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler & Truax, 1967; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). Gazda (1972) found that the effective counselor offers high levels of the "core" conditions of empathy, warmth and respect as well as the more action-oriented conditions of concreteness, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation and immediacy. Other counselor characteristics which have been shown to be important in traditional programs include high achievement, flexibility, innovativeness and enthusiasm (Levell, 1965). It is believed that these skills are important in effective counseling relationships within any guidance program that utilizes counseling strategies, whether it is a results-based guidance program or traditional guidance services.

However, according to literature and personal observation, there are other counselor skills that may prove to be
equally important within a results-based program approach. These include program development and implementation, program evaluation, planning, teamwork, persuasiveness and leadership. The additional competencies that are used in the development and implementation of a results-based program may be preferred by persons who have different personality characteristics, temperament and preferred work environments than typical counselors. Research indicates that temperament remains stable throughout an individual's life (Chess & Thomas, 1986), as do personality characteristics and work preference (Jung, 1976), therefore, changes within the guidance field may have important ramifications for counselor career planning and subsequent placement and inservice training needs.

**Statement of the Problem**

The trend toward results-based guidance programs needs to be studied to better understand which aspects of such a program are responsible for the results achieved. As an initial effort, this study looks at one aspect of the program - the counselor implementing the program. There is a need to determine personality characteristics and demographic factors of counselors who are successful in implementing results-based guidance programs. Another problem to be addressed is the selection and training of counselor teams to better utilize their characteristics for maximum success within a re-
Although many studies have addressed the characteristics of successful counselors within a counseling relationship, very few studies have addressed the characteristics of counselors in a results-based guidance program. Studies identified in the related literature define "successful counselor" as one who receives positive evaluations from the school administrator and/or supervisor (Wiggins & Weslander, 1986). This study links the success of the counselor to the attainment of student results and analyzes the characteristics of the counselors involved. Furthermore, it seeks to determine selected personality characteristics which distinguished between those counselors implementing successful programs and those implementing less successful programs.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

This study investigates the relationship of counselor personality characteristics to the success of a results-based guidance program. The research questions were formulated to explore whether counselors implementing successful results-based guidance programs differ from counselors implementing less successful programs on selected personality characteristics and other demographic factors, e.g. age, sex, race, length of service.

1. What are the success levels of results-based guid-
ance programs? How was the level of success of results based guidance programs determined?

2. Do the personality characteristics of counselors implementing successful results based guidance programs differ from the personality characteristics of counselors implementing less successful programs?

3. Do selected demographic factors of counselors implementing successful results based guidance programs differ from demographic factors of counselors implementing less successful programs?

4. Do counselor personality characteristics, demographic factors and other qualitative data differ in successful results based guidance programs and less successful programs?

Significance of the Study

In a study of a results based guidance program in eighteen secondary schools in a county school system in Maryland (Appendix A), differences were found between schools on the level of program success as measured by students' self-report on attainment of guidance goals (Lichtman, 1986). Over a three-year period, there have been continuing efforts to revise the evaluation questionnaires (Appendix B) to accurately reflect the specific knowledge, attitudes and skills that are
most indicative of student success, provided by the guidance program. Using the existing data base on program evaluation and new data collected on counselor personality characteristics (Appendix C), this study investigates the personality characteristics and demographic factors which relate to the success or lack of success of a results-based guidance program. Although other variables may have impact on the success of the programs which were evaluated, the counselor personality characteristics and demographic factors were of particular interest because they are measureable and may have influence on subsequent placement decisions and inservice training which is of concern to the researcher. Thus, information on relevant counselor characteristics might provide long-term, positive program results with little additional cost to a school district. Potentially, this information could be important in career planning for counselor candidates, in counselor preparation programs and even as one aspect of hiring information.

More specifically, in the schools used in this study, the guidance supervisor and the school principal observe and rate counselor performance. There are observed differences in a counselor's job performance as reported on a standardized observation form (Appendix D). Staff development programs have been provided in the areas of counselor needs determined through the observation and evaluation process.
However, inservice activities over the last five years have not resulted in observable differences in the success of the guidance programs implemented by these counselors. Therefore, it is suggested that the effectiveness of individual counselors within the results-based guidance program may have less relationship to acquired professional skills than to their basic personality styles and work style preferences which remain relatively stable over time.

Counselor characteristics are many and varied. Personality type, as determined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), can be analyzed from a variety of perspectives which potentially influence counselor work performance and job effectiveness. Guidance is essentially a people-oriented career. Characteristics such as temperament, work preferences, leadership style, attitude and perception effect the counselors relationships with others and, therefore, their effectiveness. Demographic factors such as age, sex, ethnic group and length of service might also relate to success and will be analyzed as a part of this study.

Some of the counselors who have been less successful implementing the results-based guidance program were evaluated positively in the former guidance services program (pre-1980). One can speculate that the traditional orientation of completing assigned tasks was a preferred work style for counselors who were subsequently judged less effective when a
results-based program required them to apply self-generated strategies and initiatives to assure the achievement of specific student outcomes. On the other hand, perhaps these counselors have become less effective as their age and length of service increased.

This study explores the relationship between counselor characteristics and guidance program success. It has not yet been determined that counselor characteristics are important in the implementation of guidance programs. However, if there are differences in counselor characteristics within successful vs. less successful programs, then there may be implications for further study of linkages between counselors and program effectiveness which could have an impact on the effective management of counseling resources within a results-based guidance program.

Long-range impact of such findings could affect:

1. hiring and placement practices
2. differential assignments and/or career ladders
3. counselor preparation and inservice training

There is research (Myers & McCaulley, 1986) to indicate that persons who are able to use their preferred work styles, experience more job satisfaction and less burn-out. The matching of counselors to a preferred work environment could
benefit both the individual and the school district. Results might include improved staff morale, increased individual productivity and more positive interactions with all populations that benefit from the guidance program, including administrators, staff, students, parents and community members.

Definition of Terms

**Attitude**: A term used to describe a feeling, conviction or position that influences an individual’s behavior. In counselor evaluations, a positive attitude is seen as a commitment to the school and to the guidance program as reflected in participation, accountability, relationships with other professionals and positive work values. On the MBTI, the Extraversion-Introversion scale is used to indicate attitude preference also described as one’s “orientations toward life” (Myers & McCaulley, 1986, p.13). One’s orientation is described as attention to the outside world of people and objects in the environment or energy drawn inward to an inner world of concepts and ideas.

**Activities/Processes**: Terms used to refer to how results are achieved. They are the methods used to reach a preestablished criterion or result.

**Competency**: A term used to indicate a developed knowledge, attitude or skill that is observable and can be trans-
ferred from a learning situation to a real-life situation and that involves the production of a measurable result.

**Counseling**: A term used to refer to both group and one-to-one relationships between students or clients and a professional counselor. The counselor assists the client or student to integrate and apply self-understanding and insight into the situations so that they may make the most appropriate choices, decisions, and adjustments. The counseling process is used in both guidance services and results based guidance programs.

**Counselor characteristics**: A set of traits or qualities which determine overall personality. Examples would include attitude, judgment, temperament, leadership.

**Counselor performance**: A term used to describe the level of effectiveness of an individual member of a counseling staff in terms of the attainment of guidance results.

**Guidance Programs**: Guidance programs consist of a defined guidance curriculum inclusive of results, management system and evaluation in the areas of educational, career and personal/social development.

**Guidance Services**: A set of resources and processes available to students who need assistance in addressing educational, career or personal/social concerns. Services are generally delivered using one-to-one or small group counseling with a certified school counselor.
Less Successful Guidance Programs: A phrase used to describe a guidance program in which students and parents report less student mastery of predetermined guidance-related competencies than was reported in successful programs.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI): A measure of personality preferences. The MBTI identifies, from self-report of easily recognized reactions, the basic preferences of people in regard to perception and judgment. Four separate indices reflect preferences for Extroversion or Introversion (EI), Sensing or Intuitive (SN), Thinking or Feeling (TF), Judgment or Perception (JP) choices. Using the MBTI indicators, attitudes refer to EI, processes of perception are SN, processes of judgment are TF and the style of dealing with the outside world is shown by JP.

Outcome: A term used interchangeably with result to mean the product of an activity or process.

Successful Results-based Guidance Program: A term used to describe a guidance program in which students and parents reported student mastery of predetermined guidance-related competencies. A guidance evaluation questionnaire was used to assess the level of competence and confidence of students on guidance competencies.

Temperament: A term that refers to the theme or motivation that determines the behavior of a person based on his/her individual needs, values and goals. It is the individual
style of emotional response that characterizes each person and remains relatively stable over time (Chess & Thomas, 1986). On the MBTI, temperament is identified by an individual’s preference as an NT, NF, ST or SP (Keirsey & Bates, 1984).

**Traditional guidance program**: A program defined by a role and function statement, or by services/processes performed by a counselor including counseling, consulting and coordinating.

**Work style**: A term which refers to the individual’s preferences in work environment, functions and attitudes. It is an approach to specific work that generates interest and satisfaction for a given individual. On the MBTI, work styles are characterized by NT, NF, SF and ST preferences.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. This study was an ex post facto research design and, as such, has the limitations inherent in this type of research, i.e. “(1) the inability to manipulate independent variables, (2) the lack of power to randomize, and (3) the risk of improper interpretation” (Kerlinger, 1973).

2. All of the participating counselors in this study are employees of a specific County Public School System in Maryland. Thus, generalizations of the findings to other populations or settings may not be appropriate.
3. This study only addresses the characteristics of counselors in results-based guidance programs. It is assumed that these may be different from characteristics of counselors in a traditional guidance system.

4. The population of this study is primarily students and counselors. Other individuals, such as principals, teachers, parents who were not surveyed may have differing perceptions of the success of the guidance programs and/or the characteristics of the counselors at a given school.

Organization of the Study

In the first chapter, the introductory information relevant to the study is presented. Chapter Two includes a review of literature delineating changes in guidance program focus and the changing roles and contributions of counselors within a results-based program. In addition, personality characteristics of counselors and other mental health professionals, background information on the MBTI and career theory is reviewed. Chapter Three provides information on the sample, the measuring instruments, data collection procedures, the design of the study and describes how the resultant data will be analyzed. Chapter Four includes analysis of the data obtained to answer the research questions. Chapter Five includes a discussion and interpretation of the findings, conclusions and recommendations based on this study.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Research

This chapter contains a review of professional literature and research studies related to the change in focus of guidance and counseling programs, counselor personality characteristics, related research using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and career development theories related to occupational choice and success.

Changes in Guidance Program Focus

The concern for changing the focus of public school guidance programs is not a recent phenomenon (Gysbers & Moore, 1981). Efforts to implant a psychological model of school counseling (Bramer, 1968) were countered by insistence on an educational model (Aubrey, 1969). The education model was supported by many studies and specifically developmental guidance studies (Drier, 1976; Gysbers & Moore, 1974; Matthewson, 1962; O’Hare & Lasser, 1971; Wellman, 1968) in the 1960s and 1970s. Matthewson (1962) suggested that even though adjustive guidance was popular, developmental forms of guidance would prevail over time. Wellman (1968) developed a systems model for the evaluation of guidance based on the belief that an appropriate measure of the value of a guidance program was its impact on students. Wellman’s model served as a basis for many evaluation models. Sullivan and O’Hare
(1971) developed a similar evaluation model for the state of California based on a taxonomy of objectives. Drier (1976) developed a systematic approach to vocational guidance programming that was based on developmental levels of students.

Accompanying the trend were efforts to cause guidance programs to be accountable for results instead of processes (Herr, 1979; Jones, Dayton & Gelatt, 1977; Keirsey & Bates, 1973; Mease & Benson, 1973; O'Hare & Lasser, 1971; Peterson & Tierchel, 1978; Wellman & Moore, 1975). Comprehensive program development models and training models were implemented in the early 1970s in California, Arizona and Georgia (Gysbers & Moore, 1981). Even though there were national trends indicating a change in programs from process or service orientation to accountability for results, few changes were made in course requirements for a masters degree in guidance and counseling or for required state certification.

The changing guidance programs have taken different titles related to the differences in the conceptual approaches used by each. There was an earlier movement referred to as guidance-by-objectives (Hays, 1972) which was related to the concurrent management-by-objectives approach used within the field of business. A program planning and budgeting system, developed within the California State Department of Education in 1968, was an early approach to similar "by-objective" program directions. Another conceptual
approach was developed using a deductive planning model (Jones, Hamilton, Ganschow, Helliwell and Wolff, 1972) in which goals and objectives were developed through use of a needs assessment as the basis for establishing goals and objectives prior to determining strategies and then evaluating before starting the process again. Keirsey (1970) introduced an approach which looked at desired results of pupil personnel programs. He contended that by specifying the desired results, first, individual pupil personnel staff members could then use whatever means they chose to cause students to acquire the defined skills. Currently there are three different conceptual approaches being pursued in the development of guidance programs within the public schools. One approach is being called "Guaranteed Services" (Sheldon, 1986; White, 1981), a second approach includes student outcomes plus accountability for time spent by counselors in guidance-related vs. non-guidance related activities (Gysbers & Moore, 1981) and the third is "results-based guidance," which is the focus of this study.

The guidance program of the future will be different yet will build upon and expand present directions. A shift from guidance services to programs focussed on providing results, will necessitate changes in the allocation of resources to achieve desired results. This change may include a redefinition of what the public school counselor will be
expected to contribute. A continuing trend is identified (Aubrey 1985) in which society expects schools to address numerous social concerns. It is obvious that changes must be made if guidance is to find ways to meet the demands of a complex, changing technological society. The counseling profession is well aware of the increasing demands placed on public school counselors. A number of books and journals address the needs of the profession now and in the future (Aubrey, 1985; Daniel & Weikel, 1983; Gelatt, 1983; Gysbers, 1978; Herr, Thompson & Walz, 1983).

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision produced a model (1985) in which the knowledge bases and skills for counselors within a variety of specialty areas were defined. Secondary school counseling was defined as being in a state of transition in which there will be more emphasis on integrating the subject matter of counseling into the school curriculum, necessitating that counselors become more engaged in teaching and group counseling in class size groups with their subject matter including life skills, life themes and life transitions (Nejedlo, Arredondo & Benjamin, 1985).

A 1983 study by Daniel and Weikel surveyed 334 full-time doctoral level faculty members on 48 possible trends in the areas of preparation, licensing, funding, professionalism, organizational bases and counseling procedures. The
second most probable trend identified by participants was "more emphasis on counselor accountability" (Daniel & Weikel, 1983).

As guidance programs change in response to the population demands, e.g., social problems of the 80's, plans for educational reform, reduced budgets and fiscal accountability; the effectiveness of any guidance program is still dependent upon the counselors and other guidance staff who are charged with implementing the program. The skills needed by counselors are in some cases similar to the skills of teachers and to the skills of administrators, but in other ways are more diverse and specialized. Aubrey (1986) states that critics of education have swamped the American public with proposals calling for change in education. The suggested changes will impact the lives of counselors and their students. He also suggests that "counselors develop strategies so their own needs and those of their students will not be ignored as change occurs in schools" (Aubrey, 1986, p.10).

Counselor Personality Characteristics

Another area of interest within this study is the literature on individual personality characteristics as they relate to career satisfaction, productivity and success. Literature related to attitudes, temperament, leadership qualities, judgment and perception are of particular interest
because of the possible relationship of these characteristics to an individual's success in the field of guidance.

The identification and description of the many aspects of personality can be examined from different points of view. Psychologists, philosophers and mental health practitioners have defined personality in a variety of ways. One of the most thoroughly researched and carefully developed model of human relations training was based on identification of the core dimensions present in helpful therapist-client relationships (Carkhuff, 1972). The first characteristics defined were called accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth and genuineness. Further investigation by Rogers, Carkhuff, Truax and many others led to the discovery that certain counselor dimensions led to growth on the part of the client. These dimensions were refined, renamed and standardized for measurement purposes (Carkhuff, 1969). Eight dimension were finally defined as necessary within a helping relationship. The first three dimensions were seen as the foundation for helping. These three include (1) empathy which was defined as depth of understanding, (2) respect which is a belief in the individual and (3) warmth which was seen as caring and love. The other five dimensions included concreteness (the ability to be specific), genuineness (honesty-realness), self-disclosure (ability to convey appropriately "I've been there too."), confrontation (pointing out discrepancies) and
immediacy (telling it like it is). All of these dimensions are taught through the human relations training model. Most counselors have received this type of training in their counselor education programs.

Another framework for examining counselor characteristics is through the theories of Carl Jung. Jung's work (1976) defined psychological types in an effort to define an individual's relationship to the world, to people and to things. Jung's work on psychological types addresses a psychology of consciousness from what he calls "a clinical angle" (p. v). In 1923 Carl Jung postulated that an individual's behavior has a pattern to it and that the pattern reflects the person's preferences for taking in information and for making decisions. It also reflected the world in which a person feels most comfortable—the outer world of action or the inner world of ideas. Using this idea of patterns of behavior, it follows that a person's behavior is fairly orderly and consistent over time. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Briggs & Myers, 1977) uses Jung's psychological types as the basis of the instrument. The MBTI was selected for use in this study because it is based on a philosophy of mankind, a theory of personality and a personality construct used as the basis for assessment.
The MBTI

In the 1920s Katharine Briggs became interested in human behavior and through her observations and reading of biographies, she developed a description of four personality types. Her schema was published in the *New Republic* magazine on December 26, 1926 and included four types: sociable, thoughtful, executive, and spontaneous (Myers, 1980).

At about the same time the Swiss psychoanalyst Carl Jung developed a theory of personality types which was similar to the research done by Katharine Briggs. Jung’s theory was published in his book *Psychological Types* (1923/1976). When Katharine Briggs read Jung’s work, she became interested in integrating her own work with that of Jung. Together with her daughter, Isabel Myers, she began to work on a paper-and-pencil inventory to help people discover more about themselves and their personality types. It took them over thirty years to develop the inventory, which was called the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, or MBTI.

From their initial work in the 1940s to 1962, Katharine Briggs and Isabel Myers gathered enough data to present their instrument to the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey. Because of the MBTI’s unorthodox development, ETS formed the Office of Special Testing to carry on further research on the MBTI. Until 1975, when the rights to the MBTI were acquired by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
the MBTI was available for research purposes only. Today it is one of the largest-selling tools for self-awareness. It has been translated into several other languages, including Spanish and Japanese, and is used to help people in career choices, in marriage and family counseling and in research projects (Myers & McCaulley, 1986).

The patterns defined through the work of Katharine Briggs and Isabel Myers (Myers, 1980), are based on an individual's preference for taking in information (perception) and preference for coming to conclusions (judgment). When individuals perceive information, they choose to rely on the five senses (sight, smell, taste, touch and hearing) or they use a sixth sense, intuition. Everyone uses both the senses and intuition to take in information about the world, but most will rely on one and tend to prefer it over the other. There is also a preference for how one comes to conclusions. Some will prefer a thinking function, deciding impersonally based on analysis and principle, others will prefer to decide based on values, impact of the decision on people and liking or disliking. The final concepts concern introversion or extraversion. Introverts find energy in their inner world of ideas, concepts and abstractions. Extraverts find energy in things and people in the world outside of themselves.

The most comprehensive data base on personality vari-
ables related to specific career fields has been collected by the Center for Application of Psychological Type (CAPT) in Florida. All of the samples included in the CAPT data base use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) as the assessment instrument. Data sources include 250,000 records generated from the MBTI scoring service which began in 1971, contributors to specific projects funded by CAPT and published literature used with the authors' permission (Macdaid, McCaulley & Kainz, 1986). The use of the CAPT data base as comparison information for this study affords a large population, from similar fields, measured with the same instrument.

Using four indices, the MBTI has sixteen different combinations possible indicators of individual preferences effecting career choices and career maintenance. However, the initials indicate only the direction of the preference, not the strength of preference. Even when individuals have the same profile, there may be a wide variation in the strength of the preference. The four letters refer to a "type." Each type has a characteristic style of behavior. It is the style of behavior that is important for understanding the relationship between counselor characteristics and program success.

In a recent publication (1986) the CAPT released composite results of studies done since 1950 when initial research began with the Myers Longitudinal Medical Sample and other
data which was extracted from published research up to that time. Included in the data base are a number of career fields related to counseling. These allied career fields may not be seen as directly related to guidance and yet many of the skills and characteristics found in people who succeed in these non-counseling fields are similar to the characteristics of successful counselors. It is important to keep in mind that all 16 MBTI types are found in most occupations. For each occupation, some types are more frequent and others are less frequent. In theory, the frequent types are those who would like the work of that occupation. The differences in type influence the ways people like to work, what motivates them, and what satisfies them.

Over four thousand individuals from 12 studies within counseling and mental health careers are reported in the CAPT data base. The most prevalent individual indicator found in the counselor samples, is the F scale, with 65% of the counselors indicating a preference for F over T. The scale which most differences between counselors and other mental health professionals is the I-E, with 63% of the counselors indicating an E preference and psychologists and social workers choosing I almost as frequently as they choose E (Macdaid, McCaulley, Kainz, 1986). In the composite scores of the counselors studied, frequent preferences also occurred on the S-N scale, with more than 60% of the counselors preferring an
The preference most expected in counseling samples is intuition, since this is the function that enables counselors to see patterns, meanings and relationships of ideas and behavior. In the general population, only 25% report a preference for intuition as contrasted with 75% reporting a preference for sensing, the polar opposite of intuition. It is expected that in positions where counseling itself is the major function within the job, there would be more intuitives than in positions where considerable paper-work is required to provide services (such as in vocational rehabilitation or social work). The field of school counseling seems to be a combination of functions involving counseling of students and considerable paperwork such as maintaining student records and organizing testing programs. Of 1803 counselors reported in a composite sample in the CAPT data bank, 62% indicated a preference for intuition (N). Of 402 psychologists studied, 85% preferred intuition and 82% of 490 social scientists preferred intuition. From these reported scores, psychologists and social scientists have a higher percentage of individuals who prefer intuition than counselors. However, counseling attracts a higher percentage of intuitives than are found in the general population.

Another expectation would be for counseling to attract more Feeling (F) types with a larger proportion of the coun-
seltor samples having an NF profile. CAPT studies indicate that 66% of counselors studied had an F preference, with 46% having an NF profile. A study at Ohio University of 111 graduate students in counselor education (Yura, 1972) indicated that 80% of the students preferred Feeling responses.

Most health professionals have a majority of judging (J) types (Macdaid, McCaulley, Kainz, 1986). Although counseling is often considered an allied field to health, i.e. mental health, counseling samples typically have fewer J’s than other health fields; they often have a majority of P’s. A counselor needs to be able to suspend judgement and to listen and understand which would make the presence of a P or perceptive score important.

In composite scores for counselors (omitting psychologists and social scientists), the CAPT data indicates the most preferred types are Extrovert (57%), Intuitive (63%), Feeling (66%) and Perceptive (52%). These indications are consistent with the expected counselor profile whereby, the NF is the most preferred mode of behavior.

In related mental health careers, such as social scientists and psychologists there are only slight differences between counselors and the other mental health professionals on any given scale. Although there are differences in strength of preference, all of the related mental health fields have a majority preferring the ENFP profile. However,
closely allied health professionals such as psychiatrists (sample n=68) preferred an INFP profile, health care therapists (sample n=765) preferred ENFJ and health service workers (sample n=900) preferred ESFJ. These findings tend to indicate that even within a field, individuals will seek the work setting within that field most in tune with their personality preferences. Although there are gradations within each group in the percent choosing each style, all of the counseling and mental health professional samples showed a preference for the ENFP style.

Myers considered the combinations of perception (S and N) with judgment (T and F) to be most important when career choices are concerned (Myers & McCaulley, 1986). Four "work types" are identified as ST, SF, NT and NF. Sensing-Thinking preferences are found in the practical, matter-of-fact types. Type theory predicts that their best chances for success and satisfaction lie in fields that demand impersonal analysis of concrete facts, such as economics, law, surgery, business, accounting, production and the handling of machines and materials. SFs are sympathetic, friendly types who are valuable in fields such as teaching in the early grades, nursing, pediatrics and other health fields involving direct patient care. NFs are enthusiastic and insightful types who are typically interested in fields that involve unfolding possibilities, especially possibilities for people, such as in
teaching in the upper grades and college, selling intangibles, counseling, writing and research. NTs are logical and ingenious types who are best in problem-solving fields such as scientific research, mathematics, finance or any sort of development or pioneering in technical or administrative areas (Myers & McCaulley, 1986).

Another approach which uses MBTI scales, identifies temperament as a variable associated with each of the characteristics. Comprehensive longitudinal studies on temperament indicate that a child’s temperament can be accurately described in infancy and remains relatively stable into adulthood (Chess & Thomas, 1986). Although the theory of temperament used by Keirsey & Bates (1984) is based on Jungian typologies, it replaces the principles of integration in which personality types are assumed to occur because of combinations of characteristics, with the principle of differentiation which assumes that growth occurs through a process of separation or splitting of functions. The four primary temperaments (Keirsey, 1987) are defined as Sensing-Perception (SP), a temperament which values action and freedom; Sensing-Judging (SJ), a temperament valuing duty and social usefulness; Intuitive-Thinking (NT), a temperament which values power and competence; Intuitive-Feeling (NF), a temperament which strives toward becoming or knowing self.

Research has been also been done relating temperament
types to leadership style (Giovanni, Berens & Cooper, 1987). With the role of counselors redefined to include responsibility for results, they can no longer wait for someone else to define what they should do on a daily basis. This change necessitates that counselors assume leadership in defining their goals and activities and include the contributions of others in their plans. The manner in which they approach the task of including others, may closely relate to the leadership styles defined by temperament. According to Keirsey & Bates (1984) "The degree to which we get what we want is the measure of our leadership" (p.129).

According to Keirsey (1987), the leadership style of an SP temperament is one of "troubleshooting". This type is good at problem-solving, especially in crisis situations. The SP leader makes decisive decisions quickly with a strong sense of reality and confidence in self. In addition, this temperament uses negotiation skills to get people to cooperate with each other and to reduce disagreements. In general this person works well in short-term crisis situations, has good observation skills, knows what is happening within an organization and effectively solves problem situations. This type of leadership would be especially helpful for a counselor who is trying to get teachers from different departments to cooperate with guidance program goals. This temperament is generally flexible, open-minded, willing to take
risks and is highly productive.

The SJ temperament is more of a stable, traditional leadership type. This person encourages a sense of belonging, security and social responsibility within an organization. Hard work, consistency in traditions and a sense of duty permeate the leadership of the SJ temperament. The strength of this temperament type on a counseling team is the willingness and commitment to follow-through on plans, make practical arrangements for processes to be implemented, evaluate efforts and complete all projects. Other temperaments may enjoy problem-solving, thinking of new ideas or planning ahead but the SJ temperament is the person who will be there to see that everything gets completed and that the details are not neglected.

The NT temperament is one that has a visionary focus. This is the person on a team who enjoys long-range planning, avoids redundancy and seeks complexity. This person anticipates change, understands the implications and possibilities of networking within the system and displays intellectual ingenuity in planning for the future. On a counseling team this individual is invaluable to motivate the team to look ahead, change those processes which are ineffective and plan for new resources/processes and results. The NT is generally very responsive to new ideas of others and generates enthusiasm for new solutions to problems.
The last temperament type is the NF, which for counselors is the most prevalent type as indicated by the CAPT reported studies (1986). The NF temperament is a catalyst for involvement. This person focuses on getting other persons involved, drawing them out and appreciating their contributions. This type values growth in self and others, is committed to other team members and is positive and enthusiastic. On a counseling team this person generates enthusiasm for the program, creates a positive climate where everyone feels appreciated and is able to motivate the accomplishment of results through working with others. This temperament type contributes a people-centered point of view which seems essential in a field that aims to help students, parents and staff in a variety of ways.

The research and data bases using the MBTI "types" was related to individuals choosing counseling as a career field and using MBTI results to assist clients in career counseling. Little was found relating MBTI types to success in the field of counseling, and no studies were identified which address success of counselors in specific kinds of programs, i.e. traditional guidance services nor in results-based guidance programs. Most of the researchers operated upon the assumption that individuals who choose and remain in a career field are relatively successful or they would change careers. No mention was made in the literature reviewed of the effect
on individuals when there were major changes within the chosen career field.

Career Theory

Germane to the subject of this study, are the studies related to theories of career development, i.e., why do individuals choose a career in counseling. Career behaviors and interventions have been formulated and studied for more than eighty years. Herr and Cramer (1972) classified career theories as (1) trait-and-factor, (2) decisions, (3) sociological, (4) psychological and (5) developmental. Tolbert (1974) classifies career theories according to their major themes; developmental, needs, psychoanalytical, sociological, decision-making and existential. Jepsen (1984) proposed that career theories can be separated into two classifications, structural and developmental.

Looking at career theories chronologically, one must first address the trait and factor theories which were developed in the 1920's and 1930's, Parsons (1909) and Williamson (1965) are names associated with early development of trait and factor theories. Holland, Roe and Bardin are also associated with structural theories which center on personality characteristics as influencers of career decisions. The rather simple and straightforward belief that people are different and that different jobs require different traits is
the basis for these theories. Structural theories are information-centered and, therefore, rely on tests and inventories.

Structural theories of career development provide support for the concept of matching individual traits with job traits (NOICC, 1986). John Holland’s research (1985) indicates that job satisfaction and stability, is determined by the interaction between personality characteristics and the characteristics of the work environment. Gysbers (1986) includes trait and factor, Holland’s theory of vocational personalities and work environments, and socioeconomic systems as three structural theory approaches.

In particular, Holland’s theory of vocational personalities and work environments is important because it defines the concept of personality being related to the work a person chooses (Healey, 1982). Holland (1985) defines six personality types and six work environments which resemble the persons choosing those environments. According to Brown (1987) differential psychology is the basis for all trait and factor theories, in that the adherents “try to measure empirically individual differences in personality variables, capacities, aptitudes and other traits” (p. 13). All structural theories are based on the belief that individuals select their occupations, as well as their career paths, based on personal preferences and the environmental factors influencing their lives.
(Gysbers, 1986). The early vocational guidance theories focused on matching an individual's self-characteristics with the characteristics of specific opportunities within the world-of-work to provide the closest fit, thereby increasing the chances of success. Later theories expanded the concept of self-characteristics to include more than just work characteristics and expanded knowledge of the world-of-work, to knowledge about many other aspects of the world. The current position regarding traits is that "they have validity only in regard to specific situations such as the performance of an occupational task" (Brown, 1987, p. 14).

Studying counselor characteristics as they relate to successful guidance programs, uses concepts integral to the trait-factor theories. However, Holland's theory goes a step further by not only defining specific types of personalities, but also the work environments that match those personalities.

In a study of 1760 guidance counselors taking the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (an assessment instrument used to measure Holland's types) there was a p<.001 correlation on three of the four MBTI scales (Myers & McCaulley, 1986). Holland's theory of career development as it relates to work environment is relevant to this study and his description of personality types is positively correlated with the MBTI personality measure used in this study. However, it
is important to understand when discussing career theories that "career theory has a weak predictive ability" (Borow, 1982, p. 30). The thrust of career theory has been more descriptive than predictive. Therefore, the career theory literature which has been reviewed is important in order to understand the similarities and differences of the individuals who have chosen counseling as a career, rather than to serve as information to predict who might choose counseling as a career or who might be successful.

It is further recognized that a common assumption of career development theories is that realistic and appropriate career choices will be followed by better adjustment to work including better job performance, job satisfaction and career advancement. Rahim (1981) found some evidence for support of job satisfaction as a function of personality-job congruence when using Jungian psychological types. Some research has been done to integrate career development data from both pre-work and work-site settings but few studies have defined this assumption as a testable hypothesis (Borow, 1982).

Structural theories use the concept of differential classification of characteristics of individuals which has a basis in differential psychology (Crites, 1981).

A second category of career theories is developmental. These theories focus on the life span of how a person grows and develops. Career development literature related to
adults incorporates recent research on life stages, life span and transitions (NOICC, 1986). Ginzberg, Super, Tiedeman & O’Hare and Krumboltz are identified with developmental theories. It is important to consider developmental career theories because they are helpful in dynamic diagnosis, helping us to understand differences based on age and experience. Super (1980) expands upon the idea of individual characteristics as a match for specific occupational areas to incorporate the concept that people change with time and experience and therefore, vocational preferences change over time. Interests, values and needs change, as well as abilities.

Ginzberg’s theory of occupational choice was a first approach to a general developmental theory (Ginzberg, 1971). He stated that “occupational choice is a process, generally irreversible, and that compromise is an important part of every choice” (p. 103). He identified three periods of decision-making; fantasy, tentative choice and realistic choices. Super (1984) believes that individuals are capable of moving through these stages at various speeds and that one may return to an early stage without venturing outside of normalcy, e.g., women who work, stop and have families, go back to work; and mid-life career changes. Super also states, “The processes of growth, exploration, establishment, maintenance and decline are not simply vocational, but involve all aspects of life and living” (p. 72). Tiedeman &
O'Hara (1963) defined career development as choice and adjustment, wherein one's vocational identity is formed by the decision-making processes which are subject to the individual's comprehension and will. In later work (Miller & Tiedeman, 1972), Tiedeman united three conditions into a cubistic model of decision-making processes, involving psychological states, the problem-condition and self-comprehension.

The social learning and behavioral theories are associated with Krumboltz (1974), and Krumboltz, Jones & Mitchell (1979). Social learning theorists believe that decision-making is influenced by genetic factors, environmental conditions and events, and learning experiences. Three main categories include reinforcement, modeling and contiguous pairing (classical conditioning).

Adult career development theories explain career development through chronological age, life stages, the life span, individual idiosyncrasies and transition. Erikson, Havighurst, Levenson, Neugarten and Schlossberg have been important researchers in the adult development area. Erikson (1950) posited that individuals move through an invariable sequence of developmental stages. Havighurst (1952) identified specific tasks related to the social roles adults take on. Levenson et al. (1978) further explored age-related developmental periods and Neugarten (1968) countered with a view-
point of individual idiosyncracy in which she stated that transitions are not related to chronological age nor do they follow an invariable sequence. Schlossberg (1984) expanded on Neugarten's work to study the continuous adaptation to transitions which occur in adult's lives.

Jung (1976) referred to a major change during the middle stage of an individual's life as a shift in the secondary personality function. Whether it is referred to as a mid-life crisis, maturity or developmental concerns, the result is that the meaning and value people place in their work changes over time. In a recent 15-year study of 197 counselors employed in Illinois (Bradley, 1986), school counselors seemed to be a remarkably stable career group with only five individuals leaving the field of education. This implies that persons in counseling positions seem to remain in the profession. However, 40% of the individuals in the study moved into an administrative position (half of those into guidance director positions) during the 15 year period in which they were followed-up. In terms of career theory, Bradley's study (1986) seems to support many of the developmental tenets present in the literature, e.g. Super's (1957) stages of establishment, maintenance and decline.

Using a developmental perspective, this study investigates job success (as measured by student results) related to the individual's age and length of service as a counselor.
"The nature of the job pattern - that is, the occupational level attained and the sequence, frequency, and duration of trial and stable jobs - is determined by the individual's ... personality characteristics, and by the opportunities to which he or she is exposed" (Super, 1984, p. 24).

In studying counselor's success in competency-based guidance programs, one must take into account not only personality, age and length of service but also the opportunities available at the time the career choice was made. Education has traditionally been a career field that was open to women, long before other fields were considered appropriate. Many of the women who chose counseling before the women's liberation movement of the 1960's did so because of perceived lack of opportunity in other areas (Kahn-Hut & Kaplan-Daniels & Colvard, 1982). For many years women were perceived as having more interest in social, conventional or artistic fields. Counseling is considered primarily a social field. Therefore, some of the females within the counseling field may not have chosen counseling because of their personal characteristics and may be less successful than if they had chosen a different work environment (Holland, 1980). In studying an adult population, it is important to make note of the change in perspectives toward work, homemaking, and leisure during the life of today's adult workforce.
Summary

There is a rebirth of attention given to public school guidance programs across the United States. In the western section of the country there is a movement to build guidance programs back to the level they had attained prior to the tax initiative, Proposition 13. This effort is being generated by the Santa Clara County Office of Education (White, 1981) and is being called "Guaranteed Services for Counseling and Guidance." It is a traditional approach in that students are provided specific services. Another approach to guidance is being generated from the central part of the United States and it focuses on both student outcome and time-on-task (processes) (Gysbers & Moore, 1981). The third approach is coming from the east coast and is results-based. The effective implementation of the three guidance approaches may call for counselors with different skills and different personality characteristics.

Effective counselors have been identified in the guaranteed services approach. The research centers on the characteristics of counselors within a counseling relationship. Traditional guidance and counseling services, as well as the guaranteed services utilize primarily individual and small group counseling processes. To date, there has been no re-
search on the characteristics of counselors implementing either of the other two types of guidance programs. This research study is a beginning attempt to identify the characteristics of counselors that successfully implement a results-based guidance program.
CHAPTER THREE

Methods and Procedures

This chapter includes a description of the sample, including a description of the demographics of the county and the specific schools within the study, the sample of students and the population of counselors participating in the study. Also included are descriptions of the measurement instruments used to assess success of the guidance programs, the instrument used to assess counselor characteristics and the form used to collect information on other counselor variables being studied, including age, sex, race and length of service. The data collection procedures, including administration of assessment instruments and interview procedures are discussed. The last section provides a description of how the data from the assessment instruments and the interviews were analyzed.

Description of the Sample

County Setting:
The county school district used in this study is a small county in Maryland, occupying 250 square miles. The county
lies approximately in the center of Maryland, between the two large metropolitan centers of Baltimore and Washington. The proximity of the two large metropolitan centers has created a unique demographic situation which is favorable to the county as a whole and specifically to the educational system. There are only two cities in the county, the largest of which has an approximate population of 85,000 people. (Basic Facts, 1986-87).

The county's unique location has fostered a growth of almost 90 percent between 1970 and 1980, making it the fourth fastest growing county in the nation. By 1990, it is estimated that the population will be 200,000 with 95,000 living in the largest city. The county ranks as the second wealthiest jurisdiction in the state on the basis of per capita taxable income. The county has a median household income of $43,900, according to state planning statistics (Basic Facts, 1986-87).

School Setting:

Total school population within the county topped 26,000 in 1987 with 60 percent of the students enrolled in neighborhood schools where they can walk to school. A wide-range of support and auxiliary programs and services are available to county students beyond the classroom instruction. Specially trained professionals provide support programs in the areas
of guidance, special education, vocational education, gifted and talented programs, computer instruction and alternative education programs, including a program for pregnant teens and teen parents.

The system currently operates 46 instructional facilities, including 25 elementary schools (grades K-5), ten middle schools (grades 6-8) and eight comprehensive high schools (grades 9-12). The ten middle schools have a student enrollment ranging from 464 to 627 and the eight comprehensive high schools range in student population from 889 to 1173. There are two special secondary programs within the district, a vocational school and an alternative school.

According to the Personnel Office, the school system has 2,545 full-time equivalent employees, 1,430 of these are teachers. Fifty-seven percent of the teachers have earned at least a master’s degree. Minorities comprise 14.4 percent of the professional staff. Follow-up studies indicate that nearly 83 percent of the graduates continue their education beyond high school, with 61 percent attending four-year colleges or universities (High School Follow-up, 1987).

**Subjects:**

This study used a random sample of students from the middle and high schools to provide data for use in determining the success level of the school guidance program. The
guidance program evaluation included a stratified random sample of 454 high school seniors (Table 1) who comprise twenty-five percent of each graduating class and 447 eighth graders (Table 2) who comprise twenty-five percent of the students graduating from each middle school. A small sample of ten seniors from each high school were also interviewed to confirm data obtained from the written questionnaires. The information from student questionnaires was used to provide data on the success rate of each guidance program.

The total population of forty-four counselors at the eighteen secondary schools in the county were invited to participate in the study by providing data on their personality characteristics and selected demographic factors. All twenty-four counselors at the eight high schools participated in the study. Of the twenty counselors at ten middle schools, sixteen participated in the study.

The sample size using data collected from all of the schools and all participating counselors was reduced to those counselors from schools which were identified as providing successful guidance programs and those providing less successful guidance programs based on ranking schools using data from the student questionnaires. At the high school level this reduced sample size included six of the eight high schools and eighteen of the twenty-four high school counselors. In middle schools, the reduced sample included seven of
**Table 1**

**Descriptive Data on High School Seniors Completing the Program Evaluation Questionnaire.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACIAL-ETHNIC BACKGROUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH IN HOWARD COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New this year</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+ years</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOL COURSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo-Tech</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. Educ.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-REPORT OF GRADES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly A</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly B</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly C</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly D and E</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Descriptive Data on 8th Graders Completing the Program Evaluation Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACIAL-ETHNIC BACKGROUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH IN HOWARD COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New this year</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+ years</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-REPORT OF GRADES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly A</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly B</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly C</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly D and E</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the ten middle schools and fourteen of the sixteen participating middle school counselors. Figure 2 shows the sequence followed in the identification of subjects from data collection to data analysis.

Further data were collected using an interview format with administrators, teachers, counselors and students from a high school with a successful guidance program and a high school with a less successful guidance program. One administrator, three teachers, three counselors and ten students from each of the two identified schools were interviewed.

Measurement Instruments

Program Success:

Guidance program success was determined by a school's rank order within the district on four measures of guidance-related competencies. Rank order scores were established through administration of an evaluation questionnaire developed within the district. The program evaluation efforts have been designed and piloted over a three-year period (Appendix A). Preliminary questionnaires were developed in 1984-85 with input from counselors, a research consultant, the guidance supervisor, school administrators and guidance advisory council members (parents, students, teachers and counselors) at each school. Eighteen secondary schools in a
Figure 2. Sequence used in identification of subjects, from data collection to data analysis.
Figure 2 (continued). Sequence used in identification of subjects, from data collection to data analysis.
school district in Maryland participated in a three-year evaluation project, part of which was to develop, field test and revise the evaluation questionnaire. Over the three-year period, changes were made to the evaluation questionnaire used to assess the results-based guidance programs. Three different forms (Appendix B) were developed for evaluation purposes; written questionnaires for 8th and 12th graders, and an interview form for 12th graders. The evaluation questionnaires were designed to gain information from students and their parents on the perceived level of competence achieved by the students in specific guidance-related competencies in the areas of educational planning (learning how to learn), career planning (learning how to work) and personal/social development (learning how to relate to others). In addition, the questionnaire gathered information on the usefulness of guidance resources available to students, the student's confidence in facing future situations and limitations which the student indicates may cause difficulty after graduation (senior questionnaire only).

During the three-year evaluation project, findings indicated that the questions on the high school questionnaire relating to personal/social development did not discriminate (all students responded with the most correct response). Therefore, the questions relating to the personal/social domain were removed from the written questionnaire, but re-
tained on the interview form where further discussion could be used to discern differences between students' awareness and achievement.

For the purpose of this study only the items on educational planning and career planning competencies from the evaluation questionnaire completed by students were used for determining success of the high school guidance program. Educational planning items were sorted into two measures, educational skills and educational confidence. Skills included studying, test-taking, computer search skills to identify college information and other post-high school educational options, course selection and financial aid information. Educational confidence included items on attitudes toward attending college, independence, getting along with a roommate, exams, and establishing schedules. Career measures included career skills using items on having a career plan, appropriateness of the plan, having a resume, interview skills and job application skills. The fourth area was career confidence which included items on attitudes toward taking a new job, competing for a job, following work rules, dealing with authority figures and cooperating at work. Since only a small sample of students (n=10 per school) were interviewed on personal/social competencies, data was too limited for inclusion in this study. The mean scores of student responses on a four-point Likert scale were used to rank
schools according to the level of success (competency-attainment).

In addition, as part of the evaluation project students were asked to provide evidence of specific results (which were kept on file in their planning portfolios) during the interview process. All seniors provided evidence of a career plan, resume and written feedback from a real or simulated interview which was reviewed and reported by counselors (validated by the signature of the school principal) as a graduation requirement of the Maryland State Department of Education. Review of these documents and the personal interview data were used to validate, from another perspective, the students' perception of their achievements. Although this review process was completed, the documentation was too lengthy and school-specific for inclusion in this study.

For middle school program evaluation, two major focus areas were assessed; educational/career skills, and personal/social confidence. The combining of educational and career skills was done to parallel the guidance program design in which units of study combine the two areas. Items in educational/career skills included studying, keeping a notebook, preparing for a test, knowing career interests and academic strengths. The middle school guidance programs also include curriculum specific to the middle school student's developmental level in personal/social areas including items on
dealing with bullies, name calling, peer pressure, gossiping and group conflicts. This approach is different from the high school programs which currently provide personal/social competencies on an individual and as needed basis. Thus, there were differences between how middle school and high school guidance programs were assessed.

**Personality Measures:**

The counselor characteristics, including personality type, work type and temperament type, were determined based on their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form G (Appendix C). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is a self-report, forced choice inventory derived from the theory of C. G. Jung, in his book *Psychological Types* (1976). Since its initial publication by the Educational Testing Service in 1962, the MBTI has been used extensively in studies related to education and to career preferences. Reliability estimates of the MBTI, based on both internal consistency (Striker & Ross, 1963) and test-retest methodologies (Levy, Murphy, & Carlson, 1972; Striker & Ross, 1963), indicate that this instrument meets standards for psychometric rigor. Validity studies indicate that the instrument distinguishes between groups of individuals in a fashion predicted by type theory (Goldschmid, 1967; Rovezzi-Carroll & Fitz, 1984; Wyse, 1975).
Reliability studies using split-half measures for internal consistency show correlations in the .70 and .80 range for continuous scores (Sandburg, 1965). Isabelle Myers reports that using tetrachoric r's and applying the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, median r's of .83 are reported. (Sandburg, 1965).

In addition, research has been done relating the MBTI preference scores to temperament and leadership (Giovanni, Berens & Cooper, 1987; Keirsey & Bates, 1984; Keirsey, 1987). For this purpose, the MBTI scores were sorted into four groups; the Intuitive-Feeling (NF), the Intuitive-Thinking (NT), the Sensing-Perceptive (SP) and the Sensing-Judging (SJ). This grouping relates positively with Spranger's type descriptions, (1928) and builds upon "theoretical contributions of Jung, Kretschmer, Freud, Adler, Sullivan and Maslow (Keirsey & Bates, 1984).

Few instruments appear to provide as much information as can be derived efficiently from the MBTI (Mendelsohn, 1965). Extensive correlational studies have been collected and published by the Center for Application of Psychological Types, University of Florida, Gainesville, that show statistical significance between other instruments and specific preferences identified on the MBTI (Macdaid, McCaulley & Kainz, 1986). Findings indicate that type scores relate meaningfully to a wide range of variables including personality,
ability, interest, values, aptitude and performance measures, academic choice and behavior ratings (Mendelsohn, 1965). Of interest to this study are correlations at the p<.001 on specific characteristics measured by the following instruments: The Adjective Check List, a frequently used instrument for investigating personality variables based on self-report; the California Psychological Inventory, Edwards Personality Preference Survey, Eysenck Personality Questionnaires, FIRO-B, Jungian Type Survey, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and Study of Values (Myers & McCaulley, 1986). In searching the literature for an instrument that would meet the needs of this study, the extensive correlational study done on MBTI and other personality measures, as well as, correlational studies on career inventories (including Kuder Occupational Interest Survey and Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory), learning style inventories and conflict management gave credence to the selection of the MBTI as an instrument with broad applicability in the dimensions identified for investigation in this study (Carskadon, 1979).

The use of the Myers-Briggs as an indicator of temperament type has been researched and related to a variety of theorists who used different terms to describe a "consistency of actions from a very early age" (Keirsey & Bates, 1984). Twenty-five centuries ago Hippocrates spoke of four tempera-
ments he termed, choleric, phlegmatic, melancholic and sanguine. Adickes in 1907 said man had four world views: dogmatic, agnostic, traditional and innovative. Kretschmer used the terms hyperesthetic, anesthetic, melancholic and hypomanic to describe temperament; Adler spoke of recognition, power, service and revenge; and Spranger identified four human values as religious, theoretic, economic and artistic. The MBTI has been used by Keirsey (1987) to identify four temperaments which parallel those of Hippocrates, Adickes, Kretschmer, Adler and Spranger.

**Demographic Factors:**

Other factors were investigated that might have an impact on counselors implementing results-based guidance programs. These include sex, race, age and length of service of each counselor. (Demographic data on students was accounted for in the sampling process). Demographic information on the counselors at each school was gathered from district records. A computer print-out of each counselor's age, sex, race and length of service was provided for this study by the Personnel Department. The records are updated yearly.

**Qualitative Data:**

Qualitative factors were identified through interviewing teachers, counselors and administrators from a school with a
ful guidance program and one with a less successful
program. A Site Visit Guide (Appendix E) was developed using a format developed by the U.S. Department of Education as part of a project to analyze excellent schools. Composite data from the interviews was coded (Miles & Huberman, 1986) to compare data on counselor characteristics and program effectiveness using a cross-site matrix (Miles & Huberman, 1986).

A semi-structured interview form (Appendix B) was developed for use with ten students at each high school. The interview included questions that paralleled the written evaluation questionnaire answered by 25% of the graduating seniors. A semi-structured interview begins with general questions and then utilizes specific questions to support the information given in response to the general questions. In a structured interview all interviewers ask the same questions in the same sequence. The student responses to the interview were compared with the results of the written questionnaire answered by 25% of the seniors from each high school. Similarities or difference in the content and/or frequency of responses from each high school were noted. In addition, student data from the two identified schools where staff and administrators were interviewed was incorporated into a cross-site, two variable matrix.
Question 1: Program Success

Data Collection. Eighteen secondary schools participated in the administration of a guidance evaluation questionnaire to 25% of their graduating class. 1986-87 is the third year of data collection for guidance program evaluation purposes. The Research and Planning Department generated a 25% stratified, random sample of graduating students from each middle and high school from the comprehensive district data base. The sample was stratified by sex and race to resemble the total population of the individual school. Student questionnaires (Appendix B), scan-tron answer sheets, directions for administration and the names of the specific students to be sampled were sent out to all schools in April, with all returns completed by mid-May, 1987.

In April, a training session was held for sixteen interviewers who conducted personal interviews with a small sample of seniors from each high school during the first week of May. Role play and practice interviews were held and feedback given during the training session. Ten seniors from each high school were interviewed. Each interviewer met with five students individually for a 45 minute interview according to an interview schedule. Interviewers were adult volunteers, many of whom serve on the Guidance Advisory Council
for a specific school. Interviewers were sent to schools where they have had no previous connection. Interviewers submitted written comments on their perception of the interviews including the willingness and openness of students interviewed, appropriateness of the interview schedule and place the interviews were held. Since this was the third year for many of the interviewers, most of the concerns voiced in previous years had been corrected.

Data Analysis. Data from the previous two years of the evaluation study indicated that schools had a difference in scores which could be used to differentiate between the programs that were successful in providing guidance-related competencies and those schools which were less successful. There have been no major changes in the program or in the process of evaluating guidance competencies and, therefore, it was reasonable to believe that the 1986-87 data would not differ significantly from 1984-85 and 1985-86 data. Based on this assumption, it was anticipated that some of the schools would consistently have more of the students rating themselves as somewhat or very competent, and somewhat or very confident on indicated educational and career competencies gained, and some schools would have consistently lower ratings using the same measurements. The assumption held true, although each year of the evaluation, the students' mean scores have increased.
For purposes of this study, the success level of a school was rated by determining a rank order of schools within the district. Thus, success is in relationship to other district schools which all have similar programs and resources rather than being based on an absolute score that is held constant for each competency area assessed or constant over years. Program success was determined by means of a secondary analysis of an existing data base. Initially the evaluation data were collected to provide data comparing results with guidance program purposes. Therefore, it was only possible to identify levels of success in relationship to the specific purposes and goals of the county guidance program for the year 1986-87.

Program success for high schools was determined by using the average student score on five items in each of four different areas to assign a rank order to each school. The four areas included educational skills, educational confidence, career skills and career confidence. Students were asked to use a 4-point Likert scale to indicate whether they were very competent/confident, somewhat competent/confident, not very competent/confident or not sure on each of five items.

Within the area of educational skills, students rated their competence in studying, test-taking skills, using a computer search to find college and career information, course selection and acquiring financial aid information.
These ratings were used to rank order the eight high schools in the area of educational skills. Likewise, in the area of educational confidence, students rated their confidence on attending college for the first time, coping with new independence, getting along with a roommate, preparing for college mid-terms and final exams, and making and keeping a study schedule. The career skills area included developing a career plan, having a career plan appropriate to one's interests, abilities and goals, developing a resume, interview skills and job application skills. Career confidence was assessed using students' self-rating on taking a full time or part time job, competing for a job, following workplace rules and regulations, getting along with authority figures and cooperating with other workers.

Each high school was ranked according to the mean score in each of the four areas. The overall level of success was determined by comparing the rank order of each high school in relationship with the other high schools. High schools that ranked in the top half of the county schools in three or more of the four areas, were determined to be "successful." (Three of the eight high schools met this criteria). Those that ranked in the bottom half of county schools on three or more of the four areas, were determined to be "less successful." (Three schools met this criteria). Those that did not rank in the top half nor the bottom half on more than three
scores were identified as "mixed success." (Two schools met this criteria).

**High School Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rank scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Top half of rankings in 3 of 4 areas studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed success</td>
<td>Mixed pattern of rank scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less successful</td>
<td>Bottom half of rankings in 3 of 4 areas studied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program success for middle schools was determined by using the average student score on five items in two different areas to assign a rank order to each school. The two areas used to determine program success included educational and career skills, and personal/social development. In the area of educational and career skills, students' rating of competence in studying, how to maintain a notebook, how to prepare for a test, how to identify your career interests and knowing your academic strengths was used to determine one ranking. The other area, personal/social confidence included ability to handle bullying, gossiping, group conflicts, name calling and peer pressure.

To determine the level of success of a given school's guidance program, the middle schools ranked in the top half of county schools in both areas were identified as "successful." (Four schools met this criteria). Those ranking in the
bottom half of county middle schools were identified as "less successful" (four schools) and those with no consistent ranking in the top or bottom half were identified as having "mixed success" (two schools).

**Middle School Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Top half of school rankings in both areas studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed success</td>
<td>Mixed pattern in rank scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Successful</td>
<td>Bottom half of school rankings in both areas studied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual school characteristics including socio-economic levels, percent of students attending college, standardized test scores, SAT scores and ethnic populations were analyzed to determine possible influences on student self-perceptions.

**Question Two: Personality Measures**

**Data Collection.** The total population of forty-four counselors assigned to the eighteen secondary schools participating in the evaluation process were requested to participate in this study by completing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. All twenty-four high school counselors from the eight high schools and sixteen counselors from eight of the ten middle schools completed the MBTI.
A memo explaining this study and asking for counselor cooperation was sent to each counselor in an individually addressed envelope. A copy of the MBTI, the memo, a return envelope and a small reinforcer were included. The counselor mailing was sent through the intra-district mail system. Counselors who did not respond in a timely manner were contacted by telephone or in person before the end of the year. All responses were submitted before the counselors left for summer vacation, June 1987. Two middle school counselors indicated that they preferred not to participate and two other middle school counselors had occurrences at the end of the school year which prevented them from submitting their MBTIs.

Data Analysis. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was used to measure the personality characteristics of counselors. The MBTI has four scales which were tallied to indicate the frequency and percentage of counselors with a particular preference in schools with successful and less successful guidance programs. In addition, the MBTI was scored in a continuous, bipolar manner (Extraversion-Introversion; Thinking-Feeling; Sensing-Intuition; and Judgment-Perception) and the scores used to indicate differences in the strength of preferences of counselors in successful and less successful programs.

The scores indicate "preference types." A type describes how a person chooses to function. The 'strength of
preference" was considered for each type in order to compare similarities and differences in characteristics. Strength of preference does not imply excellence, but rather indicates that when the respondent is forced to choose, he/she is more clear about what mode is preferred. The strength of preference is determined by continuous scores which are a linear transformation of preference scores, using a formula of 100 minus the numerical portion of the preference score for E,S,T, or J and 100 plus the numerical portion of the preference score for I,N,F, or P. The possible range of scores using a continuous score range is 33 to 167.

The following ranges are considered guidelines for looking at strength of preference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Range for E,S,T or J</th>
<th>Range for I,N,F or P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight Preference</td>
<td>91-99</td>
<td>101-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Preference</td>
<td>81-89</td>
<td>111-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Preference</td>
<td>61-79</td>
<td>121-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Clear Preference</td>
<td>33-59</td>
<td>141-167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isabelle Myers (1980) considers the combinations of perception (Sensing and Intuition) and judgment (Thinking and Feeling) to be the most important when career choices are concerned. This combination was used to investigate the work
preferences (ST, SF, NF and NT) of counselors as they relate to the counselors' success levels within a results-based guidance program.

Results were also analyzed according to temperament style (NF, NT, SJ, SP). Keirsey (1987) indicates that using the MBTI scores, temperament types can be used to identify intellectual, motivational, emotional and social traits. The four temperament types relate to an individual's relationships and role definitions.

Only the MBTI results of counselors implementing successful results-based guidance programs and less successful guidance programs were analyzed. Quantitative methods included a comparison of frequencies of MBTI preferences of counselors implementing successful programs and those implementing less successful programs. The continuous, bipolar score for each of the four preference scales (EI, SN, TF, JP) was figured and the mean scores used as an indication of the combined strength of preference within each type. A t-test was applied to the continuous scores on each scale to determine significant differences between the groups, i.e. counselors implementing a successful guidance program and counselors implementing less successful programs at the middle school and high school levels.

Question Three: Demographic Factors

Data Collection. Demographic information on the coun-
Selors and on each school was gathered from district records. A computer print-out of each counselor’s age, sex, race and length of service was requested from the Personnel Department. The school demographics are updated yearly and kept on file for use with colleges, accreditation visits, district public relations and other purposes as needed.

Data Analysis. Demographic factors- age, sex, length of service and age were analyzed by applying the non-parametric, Kruskal-Wallis one-way anova test.

Question Four: Combined Quantitative and Qualitative Methods

Data Collection. Interviews were conducted at two schools, one with a successful guidance program and one with a less successful guidance program (as determined on the guidance evaluation questionnaire). Interviews were scheduled at both schools with the principal, three teachers and two counselors. The school staff interviews were conducted during the last week of school. One school psychologist and one guidance supervisor conducted the interviews. Student interview data was extracted for the two identified schools from the ten student interviews held at each high school during the evaluation process. In addition, the quantitative data collected on counselor personality types and demographic factors were utilized to provide a combined data base for a more complete and integrated examination of factors.
**Data Analysis.** The analysis of the data used both quantitative and qualitative methods to answer the research questions. A stepwise, multiple regression was applied to personality factors and selected demographic factors to account for the amount of variance ascribed to each. Qualitative methods included a description of the preferred personality types, the work preference types and the temperament types of counselors implementing successful guidance programs and less successful programs. A cross-site, two variable, descriptive matrix (Miles & Huberman, 1986) was developed using the variables of program success and counselor characteristics. The matrix was constructed using data collected in the site interviews to identify similarities and differences as they are perceived by school staff including counselors, administrators and teachers. Using pattern coding (Miles & Huberman, 1986), the patterns and recurrences identified on the matrix were used to sort and compare interview data. An inductive method of coding was used in which none of the data was precoded until all the information had been collected and then a determination of how it “nested” within the context of this study was determined. This empirically “grounded” approach is advocated by Schatzman & Strauss (1973). Data was sorted using descriptive codes and explanatory codes to define linkages and sets related to the guidance program and to the individual counselors and counselors as a team. Unex-
pected linkages were identified in the information observed related to the guidance facility and the guidance area climate. These data were included in the descriptive analysis.

This study incorporates the quantitative and qualitative data in answering the research questions. Cook and Reichardt (1979) argue that there are at least three reasons why combining qualitative and quantitative methods can be beneficial:

First, evaluation research usually has multiple purposes which must be carried out under the most demanding of conditions. This variety of needs often requires a variety of methods. Second, when used together for the same purpose, the two method-types can build upon each other to offer insights that neither one alone could provide. And third, because all methods have biases, only by using multiple techniques can the researcher triangulate on the underlying truth. Since quantitative and qualitative methods often have different biases, each can be used to check on and learn from the other (Cook & Reichardt, 1979, p. 21).
CHAPTER 4

Findings

This chapter includes information related to the four research questions. The first section addresses data on level of success of school guidance programs. Included is how guidance program success was determined and how successful and less successful programs were identified from the original sample of all schools. The next section compares counselors in successful programs with those in less successful programs in terms of personality characteristics as measured on the Myers Briggs Type Indicator. The third section addresses demographic factors of counselors in successful and less successful guidance programs. The chapter concludes with data combining information from the MBTI, demographic factors and several qualitative indices. Data are reported separately for high schools and middle schools.

Program Success:

The first research question considers the establishment of the basis for evaluation of a results-based school guidance program.
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1. What are the success levels of results-based guidance programs? How was the level of success of results-based guidance programs determined?

**High School Data:**

A stratified, random sample of twenty-five percent of seniors at each of eight comprehensive high schools was surveyed to provide data on their perceived level of achievement of guidance-related competencies. See Table 1 for descriptive information on the sample of seniors.

Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 provide the mean ratings on a 4-point Likert scale for the four areas of educational skills, educational confidence, career skills and career confidence. Ratings ranged from 2.64 to 3.14 on five areas measuring educational skills, from 2.83 to 3.21 on educational confidence, from 3.14 to 3.43 on career skills and from 3.31 to 3.52 on career confidence competencies. The difference in scores range from .5 to .21.

Educational skills show the widest range of mean scores with a .5 difference between the highest and lowest scores at different schools. The widest range of scores within a school was .92 with skills in course selection rated highest at 3.29 and finding information on financial aid, lowest at 2.57. The most consistent selections had students at 6 of 8 schools indicating their highest level of competence was in
Table 3

Mean Ratings of High School Seniors' Perception of Self-competence in Selected Educational Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Skills</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
<th>School G</th>
<th>School H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-taking</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer search</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course selection</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Mean (x̄)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x̄</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 4 = very competent
      3 = somewhat competent
      2 = not very competent
      1 = not sure
Table 4

Mean Ratings of High School Seniors' Perception of Self-confidence in Educational Endeavors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Confidence</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
<th>School G</th>
<th>School H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend College</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommate</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 4 = very competent
3 = somewhat competent
2 = not very competent
1 = not sure
Table 5

Mean Ratings of High School Seniors' Perception of Self-competence in
Selected Career-related Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Skills</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Plan</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate plan</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Application</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 
4 = very competent
3 = somewhat competent
2 = not very competent
1 = not sure
Table 6

Mean Ratings of High School Seniors' Perception of Self-confidence in Selected Career-related Endeavors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a Job</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing for Job</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Work Rules</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating at Work</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 4 = very competent
       3 = somewhat competent
       2 = not very competent
       1 = not sure
course selection and at 5 of the 8 schools, students indicated their lowest level of competence was in using a computer search to locate college and career information. Since seniors have had at least four years of practice in high school course selection it was predictable that most students would feel competent in that area. However, every high school in the district had a computer search system which was used by each student in the development of a post-high school plan. Thus, it was not predicted that so many students would rank computer search as their lowest level of competence.

In the area of confidence in facing educational situations, students at every school rated their confidence lowest in preparing for college mid-term and final exams and highest in coping with new independence. There was a .38 difference in ratings between schools and the largest range within a school was .91 with the highest rating of 3.56 in coping with independence and 2.65 in preparing for college exams.

The two areas of career skills and career confidence had fewer differences reflected in the range of scores between schools and within a school. Career skills had a .29 difference between schools while career confidence had a .21 difference between schools. All schools had the lowest competence level reflected on developing a resume and 6 of the 8
schools indicated that job application skills was the highest level of competence. In career confidence, all schools reflect the lowest level of confidence in taking a part-time or full time job, and the highest level of confidence in following workplace rules.

In order to differentiate the schools which were more successful and ones which were less successful, a ranking of schools within the district was devised. Rank orders were assigned to the average ratings in each of the four areas. A summary of these ranks is provided in Table 7. Determination of successful, mixed success and less successful was made by examining the frequency of a school's rank order in the top half or bottom half of the schools in the study. Ranking in the top half in three of the four areas was identified as successful, ranking in the bottom half in three of the four areas was identified as less successful. Other schools were identified as having mixed success.

From these rankings, six schools were selected for additional analysis, three categorized as successful (Schools D, F and G) and three categorized as less successful (A, C and H). Each school had three counselors resulting in nine counselors at the successful schools and nine counselors in the less successful schools being included in the additional analysis.

Additional information about demographic factors of
Table 7

Levels of Success of High School Guidance Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Successful = rank in top half of schools in 3 of the areas
Less success = rank in bottom half in 3 of the 4 areas
Mixed = no majority rank order in top or bottom half of the schools evaluated
schools with successful and less successful guidance programs is provided in Table 8. Examination of these factors reveal that there was no pattern of socio-economic indicators, achievement indicators, ability indicators or ethnic enrollment that differentiated between schools with successful and less successful guidance programs. Schools with successful guidance programs included ones with the greatest percent of students receiving reduced-cost lunches, the lowest average SAT verbal and math scores and the lowest ability index. Schools with less successful programs included ones with the lowest percent of students receiving reduced-cost lunches, the lowest percent minority enrollment, the largest percent of students attending 4-year colleges, the highest SAT verbal and math scores and one of the highest ability index levels. These data are highlighted to point out that in each case, the data might be expected to be just the opposite if successful guidance programs were linked with high socio-economic levels, high achievement, and large percent of students attending college.

Middle School Data

A random sample of 25 per cent of students in grade 8 at each of the ten middle schools were given the evaluation questionnaire. See Table 2 for descriptive information on the sample of students in grade 8. Students rated percep-
tions of competence in two key guidance areas. Tables 9 and 10 provide the mean ratings on a 4-point Likert scale for the areas of education and career skills, and personal/social confidence.

Middle school ratings indicated fewer differences between schools or within each school than the high school ratings. The middle school guidance program provided classroom instruction in both areas addressed in the evaluation. However, middle school students seemed less able to differentiate between what they had heard (but perhaps not learned) and their individual level of competence in a given area. Developmentally, middle school students are primarily concerned with defining who they are, which is determined largely through their relationships with others rather than being interested in what they are going to do (Elkind, 1967). This difference in focus makes measurement of guidance results in middle school much less definitive than for high school students who are preparing to enter the world and are therefore, keenly interested in determining how prepared they are for their next step.

Ratings on educational and career skills ranged from 3.48 to 3.09, a difference of .39. The largest range within a school was .60 and the lowest was .11. There was no pattern between schools to identify areas in which the students felt the most competent, nor the least. Ratings on confi-
Table 8

Demographic Factors of High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Counselor CaseLoad</th>
<th>% Reduced Lunches (SES)</th>
<th>Ethnic*</th>
<th>% Attend 4/2yr College</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>Ability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>70/24/4</td>
<td>72/16</td>
<td>460/488</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>73/22/4</td>
<td>50/30</td>
<td>456/493</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>91/4/4</td>
<td>65/19</td>
<td>434/498</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With Successful Guidance Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Counselor CaseLoad</th>
<th>% Reduced Lunches (SES)</th>
<th>Ethnic*</th>
<th>% Attend 4/2yr College</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>Ability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>.94%</td>
<td>88/9/4</td>
<td>45/15</td>
<td>473/515</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>94/4/2</td>
<td>47/19</td>
<td>461/505</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>70/25/5</td>
<td>81/10</td>
<td>474/521</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Counselor CaseLoad</th>
<th>% Reduced Lunches (SES)</th>
<th>Ethnic*</th>
<th>% Attend 4/2yr College</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>Ability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>80/15/5</td>
<td>61/17</td>
<td>462/508</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ethnic * represents white/black/Asian
      SAT scores reported for verbal/math
      District X is for all high schools
Table 9

Mean Ratings of 8th Graders' Perception of Self-competence in
Selected Educational and Career Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educ/Career Skills</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notebook</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test prep.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Interest</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Strength</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 4 = very competent
       3 = somewhat competent
       2 = not very competent
       1 = not sure
Table 10

Mean Ratings of 8th Graders' Perception of Self-confidence in Personal/Social Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal/Social</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
<th>School G</th>
<th>School H</th>
<th>School I</th>
<th>School J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossiping</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Conflict</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Calling</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Pressure</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x \]


- Rank: 3 4 6 8 9 5 10 2 7 1

- n: 43 43 53 51 42 33 48 40 30 48

Note: 4 = very competent

3 = somewhat competent

2 = not very competent

1 = not sure
dence in personal/social areas ranged from 3.49 to 3.13, a difference of .36 between schools. Within a school, the largest range was from 3.51 to 3.02, a difference of .49. As with the educational and career skills, there was no pattern of response to indicate that one area was generally stronger, nor weaker than the others.

In order to identify successful and less successful guidance programs, rank orders were assigned to the average ratings in each of the two areas. A summary of these ranks is provided in Table 11. Successful programs were determined by identifying schools that ranked in the top half of the middle schools in both of the areas studied. Less successful programs ranked in the bottom half of the middle schools in both areas studied and mixed success were programs that were in the top half in one area and the bottom half in the other.

From these rankings, eight schools were selected for additional analysis, four categorized as successful (Schools A, B, H and J) and four categorized as less successful (Schools C, D, E and I). Each school had two counselors, resulting in eight counselors from the successful programs and eight counselors from the less successful programs being identified for inclusion in the additional analysis. (Six counselors from less successful programs were actually included in the additional analysis because two of the identified counselors failed to submit personality data).
Table 11

Levels of Success of Middle School Guidance Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educ/Career Skills</td>
<td>Personal/Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Successful determined by ranking in top half of county schools in both areas reported
Less Success = ranking in bottom half of county schools in both areas reported
Mixed = no majority of top half ranking or bottom half
Additional information about demographic factors of middle schools with successful and less successful guidance programs is provided in Table 12. Schools were compared on socio-economic levels as indicated by the percent of students on reduced-cost lunches, the ethnic enrollment and ability index levels. The demographic factors do not demonstrate clear differences between schools with successful guidance programs and those with less successful programs. However, there were slight indications that the middle schools with successful guidance programs were linked with slightly higher socio-economic levels, slightly higher ability levels and a lower percent of minority enrollment.

**Personality Characteristics:**

The second research question addressed personality characteristics of counselors as measured by the MBTI.

2. Do the personality characteristics of counselors implementing successful results-based guidance programs differ from the personality characteristics of counselors implementing less successful programs?

**High School Data:**

Data in this section are based on nine counselors from three schools with successful guidance programs and nine
Table 12
Demographic Factors of Middle Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Counselor Caseload</th>
<th>% Reduced Lunches (SES)</th>
<th>Ethnic %</th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) Ability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Successful Guidance Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>87/8/5</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>83/6/9</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>88/8/3</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>64/30/5</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Less Successful Guidance Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>94/3/2</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>72/23/4</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>71/21/7</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>83/12/2</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% Reduced Lunches (SES)</th>
<th>Ethnic %</th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) Ability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>559</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>81/14/4</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Ethnic % reported for white/black/Asian
District mean is for all middle schools
counselors in three schools with less successful guidance programs. Information on personality characteristics of counselors implementing successful and less successful programs is provided in Figure 3.

Counselors' personality characteristics were determined by administering the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Scores on four indices were obtained for each counselor. Each index reflects one of four basic personality preferences (EI, SN, TF, JP). Counselors in the two types of programs appeared to be similar on three of the four dimensions: EI, SN and JP. On the TF dimension there appeared to be differences between counselors working in successful programs compared with counselors in less successful programs.

In order to test whether these differences are statistically significant t-tests were performed using respondent's actual scores. Data are provided in Table 13. These data support the findings suggested by the graphic representation in Figure 3. The only statistically significant difference between counselors in successful and less successful programs was on the dimension of TF, where a t value of -2.93 is significant at the p<.01. An examination of the means reveals that counselors in the successful programs had a mean rating of 77.22, suggesting a clear preference for Thinking while counselors in the less successful programs had a mean rating of 114.77, suggesting moderate preference for Feeling.
Figure 3. Personality characteristics of counselors in successful (3 schools, 9 counselors) and less successful (3 schools and 9 counselors) high school guidance programs based on MBTI scores.
Table 13

Comparison of High School Counselors in Successful Results-Based Guidance Programs and Counselors in Less Successful Programs on Four Scales of the MBTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>104.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.859</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>86.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>92.77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.593</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>87.44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>77.22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>114.77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>73.22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to classifying respondents by their preference (e.g., E or I, S or N), MBTI scores were converted to continuous scores to indicate strength of preference. As was discussed in Chapter 3, the MBTI is scored on four dimensions with values ranging from 33 to 167. For example, a value of 100 or less on the dimension E—I would indicate a preference for E. A value of 100 or more on the S—N would indicate a preference for N. Scores close to the 100 midpoint (whether above or below) would indicate a very weak preference for that personality characteristic. As the values move further away from that midpoint (whether above or below), the strength of preference becomes even greater. Thus, using the E—I scale as an example, it is possible that an individual with a weak preference for “I” and one with a weak preference for “E” have more similarities than two individuals, one with a weak preference for “I” and one with a strong preference for “I”.

In order to examine the strength of preference, a graphic representation of the average scores was developed. Examining Figure 4, we can see that counselors in successful programs had a moderate preference for E while counselors in less successful programs had a slight preference for I. We can also see that counselors in both successful and less successful programs preferred S over N, although in both cases the preference was only slight or moderate. In contrast,
Figure 4. High school counselors' strength of preference using mean scores on 4 indices of MBTI
however, counselors in successful programs had a clear preference for T while counselors in less successful programs had a moderate preference for F. Counselors in both successful and less successful programs had a clear preference for J over P.

“Work-type” characteristics stem from grouping combinations based on the mental functions (S-N and T-F). These characteristics are most important “when career choices are concerned” (Myers & McCaulley, 1986, p. 33). A comparison of counselors implementing successful guidance programs and those with less successful programs, showed the greatest difference in the ST work type with 6 of the 9 counselors from successful programs and only 1 of the 9 from less successful programs preferring an ST work type. The ST types rely on sensing for purposes of perception and thinking for purposes of judgment. They tend to be practical and matter-of-fact.

Fewer differences are seen in the other three types: SF, NF, NT. More counselors from less successful programs preferred an NT work type than any other type. NTs are described as logical and ingenious types. They are best in solving problems within specialized fields such as scientific research, mathematics, finance or technical areas. NTs also tend to be impersonal in their endeavors and interests. Figure 5 provides comparisons between the high school counselors in successful and less successful programs in the work type
Figure 5. Work types of high school counselors in successful (3 schools, 9 counselors) and less successful (3 schools and 9 counselors) guidance programs based on MBTI scores.
In groupings identified as important to temperament, the largest number of counselors in successful guidance programs preferred the SJ mode of response. Figure 6 shows the comparisons of high school counselors in successful and less successful programs on the temperament types. SJ types are described as industrious and dutiful, with the need for a sense of belonging. They frequently seek work in institutions in order to establish, nurture and maintain continuity and perpetuity (Keirsey & Bates, 1978). The most preferred temperament mode of counselors in less successful guidance programs is the NT. The NT is described as one who values competence and takes pride in doing things well even in adverse circumstances. The NT temperament tends to be very self-critical, needing to be competent and to be seen as competent by others. This temperament tends toward being perfectionistic and can become tense and compulsive when under stress (Giovannoni, Berens & Cooper, 1987).

A review of all the data presented indicates that counselors in successful programs differed from counselors in less successful programs in the TF dimension primarily. The counselors implementing successful guidance programs preferred the thinking function which seeks rational order and plan according to impersonal logic over the feeling function which seeks rational order according to harmony among subjec-
Figure 6. Temperament types of high school counselors in successful (3 schools, 9 counselors) and less successful (3 schools and 9 counselors) guidance programs based on MBTI scores.
Middle School Data:

Data in this section are based on responses from eight middle school counselors from four schools with successful guidance programs and six counselors at three middle schools with less successful guidance programs. Although four middle schools were identified as “less successful,” counselors at one of the schools did not submit the requested information, thereby, reducing the data base for the study.

Information on personality characteristics of middle school counselors in successful and less successful programs is provided in Figure 7. These data do not suggest any clear distinctions between counselors in the two types of programs. Middle school counselors from successful programs and less successful programs tended to prefer an SFJ profile, with an even split between those preferring Extrovert and those preferring an Introvert response mode. The individual with an SFJ preference profile has been labeled a “Conservator” (Keirsey, 1987). They are cooperative, concrete and have a need for security. They also tend to be dependable, responsible and trust authority. They also tend to be the most prevalent of all types, with twenty-five percent of the Caucasian population preferring this type (Keirsey, 1987). In order to test whether there were any statistically significant differences between middle school counselors, t-
Figure 7. Personality characteristics of middle school counselors in successful (4 schools, 8 counselors) and less successful (3 schools and 6 counselors) guidance programs based on MBTI scores.
tests were performed using respondents’ actual scores on the MBTI. Data are provided in Table 14. No significant differences were found in any of the comparisons.

In order to examine the strength of preference, a graphic representation of the average scores was developed. Examining Figure 8, we can see that middle school counselors in both successful and less successful programs had similar preferences on each of the four dimensions. The only difference of preference was found on the JP scale with a clear preference for Judging by middle school counselors in less successful programs and a slight preference for Perception by those in successful guidance programs.

Figures 9 and 10 provide comparisons between middle school counselors in successful programs compared with those in less successful programs in the dimensions identified as “work types” and “temperament types.” More counselors from both successful and less successful guidance programs preferred the SJ temperament type. Those individuals personifying an SJ temperament are seen as the foundation or cornerstone of society and often select careers such as teaching, preaching, managing, selling. SJs excel at vigilance, detail, monitoring, and other regulatory activities within society (Giovannoni, Berens & Cooper, 1987).

The “work type” and “temperament type” comparisons were defined using the percent of counselors in successful and
Table 14

**Comparison of Middle School Counselors Implementing Successful Results-Based Guidance Programs and Those Implementing Less Successful Programs on Four Scales of the MBTI.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>97.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>93.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40.47</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>85.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>110.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>109.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>Counselors (S)</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (LS)</td>
<td>75.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strength of Preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Clear</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Very Clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Successful Programs](image1)

![Less Successful Programs](image2)

**Figure 8.** Middle school counselors strength of preference using mean scores on 4 indices of MBTI
Figure 9. Work types of middle school counselors in successful (4 schools, 8 counselors) and less successful (3 schools and 6 counselors) guidance programs based on MBTI scores.
Figure 10. Temperament types of middle school counselors in successful (4 schools, 8 counselors) and less successful (3 schools and 6 counselors) guidance programs based on MBTI scores.
less successful programs preferring specific types because the sample sizes were unequal and, therefore, comparison by frequency was not viable. In any case, there were few differences for middle school counselor’s characteristics on either work types or temperament types.

A review of all the data presented here suggests there were no clear differences in personality characteristics between counselors implementing successful middle school, results-based guidance programs compared with counselors in the less successful programs.

Demographic Factors:

The third research question addresses several demographic factors that might be associated with counselors in successful and less successful results-based guidance programs.

3. Do selected demographic factors of counselors implementing successful results-based guidance programs differ from demographic factors of counselors implementing less successful programs?

High School:

Four demographic factors were selected for inclusion in
this study: age, length of service, sex and race. Looking at
demographic factors for all counselors in the district showed
the range of time for length of service from 1 to 32 years
(mean=13 years). There were 25 women and 19 men. All seven
of the counselors who had been in the field for 18 or more
years were men. Of the nine counselors who had been in coun-
seling for less than ten years, only two were men. There
were 25 women and 19 men. Thirty-three (75%) of the counsel-
ors were white, 8 (18%) black, 1 (2.2%) Asian and 2 (4.5%)
Hispanic.

Table 15 provides descriptive data on these demographic
factors for high school counselors implementing successful
and less successful guidance programs. There were no appar-
ent patterns in age, sex, race or length of service related
to the counselor’s implementation of successful or less suc-
cessful guidance programs.

In order to test whether there were significant differ-
ences in these factors for counselors implementing successful
and less successful programs non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis
Analyses of Variance (Appendix F) were calculated. No sig-
nificant differences between counselors in each of the two
types of programs were found.

Middle School:

Table 16 provides descriptive data on the identified
Table 15

Demographic Factors of High School Counselors Implementing Successful and Less Successful Results-Based Guidance Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Successful Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Less Successful Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X (all schools)</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Demographic Factors of Middle School Counselors Implementing Successful and Less Successful Results-Based Guidance Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Successful Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demographic factors as they appeared for middle school counselors in successful and less successful guidance programs. In order to test whether there were significant differences in these factors for counselors in successful and less successful middle school guidance programs, non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Analyses of Variance were calculated. No significant differences between counselors in each of the two types of programs were found.

**Personality Characteristics, Demographic Factors and Other Qualitative Data**

The final research question examines the interrelationship of personality characteristics, demographic factors and qualitative data as it relates to successful and less successful results-based guidance programs. The research question is:

4. Do counselor personality characteristics, demographic factors and other qualitative data differ in successful results-based guidance programs and less successful programs?

**High School:**

In order to examine the relationship between selected counselor characteristics and guidance program success, a
Stepwise multiple regression was run regressing success on four MBTI scores (EI, TF, SN, JP), sex, race, age and length of service. Data are provided on Table 17. Success was first calculated as the summated scores of four measures of success derived from the evaluation of the high schools. Initially race was measured along four categories: white, black, Asian-American, Hispanic. However, due to the very small cell sizes in the minority categories, race was collapsed into two categories: white and minority.

The only variable that significantly predicted success was the T-F scores, explaining 32 percent of the variance in success. According to the MBTI Guide (Myers & McCaulley, 1986), the lower the score on this dimension, the more the individual prefers the Thinking domain; conversely, the higher the score, the more the individual prefers the Feeling domain. A b value of -.606 (t=2.77, p= .01) indicated that lower scores on the T-F dimension indicating a preference for T were associated with the more successful programs.

In order to examine the relationship between personality characteristics, demographic factors and other qualitative data, a cross-site, two variable matrix was developed following a Miles and Huberman (1986) model. Data were gathered from one high school with a successful guidance program and one with a less successful program. One administrator, two teachers, two counselors and five students were interviewed
Table 17

Regression Table for MBTI and Selected Demographic Factors for High School Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance of t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>-.606</td>
<td>-2.77</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROGRAM:
#### SUCCESSFUL
- Effective program, positive results—P
- Staff aware/value guidance goals—P,T
- Staff aware of couns. responsibility—T
- Students have easy access to couns.—P,T
- Provides help for students in course selection, sched., group counseling, classroom guid., placement in courses—P,T
- Guid.Ctr./College Fair—helpful—S
- Stud. all had career/college plan—S
- Saw couns. mostly in classroom—S
- Saw couns. for college plan/rec.—S

### LESS SUCCESSFUL
- Implementing program w/in the established goals set by district—P
- Not sure what couns. do—T
- Couns. deal with test scores, records, transcripts, no time to counsel—T
- Guid. prog. belongs to entire staff, need steps to involve staff—P
- Used Guid. Center only when couns. did units, College Fair helpful—S
- Srs. helped with financial aide info—S
- Couns. don’t help unless asked—S
- Couns. helped with personal problems—S
- Couns. don’t know stud. well—work w/ mostly low achievers—T

### COUNSELORS:
#### SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM
- Friendly, cooperative, efficient—P,T
- Resolve conflicts effectively—P
- Warm, caring, approachable—P,T
- Hard-working—P
- Work effectively in spite of poor facility, overwhelming responsibilities—T
- Cooperative in mtg. teacher needs—T
- Teachers feel can work w/ couns.—T
- Thorough, creative, hard-working—T
- Satisfied w/ resolutions of conflicts/misconceptions of guid. responsibility—T
- Knowledgeable—T,P
- Relate well to each other—T,C
- Plan individ. and as a group—C
- Respect expertise of individ. couns.—C
- Couns. integral part of staff—C,T
- Feel respected/valued—C
- Feel personally responsible for growth and success of students—C
- Helpful and friendly—S
- Came into classes every year—S

#### LESS SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM
- Experienced—P
- Committed to making guidance work—P
- Have done well sticking to goals—P
- Problem getting them to do group activ—P
- Good people, concerned about kids—T
- Ineffec. with kids because of constraints and work demands—T
- Respected & apprec. as professional—T
- Effective in doing paper work—T
- Get bad press for placement decision—T
- Don’t know course sequences for aver. students—T
- Old school of individual counseling.—P
- Commun. between couns. varies in time—C
- Feel pushed/pulled by others except.—C
- Overloaded, not enough staff—C
- Students don’t pay attn to what couns. have to offer—S
- Couns. helpful in selecting course, problem-solving, decisions—S
- Couns. not helpful in college plans—S

**Legend for sources of data:**
- P-Principal
- T-Teacher
- C-Counselor
- S-Student

**Figure 11.** Cross-site, two variable matrix of guidance program success and counselor characteristics. Also called a "Site-ordered Descriptive Meta-Matrix" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p.162).
at each of the two high schools (Appendix E). These data are provided in Figure 11.

In both schools, the administrators saw the program as successful. In the successful program, the principal and teachers indicated they were aware of the guidance program goals and that student results contributed by the guidance program were valued by the staff. In contrast, the Principal and teachers from the school with a less successful program indicated that the goals of the program were set by the district and that the guidance program focussed attention on student results with low achievers.

Interview data from the high school ranked at the top of the "successful" category yielded the following comments related to counselor characteristics. Counselors were described by two teachers and the Principal as warm, caring, effective, cooperative, thorough, hard-working, over-worked, creative, friendly, approachable and knowledgeable. Teachers indicated that the counselors were able to work successfully with teachers to accomplish guidance-related instruction and were able to accommodate the needs of teachers while not compromising the needs of students. The counselors described themselves as planners, having respect for the expertise of individual department members and as integral, essential members of the school staff and the total school program. Counselors indicated that caring and support were outstanding
characteristics of the program and of the counselors. Students were aware of the resources and skills they had gained from the guidance program but indicated less personal involvement with individual counselors for help with specific problems.

Interview data obtained from principal, teachers and counselors at one of the high schools whose program was designated "less successful" yielded the following comments related to the counselor characteristics. The teachers expressed a lack of awareness of how counselors work and seemed to feel that little was done with students. A concentration on paperwork, too busy to work with staff members, students or parents, and little counseling help for students was expressed by both teachers interviewed. Counselors were seen as somewhat unapproachable and were seldom seen in areas where students gather. The main strength of the counselors was seen in scheduling students into classes and helping students who have special problems. One teacher indicated the counselors were courteous, pleasant and easy to talk to. Another teacher indicated the counselors were remote and somewhat disconnected from the realities of curriculum sequences, prerequisites and other educational planning information which is basic to student's educational programming.

The Principal saw the program as having established goals and counselors as being able to stick to goals of the
program. The strengths of counselors were seen as being experienced, well versed in school programs and being available to students who seek their help. The Principal indicated a need to involve more staff members in the guidance program in order to integrate the program into the total school. He also indicated a need for more planning for small group counseling for students with similar problems. He indicated that interactions between counselors and students are "non-existent."

The counselors saw themselves as being pushed and pulled by their many different publics. Their advisory council wanted more individual counseling, the district program called for group involvement, the Principal wanted scheduling and counselor participation in informal interactions with students at times and places where students gather and they had little time to communicate with teachers and families. Counselors felt there was too little time to do the job and too few counselors to be able to plan effectively to get all aspects of the job done. The students either felt they knew the individual counselor well and had received help with problems or they indicated that the counselors provided them with no help at all.

The overall characteristics of counselors perceived at the school level seem to imply counselors trying to do everything to please everyone with little planning or priority
setting. There was little perception of competence and much criticism of counselors and the guidance program. A tendency to get overwhelmed by paperwork to the exclusion of human concerns was implied in the comments by teachers, Principal and counselors themselves.

Similarities in the feedback related to the view of counselors being hardworking professionals who care about kids. Differences between programs related to the ability of counselors to clearly articulate and work with other adults to implement guidance program goals. Setting priorities, time management and a feeling of being valued within the school were clear differences described by adults in the schools. The counselors in the less successful program were more individual counseling-oriented but had less communication with adults or students who had not been seen individually.

Additional data gained through observations and interviews at the two schools, concerned the guidance facilities and the office climate within the guidance area. Although this information is not directly related to the variables examined within this study, it is related to the demographic factors of two specific schools reviewed in Table 8.

In the successful program the guidance office was described as small, clean, well-lit with bright and inviting decor. The reception area was filled with information for
students and had a bulletin board posted with items of recognition of individual students. However, the office was located out of the mainstream of student traffic and one needed directions to locate it. The registrar's office was inadequate in size and there was no conference room to meet with small groups of students.

The climate within the office of the successful program and the interactions between counselors and students was described by observers as being warm and helpful. Students were acknowledged immediately upon entering the office, often with familiarity by first name. The office was relatively quiet and conversations between counselors and students were characterized as cooperative and respectful.

In the less successful program, counselors kept the office closed during much of the day (even when they were in their offices during the lunch period). There was a new office/career center complex which had been in use for nine months which was large, conveniently located and well arranged. However, walls were bare, bulletin boards had few notices and the conference room looked like a storeroom. No counselor-student interactions occurred in the office area during the time of the interview.

From the qualitative data collected, it appeared that the organization of the office areas, the access to counselors and the informal interactions between counselors and students were reflective of the success level of the programs.
CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

The research was concerned with the identification of successful results-based guidance programs using student’s perceptions of their achievement in guidance-related areas. In addition, it was further intended to determine counselor personality characteristics and demographic factors related to the success level of the guidance program.

The study was undertaken because of an identified gap in the research on evaluation of results-based guidance programs and the lack of research relating guidance program success to characteristics of the individuals responsible for program implementation. Many authors have identified the lack of useful evaluation being done in school guidance programs (Burck & Peterson, 1975; Humes, 1972; Katz, 1973; Krumboltz, 1974). Current research provided little information on strategies to determine guidance program success when success was based on student results. Most assessments of guidance outcomes consist of highly focused interventions, use an experimental design as a model, and rely on specialized samples (Hotchkiss & Vetter, 1987). In contrast the intent of this study is to assess the impact of an entire guidance program
in a school rather than one specific intervention. Also, no studies were found that related counselor characteristics to guidance program success, although many studies identified counselor characteristics related to individual counselee growth and some studies examined counselor effectiveness - as rated by guidance supervisors - to related personality and demographic characteristics (Wiggins & Weslander, 1986). A large data base was available on characteristics of counselors unrelated to success or effectiveness.

**Methods**

The methods used in completing the research began with a secondary analysis of an existing guidance evaluation data base. The data reported student responses on an evaluation questionnaire related to achievement of guidance-related competencies. The initial program evaluation was a process designed to provide data comparing results with purposes. Selected items were identified as indicators of program success based on the stated goals of guidance. Student mean scores for the selected items were computed by school. Using mean scores to rank order schools, six high schools and eight middle schools were identified as having either successful guidance programs or less successful guidance programs. Schools ranked in the mid-range were identified as having mixed success and were not included in the subsequent analy-
Counselors from the identified high schools and middle schools were asked to complete a Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from which personality characteristics were identified. Using MBTI preferences, counselor personality characteristics were categorized as MBTI types, work types, and temperament types. Temperament types was further related to leadership characteristics.

Data on demographic factors for counselors at the identified schools were collected. Age, sex, race and length of service were the selected demographic factors analyzed.

Qualitative data was collected through interviews at two high schools, one with a successful guidance program and one with a less successful program. The Principal, two teachers, two counselors and ten students were interviewed to gather their perceptions of the guidance program and of the counselors implementing the program. A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods were used to determine findings.

**Summary**

This study looks at the counselor characteristics that contribute to the success of results-based guidance programs. The findings of the research offered evidence of the following:
1. It is possible to differentiate between successful results-based guidance programs and less successful programs at the high school level, using student self-perception of competency-attainment.

2. There are counselor personality characteristics that relate to success in a results-based guidance program. The characteristics that are most clearly related to the success of a results-based guidance program are different than those related to effective counseling relationships.

3. Combining the quantitative data on counselor characteristics and the qualitative interview data, clarified and strengthened the findings on the relationship between guidance program success and counselor characteristics. The identified counselor characteristics were important in how the students viewed their own achievement but also effected how staff and administrators viewed guidance.

Although the positive findings of the study were encouraging at the high school level, the middle school level was less conclusive. The inability to clearly establish successful and less successful guidance programs at the middle school level, greatly reduced the strength of the findings.
related to counselor characteristics. Also, the scope of the
guidance program evaluation was limited to only those spe-
cific guidance-related competencies specified in the county
program. The number of potential outcomes extends beyond
those studied. The results measured were intermediate-term
outcomes rather than short-term (results of specific inter-
ventions) or long-term (how the student succeeds in the
world). A number of in-school variables such as grades, test
scores, leisure activities, successful part-time job experi-
ences may be influenced by the guidance program but were not
included in this study. In addition, the findings must be
cautiously interpreted because of the small number of schools
and counselors involved in the study.

1. What are the success levels of results-based guid-
ance programs? How was the level of success of
results-based guidance programs determined?

Using the student self-report format it was possible to
differentiate between successful and less successful results-
based guidance programs at the high school level. The range
of scores on individual response sheets as well as the range
of responses between schools at the high school level demon-
strated that the students differentiated between responses on
items when answering. Student responses to interview ques-
132

tions were similar to those given on the questionnaire. Interviewers indicated that student responses were thoughtfully given and followed the same trend by school as the questionnaire responses.

The high school senior developmentally is able to differentiate self from others and to objectify self in the world. In addition, most high school seniors have formed a concept of the post high school world of work and education. They are anxious to graduate from high school but there is a realistic anxiety about whether they will be ready for what lies ahead. Therefore, a high school senior’s measures of achievement are viewed from a more realistic framework than that of the middle school student preparing to go to high school.

There was not a clear differentiation of success levels at the middle school level. There were fewer differences between student scores, individually, by school or between schools. In many cases, the students circled entire sections of the questionnaire with a “very competent” response. The scores were considerably higher than high school seniors and were uniformly high in most areas. Therefore, it was not possible to clearly differentiate between schools with a successful program and those with a less successful program.

Middle school students are dependent on society to provide a coherent set of expectations with which and against
which they can define themselves. Therefore, the young adolescent is seldom able to objectively evaluate self, but rather attempts to project what he feels others want him to be (Lipsitz, 1980).

Using similar guidelines to those used with the high schools, middle schools were ranked and similar analyses of counselor characteristics were attempted. However, it became clear that the inability to separate the two kinds of programs, made the subsequent analyses of counselor characteristics less valid. It is possible that the lack of significance in the middle school findings on subsequent questions relates directly to the weakness of the data from research question 1.

2. Do the personality characteristics of counselors implementing successful results-based guidance programs differ from the personality characteristics of counselors implementing less successful programs?

Yes, the personality characteristics of counselors implementing successful results-based guidance programs differ from those implementing less successful programs on the TF (Thinking-Feeling) variable at the high school level. The strength of preference for Thinking related positively to the successful guidance programs. This finding is in contrast
with the expected. Literature on counselors identifies the Feeling responses on the MBTI are preferred by 65% of counselors (Macdaid, McCaulley & Kainz, 1986). However, the transition of guidance programs from being heavily counseling oriented to a stronger program development focus suggests the need for more counselors with a preference for Thinking over Feeling responses.

The Thinking preference relates to an individual’s judgement. Thinking is the function that seeks rational order and develops plans according to logical input. This preference becomes clear when the qualitative interview data is examined. Counselors implementing the successful programs were seen as having clear priorities, setting specific goals and working toward their goals in an organized, systematic manner. In contrast a Feeling preference indicates the need for harmony in decision-making judgments weighed according to relative values and what matters to others. In the interview information, the counselors implementing the less successful program were seen as being disorganized, others did not know what they were doing and the counselors felt pushed and pulled by other’s expectations.

The examination of counselor characteristics using work types and temperament types did not demonstrate a clear differentiation between counselors implementing successful or less successful guidance programs. There were more ST work types in successful high school guidance programs and more SJ
temperament types in successful high school programs. However, in the scoring process there is no "strength of preference" score and thus, there was no way to identify variations in the scores apart from frequency counts.

The SJ temperament is characterized by a need to belong and a need for structure in work. They focus on people and on serving others. They are organized, secure and stable. The ST work type is characterized as being practical and matter-of-fact. They tend to be concrete, logical and enjoy jobs where they can do impersonal analyses. The interesting finding here is that these two types are generally the antithesis of the kind of person attracted to counseling or the kind of person that counselor education programs seek. Both types have little preference for Feeling responses. There was no pattern in work type or temperament type of counselors in the identified middle school programs.

3. Do selected demographic factors of counselors implementing successful results-based guidance programs differ from demographic factors of counselors implementing less successful programs?

The demographic factors of sex, race, age and length of service were analyzed for counselors implementing successful guidance programs and those implementing less successful pro-
grams. There were no significant patterns when factors were subjected to a one-way analysis of variance using Kruskal-Wallis anova.

The participating schools have had little turnover in guidance positions, therefore, age and length of service could be important factors when considering variables that remain stable over time. The average age of counselors in the county schools was 46 and the average length of service was 13 years. Efforts have been made by school officials to balance guidance staffs in terms of gender and race. All of the schools in the identified groups had both male and female staff members.

Other demographic factors, while not subjected to quantitative analysis were examined for relationship to the success level of the guidance program within a specific school. Factors such as size of school, counselor caseload, socioeconomic levels, ethnic background of students, ability test scores and college entrance test scores were reviewed to discern if there were any specific trends. None were found.

4. Do counselor personality characteristics, demographic factors and other qualitative data differ in successful results-based guidance programs and less successful programs?
Combining the counselor personality characteristics and selected demographic factors in a stepwise, multiple regression indicates that the TF preference is responsible for 32% of the variance. None of the other characteristics nor demographic factors were significant variables in determining the amount of variance between successful and less successful programs.

Qualitative data combined with quantitative findings indicated that counselors implementing successful programs were organized, communicated a clear purpose for the program and established clear priorities. In addition, they were accessible to students and worked closely with teachers in the classroom. Less successful programs were less organized, with no clear priorities or purpose. The counselors were too busy and were pulled in too many directions to be accessible to students and teachers.

The students who were interviewed in the less successful school either felt that they received a lot of individual help from a counselor who cared, or said they received no help at all. In the successful schools, students reported less individual or personal help but were clear about what guidance-related competencies were expected and how guidance counselors could help them achieve the competencies.
As school guidance programs continue to evolve and change in response to the needs of their clients and in response to changes in the field of education, the characteristics of counselors implementing the programs will become even more important than in the past. Career theories have expanded to include consideration of the entire lifespan, the environmental impacts and a variety of other variables that impact an individual's career. However, the world changes are occurring at such a rapid rate that individuals frequently find themselves holding jobs that no longer have the same requirements or functions that were initially expected.

In many fields, accommodating workers who are less than successful can be arranged until the individual retires. However, in guidance the student is the primary client and anything less than the best the educational system can provide, may have lifelong negative effects on a young person's career. Therefore, evaluation of guidance programs and evaluation of individuals implementing those programs is a critical element in planning for students' success.

**Conclusion 1:** The Thinking-Feeling preference on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator differentiates at the $p < .01$ level between counselors implementing successful re-
sults-based guidance programs and those implementing less successful programs at the high school level.

There are some counselor personality characteristics that relate to the success level of a high school results-based guidance program. Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as the measurement instrument, the Thinking response was the preferred mode of counselors in successful programs. The Feeling response is the one most commonly preferred by school counselors (Macdaid, McCaulley & Kainz, 1986; Yura, 1972). Therefore, many counselors prepare to enter the field of school counseling with expectations that may differ from what is needed to provide a successful guidance program. Counselors who entered the field before the advent of accountability and results-based programs, may not be prepared to fulfill the expected responsibilities in the new paradigm of guidance.

Conclusion 2: None of the other three indices measured by the MBTI (EI, SN or JP) differentiates between counselors implementing successful or less successful results-based guidance programs.

The other three indices measure an individual’s attitudes or orientation toward people or toward ideas (EI); the
preference of an individual toward taking in information (P) or making decisions in order to come to closure (J); or the SN preference of how a person prefers to take in information, through the senses or through intuition. None of these indices differentiated between counselors in successful or in less successful guidance programs. Results-based programs are organized to encourage counselors to use their strengths to accomplish the guidance goals, therefore, it is expected that a counselor would be able to create their own strategies to best utilize their preferred types.

**Conclusion 3:** Using a student self-report format it was possible to differentiate between successful and less successful results-based guidance programs at the high school level only.

High school students could clearly identify the competencies they had attained and those for which they were less sure. Middle school students tended to have uniformly high ratings in all competency areas. Therefore, it was not possible to clearly identify the successful programs and the less successful programs at the middle school level. It was believed that there were differences in the success levels of the middle school guidance programs participating in the study. It may be that the student self-report format is not
the best strategy for collecting the evaluation data. It is further believed that the difference in the developmental levels of high school seniors and middle school students affected the thought and the quality of the answers given on the evaluation questionnaire.

**Conclusion 4:** Combining data on counselor personality characteristics, demographic factors and other qualitative data shows clear differences between successful results-based guidance programs and less successful programs.

A review of the comments made during interviews at two of the high schools and the stepwise, multiple regression data taken together, provided clearer definition of the dynamics between the counselors personality characteristics and the success level of the guidance programs. It is apparent that quantitative data provided by the MBTI and demographic factors alone, did not capture the full impact of the findings. Likewise, the qualitative data is far from conclusive even though linkages and patterns were identified. However, by looking at the study from a variety of perspectives, the findings became more understandable.

The counselors with a preference for the Thinking responses provided the guidance program with a logical, clear
and articulated set of goals and objectives. Staff, parents and students were aware of what the student was to achieve through the guidance program activities and each could play a part in the program. In addition, at the school with a successful results-based guidance program, the guidance office and career center was well organized, resources were easily accessible to students and guidance staff members were not feeling overwhelmed or too busy to see students.

Recommendations

1. Guidance program evaluation should be expanded, especially at the middle school level, to include impact data such as test scores, deportment, student participation in school activities, grades, etc. as validation of the students' self-perception of competency-attainment. Methods other than self-report should be included for middle school students. In addition, further research should be done on the evaluation questionnaires to expand the range of options available to students.

Although the student's self-perception of goal-attainment is an important part of guidance program evaluation, the guidance program effects much more than just the limited items which were used to determine program success for this
study. It is important to ensure that evaluation data will be directly linked to the guidance program goals and purposes. However, a variety of methods could be utilized to validate results. Of particular concern is the middle school student who may be able to demonstrate knowledge, attitudes and skills in guidance-related areas, but still be unable to articulate or fully understand the use or value of the competencies learned. Use of qualitative data, in addition to impact data, would further differentiate the successful vs. less successful programs.

**Recommendation 2:** The study of counselor characteristics should be expanded to include counselors from traditional guidance programs and should provide for comparison between the different kinds of programs.

Given the constraints of this study, it is not possible to know whether the findings are true only for counselors in results-based programs or if they also hold true for counselors in traditional guidance services. It may not be logical to assume that the characteristics identified by the TF index on the MBTI, are positively related only to implementation of a successful results-based guidance program when those same characteristics may also be related to the successful organization and implementation of other kinds of guidance programs.
Recommendation 3: Further investigation should be done on the relationship between personal characteristics and job performance using additional measures and larger populations.

The situation counselors face in adapting to new demands of a changing career field are not unique to guidance. There is a need for more research to clarify how personality characteristics relate to job performance within a chosen field and within a chosen field that changes during an individual’s tenure in that field. Given the apparent and dramatic changes in the field of guidance, it is timely for such studies to be undertaken soon.

Recommendation 4: The study just completed should be replicated to confirm the findings in a different setting, using a similar results-based guidance program philosophy and a larger or multiple-district population.

Given the constraints of the size of the population studied, results must be used in a tentative manner unless further research is done which replicates and confirms the findings. If the findings are replicated in further research studies then the results could be used heuristically, along with other data, to effect allocation of guidance resources,
add another dimension to career planning and decision-making programs for potential counselors and modify counselor preparation and inservice training programs.
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APPENDIX A

GUIDANCE EVALUATION PROJECT

1984–1987
1. **Project Title:** Comprehensive Evaluation of Guidance

2. **Project Coordinator:** Sharon Johnson/Sheila Stewart

3. **Non-Public School Involvement:** A letter inviting private schools of Howard County has been sent requesting participation in the planning and implementation of the evaluation of guidance.

4. **Purpose of Project:** The purpose of the project is to design and implement strategies which will result in a comprehensive evaluation of guidance at the school level and district level. The evaluation will include student competencies, goal attainment at the time of graduation, and long-term (impact) evaluation to validate the effectiveness of guidance competencies in later life. It is recognized that the one-year project will only give one year of data. The program evaluation strategies will be used annually three-years in order to produce longitudinal data for trend analysis.

5. **Statement of Need/Rationale:** Since the 1980-81 school year, Howard County Public School System has been in the process of developing and implementing a competency-based guidance program. Full implementation was scheduled by June 1984. It is now time to evaluate the level of implementation, program effectiveness, and begin collection of data to determine the impact resulting from students having specific competencies in learning, working and relating to others. Only a comprehensive evaluation plan can answer the many questions necessary to revise, continue or eliminate the current program.

Questions include:

1. Is the program delivering the delineated guidance competencies to all students?

2. Do the competencies acquired by students enhance/facilitate achievement in high school and post high school endeavors?

3. Are the goals defined and met by the program important in long-range impact?

4. What changes in students' decisions occur (over a three year period) as the program impacts all students 6-12?

5. What is the level of awareness of parents and staff of the guidance program goals and competencies?

The answers to these and other related questions will serve to validate or to discount the guidance efforts to assure that all students gain specific guidance-related competencies. There has been no effort to-date in the literature that attempts to validate defined guidance competencies in terms of the importance to students now and in the future.
6. **Project Objectives:**

**STUDENT RESULTS:**
- To validate usefulness of guidance competencies to students' high school and post-high school endeavors.
- Determine that students have attained appropriate grade level guidance competencies.
- Determine the level of goal-attainment at the time of graduation.
- Determine if guidance competencies have an effect on students' post-high school lives.

**PARENT/STAFF RESULTS:**
- Determine parent and school staff awareness of guidance goals and competencies.
- Determine parents' awareness of progress of their student in attainment of guidance competencies.

7. **Procedures:**

a. A task-force of counselors with the assistance of a consultant will develop a data-flow plan to provide information needed to measure competency-attainment by all students.

b. A paper-and-pen survey will be developed for students and parents to validate usefulness of competencies and to self-report student's progress on competency-attainment.

c. A set of questions will be developed that will collect goal and impact data to use with a random sample of current graduating seniors and a 1-3-5 year follow-up.

d. A set of questions will be developed for use with a random sample of graduating seniors and their parents.

e. Counselors, advisory council members, and outside evaluators will administer all parts of evaluation in the spring for compilation, analysis and summary report in June 1985.

f. Training sessions for counselors and other data collection personnel will be held to standardize procedures and explain processes to be used.
8. **Evaluation:** Each of the elements of the evaluation program listed below will be judged by a panel of experts to:

(1) Assess what is intended

(2) Have adequate criteria to be validated as successful, and

(3) Approve of the data collection processes

The elements are:

- Competency assessment at the grade 6-12 levels
- Goal assessment at grade 12 by written and oral data collection
- Impact determination by a personal interview

The panel of experts will include:

- Consultant - Dr. Roger Kaufman
- Guidance Supervisor - Dr. E. Whitfield
- Research/Evaluation - Mr. J. Schuchman
- University Specialist in Evaluation - Dr. M. Lichtman

9. **Impact on Students:**

All students are affected by the guidance program. Collection of evaluation data will determine effectiveness of current delivery strategies and will be used for program revision to guarantee student results.

The result will be more efficient and effective delivery strategies. All students will attain guidance competencies in educational planning, career planning and personal/social development.

10. **Impact on Professional Staff:**

Staff awareness will be increased by their participation in the evaluation process. Results of survey will identify which staff members are totally or partially unaware of guidance program goals, as well as, identify staff members aware of the program goals. This data will be used for future planning at the school level to increase staff awareness and, thereby, increase staff cooperation and collaboration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Guidance Competencies</td>
<td>Written Survey</td>
<td>Develop-December 1984 Administrator-March 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of Grade Level Competencies</td>
<td>Data Flow System</td>
<td>Develop-September 1984 Administrator-Ongoing 9/84-6/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment at Graduation</td>
<td>Interview Seniors</td>
<td>Interview Training-November 1984 Interviews-April, May 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Survey</td>
<td>Develop-December 1984 Administrator-April 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Staff Awareness of Program</td>
<td>Written Survey or Phone Survey</td>
<td>Develop-December 1984 Administrator-Spring 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Awareness of Student Progress</td>
<td>Written Survey</td>
<td>Develop-December 1984 Administrator-Spring 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Consultants

   a) Evaluation Design and Instrumentation
      (includes travel, accommodations + fees) $2,000.00

   b) Delphi process (evaluation of
      instrumentation and design) 400.00

   c) Training for interviewing process 500.00

2. Workshop

   a) All day workshop with all county
      counselors to develop data flow system
      50 persons @ $10.00 each
      (covers lunch and meeting site) 500.00

   b) Two day workshop for eight counselors
      and two supervisors with consultant
      to develop evaluation design and begin
      instrumentation
      10 persons @ $10.00 each for 2 days 200.00

   c) Three after school meetings for eight
      counselors to develop items for
      evaluation surveys
      8 counselors x 6 hours x $10.40/hour
      (workshop pay) 499.20

   $4,099.20
APPENDIX B

EVALUATION SURVEY FORMS

HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS
HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR INTERVIEW
To The High School Senior:

The Pupil Services Department of Howard County is conducting an evaluation of the Guidance Program. The Guidance Program at your school should help you to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes in the areas of educational and career planning and in personal or social development. You have been selected at random to give us your views on the usefulness and effectiveness of the Guidance Program. Measures of the effectiveness of the Program are determined by the degree of competence and confidence you have as a result of the guidance program. Your views are very important. Thank you for your cooperation.

For each item on the survey form, circle the letter corresponding to your response and bubble in the appropriate letter on the SCAN-TRON sheet. Be sure to use a #2 pencil.

1. THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM IN MY SCHOOL HELPED IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS:
   (You may choose more than one answer)
   
   A. Educational Planning
      (High school course selection, college choice, study skills)
   B. Career Planning
      (Career information, jobs, resume, interview)
   C. Personal/Social Development
      (Solving conflicts, communication skills, student rights and responsibilities)

2. DO YOU HAVE A CAREER PLAN?
   
   A. Yes
   B. No

3. IF YOU DO HAVE A CAREER PLAN, HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU THAT IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR YOUR INTERESTS, ABILITIES, AND GOALS?
   (Choose only one)
   
   A. Very confident
   B. Somewhat confident
   C. Not very confident
   D. Not sure
4. DO YOU HAVE A CURRENT RESUME?
   A. Yes
   B. No

5. HAVE YOU HAD A REAL OR SIMULATED (PRACTICE) INTERVIEW?
   A. Yes
   B. No

RATE HOW COMPETENT YOU ARE IN THE SKILLS LISTED BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Very Competent</th>
<th>Somewhat Competent</th>
<th>Not Very Competent</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Applying for a job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conducting a computer search for colleges or careers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interviewing for a job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Making decisions</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Managing time</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Selecting appropriate courses</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Solving problems</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Studying</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Taking a test</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Developing a personal resume</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Developing a career plan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Acquiring financial aid information for college or technical school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. RIGHT NOW MY PLAN IS:
   (Selections may be made from item 818 and/or 819)
   A. Full time employment
   B. Part time employment
   C. Apprenticeship Program
   D. Two year college or technical school
   E. Four year college/university
19.

A. Marriage
B. Travel
C. Military
D. Undecided

20. I HAVE DIFFICULTY PLANNING FOR THE YEAR AFTER GRADUATION BECAUSE:

(Selections may be made from items 199 and/or 201)

A. I took inappropriate courses
B. I had poor test scores
C. My goals were unrealistic
D. I missed deadlines for tests, applications and opportunities
E. My attendance and lateness was a problem

21.

A. My grade point average is low
B. Sufficient money is not available
C. I am interested in a nontraditional career
D. My parents and I disagree about my goals
E. No difficulties

RATE THE USEFULNESS OF THE FOLLOWING RESOURCES THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO HELP YOU IN YOUR POST-HIGH SCHOOL PLANNING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Very Useful</th>
<th>I Did Not Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Career Resource Center</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Career Speakers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. College Fair</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. College Handbooks/Catalogs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. College Representatives</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Counseling Sessions</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Very Useful</td>
<td>Somewhat Useful</td>
<td>Not Very Useful</td>
<td>I Did Not Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Financial Aid Information</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Interest Inventories</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The GIS System</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Military Recruiters</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Planning Portfolio</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How confident are you in facing the following situations?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Attending college for the first time</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Making new friends at college</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Getting along with a college roommate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Coping with new independence</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Managing your budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Joining clubs or college organizations</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Making and keeping a study schedule at college</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Preparing for college mid-terms and final exams</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Taking a full time or part time job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Competing for a job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Getting along with authority figures</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Cooperating with other workers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Following workplace rules and regulations</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Getting along with workers who are different from you</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
47. Finding positive solutions to conflict situations
48. Using leisure time
49. Selecting new leisure activities
50. Financing leisure activities
51. Establishing new significant relationships
52. Maintaining significant relationships
53. Making appropriate post high school plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Not Very Confident</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Which of the following factors keep you from being successful in your personal or social life? (You may select as many or as few items from 54 and 55 as you feel are applicable to you)

A. Shyness
B. Uncertainty about jobs
C. Dependence on parents
D. Reluctance to leave home
E. Lack of self-confidence

55.

A. Peer pressure
B. Difficulty with authority figures
C. Conflicts with others
D. Difficulty controlling your temper
E. Lack of knowledge about life skills (buying a car, keeping a checking account, voting, etc.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Not Very Confident</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56. Not succeeding in college</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Losing a job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Death of a friend or family member</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Handling a crisis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Ending a relationship</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Resisting pressures to use drugs and alcohol</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Difficulty in reaching your life goals</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Coping with personal health problems</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. RACIAL-ETHNIC BACKGROUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Spanish Surname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. How long have you attended school in Howard County?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New this year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 1 to 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 4 to 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 7 or more years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
67. What kinds of courses did you take in high school?
   A. General
   B. Vocational-Technical
   C. Special Education
   D. Academic (College Prep)

68. What are your grades this year?
   A. Mostly A's
   B. Mostly B's
   C. Mostly C's
   D. Mostly D's and E's

69. What is the name of the high school you attend?
   (Selections may be made from item 66 and/or 67)
   A. Atholton
   B. Centennial
   C. Glenelg
   D. Hammond
   E. Howard

70. 
   A. Mt. Hebron
   B. Oakland Mills
   C. Wilde Lake
To The Middle School Student:

The Pupil Services Department of Howard County is conducting an evaluation of the Guidance Program. The Guidance Program should help you to develop competencies in the areas of educational and career planning, and social or personal growth. As a part of guidance, you should have been exposed to a number of materials and activities, including a Student Planning Folder.

You have been selected at random to give us your views on the usefulness and effectiveness of the Guidance Program. Please take a few minutes now to complete this questionnaire and return it to your counselor. Your views are very important! All information will be treated confidentially. Thank you for your cooperation.

For each item on the survey form, circle the letter corresponding to your response and bubble in the appropriate letter(s) on the SCAN-TRON sheet. Be sure to use a #2 pencil.

1. The Guidance Program in my school helped me in the following areas:
   (Select as many as appropriate)
   
   A. Educational Planning
      (Basic skills, study skills, graduation requirements)
   
   B. Career Planning
      (Information on career interests, interests and aptitudes, identifying careers)
   
   C. Personal/Social Development
      (Solving conflicts, dealing with personal problems)

   How competent are you in the skills listed below?
   (Circle the letter and bubble in on your SCAN-TRON sheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY COMPETENT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT COMPETENT</th>
<th>NOT VERY COMPETENT</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   2. How to study | A  | B               | C               | D       |
   3. How to maintain a notebook | A  | B               | C  | D           |
   4. How to prepare for a test | A  | B               | C  | D           |
   5. How to identify your career interests | A  | B               | C  | D           |
6. Knowing your academic strengths
   A. Very competent
   B. Somewhat competent
   C. Not very competent
   D. Not sure

7. Knowing your academic weaknesses
   A. Very competent
   B. Somewhat competent
   C. Not very competent
   D. Not sure

8. Do you have a tentative four-year high school plan?
   A. Yes
   B. No

9. What are your educational goals?
   (Select as many as appropriate)
   A. College
   B. Vocational Training
   C. Other

10. Do you know the requirements for a certificate of merit?
    A. Yes
    B. No

11. Do you know the high school graduation requirements?
    A. Yes
    B. No

12. What functional tests are needed for high school graduation?
    (You may select as many as appropriate)
    A. Reading
    B. Writing
    C. Math
    D. Citizenship

13. It may be difficult for me to succeed in high school because of:
    A. Poor study skills
    A. Yes
    B. No
14. Boring classes
   A. Yes
   B. No

15. No friends in my classes
   A. Yes
   B. No

16. Illness
   A. Yes
   B. No

17. Not doing well on tests
   A. Yes
   B. No

18. Family problems
   A. Yes
   B. No

19. Difficult classes
   A. Yes
   B. No

20. Poor attendance, tardiness
   A. Yes
   B. No

RATE THE USEFULNESS OF THE FOLLOWING GUIDANCE ACTIVITIES THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO YOU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>VERY USEFUL</th>
<th>SOMETHING USEFUL</th>
<th>NOT VERY USEFUL</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL INVOLVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Filmstrips</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Classroom guidance activity</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Career planning
24. High school course selection
25. Disability awareness programs
26. Problem-solving, decision-making activity
27. Discussions with counselor
28. Dittos, worksheets
29. Speakers, career day
30. Interest Inventory
31. Coping with stress instruction
32. Peer relationships
33. Test-taking skills training
34. Student Planning Folder
35. Shadow day, day-in-industry

36. WHAT THINGS DO YOU PLAN TO DO TO MAKE HIGH SCHOOL EXCITING?
   A. Become active in clubs, activities, athletics
   B. Study hard and get good grades
   C. Get a job
   D. Date
   E. Run for elected office

37. Bullying
38. Drugs, alcohol
39. Fighting
40. Gossiping

HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU IN HANDLING THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS?
41. Group conflicts

42. Name-calling

43. Peer pressure

44. SEX
   A. Male
   B. Female

45. Racial-Ethnic Background
   A. White
   B. Black
   C. Spanish Surname
   D. Asian
   E. Other

46. How long have you attended school in Howard County?
   A. New this year
   B. 1 to 3 years
   C. 4 to 6 years
   D. 7 or more years

47. What are your grades this year?
   A. Mostly A's
   B. Mostly B's
   C. Mostly C's
   D. Mostly D's and E's

48. What is the name of your middle school?
   (Selections may be made from item 448 and/or 449)
   A. Clarksville
   B. Dunloggin
   C. Glenwood
   D. Hammond
   E. Harper's Choice

49.
   A. Oakland Mills
   B. Owen Brown
   C. Patapsco
   D. Waterloo
   E. Wilde Lake
HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
INTERVIEWER FORM

(Read these introductory remarks to the student. Try to avoid sounding stilted.)

THE PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES OF HOWARD COUNTY IS CONDUCTING AN EVALUATION OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM. GUIDANCE SERVICES SHOULD HELP YOU TO DEVELOP COMPETENCIES IN THE AREAS OF EDUCATION, CAREER PLANNING, AND SOCIAL AND PERSONAL GROWTH. AS PART OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM, YOU HAVE BEEN EXPOSED TO A NUMBER OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING A PLANNING PORTFOLIO.

YOU HAVE BEEN SELECTED TO GIVE US YOUR VIEWS AS TO HOW USEFUL AND EFFECTIVE THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM HAS BEEN BY RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS IN THIS INTERVIEW. OTHER SENIORS IN YOUR HIGH SCHOOL AND IN ALL THE OTHER HIGH SCHOOLS IN HOWARD COUNTY HAVE ALSO BEEN CHOSEN TO BE INTERVIEWED.

SOME SENIORS HAVE BEEN ASKED TO GIVE THEIR VIEWS ABOUT THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM THROUGH MEANS OF A WRITTEN SURVEY. THE QUESTIONS IN THIS INTERVIEW ARE SIMILAR TO THOSE THAT WERE GIVEN IN THE WRITTEN SURVEY. BY ASKING YOU QUESTIONS FACE-TO-FACE WE HOPE TO GET A MORE THOROUGH UNDERSTANDING OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM. WE HOPE YOU'LL PROVIDE AS MUCH INFORMATION AS YOU HAVE. WE CAN THEN USE THAT INFORMATION TO PLAN THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM IN THE FUTURE.

WE REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR WILLINGNESS TO TAKE THE TIME RIGHT NOW TO WORK ON THIS. LET ME ASSURE YOU THAT ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

ALL RIGHT. LET'S GET STARTED.

(Record the following information. Ask only if you are not sure.)

1. NAME ____________________________

2. SEX
   MALE _______ FEMALE _______

3. RACIAL-ETHNIC BACKGROUND
   WHITE _______ BLACK _______ SPANISH SURNAME _______
   ASIAN _______ OTHER _______

4. HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDED
   ATHOLTON _______ CENTENNIAL _______ OLENELE _______
   RAYMOND _______ HOWARD _______ MT. HEBRON _______
   OAKLAND MILLS _______ WILDE LAKE _______
(Begin asking questions here.)

5. WHAT KINDS OF COURSES AND PROGRAM HAVE YOU TAKEN IN HIGH SCHOOL? FOR EXAMPLE, GENERAL COURSES, VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL, SPECIAL EDUCATION, OR ACADEMIC/COLLEGE PREP?

6. WHAT HAVE YOUR GRADES BEEN THIS YEAR? FOR EXAMPLE, MOSTLY A'S, MOSTLY B'S, MOSTLY C'S, OR MOSTLY D'S AND E'S.

FIRST I'M GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PLANS AFTER GRADUATION FROM HIGH SCHOOL. I WANT TO FIND OUT HOW WELL PREPARED YOU FEEL YOU ARE TO CARRY OUT THESE PLANS. ALSO, WHAT KIND OF PREPARATION YOU FEEL YOU STILL NEED.

7. IN GENERAL, HOW HAS THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM HELPED YOU?

(DEPENDING ON RESPONSE, YOU MIGHT WANT TO ASK THE SPECIFIC AREAS THAT FOLLOW. IF THEY HAVE ALREADY MENTIONED THEM, DON'T BOther TO ASK AGAIN.)

* IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, SUCH AS CHOOSING COURSES, SELECTING COLLEGES OR STUDYING.

* IN CAREER PLANNING, SUCH AS GETTING CAREER INFORMATION, FINDING OUT ABOUT CAREER INTERESTS, OR IN WRITING JOB RESUMES.

* IN SOCIAL OR PERSONAL PLANNING, SUCH AS RESOLVING CONFLICTS, STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, AND COMMUNICATION.
8. **What kinds of plans do you have after high school? Do you plan to work, go to school?** Be sure to find out:

- If going to school, what kind - 2 year, 4 year, technical, career
- If going to work, full time/part time, what sort
- If undecided, what direction they think they will go
- If some combination

9. **How does your career plan match your interests, abilities, and goals?**

10. **Do you have a current resume? Do you know how to write a resume?**

11. **Have you had a job or college interview? Did you have a practice interview during your high school years? How was the interview helpful to you?**
12. ON THIS SHEET ARE SOME OF THE SKILLS YOU MIGHT HAVE LEARNED IN HIGH SCHOOL. (Show student the sheet labeled skills.) LOOK AT EACH AND TELL ME HOW COMPETENT YOU FEEL IN THESE AREAS. (Try to capture the essence of what student says. Don't need exact responses. Also not necessary to address each skill unless they do. While student looks at sheet you write responses directly on this form.)

APPLYING FOR A JOB

CONDUCTING A COMPUTER SEARCH FOR COLLEGES OR JOBS

INTERVIEWING FOR A JOB

MAKING DECISIONS

MANAGING TIME

SELECTING COURSES

SOLVING PROBLEMS

STUDYING

TAKING A TEST

WRITING A RESUME

DEVELOPING A CAREER PLAN

ACQUIRING FINANCIAL AID INFORMATION

13. HAVE YOU HAD ANY TROUBLE DECIDING ON A PLAN? WHAT KINDS OF THINGS HAVE INTERFERED WITH YOUR ABILITY TO MAKE A PLAN? (If they need help, you might mention such things as the following:

   Inappropriate course selection
   Poor test scores
   Unrealistic goals
   Missed deadlines
   Attendance record
Grade point average
Lack of money
Career stereotypes
Conflicting goals with parents

Only mention these areas if they seem unable to respond. Not necessary to name all areas if you are able to get them to start talking.

14. ON THIS SHEET ARE A NUMBER OF RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES THAT THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM HAS SPONSORED IN YOUR SCHOOL. (Show student the sheet.) WHICH ONES HAVE BEEN USEFUL TO YOU? IN WHAT WAYS? WHAT DID YOU LIKE ABOUT THE ACTIVITIES? WHICH ONES DID YOU ACTUALLY PARTICIPATE IN? DO YOU HAVE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM MIGHT USE IN PLANNING FOR FUTURE ACTIVITIES? (While showing student sheet, write responses on this page.)

CAREER/GUIDANCE/RESOURCE CENTER

CAREER SPEAKERS

COLLEGE FAIR

COLLEGE HANDBOOKS/CATALOGS

COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES

COUNSELING SESSIONS

FINANCIAL AID INFORMATION

INTEREST INVENTORIES

THE GIS SYSTEM

MILITARY RECRUITERS

PLANNING PORTFOLIO
35. This sheet has a number of situations which you may face in the next year. 
How confident do you feel in your ability to face each situation? Are 
there situations on this list you wish you were more prepared to face? 
How could the guidance program be helpful in preparing you to face new 
situations?

**College-related situations:**

- Attending college for the first time
- Making new friends at college
- Getting along with a college roommate
- Coping with new independence
- Managing your budget
- Joining clubs or college organizations
- Making and keeping a study schedule at college
- Preparing for college mid-terms and final exams

**Work-related situations:**

- Taking a full time or part time job
- Competing for a job
- Getting along with authority figures
- Cooperating with other workers
- Following workplace rules and regulations
Getting along with workers who are different from you

Finding positive solutions to conflict situations

PERSONAL, SOCIAL, LEISURE SITUATIONS:

Using leisure time

Selecting new leisure activities

Financing leisure activities

Establishing new significant relationships

Maintaining significant relationships

Making appropriate post high school plans

36. WILL ANY OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN YOUR PERSONAL OR SOCIAL LIFE?

Shyness

Uncertainty about jobs

Dependence on parents

Reluctance to leave home

Lack of self-confidence

Peer pressure

Difficulty with authority figures

Conflicts with others
Difficulty controlling your temper

Lack of knowledge about life skills (buying a car, keeping a checking account, voting, etc.)

17. HOW CONFIDENT DO YOU FEEL IN FACING THE FOLLOWING DIFFICULTIES?

Not succeeding in college

Losing a job

Death of a friend or family member

Handling a crisis

Ending a relationship

Resisting pressures to use drugs and alcohol

Difficulty in reaching your life goals

Coping with personal health problems

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP!
APPENDIX C

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

FORM G
DIRECTIONS:

There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers to these questions. Your answers will help show how you like to look at things and how you like to go about deciding things. Knowing your own preferences and learning about other people's can help you understand where your special strengths are, what kinds of work you might enjoy and be successful doing, and how people with different preferences can relate to each other and be valuable to society.

Read each question carefully and mark your answer on the separate answer sheet. Make no marks on the question booklet. Do not think too long about any question. If you cannot decide on a question, skip it but be careful that the next space you mark on the answer sheet has the same number as the question you are then answering.

Read the directions on your answer sheet, fill in your name and any other facts asked for and, unless you are told to stop at some point, work through until you have answered all the questions you can.
APPENDIX D

COUNSELOR OBSERVATION FORM
COUNSELOR OBSERVATION FORM

Counselor's Name ________________________________ Announced ___ Unannounced ___
Observer's Name ________________________________ Tenured ___ Montenured ___
School ________________________________ Date _______ Time of Observation: From _______ To _______

1.0 Program Elements

1.1 The results agreement should include student results, personal results, parent results, staff development results, and other assigned tasks.
Results Agreement Negotiated and Approved by Administrator on (date) __________
Results Agreement Approved by Guidance Supervisor on (date) __________ (when applicable)

1.2 The program plans should include competencies, content, activities, time, person responsible, materials and evaluation strategies (criteria of success and means of evaluation).

1.21 Program plan, submitted and audited by Principal/Supervisor on (date) ________
1.22 Progress report(s) submitted on (date) ________
Progress report(s) audited on (date) ________
1.23 Assessable evidence of attainment provided to ________ on (date) ________

2.0 Observation

2.1 List results to be achieved during this observation

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2.2 Description of Activity (Individual or Group Counseling, Classroom Activity, Other)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Date _______ Observer _______ Initial _______ Counselor _______ Initial _______

SAAC 140
Distribution: White-Observer, Canary-Counselor, Pink-Principal/Supervisor, Goldenrod-Director
2.3 Program Development Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.31 Accurately completes:</td>
<td>• Results defined for all students (or caseload)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Agreement</td>
<td>• Defines plans for management of a domain (educational, career, personal/social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Plans</td>
<td>• Collaborates with others in plans for delivery of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
<td>• Includes results for staff, parents and personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilizes IGA needs data in plans for student groups &amp; individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 Implements plans</td>
<td>• Develops a variety of strategies to insure competency attainment by all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilizes planning portfolio to monitor individual student progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborates with other staff members to deliver and reinforce guidance competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides opportunities for individual students to request assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budgets time for efficient and effective management of the guidance program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33 Evaluates guidance program</td>
<td>• Produces assessable evidence of results attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintains data for accountability and program monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjusts program strategies in response to evaluation data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Periodically reviews program outcomes for all students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.34 Acquires new competencies
- Develops a personal plan for professional development
- Attends courses, workshops, seminars and inservice meetings to increase competence
- Maintains awareness of current trends in guidance field
- Actively participates in the profession through reading/subscribing to professional journals, joining local, regional, national organizations, publishing articles, attending conventions, etc.

### 2.4 School Staff Competencies

#### 2.41 Staff Relationships
- Collaborates with others to accomplish program goals
- Participates in regularly scheduled staff meetings, department meetings, school staff events
- Establishes rapport with staff
- Consults with psychologists, PPW's, teachers, administrators in regard to individual students

#### 2.42 Staff Responsibilities
- Assumes an active role as a staff member
- Participates on school instructional and supplemental services teams (screening, ARD)
- Utilizes established channels for positive change
- Communicates guidance goals to administrators and staff members
- Punctuality in paperwork, appointments and time commitments
3.0 Evaluation

3.1 Evidence of Satisfactory/Marginal*/Unsatisfactory Progress (Indicate evidence that documents success or failure in attaining outcomes outlined for this observation):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3.2 Evidence of attainment of outcomes as delineated in results agreement.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3.3 Commendations/Recommendations/Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3.4 Assessment of Progress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Marginal Performance*</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be used only for non-tenured employees. Signature indicates only that the observation has been made and shared.

Copies: Counselor
        Principal (If observed by Supervisor)
        Supervisor (If observed by Principal)

Attachments _____ (Check if any are attached)

Counselor Comments (Optional):
APPENDIX E

SITE VISIT FORM
1. **THE TEACHERS**

Subject(s) taught:

Length of tenure at the school:

a) Please describe the teachers' perceptions of the current state of the guidance program. Do they think it is a good program? What do they think are the important strengths of the program? How does the guidance program feel to them? (i.e. friendly, warm, exciting, boring, etc.)

b) Do teachers think that the students' guidance needs are being met? What evidence do they offer to support their assessments?
c). Do teachers think the guidance counselors have a meaningful role in planning and decision-making within the school? Please cite examples.

d). Do teachers feel that counselors understand their curriculum area and are responsive to their guidance-related needs?

e). Do teachers feel there are aspects of the guidance program that could be improved? If so, what are they? Do the teachers believe that the improvements will occur?

f). What are five things teachers would tell a student or parent who is new to their school about the guidance program?
2. **COUNSELORS:**

a). *Do the counselors perceive that their contributions are adequately integrated into the regular school program? How?*

b). *Do the counselors feel that they have ample opportunity for communication with subject area teachers, building administrators, support staff, and parents? With whom do they actually work? How much time is available for collaboration with other counselors?*

c). *How do counselors see their programs and projects contributing to the overall success of the school?*

d). *What five things would the counselors tell a stranger who asked about the guidance program? What do they identify as the most outstanding characteristic of the guidance program?*
3. **THE PRINCIPAL**

a). Please describe the principal's assessment of the current state of the guidance program. What is she/he really excited about? What does she/he identify as the most outstanding characteristic of the guidance program?

b). What is the principal doing to sustain improvements and what is she/he doing to solve problems in the area of guidance? What specific plans and programs are in place to carry out improvements?

c). Describe the principal's vision of the future of the guidance program. How does she/he plan on realizing it?

d) What five things would the principal tell a new student/parent about the guidance program?
INFORMAL SETTING

a). Please describe the general nature of the interactions among students and counselors in the corridors, in the cafeteria, and in other gathering places inside and outside the building.

b). Please describe the atmosphere of the guidance office. (i.e. noise level, interruptions, orderly, tense, quiet? Are the students and counselors interested, enthusiastic, tense, etc?)

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Please describe the physical environment of the guidance office. Is it clean, neat, well-maintained? Is the organization of the office apparent (i.e. who makes appointments, answers questions, gives out materials, etc.).

Is the location of the guidance office convenient and accessible to students, staff, parents? Is the guidance/career center convenient and accessible?
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Please use this space to note anything that you believe is important in understanding the guidance program in this school, and that is not mentioned elsewhere in your report.
APPENDIX F

KRUSKAL-WALLIS 1-WAY ANOVA
SPSS/PC+

--- Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I3</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>by I2</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I2 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I2 = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I2 = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square Significance</th>
<th>Chi-Square Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.3022</td>
<td>1.4938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I4</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>by I2</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I2 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I2 = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I2 = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square Significance</th>
<th>Chi-Square Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.3814</td>
<td>.4171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I5</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>by I2</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I2 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I2 = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I2 = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square Significance</th>
<th>Chi-Square Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.5200</td>
<td>.6970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected for Ties
SPSS/PC+

- - - - Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>I2 = 1</th>
<th>I2 = 2</th>
<th>I2 = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Corrected for Ties</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.9689</td>
<td>.6160</td>
<td>1.5222</td>
<td>.4672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8889</td>
<td>.4444</td>
<td>.6462</td>
<td>.5342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.4444</td>
<td>.6878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.3333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
<td>F Ratio</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.2500</td>
<td>.1425</td>
<td>.8680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8333</td>
<td>1.7540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.3333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1806</td>
<td>.0903</td>
<td>.3281</td>
<td>.7239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7778</td>
<td>.2751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.9583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### One Way Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9444</td>
<td>.4722</td>
<td>.7694</td>
<td>.4759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.8889</td>
<td>.6138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.8333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA: Age by Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>I2 = 1</th>
<th>I2 = 2</th>
<th>I2 = 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrected for Ties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8375</td>
<td>.3990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA: Service by Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>I2 = 1</th>
<th>I2 = 2</th>
<th>I2 = 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrected for Ties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5384</td>
<td>.4634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA: Sex by Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>I2 = 1</th>
<th>I2 = 2</th>
<th>I2 = 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrected for Ties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.2857</td>
<td>.5258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SPSS/PC+

- - - - - Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic by Success</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3589</td>
<td>.5069</td>
<td>2.7978</td>
<td>.2469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variable I3  Age
By Variable I2  Success

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7500</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variable \( I_4 \) \( \rightarrow \) Service

By Variable \( I_2 \) \( \rightarrow \) Success

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>1.0039</td>
<td>.3872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.8750</td>
<td>.9338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.7500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SPSS/PC+

---

**O N E W A Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4500</td>
<td>.2250</td>
<td>.8500</td>
<td>.4448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>.2647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Variable I5**

**By Variable I2**

**Analysis of Variance**

- **Sex**
- **Success**
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