CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation of Results

This chapter describes the results of the data collection procedures delineated in Chapter Three. The survey response is presented first and includes steps in a Follow-up Telephone Interview (FTI), a description of the population, subsequent sample, and the follow-up interview respondents, followed by the results. The three research questions in this study were 1) What does the research indicate are the characteristics of effective counselors? 2) What are current admission requirements of master's level CACREP counseling programs in the United States? and 3 A) To what extent do admission requirements and procedures of CACREP counseling programs reflect and assess characteristics of effective counselors? What's missing? B) What would a framework of a standard set of admission requirements consist of if it was balanced between cognitive-behavioral characteristics and personal-emotional characteristics of effective counselors? These 3 questions were answered by (a) a review of literature related to effective counselor characteristics and counseling graduate admission requirements (Chapter Two), (b) data collected from web sites of the 129 CACREP counseling programs, and (c) interviews conducted with a representative from each of 20 programs that formed the sample (10 academically focused and 10 personally focused). Two programs' representatives did not respond and were unreachable therefore making for a valid sample of 18 (9 academically focused and 9 personally focused). This chapter answers the 3 research questions and gives a brief explanation of the procedures and processes. What follows are the main research questions and the data.

Research Question 1

1. What does the research indicate are the characteristics of effective counselors?

Chapter Two addressed this question by presenting findings of researchers who have examined this topic. The question is restated in this chapter with data presented as a summary of the literature review. This researcher divided the checklist of effective counselor characteristics (ECC), based on the literature, into two categories, cognitive-behavioral characteristics (CBC) and personal-emotional characteristics (PEC). Table 4 (p. 64) presents the findings from the literature, divided by this researcher, into cognitive-behavioral characteristics and personal-emotional characteristics. Then Table 6 (p. 65) presents the researcher's checklist of ECCs (used in survey item number 8) based on the literature, divided in the same manner as Table 4 (p. 64). Additional characteristics resulted from examining respondents' replies to survey item number 8. Their suggestions are summarized in Tables 7 and 8 (p. 66).

Characteristics of effective counselors were extracted from the research, grouped by similarities and divided into cognitive-behavioral characteristics and personal-emotional characteristics (see Table 6, p. 65). They included categories such as insightful, good problem-solving and coping skills, empathetic and compassionate, and developed inter- and intrapersonal skills. Fifty-six studies were reviewed on ECCs. All 56 cited personal-emotional characteristics as important for being an effective counselor while 34 specifically endorsed cognitive behavioral characteristics (see Table 3, p. 67). Those cited most in the literature included 17 personal-emotional characteristics, 11 of which were 'common factors'; thirteen characteristic of emotional intelligence and twelve characteristic of developed emotional skills. Individual characteristics mentioned most often in the literature included interactions/relationships with clients/others (38), warm (34), respectful (33), and accepting (30).

Table 4

Classification of Effective Counselor Characteristics

Cognitive-Behavioral Characteristics	Personal-Emotional Characteristics
(i.e., academic)	
Knowledgeable (i.e. skills, theories)/Intelligence/ Understanding	Empathetic/Compassionate/ Understanding
Insightful	Intuitive
Rational	Emotionally well-adjusted/Low Neuroticism
Developed Communication skills (verbal & non)	Genuineness
Persuasiveness	Trusting
Good Problem-solving skills/ Developed Coping Mechanisms	Developed Interpersonal Skills
Self-Awareness	Developed Intrapersonal Skills
Open-minded	Flexible
Higher Abstract & Cognitive Processing Ability	Positive Regard/Respectful/ Accepting/ Warm
Internal Locus of Control/ Independent/ Self-Managing/ Self-Motivating	Internal Locus of Control/ Independent/ Self-Managing/ Self-Motivating
Prior Work Experience	Personally Mature
Life Experiences	Strong Self-Esteem
Persistent/Determined/Assertive	Optimistic

Note: Not in any sequential order (not ranked), nor paralleled with the other column (categories not necessarily matched). Literature identified characteristics were categorized by researcher.

Table 6

Summarized Effective Counselor Characteristics

Cognitive-Behavioral Characteristics	Personal-Emotional Characteristics
(i.e., academic)	
Knowledgeable (i.e. skills, theories)/Intelligence/ Understanding	Empathetic/Compassionate/ Understanding
Insightful	Intuitive
Rational	Emotionally well-adjusted/Low Neuroticism
Developed Communication skills (verbal & non)	Genuine
Persuasive	Trusting
Good Problem-solving skills/ Developed Coping Mechanisms	Developed Interpersonal Skills
Self-Aware	Developed Intrapersonal Skills
Open-minded	Flexible
Higher Abstract & Cognitive Processing Ability	Positive Regard/Respectful/ Accepting/ Warm
Internal Locus of Control/ Independent/ Self-Managing/ Self-Motivating	Internal Locus of Control/ Independent/ Self-Managing/ Self-Motivating
Prior Work Experience	Personal Maturity
Life Experiences	Strong Self-Esteem
Persistent/Determined/Assertive	Optimistic
Other: _____	Other: _____

Note: The literature identified effective counselor characteristics were classified as either cognitive-behavioral or personal-emotional characteristics by this researcher. Characteristics are not in any sequential order, not ranked, nor are parallel to the adjoining column.

Table 7

AFAR's Suggestions of Additional Effective Counselor Characteristics

Cognitive-Behavioral Characteristics	Personal-Emotional Characteristics
Cognitive Flexibility	Acceptance of Diversity
Conflict Management/Resolution Skills (i.e., issues with Authority Figures)	Engaging (i.e., have emotional energy and willing to engage others)
Critical Thinking and Analysis	Enthusiasm
Curiosity (i.e., in human behavior)	Holistic Energy and Presence
Enthusiasm	

Note: AFAR respondents' answers to number 14 of Follow-up Interview Protocol Question 8.

Table 8

PFAR's Suggestions of Additional Effective Counselor Characteristics

Cognitive-Behavioral Characteristics	Personal-Emotional Characteristics
Undergraduate Liberal Arts Degree in Humanities that includes music, literature, etc.	Non-judgmental Attitude
	Ability to Address Affect of Self & Others
Professionally Oriented	
	Developed Personhood

Note: PFAR respondents' answers to number 14 of Follow-up Interview Protocol Question 8.

Table 3

Literature Identified Effective Counselor Characteristics with Descriptions and Sources

Cognitive-Behavioral Characteristics	**Personal-Emotional Characteristics**
Independent/Self-Managing (17) (free from the influence or control of others; self-governing; self-reliant; one who is independent in thinking and action) (Sources 3, 5, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 31, 35, 39, 40, 45, 46, 55, 56)	Developed Interpersonal Skills (38) (healthy and/or intimate interactions between persons; relationships) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55)
Developed Coping Mechanisms (17) (cope = to fight or contend with successfully; managing problems in a healthy manner) (Sources 1, 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 29, 31, 44, 45, 50)	Warm (34) (sympathetic or loving; affectionate feelings; enthusiastic; genial) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 51, 55)
Good Problem-Solving Skills (14) (ability to cope successfully; ability to handle problems) (Sources 1, 3, 5, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 29, 31, 45)	Respectful (33) (considerate of others; expressions of regard to feel or show honor or esteem for) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 46, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55)
Knowledgeable (13) (i.e., skills, theories, techniques) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 8, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 29, 31, 39, 46)	Accepting (30) (to approve of emotionally) (Sources 3, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 54, 55)
Understanding (11) (comprehension; the power to think & learn; intelligence) (Sources 3, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 41, 45, 46, 50)	Strong Self-Esteem/Self-Confidence (29) (emotional belief / pride in oneself) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 35, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56)
Self-Motivation (11) (to urge to action; mental ability/energy) (Sources 3, 5, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 39, 44, 45)	Developed Intrapersonal Skills (26) (healthy interactions within self; relating to self) (Sources 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 39, 40, 41, 49, 51, 52, 55)
Internal Locus of Control (9) (Cognitive Inner/intrinsic regulation or directing of self) (Sources 3, 5, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19, 31, 45)	Genuine (24) (sincere; real; true; not counterfeit or artificial) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 40, 41, 42, 43, 49, 51, 55)

Table 3 (continued)

Cognitive-Behavioral Characteristics	Personal-Emotional Characteristics
Developed Communication Skills (verbal/non) (9) (to impart; transmit; giving or exchanging of information, etc.) (Sources 1, 3, 5, 13, 20, 29, 33, 37, 38)	Trusting (23) (to commit something to a person's care; to hope ready to confide; belief in honesty, reality, etc.; confident expectation, hope, etc.) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 40, 41, 43, 46, 49, 51, 55)
Life Experiences (8) (i.e., deaths, relationships; human adversities, injuries, etc.) (Sources 3, 5, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 48)	Independent/Self-Managing (22) (free from the emotional influence or control of others; emotionally self-governing and self-reliant; one who is independent in feeling and is in charge of their emotions/behavior) (Sources 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 39, 45, 46, 51, 55)
Higher (Cognitive) Intelligence/IQ (8) (what's known; learning) (Sources 1, 3, 13, 20, 22, 23, 29, 46)	Positive Regard (22) (confident and affirmative consideration, concern, respect, and/or affection) (Sources 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 40, 41, 42, 43, 49, 51, 55)
Rational (8) (able to reason; reasoning; sensible or sane) (Sources 1, 5, 13, 17, 18, 20, 45, 46)	Internal Locus of Control (22) (Emotional inner/intrinsic regulation of self) (Sources 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 35, 39, 45, 46, 55)
Self-Aware (8) (knowing/realizing of self; conscious of self) (Sources 3, 5, 21, 24, 39, 40, 52, 55)	Emotionally well-adjusted (21) (suitable strong feelings; in good emotional health; comfortable with emotions) (Sources 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 26, 27, 29, 32, 34, 35, 43, 49, 51, 53, 54)
Insightful (7) (ability to clearly see & understand the inner nature of things) (Sources 1, 3, 20, 22, 23, 25, 46)	Self-Motivating (20) (emotional/spiritual energy use to incite or urge to action) (Sources 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 24, 27, 31, 35, 39, 45, 46, 55)
Assertive (7) (persistently positive or confident) (Sources 3, 13, 17, 18, 33, 39, 45)	Empathetic/Compassionate (20) (ability to share in another's emotions, thoughts, or feelings; deep sympathy; sameness of feeling) (Sources 3, 5, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 41, 42, 50)
Persuasive (7) (having the power to convince; to cause to do something by reasoning) (Sources 3, 14, 16, 17, 18, 37, 38)	Personally Mature (18) (fully developed character and conduct of a person) (Sources 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 27, 28, 31, 45, 46, 51, 52, 55)

Table 3 (continued)

Cognitive-Behavioral Characteristics	Personal-Emotional Characteristics
Persistent/Determined (5) (continues, especially in face of opposition; determined; firm) (Sources 3, 13, 17, 18, 45)	Understanding (15) (emotional comprehension; mutual agreement; sympathetic) (Sources 3, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25, 26, 31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 41)
Prior Work Experiences (paid or volunteer) (5) (employment, especially in relation to related field) (Sources 3, 5, 13, 21, 48)	Openness/Open-minded (13) (free to be entered; not decided; being emotionally open to new experiences; emotionally unprejudiced) (Sources 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 35, 41, 45)
Open-minded (4) (having a mind open to new ideas; unprejudiced) (Sources 10, 19, 35, 45)	Optimistic (11) (the tendency to take the most hopeful view of matters; the belief that good ultimately prevails over evil) (Sources 3, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 26, 35, 45, 46)
	Positive (11) (hopeful; optimistic; confident; constructive; being of quality) (Sources 3, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 27, 41, 54, 55)
	Flexible (9) (adjustable to change; able to bend w/o breaking) (Sources 3, 5, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19, 34, 35)
	Intuitive (4) (the immediate knowing of something without the conscious use of reasoning) (Sources 3, 17, 18, 25)

Note: (#) next to characteristic = # of references that cited that characteristic. Chart includes effective counselor characteristics from the literature categorized into two groups by this researcher.

This researcher then devised a checklist of ECCs, to be used in the survey, by combining those ECCs cited in the research with similar meanings into 13 characteristics for the cognitive-behavioral list and 13 for the personal-emotional list. This condensed list can be seen in Table 6, p. 65).

Once characteristics of effective counselors were established and grouped, this researcher examined admission requirements of master's counseling programs.

<u>Research Question 2 and 3 Part A</u>

2. What are current admission requirements of master's level CACREP counseling programs in the United States? and 3. A) To what extent do admission requirements and procedures of CACREP counseling programs reflect and assess characteristics of effective counselors?

To answer research questions 2 and 3 in an efficient and effective manner, responses of participants sampled (in 2 categories) were:

- Academically Focused Admission Requirements (AFAR)

- Personally Focused Admission Requirements (PFAR)

Responses analyzed from the 20 follow-up interviews and data collected from each program were tallied and placed in tables to assess for both similarities and differences across the two groups, gaps between the literature reviewed in Chapter Two, and what actually occurs during admissions of prospective counseling students. Data are categorized in two groups: AFAR and PFAR (Appendix D, p. 134). Cells containing 'NR' indicate no response from the representative of that particular

program.

Chapter Two partially addressed these questions by presenting general graduate admission requirements and CACREP guidelines in the literature. These questions are then more

thoroughly answered using admission requirements information collected and analyzed from 129

CACREP programs' web pages and application packets obtained through the mail and as

described in Chapter Three. Gaps (i.e., missing personal-emotional effective counselor

characteristics) between literature-identified characteristics of effective counselors and current

admission requirements (what prospective students are typically assessed for) of CACREP

programs were ascertained. In addition, some characteristics of the surveyed program

representatives are given. To parallel the effective counselor characteristics presented in this

study, data collected was categorized into one of two groups:

- Cognitive-Behavioral Admission Requirements, or

- Personal-Emotional Admission Requirements

and displayed in Tables 1 and 2 (pp. 75-76).

<u>Survey Response</u>

Data collection procedures were detailed in Chapter Three. Briefly, for the admission

requirements and the Follow-up Telephone Interview Protocol, there were four steps:

1. An Internet search of web sites describing program's admission requirements of all

   129 CACREP-accredited counseling programs' across the U.S. representing 45 states;

2. A telephone call to representatives of programs with limited web information to

   request further information and clarification such as the master's application packet;

3. A follow-up telephone interview (FTI) with a representative from each of 20

   programs selected from 129 programs and categorized as either academically focused

   (AFAR, n = 10) or personally focused (PFAR, n = 10).

Admission requirements were obtained from all 129 programs across the United States

either from programs' web pages and/or a mailed admission packet. During the follow-up

interview after examining programs' web sites and application packets, two programs'

representatives, one from the AFAR group and one from the PFAR group, could not be reached

after eleven attempts over a one month period and therefore were classified as non-respondents

or having no response (NR). The final response rate for the follow-up interview was 90% (n =

18), with 100% usable returns.

Respondents

Those that participated in the FTI (n = 18) were program faculty occupying coordinator,

department chair, and/or CACREP liaison positions. Appendix D (p. 134) presents the

respondent's title by number and overall percentages including mean years of counselor educator

experience, then as divided into the AFAR and PFAR groups. There were two non-respondents

to the follow-up interview from 2 different states in the U.S.

To assist in understanding the surveyed representatives and their responses, some of their

characteristics are presented here. Those who responded to the follow-up telephone interview

were faculty coordinators, chairs/CACREP liaisons (Appendix D, p. 134). The follow-up

interviews administered to the sample of 18 program representatives (AFAR = 9, PFAR = 9)

produced similar results with respect to average overall experience (AFAR = 8yrs, PFAR =

7yrs), average years with their program (AFAR = 18yrs, PFAR = 15yrs), average experience as a

counselor educator (AFAR = 23yrs, PFAR = 19yrs) and average number of full-time faculty

(AFAR = 9, PFAR = 8). There were some differences in the average number of students in

programs at any one time (AFAR = 107, PFAR = 178). (For complete results see Appendix D, p.

134).

Given the sampled program representatives' characteristics, answers to survey items

relevant to these research questions are presented along with a discussion of the literature review.

Per the literature review in Chapter 2, the most recent trend in the assessment of counselor performance has been to broaden the perspective of what it means to be an effective counselor (Bell & Acker, 1990). However, to date, the primary focus during admissions has been on possessing content knowledge with some attention to application, but little attention to the interpersonal and emotional elements of the potential counseling student. According to the literature reviewed, the most common admission requirements have been undergraduate GPA, academic transcripts, GRE or MAT scores, graduate and program applications, and sometimes letters of recommendation, all of which are categorized by this researcher as cognitive-behavioral requirements.

The data analysis of 129 CACREP programs' admission requirements produced an almost identical conclusion to those listed in the literature. The most common admission requirements cited by the 129 programs analyzed also fell under the cognitive-behavioral admission requirements' category. These included graduate school and program application (N=129 or 100%), undergraduate/graduate GPA (N=128 or 99%), academic transcripts (N=128 or 99%), letters of recommendation (N=115 or 89%), personal statement of goals (academic/career) (N=107 or 83%), and GRE/MAT scores (N=103 or 80%) with the next common requirement being individual/group interviews (N=74 or 57%) (see Table 1, p. 75).

Of the personal-emotional admission requirements extracted from the analysis of 129 programs, individual/group interviews (N=74 or 57%) and autobiographical statements (N=49 or 38%) were cited most often in the PFAR category. Furthermore, the analysis of program's admission requirements revealed only 5% (N=7) of the 129 programs used psychological/personality assessments (see Table 2, p. 76). The gaps found from the data analysis consisted of a lack of focus on personal-emotional characteristics of effective counselors

as seen in Tables 1 and 2 (pp. 75-76) and discussed here. Of the 18 programs in the sample, all

required academically focused admission requirements (AFAR) that included graduate school

and program admission applications, GPA, GRE/MAT scores, and transcripts. Only 4 of the

AFAR programs used letters of recommendation, while all of the PFAR programs used letters of

recommendation as well as one or more admission criteria focused more on personal-emotional

characteristics.

Table 1

Cognitive-Behavioral Admission Requirements

Admission Requirements	Number of Programs
Graduate School Application	129
Program Application	129
Undergraduate/Graduate GPA	128
Academic Transcripts	128
Letters of Recommendation (Work/Academic)	115
Personal Statement of Goals (academic/career)	107
GRE/MAT Scores	103 + 1 req. if GPA < 2.75 & 1 if GPA < 3.0 = 105
Individual/Group Interview	74 + 5 who don't but believe is highly desirable
Prerequisite Courses/Relevant Undergraduate Preparation	41 + 4 not req., but give preference to
Prior Work/Volunteer Experience	39 requires + 39 prefer/encourage/highly desirable
Impromptu Writing/Essay(s)	18
Resume	14 requires + 1 encourages
Teaching Certificate	11 SC only + 4 regardless of discipline = 15 total
Speech	11
Writing Proficiency Exam (i.e., PRAXIS 1, CET, CBT, etc.)	7
Miscellaneous (not otherwise specified) Requirements	3 total: 2 Pre-admission orientations & 1 FBI Fingerprint Check
Adult Learning Outcomes Assessment (ALOA)	1

Table 2

Personal-Emotional Admission Requirements

Admission Requirements	Number of Programs
Individual/Group Interview	74 + 5 who don't do but believe is highly desirable
Autobiographical Statement	49
Letters of Recommendation concerning Personal Character	23
Psychological/Personality Assessment/Instrument	7 total: 1 Global Personality Assessment, 1 Optimism Scale, 2 MMPI-2, 1 CPI, 2 various testing included in portfolio
Miscellaneous (not otherwise specified) Requirements	6 total: 1 mock counseling session, 1 responses to an audiotape in order to assess level of facilitativeness, 1 experiences & understanding of cultural diversity, and 3 pre-admit workshops.
Professional Counseling Assessment Portfolio I (includes courses, skills, & personal assessment/evaluation)	3

Overall for Question #8 (Appendix E and F, pp. 150 & 158), 'What do you believe are the characteristics of effective counselors and do you screen for them?,' the 18 respondents surveyed (9 AFAR and 9 PFAR) were in agreement with the ECCs cited in the literature and combined by this researcher, but didn't necessarily screen for these characteristics. Examples of these discrepancies are that from the AFAR group all 9 cited empathetic/compassionate/understanding, developed Interpersonal skills, insightful, good problem-solving skills/developed coping mechanisms, and trusting as important, but only 6 admitted screening for empathy, 5 for developed interpersonal skills, 3 for insightful, 3 for good problem-solving skills, and 3 for trusting (Appendix E, p. 150). Examples from the PFAR group (N=9) found characteristics such as trusting (8), independent/self-managing (7), intuitive (7), and persistent/determined/assertive (6) to be important, yet only 4 screened for trusting, 3 for independent, 2 for intuitive, and 2 for persistent (Appendix F, p. 158). In addition to agreeing with this researcher's ECC's list (Table 6, p. 65), some of those interviewed added additional characteristics they felt were important. Table 7 (p. 66) presents additional ECCs suggested by respondents in the AFAR group while Table 8 (p. 66) presents those suggested by the PFAR group.

When program representatives were asked if they thought their admission requirements and procedures resulted in adequate screening of prospective students, the 9 in the AFAR group responded with 5 'yes's' and 4 'no's'. The 9 in the PFAR group had 8 'yes's' and 1 'no.' One department chair in the PFAR group expressed most interest in having prospective students complete a portfolio prior to admission. One CACREP liaison, also from the PFAR group, believed their group interview, whereby they rated students on various criteria such as flexibility, personal experiences, etc., was very helpful, yet subjective. Still another from the PFAR group, a

CACREP liaison and Director of Admissions, stated they do a good job, although aren't perfect and expressed dislike for their reference form saying it wasn't personal enough. To improve their screening of personal-emotional characteristics and interpersonal skills, this respondent suggested a 2-3 day retreat where students would function as a team/in groups such as participating in ropes courses and group initiatives. Additionally, another program chair from the PFAR group reported their screening was good "in general" yet marginal and felt the admission screenings would be better if they were more intense and specific with prospective students, but this sometimes hindered their maintenance of enrollment.

Results from the interviews seem to indicate that those doing more intensive admission screenings (i.e., PFAR) are three times more likely (than AFAR) to believe their admissions' screenings are adequate. Thus, they report being more satisfied overall with their admissions. Interestingly, the PFAR group has been using their current admissions criteria 1 year less (average of 11 yrs) than the AFAR group (average of 12yrs).

Results from survey item 11 asking 'If your current admission requirements and procedures are currently more focused on characteristics of effective counselors, do you believe your students to be better and more prepared personally and professionally/cognitively/ academically?' demonstrated that 9 of 9 from the PFAR group do focus on personal-emotional characteristics, whereas 7 out of 9 in the AFAR group do not. Further, the PFAR group as a whole believes they have better students because of this personal-emotional focus.

Comments made by 1 AFAR group representative about his program that did focus more on personal-emotional characteristics were that their students were "much better" than before as a result of the personal focus. Comments made by program representatives in the PFAR group were shy of unanimous. Eight PFAR respondents felt their students were better because of the

more personal-emotional focus compared to when they had less of this focus. These respondents believed this helped increase the program's standards and quality, and that faculty didn't have to work as hard to develop students once they were in the program. The remaining PFAR respondent believed there were no major improvements yet was the one who said their faculty didn't work as hard to develop students because of the personal-emotional focus during admissions.

Survey item 12 asking 'have you had less or more problems with your students since adopting personal-emotional focused admission requirements?' was specifically geared towards the PFAR programs. The majority of the 9 AFAR programs did not focus on personal-emotional characteristics, however 2 representatives did respond. One reported no variation in the amount of problems they had with students as a result of a more personal-emotional characteristics focus and the other mentioned fewer remediations and problems. Of the 9 PFAR programs, 7 of 9 reported fewer problems. One of the two remaining responded with "I can't say for sure, while the other stated "not better or worse, neutral."

After discussing if they were having less or more problems with students, PFAR respondents were asked how effective they thought their extensive personal/group interviews and use of multiple criteria to assess prospective students were. For item 12 the PFAR respondents were also asked if they believed the measures they were using were good indicators of ECCs. Although this question did not apply to the AFAR group, one department chair reported that they used a weighted formula consisting of undergraduate GPA, work experience and GRE score (800+) that was converted to weight on a 10-pt scale and that it was helpful in the admissions process. Below, PFAR responses to this question are divided as follows:

A) The 9 PFAR respondents believed their measures worked well and were good at identifying such things as skills (specifically inter- and intrapersonal), cognitive and emotional self-awareness, presentation, emotional and cognitive maturity, and other personal-emotional characteristics.

B) Nine of the nine respondents in the PFAR group reported that all their measures worked well/were good indicators for assessing prospective students. The MMPI-II was mentioned by 3 of the 9 respondents. One reported that the MMPI-II was "so-so effective" during admissions when they used it to verify recommendation letters and the workshop impressions. Another felt recommendation letters didn't really say much other than "who their (students') friends are."

C) Only one person reported that using the GC-640 Dogmatism Scale and whether the student agrees with experts on counseling vignettes were good indicators.

D) Various measures used by representatives of PFAR programs, in addition to undergraduate GPA, GRE/MAT scores, and transcripts included:

- Interviews (individual/group) = 3
- MMPI-II = 3
- Personal Statements = 3
- Recommendation Letters = 3
- Carkhuff's 6 vignettes = 2
- Pre-Admission Workshop = 2
- 24 point matrix (a weighted scale) = 1
- CPI = 1
- Dyad interactions = 1
- GC-640 Dogmatism Scale = 1
- Optimism scale = 1
- Self recommendation letter = 1
- Truax-Carkuff Measure (weight scale) = 1
- Writing sample = 1

As for admission criteria used in the past, 4 of the 8 AFAR programs reported previously using additional/other admission criteria. One reported using students' undergraduate major, but

that it didn't work well. Another reported utilizing a combination of an application, short autobiography, 3 letters of recommendation and periodic interviews, yet stated these weren't working as well and that they had to do many remediations. This particular program reported previously administering the MMPI-II, but it was "too risky." Still another tried a weighted formula 4-5 years ago, but was not satisfied with results. And the fourth responding program representative said they used a personality test a "very long time ago."

Of the PFAR programs, 6 of the 9 reported previously trying other methods for assessing students for admission. One reported group problem-solving didn't work well and Myers Briggs was "no good." Another felt neither the MMPI-II nor the Myers Briggs worked very well. One stated the 16PF wasn't good and wasn't giving them what they wanted. Two others reported requiring GRE/MAT scores and rated these as 'okay' measures. The sixth respondent mentioned the Counselor Characteristics Inventory, but again, this measure was rated as just 'okay.'

Overall most were satisfied with their admission criteria, some representatives from the AFAR and PFAR group were considering or said they'd like to use other/additional measures. Additional measures the AFAR representatives would like to use or are considering ranged from 'nothing, because can't defend personal measures legally'-this respondent was concerned about using multiple measures, relating the measure to performance of program and defending some of the information from the measures- to group interviews although didn't believe this works well alone, to a 3+ faculty panel interview with a structured interview form including personal-emotional characteristics and an informed consent students would sign. By signing an informed consent the prospective student would be agreeing with the idea that professional and emotional elements of self are as important as GPA, or other non-personal criteria and would be open to counseling and other self-exploratory requirements while in the program.

81

Some of the PFAR program representatives considered such things as an internal locus of control measure, GRE writing test although would not address personal characteristics, or a 2-3 day retreat that would involve groups and ropes courses. The six that weren't considering any other measures were merely satisfied with their admissions with one being happy.

Finally in question 16 asking 'at the time of admissions, do you believe most counseling programs adequately screen and assess the characteristics deemed necessary to be an effective counselor, particularly the personal characteristics? If so why? If not, why and what would you add/suggest?' Six of the nine AFAR respondents reported believing that most counseling programs do not adequately screen overall as well as assess characteristics deemed necessary to be an effective counselor at the time of admissions, particularly personal-emotional characteristics. One didn't know. One said, "Probably" adequately screen. Only one AFAR respondent believed programs adequately screen for and assess students for ECCs during admissions.

Reasons given by AFAR respondents for inadequate admission screenings of ECCs were "don't have time," "believed best screening is within the program and is built into program remediation," and "fear of litigation, liability issues, ambiguity of personal elements, and unable to quantify/justify personal characteristics."

Similarly, 6 of the 9 PFAR respondents did not believe most counseling programs adequately screen overall or assess ECCs, particularly personal-emotional characteristics, during admissions. One said the few he knew did screen adequately, while another said, "yes, adequately screen maybe 70% of the time." The remaining respondent reported believing that most *try* to screen thoroughly.

Reasons given by PFAR respondents for inadequate admission screenings of ECCs were "50% hold no interviews," "don't take the time, aren't as committed to professionalism and don't have administrative support," and "no existing admission procedures period."

After gathering information via interviews and admission packets of these CACREP counseling programs by this researcher, it was evident that a standard set of admission requirements was needed. This question was posed and answered in research question 3 B.

Research Question 3, Part B

3. B) What would a framework of a standard set of admission requirements consist of if it was balanced between cognitive-behavioral and personal-emotional characteristics of effective counselors?

To answer the second part of this research question, the methods delineated in Chapter Three were followed. Information collected from programs' application packets, web pages and from follow-up telephone interviews in conjunction with the effective counselor characteristics presented in Chapter Two and again briefly and earlier in this chapter, was used to develop a set of admission requirements for assessing prospective students for CACREP-accredited counseling programs. Suggestions by respondents were first discussed in research questions 2 and 3 A. From this information, a possible framework for a standard set of admission requirements (see Table 9, p. 84) to more thoroughly assess prospective students for admissions to CACREP counseling programs was developed using the procedures described in Chapter Three.

Unanimously, AFAR respondents said "no" to the question, 'Do you believe it's possible to have one measure/instrument to assess characteristics of effective counselors?' One AFAR respondent stated multiple measures are needed.

Table 9

Proposed Framework of Admission Requirements

Cognitive-Behavioral	**Personal-Emotional**
Graduate School/Program Application	Individual/Group Interview
Undergraduate/Graduate GPA/GRE Scores	Psychological/Personality Assessment/ Instrument
Academic Transcripts	Autobiographical Statement
Personal Statement of Goals (academic/career)	Personal Portfolio (includes courses, skills, & personal assessment/evaluation)
Letters of Recommendation (Work/Academic)	Letters of Recommendation (Personal Character)
Prerequisite Courses/Relevant Undergraduate Preparation	
Relevant Prior Work/Volunteer Experience	

Signed Informed Consent & FBI fingerprinting and background check

Note: Proposed and assembled by this researcher.

The PFAR respondents were one short of a unanimous 'no' to this survey item. The one

left said, "I suppose in a perfect world." PFAR respondents who stated "no" concerning adequate

admissions' screenings made several comments. As in the AFAR group, one PFAR respondent

believed multiple measures are needed during admissions. Another stated that the best

instruments are "effectively living people" (Robert Carkhuff's concepts), such as role models,

while one said "No, at least not in written form." Lastly, one who believed it takes a battery of

tests stated, "those with 4.0 don't do as well – lack flexibility."

When respondents from both groups were asked if they would like to see such a measure

developed and why, 6 of the AFAR and 4 of the PFAR respondents reported 'no,' while 5 of the

PFAR and 3 of the AFAR respondents answered 'yes' or 'would be interested.'

The AFAR respondents reported not believing in one measure at all and a few saying

multiple measures were needed during admissions. One AFAR respondent was adamant about

how personal issues must be tied to coursework or else would get into legal problems. This

respondent commented that once a student was in the program screening could be done in the

classes.

Similarly, 3 PFAR respondents who didn't believe in such a measure being developed

endorsed multiple measures during admission screenings. One respondent specifically mentioned

personality measures and doing multimodal assessments. Those answering 'yes, would be

interested,' had no additional comments.

Finally, when respondents were asked if they would use such an instrument if it existed, 5

of the AFAR members answered 'no' with the remaining 4 answering 'yes.' This is different

from the number of no's in survey question 18. There 6 AFAR respondents answered 'no.' The

one respondent who had previously answered 'no, not interested' was also the one who made the

comment about personal issues needing to be tied to coursework and screening being done in classes once the student is admitted. Now this respondent was saying they would probably use such a measure if it existed.

There was also a change of yes's and no's within the PFAR group. Originally 5 answered 'yes' and 4 answered 'no' when asked if they'd like to see such a screening instrument developed. Later, when asked if they would use such a measure if it existed, 6 answered 'yes', 2 'no' and 1 'maybe.' The 'maybe' respondent on this item indicated he would consider and try, but would still bring the prospective students in for an initial face-to-face screening. The CACREP Liaison and Director of Admissions PFAR respondent who originally answered 'no' to seeing an instrument developed, on this item, stated he would try it, but not by itself.

From this data, it's obvious that many different measures were used to assess prospective students, yet no single measure emerged as adequate by itself. The consensus of the 9 PFAR respondents indicated multiple measures worked well, although each program's admission requirements varied tremendously. Therefore, there appears to be no standard set of admission requirements among CACREP programs.