

DOGMATISM, LOCUS OF CONTROL, PERCEIVED COUNSELOR SELF-
EFFICACY, AND THE THEORETICAL ORIENTATION OF STUDENTS IN A
MASTER'S LEVEL COUNSELING PRACTICUM

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Counselor Education

Sam Houston State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Andrew Christopher Benesh

May, 2017

DOGMATISM, LOCUS OF CONTROL, PERCEIVED COUNSELOR SELF-
EFFICACY, AND THE THEORETICAL ORIENTATION OF STUDENTS IN A
MASTER'S LEVEL COUNSELING PRACTICUM

by

Andrew Christopher Benesh

APPROVED:

Richard E. Watts, PhD
Committee Director

Jeffrey Sullivan, PhD
Committee Co-Director

Richard Henriksen, Jr. PhD
Committee Member

Stacey Edmonson, EdD
Dean, College of Education

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to my parents, Dr. Greg and Dr. Dana Benesh, and my wife, Dr. Mary Ashton Phillips-Benesh, whose love, support, and encouragement has helped me through the process of writing this dissertation.

ABSTRACT

Benesh, Andrew Christopher, *Dogmatism, locus of control, perceived counselor self-efficacy, and the theoretical orientation of students in a master's level counseling practicum*. Doctor of Philosophy (Counselor Education), May, 2017, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to fill a gap in the literature by examining the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy, and counselor theoretical orientation in a sample of master's level practicum students.

Method

A total of 45 master's practicum students completed a series of four instruments, the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised. Data were analyzed using quantitative analysis. Cronbach's alphas were computed to answer the first research question, to determine if the instruments were reliable for the sample. A series of Pearson product-moment correlations were used to answer the second research question. This question addressed whether there were any relationships between dogmatism, locus of control, or perceived counselor self-efficacy. Finally, a MANOVA was conducted to answer research question three. The MANOVA was used to see if there were statistically significant differences in respondents' levels of dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy based on their theoretical orientation.

Results

The analyses revealed that the instruments were reliable for the sample. Also the Pearson's product correlations suggested a large, positive correlation between locus of

control and perceived counselor self-efficacy. No other statistically significant relationships were found.

KEY WORDS: Master's counseling students, Dogmatism, Locus of control, Perceived counselor self-efficacy, Theoretical orientation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the culmination of a long journey and lots of work that would not be possible without the support of a number of people. First of all, thank you to my parents for setting an example of academic excellence and perseverance. Your modeling helped to set the high bar to which I aspire. Secondly, thank you to my wife, Ashton. Your constant encouragement and reassurance helped me push ahead countless times over innumerable bumps along the way in the last few years. I'm looking forward to practicing with you, and being The Doctors Benesh. Also, thank you to my siblings who asked about my research and helped keep me motivated by your achievements.

Special thanks goes out to the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Richard E. Watts, Dr. Jeffrey Sullivan, and Dr. Richard Henriksen, Jr. Thank you for your encouragement, your questions, your guidance, and your intellectual curiosity that continually sparked my own curiosity throughout the long dissertation process. Thank you Dr. Watts for helping me formulate an idea for a study and guiding me along the way, and thank you Dr. Sullivan for coming in at short notice and sharing your insight and analytical expertise. Your feedback was instrumental in helping me formulate the latter half of this manuscript. Also, thank you to all the counseling professors at Sam Houston State University. The education I received in your classes was rigorous and challenging, and helped me along the way toward being a counselor educator. Thank you Dee Dee Dirk, for your patience and help along the way. And, lastly, thank you to my fellow doctoral students at SHSU. Your friendships, perseverance, and dedication helped me finish this long journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	4
Definitions	6
Theoretical Framework	7
Research Questions	11
Limitations	11
Delimitations	12
Assumptions	12
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER II	15
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
Religiosity	15
Locus of Control	22

Perceived Counselor Self-Efficacy.....	26
Choice of Counseling Theory.....	31
Conjoint Research	34
Summary.....	39
CHAPTER III	41
METHODOLOGY	41
Instrumentation.....	42
Participants	51
Data Collection.....	53
Data Analysis.....	54
Summary.....	55
CHAPTER IV	57
RESULTS.....	57
Description of the Sample	58
Demographics.....	59
Instruments	62
Procedure.....	63
Research Questions	63
Summary of Results	68
CHAPTER V	69
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND	
RECOMMENDATIONS	69
Summary of the Study	69

Discussion of Findings	70
Implications	78
Limitations.....	82
Recommendations for Future Research.....	83
Conclusion.....	87
REFERENCES	89
APPENDIX A.....	108
APPENDIX B	113
APPENDIX C	114
APPENDIX D.....	115
APPENDIX E	116
APPENDIX F.....	117
APPENDIX G.....	118
APPENDIX H.....	119
APPENDIX I	122
APPENDIX J	124
APPENDIX K.....	128
APPENDIX L	131
APPENDIX M	134
VITA.....	136

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Gender.....	59
2 Ethnicity.....	60
3 Age.....	60
4 Sexual Orientation.....	60
5 Theoretical Orientation.....	61
6 Reliability Tests.....	65
7 Correlations.....	66
8 Multivariate Tests.....	67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A plethora of counseling theories exists from which counseling students are able to choose. Some estimate that there are between 250 and 400 different counseling approaches (Corsini & Wedding, 2013). Theoretical orientations affect how counselors conceptualize clients, view human nature, understand maladjustment, and believe how clients move toward optimal functioning and adjustment. Theoretical orientations also affect what techniques counselors might use with clients in specific situations. Therefore, the theoretical orientation of counseling students is an important area of investigation for both counselor development and client welfare. Many researchers have commented on the importance of theoretical orientation as a guide for the process of counseling (Cohen & Oyster-Nelson, 1981; Gil-Adi & Newman, 1984; Vasco & Dryden, 1997; Coleman, 2004; Murdock, Duan & Nilsson, 2012). Counselors using different theoretical orientations evinced significantly different conceptualization of, and work with, clients, though outcomes were no different.

Some researchers have examined the effects of personality on theory choice. For example, Freeman (2003) and Freeman, Hayes, Kuch, & Taub (2007) studied personality traits and how they related to theoretical orientation in beginning counseling students. Freeman (2003) used the Self Directed Search and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to examine personality, and a survey to gather the theoretical orientation data. Freeman's study did not uncover a statistically significant relationship between personality traits as measured by the SDS and MBTI and theoretical orientation. He noted, however, that his findings differed from those of previous studies by Hawkins (1988) and Sundland (1977).

Hawkins discovered that students gravitated toward theoretical orientations more consistent with their view of life and their personality. Sundland suggested that people with different theoretical orientations also differed in their values, attitudes, behavior, and personality. In addition, research by Erickson (1993), Fredrickson (1993), and Dodd & Bayne (2006) also confirmed that personality has an influence on theoretical orientation.

Other researchers have also examined various aspects of personality and their interactions in people. Adegbola (2007, 2011) examined spirituality and self-efficacy. She noted a significant relationship between one's spirituality and one's general self-efficacy. This appears to support earlier research by Matthews (2004), who determined that counselor self-efficacy was related to spirituality. She was able to show a relationship between the Counselor Self Efficacy Scale (CSES) and each element of the Psychomatrix Spirituality Inventory (PSI) except in the case of Childhood Spirituality. Furthermore, the results indicated a significant relationship between CSES scores and PSI Total Factor scores. This suggests that religion/spirituality may affect Counselor Self-Efficacy. Also, Rehn (1985) examined the relationship between dogmatism, self-esteem, locus of control, and predisposition toward two instructional methods in female nursing students. The study used the Dogmatism scale, the Internal-External scale for measuring locus of control, the Self-Esteem inventory, and two different teaching methods. Rehn observed that self-efficacy correlated with better learning. Also, although dogmatism was not seen to be significant in the study, group dogmatism appeared to be significant when measuring learning success.

Several researchers have noted the differences in theoretical orientation and the effects this has on counseling and client conceptualization (Cohen & Oyster-Nelson,

1981; Gil-Adi & Newman, 1984; Vasco & Dryden, 1997; Coleman, 2004; Murdock, Duan & Nilsson, 2012). Other researchers have examined if there is a connection between personality and theoretical orientation differentiation, with some suggesting that a counselor's personality affects which theory they choose to use in counseling (Hawkins, 1988; Sundland, 1977; Erickson, 1993; Fredrickson, 1993; Freeman, 2003; Freeman et al. 2007; Dodd & Bayne, 2006). Further, researchers have examined the connections between elements of spirituality, self-efficacy, and locus of control, finding statistically significant correlations between each (Adegbola, 2007, 2011; Pollock, 2007; Matthews, 2004; Rehn, 1985). Because these variables are all elements of personality, it would follow, based on past literature, that they may influence one's choice of theoretical orientation. However, in a search of the literature, I found no such study. Pollock (2007) suggested further research into spirituality and counselor self-efficacy. This echoes Matthews' (2004) recommendations for more study on spirituality in counseling. In discussing the validity of his dogmatism scale, Altemeyer (2002) suggested future research addressing dogmatism.

Statement of the Problem

The concepts surrounding the development of a counseling theoretical orientation have been studied at length from various perspectives. Researchers have suggested that a counselor's theoretical orientation significantly influences case conceptualization and choice of techniques used in counseling (Cohen & Oyster-Nelson, 1981; Gil-Adi & Newman, 1984; Vasco & Dryden, 1997; Coleman, 2004, Murdock, Duan & Nilsson, 2012). Also, many researchers have seen a relationship between a counselor's personality and his or her theoretical orientation (Hawkins, 1988; Sundland, 1977; Erickson, 1993;

Fredrickson, 1993; Ogunfowora, 2006; Ogunfowora & Drapeau, 2008). Examining the research on personality, researchers have observed relationships between spirituality and self-efficacy (Adegbola, 2007, 2011; Matthews, 2004), and dogmatism, self-esteem, locus of control, and learning (Rehn, 1985). Pollock (2007), Matthews (2004), and Altemeyer (2002) all recommended more study on self-efficacy, spirituality, and dogmatism. I discovered no research, however, examining the relationship between dogmatism, counselor self-efficacy, locus of control and theoretical orientation, despite the ties between the variables noted in the research and the findings that suggested a link between personality and theoretical orientation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to fill a gap in the literature by examining the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy, and counselor theoretical orientation in a sample of master's level practicum students. Previous research (e.g., Hawkins, 1988; Sundland, 1977; Erickson, 1993; Fredrickson, 1993; Ogunfowora, 2006; Ogunfowora & Drapeau, 2008) suggested a link between personality and theoretical orientation, but I observed no research examining all of the constructs together.

Significance of the Study

Religion and spirituality are important areas of life for a significant portion of the world's population. The Central Intelligence Agency (2011) estimated that 89 percent of the world's population has religious or spiritual beliefs. This figure is fairly consistent with a recent Gallup poll that determined 75% of Americans reported religion to be fairly important or very important to them (Gallup, 2016). Because such a high percentage of

potential clients and counselors on average will have religious or spiritual beliefs it is ethically and clinically important for counselors to be cognizant of the influence of religion and spirituality on counseling (Watts, 2001, 2007). Tarakeshwar, Stanton, and Pargament (2003) discussed the importance of looking at religion in counseling and psychology. They suggested, “religion is inextricably woven into the cloth of cultural life” (p. 377).

This idea of religion and spirituality as part of a person’s culture addresses current trends in the counseling field. Multicultural efforts have become extremely important in counseling in the past few decades, with Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) issuing a call for counselors to utilize multicultural competencies in their practice. One of the competencies they list indicates that culturally competent counselors “are aware of how their own cultural background and experiences, attitudes, and values and biases influence psychological process” (p. 482). Subsequently, Arredondo, Toporek, Brown, Sanchez, Locke, Sanchez, and Stadler (1996) listed many characteristics of competent counselors, including several that had to do with religious beliefs. Also, in 2009 the Association for Spiritual, Ethical, and Religious Values in Counseling (ASERVIC) revised their competencies for addressing religious and spiritual issues in counseling that emerged from several years of research and discussion (Cashwell & Watts, 2010). Therefore, it is imperative that researchers investigate religious belief and personality and the effects these have on counseling. My study attends to important aspects of the multicultural competencies by exploring the interplay between religious beliefs (in this case dogmatism), other personality elements (perceived counselor self-efficacy and locus of

control), and theoretical orientation, which in turn influences how clients experience the process of counseling.

Definitions

In this section I define the terms relevant to the study in order to help the reader better understand the elements of the present study.

Perceived Counselor Self-Efficacy

The concept of self-efficacy originally came from Bandura's social learning theory (1977). He later defined self-efficacy as more than the ability to self-regulate and control one's actions. It also includes "thought processes, motivation, and affective and physiological states" (Bandura, 1997, p. 36). Perceived counselor self-efficacy is the belief that a counselor has the ability to do counseling in a way that helps clients. Research has indicated that counseling self-efficacy is related to training and experience (Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996).

Dogmatism

Rokeach (1956) began the study of dogmatism and defined it as, "relatively closed systems of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, provides a framework for intolerance and qualified tolerance for others" (p. 195). My study will focus on the work of Altemeyer (2002) who sought to improve upon Rokeach's work and defined dogmatism as, "relatively unchangeable, unjustified certainty" (p. 713) of belief. Altemeyer's definition will be used for the purposes of this study.

Locus of Control

Rotter (1966) developed the concept of locus of control. Locus of control is the degree to which people believe they can control events that affect them. Those with an external locus of control tend to believe that reinforcements, or things that happen in their lives, are due to fate or chance, rather than their actions. Those with an internal locus of control tend to believe that reinforcements, or things that happen in their lives, are due to actions they take.

Theoretical Orientation

The theoretical orientation of a master's level practicum student is defined as the counseling theory they choose to use in counseling clients during their practicum experience. Coleman (2004) suggested that one's "theoretical orientation guides how the clinician understands psychopathology and the process of helping, and each theory and approach has associated techniques and a style of relating to the client" (p. 117).

Theoretical Framework

My study examined four variables, dogmatism, perceived counselor self-efficacy, locus of control, and theoretical orientation. Consequently, I used several theoretical frameworks for the study. This study focused on Bandura's work on self-efficacy, the work of Altemeyer on dogmatism, and Rotter's work on locus of control.

Perceived Self-efficacy and Perceived Counselor Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is the belief that someone is able to act in a certain way to attain his or her goals. Bandura (1997) noted that self-efficacy was more than just the ability to self-regulate and control people's own actions, but includes "thought processes, motivation, and affective and physiological states" (p. 36). Self-efficacy can have a

significant impact on people's ability to successfully complete a task. People with high self-efficacy are more likely to succeed and see tasks as challenges to overcome, rather than barriers that hinder success. People with similar skills and abilities but with lower self-efficacy are more likely to avoid a task or challenge, rather than engage it. Bandura (1977, 1986a) postulated that perceived self-efficacy emerges from four sources. First, people can gain self-efficacy from accomplishing things. As they meet tasks and achieve, they gain confidence in themselves and their abilities and raise their self-efficacy. Second, people can gain self-efficacy from vicarious experience (or inactive learning); that is, people can learn by watching others succeed in difficult tasks. As people see another person come to a challenge and overcome it, they can gain confidence in their own personal ability to achieve and overcome the task or challenge. Third, people can gain self-efficacy through verbal encouragement. Something as simple as appropriate feedback can stimulate self-efficacy in people and help them see their own potential and strive to meet tasks or challenges they had previously avoided. Upon successful completion they increase their self-efficacy even further because the first factor of accomplishment comes into effect. Finally, Bandura suggested that people may gain self-efficacy through emotional arousal. He theorized that emotions in stressful situations could lead to fear and anxiety and negatively affect people's self-efficacy. By being able to accurately assess the emotions likely to arise from a task or situation, they could improve self-efficacy and the ability to handle difficult situations.

Counselor self-efficacy is a corollary of self-efficacy. The concept has attracted significant attention from researchers. Constantine (2001, 2002) examined counselor self-efficacy as well as multicultural counseling competence. She discovered that counselor

self-efficacy contributed to multicultural counseling competence and that multicultural counseling training and supervision also helped improve multicultural counseling competence. She concluded that “supervisees’ general beliefs or judgments about their ability to work with clients are, in part, related to their beliefs about their ability to work with culturally diverse clients” (p. 87). Furthermore, Barbee, Scherer, and Combs (2003), Levitt (2001), and Tang, Addison, LaSure-Bryant, Norman, and Steward-Sicking (2004) examined factors that contribute to counselor self-efficacy. According to Barbee et al. counselor self-efficacy had a significant positive correlation with service learning in pre-practicum students. Service learning led to higher levels of counselor self-efficacy in his sample. Also, counselor training and experience had an even higher positive correlation with counselor self-efficacy. Levitt examined active listening in counselor training, and determined that beginning counselors who had active listening emphasized in their instruction and supervision developed better active listening skills with clients. This improvement in active listening skills leads to improvements in their reflection of feelings, challenging clients, and immediacy. The subsequent positive experience brought about an increase in the students’ counselor self-efficacy. Tang et al. reported that as students’ time in coursework and clinical experience increased, they were more confident in their abilities. Their education and experience had both contributed to increased self-efficacy as Bandura suggested. Finally, Leach and Stoltenberg’s (1997) results suggested that regular supervision increases counselor self-efficacy and counselor anxiety has a negative effect on counselor self-efficacy.

Dogmatism

The study of dogmatism began with Rokeach (1956). He defined dogmatism as a “relatively closed systems of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which in turn, provides a framework for intolerance and qualified tolerance for others” (p. 195). In 1960, Rokeach introduced his D Scale. However, the validity of the scale has been called into question since it was introduced (Altemeyer, 2002). Therefore, the dogmatism aspect of my theoretical framework is based on the work of Altemeyer. Altemeyer (2002) introduced a 20-item DOG Scale to measure dogmatism. He defined dogmatism as “relatively unchangeable, unjustified certainty” (p. 713). This scale was created to help identify dogmatism, and possesses a higher validity than Rokeach’s (1960) scale. Example statements include protrait items such as “The things I believe in are so completely true, I could never doubt them,” and contrait items such as “Flexibility is a real virtue in thinking, because you may well be wrong” (p. 713). In his research, Altemeyer reported strong relationships between his DOG Scale and right wing authoritarianism, zealotry, and religious belief. Altemeyer found the assessment to be internally consistent and reliable.

Locus of Control

Locus of control concerns the belief that persons are in control of what happens to themselves. People with an internal locus of control see themselves as having power over their situation, whereas individuals with an external locus of control see themselves as powerless and being acted upon, rather than acting on the environment. The idea of locus of control emerged from Rotter’s (1966) work. He studied reinforcements and how they can influence behavior. People with an internal locus of control believe reinforcements

are due to their actions. Individuals operating from an external locus of control believe that reinforcements in their lives are due to fate or chance. Research suggests that locus of control can have a significant impact on one's personality, and is a part of a person's personality (Seeman & Evans, 1962; Seeman, 1963; Davis & Phares, 1967; Judge, Erez, Bono & Thoresen, 2003; Injeyan, Shuman, Shugar, Chitayat, Atenafu, & Kaiser, 2011), which in turn can influence one's theoretical orientation (Erickson, 1993; Fredrickson, 1993; Freeman, 2003; Freeman et al. 2007).

Research Questions

1. Are the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised valid instruments for use with master's level practicum students?
2. What is the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy?
3. To what degree does dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students?

Limitations

This study had three main limitations. The first limitation of the study is that participation was voluntary. When I contacted students at the various universities, the students had a choice of whether they want to take the assessments or not. This posed a problem in getting the required number of participants needed for my statistics. Secondly, the theoretical orientation of master's level counseling students may not have been inchoate. Because they were in the midst of their studies, and possibly still forming their

thoughts about theoretical orientation, this may have influenced the results. A final limitation of my study was that the assessments were self-reported. This could have limited the accuracy of the data, as the participants might have tended to report as they think they should.

Delimitations

Delimitations are self-imposed limitations on the study. They function to help focus the study and limit the scope to control for extraneous variables. For this study I set two delimitations. First of all, this study was limited to four CACREP accredited counseling programs located within universities in Texas. There are many universities in the state, and this helped me to gather data in a focused and timely manner as I contacted the four counseling programs within the universities to present my study to the master's practicum students. A second delimitation is that the participants were limited in such a way that they met the criterion of being master's level practicum students. This delimitation helped me focus the sample on students who were best able to answer the questions in the assessments and provide useful data that could be interpreted.

Assumptions

This study included several assumptions. My first assumption was that students would fill out the instruments correctly. I assumed that they had the reading and English proficiency to read, understand, and answer the questions appropriately, and the technological understanding to complete an online survey. Similarly, another assumption is that the students were truthful in the answers they gave. I assumed they were honest and did not give random or bad data when taking the instruments. A third assumption was that the instruments were valid and reported accurately what they were supposed to report

in the chosen sample. This assumption was based on the psychometrics reported on all of the instruments. A fourth assumption was that the students at the practicum level were able to conceptualize their theoretical orientation when asked about it in the theoretical orientation instrument. Students can often struggle in adopting a theoretical orientation, but as they gained clinical experience with clients, I assumed they were motivated to reflect on their theoretical orientation more purposefully.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. In the first chapter I have discussed the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the definition of terms, the theoretical framework of the study, the research questions of the study, the limitations of the study, the delimitations of the study, and the assumptions of the study.

Chapter II includes the review of the literature. First, the literature surrounding religiosity, dogmatism, and the link between the two is presented. Then, the literature addressing the study of locus of control is reviewed. Third, I review the literature concerning perceived self-efficacy and perceived counselor self-efficacy. Next, the chapter includes a section examining the literature having to do with counselor theoretical orientation. Finally, I review the studies in the literature addressing more than one of the pertinent variables to this study.

Chapter III includes a discussion of the methodology I used in this study. The method utilized to select participants is detailed. Also, the various instruments I used in the collection of data are discussed. Finally, the statistical analyses I used to examine the data are presented and discussed.

Chapter IV includes a presentation of the results I obtained from the sample after collecting data. The relevant statistical analyses are discussed, and the results of the analyses are presented. My research questions are also presented and answered using the statistical data obtained after analyzing the data I collected.

Chapter V includes a discussion of the results. The research questions are answered, limitations of the study are given, and implications from the results are discussed. Finally, the chapter ends with a discussion of recommendations for future research based on my study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chapter two includes a review of both seminal and recent research of the various variables examined in my study. First is an examination of the literature surrounding religious belief as it relates to counseling and the development of the psychology and assessment of religion and the ties between religiosity and dogmatism. Second, the research surrounding the study of the concept of locus of control will be discussed. Next, the review of literature will include a section on counselor self-efficacy and the development of that concept. Further discussion will center on the idea of counseling theory and theoretical choice and orientation. Finally, the literature review will end with a section examining studies that researched relationships between two or more of the variables in this study.

Religiosity

Religion and spirituality as it relates to counseling is an important area that counselors need to be familiar with in order to ethically provide the best possible care for their clients (Watts, 2001, 2007; Francis, 2016). In this section, the views of counselors and psychologists on religion and spirituality are addressed. Next, various measures used to examine religiosity and related constructs in clients will be discussed. Both seminal research and current findings will be discussed.

Views of Counselors and Psychologists on Religion and Spirituality

The view of psychologists or counselors on religion or spirituality is a complex and varied topic. As expected when dealing with a large population, a wide range of opinion appears even in a brief examination of the literature. Some counselors and

psychologists have positive, or at least neutral or utilitarian, views of religion and spirituality. Alfred Adler, a colleague of Freud, believed religion could help people accomplish life tasks. Two core beliefs in Adler's theory of counseling have direct applications for religion and spirituality in a client's life. First, Adler suggested that people often have feelings of inferiority that they strive to overcome. Religion and spirituality can help one overcome these feelings of inferiority, something Adler saw as a positive outcome. Second, Adler stressed social action. Many religions encourage social involvement. To the degree that a specific religion or religious belief held by the client motivated him or her toward social action, Adler viewed that as a positive outcome (Adler, 1964).

Another contemporary of Freud and Adler, Carl Jung, also had a positive view of religion and spirituality (Jung, 1964). He suggested religion and religious symbols could help a person give meaning to his or her life beyond their own existence. Likewise, Erik Erikson (1972) identified religion/spirituality as a useful element in his conception of counseling and the human experience. To Erikson, religion and spirituality had a deep link with his *trust vs. mistrust* stage. Furthermore, he thought that religious beliefs could help a person move through his developmental stages by teaching the person the needed virtues in life. Carl Rogers, the creator of person-centered therapy, also had a deep connection with religion and spirituality. He grew up in a devoutly Christian home and attended seminary, with a desire to go into the ministry, before he changed career paths and pursued psychology. As such, his views on religion and spirituality were positive and this shows in his therapy. If a client has religious beliefs, they are valid for the client (Rogers, 1951).

More recently, Masters, Bergin, Reynolds, and Sullivan (1991) suggested that religion is more important to consider in mental health situations than had previously been thought. Harris, Randolph, and Gordon (2016) conducted a literature review of spirituality in counseling and found many clients want spirituality addressed in some way during the counseling process. Rowan (1993) suggested that to understand the meaning of being human, one must also understand the spiritual dimension of humanity. In other words, all people have a part of their natures that is spiritual, and counselors need to be willing to address that piece of the clients' lives in order to accurately conceptualize a person. Therefore, having a religious or spiritual belief is normal for people and helps to define a person. Giordano, and Cashwell (2014) explored using motivational interviewing with clients to engage in looking at spirituality issues in the counseling process without imposing the counselor's values. In 1981, an attempt was made by James Fowler to explore and root religion and spirituality in a psychological foundation. Fowler (1981), a professor of both theology and human development, published a book on stages of faith that he developed. Based on Erikson's ideas, along with strong influences from Piaget and Kohlberg, Fowler's study sought to bring together religion and spirituality and show it in terms of human psychology. In a study by Shafranske and Maloney (1990), it was reported that the majority of psychologists in their sample held religious beliefs and were of the opinion that religious beliefs were positive for people to have.

In a recent study, Glover-Graf, Marini, Baker, and Buck (2007) identified that religion and spirituality helped those with chronic pain to cope. Similarly, Day-Vines (2007), a counselor in Virginia, in reflecting on the Virginia Tech massacre, discussed how religion and spirituality helped her cope and increased her wellness. Her faith

functioned in such a way as to contribute “to a sense of personal agency” (p. 243). In a subsequent article, Moore-Thomas and Day-Vines (2008) also discussed how important religion and spirituality is in the African American culture and how counselors need to address this area in counseling. Using a case study, the authors showed how counselors could work for the benefit of their clients by raising clients’ awareness of religion and spirituality in their lives and help more fully integrate all areas of their lives, including religious and spiritual aspects. Finally, Villalba and Redmond (2008) discussed how the importance of understanding culture, including religion, led them to work with their counseling students using the movie *Crash* to facilitate discussion and reflection on multicultural aspects of counseling including religion and spirituality. The area of religion and spirituality has had its proponents in the counseling field from the beginning of the field to the current day.

Although some psychologists and counselors have had positive views of religion and spirituality and even sought to bring religion and spirituality into psychological contexts, not all mental health professionals share such sentiments. Freud, traditionally considered the founder of the field, had a very negative view of religion and spirituality. He saw religion and spirituality as a crutch, something “infantile” and “foreign to reality” (Freud, 1961, p. 21) and is a form of wish fulfillment. He even went so far as to describe religion and spirituality in terms of pathology (Freud, 1961, 1963). Freud is not the only mental health professional to have voiced an extreme aversion to religion and spirituality. Albert Ellis, creator of the Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy theory of counseling, was an avowed atheist who found no use personally for religion and spirituality, and virtually none in counseling. His opinion, like Freud’s, was that religious or spiritual belief was

pathological. Religion was irrational belief, and a form of “neurosis” (Ellis, 1980, 1985). However, it should be noted that late in life Ellis’ opinion did seem to waver somewhat when he admitted some usefulness of religion and spirituality for some clients in cases where nothing else showed any positive effect (Nielsen, Johnson, & Ellis, 2001; Ellis, 2004). Although some scholars have shown open hostility to religion and spirituality, the study of the psychology of religion is, nevertheless, a burgeoning area of research. Starting in the latter half of the 20th century, researchers have sought to examine, conceptualize, and measure religious belief.

Religiosity and Dogmatism

Many other researchers in the latter half of the 20th century examined religiosity and its link to dogmatism. For instance, DiGiuseppe (1971) used Rokeach’s (1960) Dogmatism Scale and reported a Spearman rho of $.89$ $p < .01$ showing that the more important religion is to a person, the higher the Dogmatism Scale score. Furthermore, Seaman, Michel, and Dillehay (1971) used Troidahl and Powell’s (1965) Dogmatism scale. They surveyed college students at Texas Christian University and reported a $.42$ gamma correlation, $p < .001$ between religiosity and dogmatism. Hunter and Trusty (1998) examined the relationships among dogmatism, family ideology, and religiosity in master’s counseling students using Rokeach’s Dogmatism scale. In analyzing their results, the authors suggested that though they did not see as strong a correlation between dogmatism and religiosity as previous researchers, this could have been due to a lack of sensitivity in the instruments they used. Wagner (2006) studied religiosity, dogmatism, and tolerance of violence using Altemeyer’s (1992) DOG Scale. She concluded that there was a moderate and positive statistically significant relationship between dogmatism and

religiosity with an r of .55, $p < .01$. Also, in a meta-analysis of authoritarianism and related concepts, Eckhardt (1991) suggested that the same pattern of beliefs and attitudes in dogmatism was also common in religiosity. Finally, Moore and Leach (2016) studied dogmatism and mental health. They suggested that existential dogmatism and religiosity have positive relationships with mental health.

Measures of Dogmatism

An important and foundational researcher in the area of religiosity was Gordon Allport. In the 1950's he published his Religious Orientation Scale (Allport, 1950), one of the most widely used assessments in the area of the psychology of religion (Allport & Ross, 1967). In this measure, Allport sought to determine a person's religiosity as either extrinsic or intrinsic. Extrinsic religiosity is religious belief that is held for utilitarian purposes. People that have a high extrinsic religiosity holds these beliefs in order to get something out of them, and not because it is deeply personal for them. An intrinsic religiosity, conversely, is religious belief that is held as a deeply personal and internalized system of beliefs.

In 1960, Rokeach published his dogmatism scale (D-Scale). He sought to differentiate between people with open minds and closed minds. The scale consists of 40 Likert questions, and a low score on his scale indicated that a person was open, or non-dogmatic. A high score on the scale indicated dogmatism and a closed mind. According to Rokeach, he developed the scale to also assess authoritarianism and intolerance. As evidence of this, Rokeach and Kerlinger (1966) observed a correlation of .70 between the D-Scale and the California F scale that also measured authoritarianism. Despite Rokeach's foundational work in the field, his scale has been criticized. According to

Altemeyer (2002), the validity of Rokeach's scale has been called into question since it was published. Also, Parrott and Brown (1972) suggested that the test was biased toward conservatism.

Altemeyer and Hunsberger introduced another more recent assessment in 1992. They developed a twenty question Religious Fundamentalism Scale that they suggest is applicable to many different religions (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). It contains items such as, "anyone who is honestly and truly seeking the truth will end up believing what I believe," "there are so many things we have not discovered yet, nobody should be absolutely certain his beliefs are right," and "flexibility is a real virtue in thinking, since you may well be wrong." In the associated study, they surveyed a sample of predominantly Christians and Jews. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the applicability to other religions without further research, although the questions themselves appear neutral and not focused on Jewish or Christian thought. In their study, they also suggested a connection between the Religious Fundamentalism Scale and the Right Wing Authoritarianism scale. In 2004, Altemeyer and Hunsberger revised their Religious Fundamentalism Scale. The newly revised scale consists of 12 questions. Although it is significantly shorter, the new scale has very similar psychometrics. Again, it is highly correlated with the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (.79), and also is highly correlated to dogmatism (.75).

Finally, Altemeyer (2002) introduced a 20-item DOG Scale to measure dogmatism. He defined dogmatism as "relatively unchangeable, unjustified certainty" (p. 713). This scale was created in an effort to help identify dogmatism using a measure that was valid and reliable. Although Rokeach's earlier D scale (1960) had been used in the

literature, it has been plagued with questions about its validity (Altemeyer, 2002).

Example items in the DOG Scale include protrait items such as “The things I believe in are so completely true, I could never doubt them,” and contrait items such as “Flexibility is a real virtue in thinking, because you may well be wrong” (Altemeyer, p. 713).

Altemeyer revealed statistically significant correlations between his DOG scale and right wing authoritarianism, zealotry, and religious belief. Altemeyer determined that the assessment was internally consistent and reliable. I will discuss Altemeyer’s scale more at length in Chapter III.

In this section I examined the variable of religiosity as it pertains to this study. First, various viewpoints from different psychologists and counselors about religion and spirituality were discussed. Some such as Adler and Jung held positive views of religion and spirituality. Others such as Freud and Ellis had staunchly negative views of religion and spirituality. Finally, different assessments of religiosity were examined. Allport’s seminal work on extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity was mentioned. This was followed by a couple more recent assessments created by Altemeyer and Hunsberger, and by Altemeyer alone. These assessments looked at religious fundamentalism and dogmatism.

Locus of Control

The second main variable in this study is locus of control. This concept has a fairly long and well-researched history in the counseling field.

Construct of Locus of Control

According to Strom and Bernard (1982), locus of control refers to how people view the “forces that shape their lives and destinies” (p. 352). People with an internal locus of control view themselves as having power over their situation. People with an

external locus of control see themselves as powerless and being acted upon, rather than acting on the environment. Strom and Bernard suggested that people with an internal locus of control are optimistic and more likely to attempt goals, whereas people with an external locus of control often believe they have no power and do not work toward goals, seeing it as a futile endeavor. The idea of locus of control originated with Rotter's (1966) work. He studied reinforcements and how they can affect behavior. Those with an external locus of control tend to believe that reinforcements, or things that happen in their lives, are due to fate or chance, rather than their actions. Those with an internal locus of control tend to believe that reinforcements, or things that happen in their lives, are due to actions they take. Later, Rotter, Chance, and Phares (1972) suggested that the theory of locus of control is defined as how much "a person perceives life's dealings as dependent on his or her own behavior or independent of it" (p. 261). Since the concept was first developed, there have been many studies exploring various aspects of locus of control.

Research on Locus of Control

There are numerous studies examining locus of control and how it affects personality. One early study by Seeman and Evans (1962) looked at tuberculosis patients in a hospital. Examining their locus of control and their knowledge base, the researchers reported that patients with an internal locus of control tended to know more about their condition and treatment than did patients with an external locus of control. Seeman (1963) later did further research on locus of control and observed that people with internal locus of control tended to try to get more control over their lives than those with an external locus of control. This is consistent with his earlier findings in the hospital study. Davis and Phares (1967) also conducted a study on locus of control and

determined that those with an internal locus of control asked for information more than those with an external locus of control. This is consistent with previous research and the idea that people with an internal locus of control act to try and control or have power in their world. They see themselves as agents, with an ability to alter their environment.

Another area of study in locus of control is that of performance. Phares (1965) noticed that those that were given power over their actions and consequences performed better and learned more than those that were given consequences that seemed to be left up to chance. Also, Phares (1976) observed that those with an internal locus of control were more likely to take an action to fix their weaknesses when given the chance.

Evidence also points to locus of control affecting control over self as well as the environment. Straits and Sechrest (1963) reported that nonsmokers showed a significantly more internal locus of control than smokers. Subsequent studies by James, Woodruff, and Werener (1965) and Lichtenstein and Keutzer (1967) were mixed in their results. Werener's results agreed with Straits and Sechrest whereas Keutzer's study did not. More recently, Charles (2007) studied locus of control, triarchic intelligence, and self-efficacy in African American males. Triarchic intelligence contains practical, creative, and analytical pieces. She did not find a significant correlation between triarchic intelligence and locus of control. Kass-Shraibman (2008) examined the locus of control of accountants and their job satisfaction. She reported a small, but significant correlation between an internal locus of control and job satisfaction. Jorn (2000) noted that internal locus of control was positively correlated with a temporal perspective in a study of college freshmen. A temporal perspective is where one puts importance on past reflection and future anticipation. In other words, people with an internal locus of control tended to

be more reflective and forward thinking, while those with an external locus of control were not.

Numerous studies have indicated that locus of control can have a significant effect on how one responds to situations in life. Studies by Seeman and Evans (1962) and Davis and Phares (1967) suggested that people with an internal locus of control work to control their environment. Many times this is evidenced by those with internal locus of control either being more aware of their condition and events around them or by their willingness and eagerness to ask questions and gain as much information as possible in an attempt to understand, and thus exercise some level of control over, their environment. Phares (1965, 1976) also reported that those with an internal locus of control were more likely to perform better and to correct their mistakes if given an opportunity. A study by Straits and Sechrest (1963) noted that those with an internal locus of control are more likely to exhibit self-control than those with an external locus of control. In subsequent studies those findings were both confirmed and questioned. In 2010, Ghonsooly and Elahi surveyed 240 Iranian college students. They found a statistically significant positive relationship between the internal locus of control of the university students they sampled and those students' achievement in a General English course. Finally, Injeyan, Shuman, Shugar, Chitayat, Atenafu, and Kaiser (2011) studied compassion fatigue among 355 Canadian genetic counselors. They found that genetic counselors with an external locus of control and low optimism had the highest risk for developing compassion fatigue, which could lead to burnout.

Perceived Counselor Self-Efficacy

The third variable in this study is perceived counselor self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is another construct that has been much researched. Similarly to locus of control, self-efficacy and its corollary, counselor self-efficacy, have been studied extensively in the past few decades. Self-efficacy is the belief that a person is able to act in a certain way to attain their goals. The idea of counselor self-efficacy comes from self-efficacy. Self-efficacy was first conceptualized in social learning theory by Albert Bandura (1977; Rushlau, 1998) and later in Bandura's (1986a) social cognitive theory. Therefore, before discussing counselor self-efficacy, I address the more general understanding of self-efficacy.

In social learning theory, Bandura (1977) posited that environmental, behavioral, and cognitive factors are entwined together, each operating on the other. As behavior affects the environment, the environment affects behavior. Likewise, as cognitive factors affect behavior, behavior affects cognitions, and as cognitions affect the environment, the environment affects cognitions. Related to this interplay between the various factors in a person's life is the idea of self-regulation. Self-regulation develops when a person sees different actions he or she could take and makes a decision on what to do based on his or her judgment as to the ability to complete the action and attain the desired result. Self-regulation is directly tied to self-efficacy. One's judgment of one's own ability to act in the world and accomplish tasks helps regulate how a person acts and what goals he or she strives toward. As described by Bandura, Adams, Hardy, and Howells (1980), self-efficacy was developed to help explain behavior when a person is faced with various options or tasks. As Bandura's understanding of social learning evolved, he began to

move to a social cognitive theory (1986a). This theory expanded on social learning theory to include all of human behavior, not just learning, and suggests that humans have agency, or some control over their lives (Bandura, 1989). Also, in social cognitive theory, Bandura introduced the triadic model of reciprocal causation. In this model, personal, behavioral, and environmental factors all interact on each other, suggesting that people can create their environments, and are not just molded by them (Bandura 1986b, 2001).

In discussing self-efficacy, Bandura (1997) noted that the idea was more than just the ability to self-regulate and control one's own actions. He indicated that it included "thought processes, motivation, and affective and physiological states" (p. 36). Self-efficacy can have a significant impact on a person's ability to successfully complete a task. People with high self-efficacy are more likely to succeed and view tasks as challenges to overcome, rather than barriers. A person with similar skills and abilities but with lower self-efficacy is more likely to avoid a task or challenge, rather than meet it. Bandura (1977, 1986a, 1986b) postulated that self-efficacy develops from four different sources. First, people can gain self-efficacy from accomplishments. As people meet tasks and achieve, they gain confidence in themselves and their abilities and raise their self-efficacy. Second, one can gain self-efficacy from vicarious experience. That means that a person can learn by watching others succeed in difficult tasks. As a person sees another overcome a challenge, he or she can gain confidence in his or her own personal ability to achieve and overcome the task or challenge. Third, one can gain self-efficacy through verbal encouragement. Something as simple as appropriate feedback can stimulate self-efficacy in people and help them see their own potential and strive to meet tasks or challenges they had previously avoided. Finally, Bandura suggested that people could

gain self-efficacy through emotional arousal. He theorized that emotions in stressful situations could lead to fear and anxiety and negatively affect their self-efficacy. By being able to accurately assess the emotions likely to arise from a task or situation, one could improve self-efficacy and the ability to handle difficult situations.

Counselor self-efficacy is a specific, discipline related form of self-efficacy.

Counselor self-efficacy is the belief that one has the ability to do counseling in a way that helps clients. Researchers have indicated that counseling self-efficacy is related to training and experience (Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996; Na, 2013). This is consistent with Bandura's (1977) idea of a person gaining self-efficacy from experience. Bakar, Zakaria, and Mohamed (2011) also studied the counselor self-efficacy of 443 Malaysian counselors and determined that counselor self-efficacy in that population was statistically significantly correlated with experience as a counselor, $r = .195, p = .000$. Pasquariello (2013) sampled 58 psychology doctoral students on their counselor self-efficacy of physical activity counseling and she found that an introductory training course significantly raised their self-efficacy. Scoles (2011) surveyed 129 school counselors in Ohio to find if their counselor self-efficacy varied based on teaching experience. He reported that school counselors in his study had a statistically significantly higher counselor self-efficacy with teaching experience than those school counselors without teaching experience, $t(129)=2.30, p = .023$. In 2010, Crook studied counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy among school counselors and observed "a moderate to strong positive relationship between the two" (p. 62) $r = .596-.675, p < .01$. This is consistent with previous research conducted by Constantine (2001) and Sharpley and Ridgeway (1993) who developed studies examining the self-efficacy of

master's counseling students. Constantine examined counselor self-efficacy as well as multicultural counseling competence. She determined that counselor self-efficacy contributed to multicultural counseling competence and that multicultural counseling training and supervision also helped improve multicultural counseling competence.

Furthermore, Barbee, Scherer, and Combs (2003), Levitt (2001), and Tang et al. (2004) looked at what factors add to counselor self-efficacy. Barbee et al. detected that counselor self-efficacy had a significant positive correlation with service learning in pre-practicum students, and this might be due to the students gaining clinical experience with clients. Levitt conducted a study examining active listening in counselor training. She reported that beginning counselors who had active listening emphasized in their supervision and instruction developed better active listening skills with clients. This led to improvements in their reflection of feelings, challenging clients, and immediacy. This positive experience brought about an increase in the students' counselor self-efficacy. Also, Leach and Stoltenberg (1997) determined that regular supervision increases counselor self-efficacy and counselor anxiety has a negative effect on counselor self-efficacy. Harris (2007) observed that both beginning and advanced master's level rehabilitation counselors had high levels of counseling self-efficacy. She also suggested a link between both prior supervision and experience with counseling self-efficacy. Tang et al. noted that students with more coursework and clinical experience were more confident in their abilities. Their education and experience had both contributed to increased self-efficacy as Bandura suggested.

Additionally, Harper (2008) noticed a positive relationship between internal locus of control and high counseling self-efficacy and high tolerance for ambiguity and high

counseling self-efficacy. Also, she noticed a positive relationship between external locus of control and low counseling self-efficacy and low tolerance for ambiguity and low counseling self-efficacy. However, not all researchers have discovered significance in their studies on counselor self-efficacy. Curry (2007) examined the relationship between counselor self-efficacy and counselor wellness, but failed to find a significant link between the two. Przytula (2009) examined counseling self-efficacy and supervision in school counselors, but was unable to find a statistically significant correlation between counseling self-efficacy and supervision. In the course of Przytula's study he did find a statistically significant correlation between supervision and job satisfaction.

Self-efficacy is the belief that a person is able to act in a certain way to attain their goals. The concept is borne out of Bandura's social learning theory. Social learning theory states that environmental, behavioral, and cognitive factors are entwined together, each operating on the other. With this interplay comes the idea of self-regulation. A person has the ability to judge his or her abilities and the task at hand and hypothesize whether or not the desired outcome is attainable or not. A person with a high level of self-efficacy is more likely to attempt a task than a similarly skilled person with low self-efficacy. Bandura also reported four sources for self-efficacy. First, one can gain self-efficacy from accomplishing things. Second, one can gain self-efficacy from vicarious experience. Third, one can gain self-efficacy through verbal encouragement. Finally, Bandura suggested that people could gain self-efficacy through emotional arousal. Counselor self-efficacy, a corollary of self-efficacy, is the discipline-specific application of self-efficacy to the counseling field. It suggests that a counselor that has a high level of

counselor self-efficacy believes that he or she can conduct counseling tasks in such a way that clients are helped.

Choice of Counseling Theory

The last variable this study will look at is counseling theoretical orientation. Counseling theory is a vital, yet complex area of the field. Hundreds of theories exist, all espousing a different nuance on counseling technique and client conceptualization (Corsini & Wedding, 2013). A significant amount of research has appeared in the past decades examining theoretical orientation, its importance, and the process of theory acquisition. It is to this body of research that I will now turn.

The significance of theoretical orientation is suggested when examining studies on the effects of theoretical orientation on counseling. A number of studies have sought to show the effect that theoretical orientation has on how one works with clients. For instance, both Cohen and Oyster-Nelson (1981) and Gil-Adi and Newman (1984) determined that when practitioners held different theoretical orientations, they conceptualized and carried out therapy quite differently. Larsson, Kaldo and Broberg (2009) reported many differences from Swedish practitioners with several different theoretical orientations. Furthermore, Vasco and Dryden (1997) reported that theoretical orientation accounted for more of the variation of therapy technique than did the experience of the counselor, and that theoretical orientation often changes with experience. McClure, Livingston, Livingston, and Gage (2005) and Sammons and Gravitz (1990) also observed that theoretical orientation changed with experience in a survey of counselors and psychologists in Texas. Coleman (2004) attempted to create a measure for theory choice and noted that theoretical orientation “influences what

clinicians think and what they say” (p. 117). Also, Larsson, Kaldø, and Broberg (2009) noted that the various theoretical schools each “have evidence-based treatments to deliver” (p. 161).

In an article examining theoretical orientation studies, Watkins and Watts (1995) reported that between one and two-thirds of counselors identified themselves as being eclectic when it came to theoretical orientation. Also, it was determined that most counselors used a combination of cognitive, behavioral, humanistic and psychodynamic theories in their practice of counseling. Furthermore, they noticed that in the decade prior to their article, the prevalence of eclecticism among counselors had increased. These findings support what Norcross and Prochaska (1982; 1983; 1988; 1989; 1993), and later Norcross, Hedges, and Prochaska (2002) reported in their surveys of psychologists over the past few decades. McClure et al. (2005) also observed that counselors identified, increasingly, with an eclectic theoretical orientation when surveying licensed professional counselors and psychologists in Texas. Demir and Gazioglu (2012) surveyed Turkish counselors and reported that a majority of Turkish counseling students also preferred an eclectic theoretical orientation. Sun, Hoyt, and Zhao (2016) reported that most Chinese counselors identified themselves as integrative or eclectic. Anchin and Magnavita (2008) have also suggested that a unified theory of therapy will emerge. Sammons and Gravitz (1990) undertook a study of psychologists and suggested that there were three main theoretical orientations, psychoanalytic or psychodynamic, behavioral theories, and eclecticism. They further noted that theoretical orientations tended to shift in a person’s professional lifetime. They reported that forty percent of people in their study had changed their theoretical orientation, and 68% of those switched to eclecticism. Glidewell

and Livert (1992) undertook a study of psychologists in the U. S. Their findings suggested that psychologists are identifying, increasingly, with more than one theoretical orientation. Half of the respondents reported having three orientations, psychodynamic, cognitive, and eclectic.

Steiner (1978) studied psychologists and determined that the most influential factors determining theoretical orientation were the influence of a personal therapist, course work and reading selections, and the theoretical orientation of peers. Pulver (1993) suggested that there was some amount of attraction to a theoretical orientation based on a counselor's personality. The idea of personality affecting theoretical orientation was examined by Demir and Gazioglu (2012). They discovered that the theoretical orientation of Turkish students in their study was related to whether the students had a conservative or liberal thinking style. Hummel (2009) also examined personality and theoretical orientation. She determined that "personality was modestly related to belief in and identification with theoretical orientation" (p. 65) in the population she studied. Lovinger (1992) posited that theoretical orientation could grow out of the influence of a significant person in the counselor's life such as a therapist or supervisor. Theoretical orientation according to Lovinger could also come from a counselor's defensiveness. The counselor could choose the theory to avoid conflict in his or her personality. Lovinger also suggested that theoretical orientation could be borne out of a specific theory that works to help the counselor through an issue they are dealing with in their own life.

Theoretical orientation is a pivotal area of counseling for both the counselor and the client. Working from a theoretical base has been shown to help clients change although there seems to be a movement toward eclecticism and away from single

theoretical orientations among practitioners. As we can see, theoretical orientation is a rich and varied subject, with many avenues for further research. However, we now turn our attention to research that shares some of the variables with the currently proposed study.

Conjoint Research

In this section, I discuss recent studies that contain one or more of the variables that are to be examined in the current study. The participants, methods, and results will be addressed to give the reader an idea of how prior research on this topic has been conducted.

Pollock (2007) examined the relationship between counselor self-efficacy and students' perceptions of spirituality. Pollock believed that people who are more in touch with their spirituality were more confident. She hypothesized that counselors with a higher level of spirituality would also have a higher measure of counseling self-efficacy. She examined master's level counseling students from six CACREP-accredited universities, with four universities being secular and two religious. A total of 135 students were included in the sample. The variables were measured using the Human Spirituality Scale (Wheat, Cashwell, Young, Cashwell, & Belaire, 2001) and the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Melchert et al., 1996). Using a regression statistical analysis, she reported statistical significance with an R^2 of .113, which is a small effect size and shows that between 11% and 13% of the variance of counseling self-efficacy was accounted for by spirituality level. She also determined that counseling self-efficacy and perceived spirituality had a statistically significant positive correlation of $r = .337$ $p < .05$. Also, she determined there was a statistically significant relationship between

counseling self-efficacy and the demographic variables of age, gender, practicum or internship status, and number of hours completed. This resulted in a large effect size with an R^2 of .245. As a result, Pollock argued for more material on spirituality being presented in master's programs. As has been shown in the review of the literature, dealing with religious issues in counseling has had a long and somewhat controversial past. One element that is really interesting in her study is the use of both secular and faith-based universities. Further research might look to see if there are any differences in survey results between students in secular and faith-based universities. Her study, as well as her argument for more research and more material on spirituality introduced in master's programs, suggests that this could be an important study that leads to further research and inclusiveness when the topic of religion/spirituality is addressed in counseling programs and could further impact counseling as the area of religion/spirituality in clients and practitioners is further integrated into both study and the practice.

Freeman (2003) and Freeman et al. (2007) studied personality traits and how they related to theoretical orientation in beginning counseling students. Freeman used the Self Directed Search and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to examine personality, and a survey to gather theoretical orientation data. A total of 159 graduate students from the University of Central Florida and Rollins College were included in the study. A vast majority, 94.7%, were female, and white, 75%, and the average age was 30.19. The largest percentage of the sample, 39.4 %, responded that they held a humanistic orientation. Using discriminant function analysis, Freeman observed no statistically significant relationship between personality traits as measured by the SDS and MBTI and

theoretical orientation. However, Freeman noted that these results were at odds with previous studies by Hawkins (1988), Larson (1980), and Sundland (1977). This disagreement with established research suggests that, although his study appeared to be well organized and thought out, it had many inherent weaknesses. As noted in his discussion, Freeman's study had several limitations. First of all, he chose to use students earlier in their program than I plan to use. The variability he faced due to teaching style of the professor, as well as their own theoretical leanings, would not be as prevalent in my study because students will have had a longer time to think about theories and evaluate which one they most agree with prior to my study. Also, I will be using different instruments, which could increase the validity and usefulness of my study. Finally, I will work to make sure students are tested at roughly the same time, as Freeman noted he had some students that put the internal validity at risk by delaying the completion of their instruments.

Matthews (2004) examined spirituality and self-efficacy in counseling and social work students. She used the Spirituality Awareness survey, Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Psychomatrix Spirituality Inventory to look at the spirituality and self-efficacy of the sample. An initial pilot test of the study was run with 16 students, with the full study having a total sample size of 423, 252 from social work programs and 171 from counseling programs. Matthews observed a positive correlation between the Counselor Self Efficacy Scale and each element of the Psychomatrix Spirituality Inventory except in the case of Childhood Spirituality. Furthermore, the author identified a statistically significant relationship of .267 between CSES scores and PSI Total Factor scores. The effect size was medium ($\eta^2 = .123$). This indicates that religion/spirituality could affect

Counselor Self-Efficacy. The chief limitation of this study that I see is that the author used a web survey at a time when the internet was not as entrenched in society as it is today. This could preclude people without computer and internet access that is readily available from participating, thus skewing the data. Furthermore, with a web survey there is a question of the identity of the person taking the assessment. My study should not be as susceptible to this limitation with the students having more easy access to email and the internet now. However, Matthews' study does add to the literature surrounding spirituality and its interactions with other elements of personality much like my study will. No study is perfect, and despite some inherent weaknesses in the method, her study contributes to the literature and furthers the discussion of religion/spirituality in daily and professional life.

Adegbola (2007, 2011) examined the relationships among spirituality, self-efficacy, and quality of life in adults with sickle cell disease. She used the Sickle Cell Self-efficacy Scale (SCES) to measure self-efficacy, the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General (FACT-G) to measure quality of life, and the Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy-Spirituality (FACIT-Sp) to measure spirituality. Adegbola hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between the various factors. A total of 90 participants responded to either mailings or an online *Survey Monkey*. Using Pearson r analysis, she noted a statistically significant relationship between spirituality and quality of life, $r(88) = .68, p < .05$, meaning that as spirituality increases, so does quality of life in patients with sickle cell disease. Adegbola also reported a statistically significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and quality of life, $r(88) = .67, p < .05$. Furthermore, she reported a positive statistically significant

correlation between self-efficacy and spirituality, $r(88) = .63, p < .05$. In patients with sickle cell disease, as spirituality rose, so did self-efficacy. Finally, she examined whether spirituality and self-efficacy contributed to quality of life in her population of people with sickle cell disease. She observed an adjusted R^2 of .55, indicating that more than half of the variance in quality of life was accounted for by spirituality and self-efficacy. She did not report effect sizes. For the current study, the positive correlation of self-efficacy and spirituality is most relevant and seems to match previous research. Furthermore, her study, in this author's opinion, is very important. She was able to find a relationship between spirituality, self-efficacy, and well-being. While many previous researchers have been skeptical of the utility of spirituality in daily living, linking it to dogmatism and having a closed mind, this study shows that it can aid people in living a more rich and full life, one of the aims of counseling. Finally, it suggests and adds to the literature about the importance of self-efficacy and the idea of being able to affect one's environment and live a quality life, even while sick.

In this section, recent studies were examined. First, Pollock (2007) discovered significance in the relationship between counselor self-efficacy and spirituality. Freeman (2003) determined that there was no significance in the relationship between personality and theoretical orientation, but noted that this result was counter to several previous studies on the topic. Matthews (2004, in her study of counseling and social work students, observed a correlation between spirituality and counselor self-efficacy. Adegbola (2007) identified a positive correlation between self-efficacy and spirituality. Much of the current research revolves around spirituality and self-efficacy. Almost

universally, there appears to be a positive, statistically significant relationship between the two. As a person's measure of spirituality goes up, so does their self-efficacy.

Summary

In this chapter I examined the literature surrounding the different variables relevant to this study. First, religiosity was discussed. A wide variety of opinion among practitioners was shown to exist in the literature. Some such as Adler and Jung were accepting of religion and spirituality in counseling. Others such as Freud and Ellis were staunchly against religion and spirituality in counseling. Then a brief overview of the area of the psychology of religion was mentioned. Starting with Allport in 1950, and continuing to the present, different researchers in the field were discussed and their findings presented. Finally, the section ended with an examination of different assessments in the area of religiosity. The next section discussed the concept of locus of control. Starting with Rotter's original research in the area in 1966, different studies were presented to show both what internal and external loci of control are and how they affect the way a person deals with their environment. The third section examined perceived counselor self-efficacy. A brief background explanation of social cognitive theory, as conceptualized by Bandura, was given. From there the discussion moved to a treatment of self-efficacy as a general concept. Four causes of increased self-efficacy were discussed. Among these were accomplishment, vicarious learning, verbal encouragement, and emotional arousal. The section then ended with an examination of counselor self-efficacy. Various studies were presented to show how counselors gained counselor self-efficacy. The fourth section of the literature review concerned theoretical orientation. Several studies were introduced that showed the significance of a counselor's theoretical

orientation, trends in how counselors identify their theoretical orientations, and factors that lead to the acquisition of a theoretical orientation. Finally, the literature review ended with an examination of four recent studies that shared one or more variables in common with the proposed study. The findings were presented and can help inform and guide the researcher in what to look for or expect in the results from the current study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of my study was to examine relationships between dogmatism, locus of control, perceived counselor self-efficacy, and counselor selected theoretical orientation. Some of these elements have previously been examined together (Pollock, 2007; Rehn, 1985; Freeman, 2003; Matthews, 2004; Adegbola, 2007, 2011). This study filled the gap found in the literature by examining these elements in relation to master's level practicum students. Previous research suggests a link between personality and theoretical orientation (Erickson, 1993; Fredrickson, 1993), and my study extended that research by examining the specific variables that have shown linkages in several previous studies.

In examining the variables dogmatism, locus of control, perceived counselor self-efficacy and their effects on theoretical orientation in master's level practicum students, the following research questions were addressed:

1. Are the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised valid instruments for use with master's level practicum students?
2. What is the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy?
3. To what degree does dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students?

This chapter will discuss the methodology of the proposed study. First, I will discuss the various instruments I used with the participants to generate the data needed for the study. Next, I will discuss the participants recruited for this study. Then I will discuss the data collection method used for the study. Following the data collection discussion, I will discuss how I analyzed the data to get the results of the study. Finally, I will conclude this chapter with a brief summary of the contents of the chapter.

Instrumentation

In this study, four variables were examined. In order to answer my research questions, I used standardized instruments that measure dogmatism, locus of control, perceived counselor self-efficacy, and theoretical orientation. In this section I will discuss the instruments I used in this study.

DOG Scale

One of the most widely used measures of dogmatism has been Rokeach's (1960) D scale. However, there has not been much evidence to support its validity (Altemeyer, 1996). Therefore, Altemeyer (2002) developed the 20-item DOG Scale to measure dogmatism. He defined dogmatism as "relatively unchangeable, unjustified certainty" (p. 713) and his definition builds on Rokeach's (1956) earlier definition. Rokeach defined dogmatism as a "relatively closed systems of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which in turn, provides a framework for intolerance and qualified tolerance for others" (p. 195). Of the 20 questions on the instrument, ten are protrait, focusing on dogmatic beliefs and ten are contrait, focusing on accommodating beliefs, with two introductory questions that are not scored. Protrait items include "The things I believe in are so completely true, I could

never doubt them,” that are scored regularly and contrait items include questions like “Flexibility is a real virtue in thinking, because you may well be wrong” (p. 713) and are reverse-scored. People taking the instrument can agree or disagree with the items on a 5-point Likert scale (“Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Neither Agree or Disagree,” “Disagree,” “Strongly Disagree”). After the responses are scored from one to five, they are added up to produce the total Dogmatism score. Using students and parents in Manitoba as participants, Altemeyer reported the DOG scale had a .30 inter-item correlation average, as opposed to a .10 inter-item correlation average for the D scale. This correlation produces a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .90 and is consistent with the .90 to .93 Cronbach’s alpha that Crowson, DeBacker, and Davis (2008) reported in their study of 415 undergraduate and graduate students from two universities in the southwestern United States. Altemeyer saw good criterion validity his DOG scale and the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (.50-.65), zealotry (.43-.52), and Religious Fundamentalism Scale (.60). Furthermore, in a series of studies, Altemeyer established that the DOG scale had empirical validity by first asking a sample of students and parents their level of zeal about “their most important outlook on life.” He then noted a correlation between the summed zealot scores and the DOG scale of .43-.52. Additionally he discovered empirical and predictive validity when he used the DOG scale in a study of students who were hostile toward homosexuals. Altemeyer observed that students who were hostile toward homosexuals and highly dogmatic on the DOG Scale did not change their views after hearing a presentation about the biological causes of sexual orientation. Those students hostile toward homosexuality that had scored lower on the DOG Scale adjusted their beliefs after the presentation. Altemeyer suggested that those who scored high on the

DOG Scale would hold to attitudes that scientific evidence suggests are unsupportable. He asked students in the study if they would change their beliefs after a hypothetical discovery was made that suggested Jesus was based on Greek myths. Those that said that Jesus was the son of God and had a high DOG Scale score said that the discovery would not affect their beliefs. Those with a lower DOG Scale score reported that the discovery would cause them to change their beliefs (Altemeyer, 1996). Further, Crowson, DeBacker, and Davis (2008) demonstrated evidence of factorial validity, discriminant validity, convergent validity, and criterion validity for the DOG Scale. They concluded that the DOG Scale, “functions as a unidimensional and internally consistent measure within American college student and community adult samples” (pp. 22-23).

Factorial Validity of the DOG Scale. Crowson, DeBacker, and Davis (2008) tested the DOG scale on multiple fronts. One of the aspects of the scale that they tested was the factorial validity. Factorial validity is the validity of a test that is determined by its correlation with a factor that is determined by factor analysis. They tested the unidimensionality of the scale using two confirmatory factor analysis models. One model loaded all items on the scale onto a single latent factor. The second model loaded positively worded items onto one factor, and negatively worded items onto another factor. The factors were then allowed to correlate. Using these confirmatory factor analysis models, the researchers suggested that a 2 factor, nested, model which separated positively and negatively worded questions fit better than a one-factor model. However, both models met the criteria for Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (.07) and Comparative Fit Index (.94). In addition, the two-factor model met the criteria for the Root Mean Square Error of approximation (.08). Furthermore, although there is some

evidence to suggest that the two-factor model is a better fit than the one-factor, the authors noted that the positively worded and negatively worded halves correlated well at .77 and argued that the two halves are likely measuring the same thing (Crowson, Debacker, & Davis, 2008; Crowson, 2009).

Discriminant Validity of the DOG Scale. Discriminant validity measures whether concepts that are supposed to be different are actually different. Crowson, Debacker, and Davis (2008) looked at the relationship between dogmatism and one's interest in cognitive activity as measured on the Need for Cognition Scale (Cacioppo, Petty, & Kao, 1984), $r(415) = -.24, p < .01$. They also examined the relationship between dogmatism and greater need to evaluate $r(244) = .26, p < .01$. Finally, they measured the relationship between dogmatism and less rational engagement $r(244) = -.30, p < .01$. In a subsequent study, Crowson (2009) reported significant correlations between the DOG Scale and the Need for Recognition Scale, $r(51) = -.442, p = .001$, Personal Needs for Structure Scale, $r(49) = .255, p = .034$ (one-tailed), and the Need to Evaluate Scale, $r(49) = .349, p = .012$. Crowson, Debacker, and Davis concluded that the DOG scale is valid and suggested that it was a good instrument in the continued research on dogmatism.

Convergent Validity of the DOG Scale. Convergent validity looks at the degree to which two measures of constructs that should be related are related. Crowson, Debacker, and Davis (2008) compared scores on the DOG Scale with scores on the 20-item dogmatism scale and a belief in certain knowledge subscale put forth by Troidahl and Powell (1965). There was a statistically significant correlation between the DOG Scale and Troidahl and Powell's dogmatism scale, $r(254) = .45, p < .01$, as well as the belief in certain knowledge subscale, $r(254) = .63, p < .01$. The next year, Crowson (2009) was

able to replicate the findings between the DOG scale and the belief in certain knowledge subscale, $r(85) = .566$, $p < .001$, though he only observed a moderate correlation between the DOG scale and Troidahl and Powell's scale, $r(83) = .197$, $p = .035$.

Criterion Validity of the DOG Scale. Crowson, Debacker, and Davis (2008) set out to determine criterion validity for the DOG scale in a number of ways. They were able to correlate the DOG scale with ideological polarization, $r(253) = .15$, $p < .05$, and self-rated political conservatism, $r(253) = .37$, $p < .01$ using a Self-Related Political Conservatism and Ideological Polarization scale, and right wing authoritarianism, $r(253) = .64$, $p < .01$, using a shortened form of the Right Wing Authoritarianism scale. This is consistent with the earlier criterion validity Altemeyer (2002) had seen when he noted that the DOG scale correlated over .5 with right wing authoritarianism, almost .60 with Fundamentalism, and .45 with Zealot measures.

Internal Control Index

Locus of control, the second variable examined, was assessed using the Internal Control Index (ICI) instrument. Developed by Duttweiler (1984), the ICI improves on Rotter's I-E scale. It consists of 28 Likert scale questions asking if the participant would behave in a certain way rarely, occasionally, sometimes, frequently or usually. Individual items are scored from 1 = rarely to 5 = usually. All individual item scores are added up and total scores range from 28 to 140, with higher scores indicating a higher internal locus of control. It has good internal reliability and a Cronbach's alpha of .85 according to Duttweiler (1984) and replicated by Meyers and Wong (1988). Furthermore, Jacobs (1993) determined the Internal Control Index to have an internal consistency alpha coefficient of .82. Also, Maltby and Cope (1996), noted a reliability alpha of .86 to .87 in

a sample of adults from Northern Ireland and England. In their study of locus of control scales, Furnham and Steele (1993) established that the Internal Control Index had one of the highest reliability measures, as well as concurrent validity. Additionally, Meyers and Wong (1988) compared the Internal Control Index to Rotter's 1966 scale and suggested that it had better internal consistency, homogeneity, and correlates, and said that it offered "a superior measure of locus of control compared to Rotter's 1966 I-E scale (p. 760). While Duttweiler (1984) said that the index had two factors, factor analysis by Meyers and Wong (1988) produced 3 factors. They saw factors of "autonomy," 'leadership,' and 'steadfastness/decisiveness" (p. 755). Finally, Meyers and Wong (1988) calculated Pearson *rs* showing correlations of .44 $p < .05$ with Rotter's I-E Scale, .41 $p < .05$ with Beck's Depression Scale, .38 $p < .05$ with Spielberger et al.'s State Anxiety, .52 $p < .05$ with Spielberger et al.'s Trait Anxiety, and .56 $p < .05$ with Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory. Based on these statistics, Meyers and Wong (1988) stated that the Internal Control Index is a valid measure of locus of control.

Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale

Counselor self-efficacy was the third variable examined. This variable was measured using the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSES). This scale, developed by Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, and Kolocek (1996), consists of 20 questions scored on a five point Likert scale with 10 questions being reverse scored. Total scores range from 20 to 100. It explores the participant's confidence in gaining skills to do counseling in a variety of settings. The scale was developed using graduate counseling psychology students and licensed psychologists. It has strong internal consistency with a Cronbach alpha of .93 and a test-retest reliability score of .85. The Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale also has

convergent validity, with Friedlander, Keller, Peca-Baker, and Olk (1986) finding a .83 correlation with another self-efficacy inventory in a sample of graduate student counselors. Multiple researchers also suggested that it was correlated with experience (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Melchert et al, 1996). Furthermore, Melchert et al (1996) established that the scale correlated highly with the Self-Efficacy Inventory, ($r = .83$). Also the scale was reported to have interrater content validity according to three expert licensed psychologists who supervised counseling students. The experts were unanimous in their agreement on 19 of the 20 items. Recently, the scale has been used in various studies and programs. For instance, the University of Central Florida uses the CSES in its counseling program as one measure to evaluate counseling students. Also, Pollock (2007) revealed a statistically significant correlation between perceived spirituality and counselor self-efficacy in her study that utilized the CSES to measure counselor self-efficacy in her sample of master's level counseling students at both secular and Catholic universities. Curry (2007) used the CSES to determine if there was a correlation between counselor self-efficacy and counselor wellness, but could not find a statistically significant correlation in her sample of master's level counseling students in mental health and school counseling tracks at a university in the southeastern United States.

Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised

The last variable measured was the theoretical orientation of master's practicum students. This was measured using the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised. Developed by Worthington and Dillon (2003), the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised consists of 18 items that cover six different theoretical schools: psychoanalytic/psychodynamic, humanistic/existential, cognitive-behavioral, family

systems, multicultural, and feminist. Three items address how closely the participant identifies with each of the theoretical branches. The questions are measured on a 10-point Likert scale (1 is not at all/never and ten is completely/always). Each of the six subscales are scored from zero to 30 to determine how much the respondent adheres to each of the six theoretical schools.

In their validation study, Worthington and Dillon (2003) reported that the subscales had high internal consistency reliability. Their sample included 357 adults in the United States from the helping professions, including counseling, social work, and psychology. Scores were .96 for Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic, .95 for Cognitive-Behavioral, .95 for Humanistic/Existential, .95 for Family Systems, .95 for Feminist, and .94 for Multicultural. They also determined criterion validity in their analysis by using a discriminant function analysis. Their discriminant functions indicated statistical significance, with a Wilks' lambda = .300, $\chi^2(12, N = 300) = 354.29, p < .001$ for the first function and Wilks' lambda = .915, $\chi^2(5, N = 300) = 26.15, p < .001$ for the second discriminant factor.

In another study of 94 adults working in the United States in counseling psychology, or social work, Worthington and Dillon established construct validity for the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised when correlating it with the Etiology Attribution Scale, Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised, and the Hoffman Gender Scale. Specifically, they observed a positive correlation between the Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic subscale and developmental factors etiology attributions, .25, and a negative correlation with cognitive factors etiology attributions, -.33. Also, they detected that the Humanistic/Existential subscale correlated positively with gender

self-acceptance among women, .31, and correlated negatively with cognitive factors etiology attributions, -.27. The Cognitive-Behavioral subscale showed a positive correlation of .49 with cognitive factors and .26 with somatic factors and a negative correlation of -.23 with sociocultural factors and -.30 with developmental factors. The Feminist subscale had a positive correlation of .37 with sociocultural factors and .43 with gender self-definition among women and a negative correlation of -.33 with cognitive factors, -.25 with biophysical factors, and -.27 with developmental factors. The Multicultural subscale was positively correlated with sociocultural factors, .27, and negatively correlated with interpersonal factors, -.22. Additionally, the Multicultural subscale was positively correlated with the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-revised, .38. Additionally, in two studies, Worthington and Dillon (2003) observed the subscales to have high internal consistency, consistent with previous research.

The scale has been used in at least one recent dissertation examining theoretical orientation (Ogunfowora, 2006). She used it to examine the relationship between personality and theoretical orientation. In her sample of 493 adults either practicing or training in psychotherapy in North America, she detected a weak relationship between personality and theoretical orientation because of a high level of eclecticism. Many of the subjects in her study showed a preference for multiple theories. Barrio Minton and Myers (2008) also used the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised in a study of 203 professional and student counselors on Developmental Counseling and Therapy. They discovered that counselors who had a higher cognitive/emotional style preference “reported stronger corresponding intervention styles and theoretical orientations than those with lower CES preferences” (p. 339). In other words, the stronger the

cognitive/emotional preference a subject had, the stronger their intervention style and theoretical orientation preferences were.

Participants

Convenience sampling was used to select the participants for this study.

Purposeful sampling, according to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), is “selecting a sample based on the researcher’s experience or knowledge” (p. 175). Furthermore, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) suggested that purposive sampling includes specific participants because “they are believed to facilitate the expansion of the developing theory” (p. 65). In this case, the participants of the proposed study were practicum-level master’s students in counseling programs at four universities in the state of Texas. Practicum-level master’s students are students typically in the last half of their master’s program. They have already taken many of the foundational classes in the program and are working with clients for the first time. Practicum-level master’s students were chosen because at that point in their education they are more likely to have chosen a guiding counseling theory and will have had an opportunity to begin using it in their work with clients. Prior to practicum, master’s students are less likely to have selected a guiding theoretical orientation for their work with clients. Also, as master’s students, they were more easily contacted for use in the study. I contacted the Master’s program directors at four CACREP programs at universities across the state from the list of currently CACREP accredited programs and obtained permission to contact practicum students at the various campuses. CACREP accreditation helped ensure that all programs had similar standards in regard to teaching objectives in their counseling theory classes. Once identified as practicum-level master’s students at the universities involved in my study, the students

were presented with the purpose of my study and the instruments and given an option to participate. I did this by sending them an email describing my study with a link to the SurveyMonkey site where the assessments were hosted so that they could take them.

Another factor to consider when dealing with participants is the needed sample size for the given statistical measures. I used a Pillai V when running the MANOVAs during data analysis. According to the GPower statistical analysis tool, I needed approximately 40 participants for my study. This was the number needed to run a MANOVA at a p value of .05 with a medium effect size. Current literature using some of the same instruments indicated a small to medium effect size (Adegbola, 2007, 2011; Matthews, 2004; Pollock, 2007). I emailed students from four universities to make sure I had more than the needed number of valid participants in the study. Web based surveying is becoming an increasingly common, and low-cost, way to gather information. Response rates reported in the literature seemed to vary significantly, from 10-25% (Sauermann, & Roach, 2012), to 34-41% (Sid Nair, 2013).

The population from which the sample used in this study was taken was CACREP accredited master's programs in Texas. Currently, CACREP accredits 13 master's programs in the state of Texas. The sample included practicum-level master's students from four of these programs. After distributing my study to the four universities, I obtained responses from 101 students. Of those students, 59 completed the study. This produced a response rate of 58% ($n = 59$). Out of the 59 completed surveys, one participant declined to participate, one participant identified a theoretical orientation of Feminist, one participant identified a theoretical orientation of Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic, one participant indicated that he or she had not started

practicum yet and was thus ineligible, and 10 participants identified two primary theoretical orientations. This left a useable response rate of 44.6% ($n = 45$).

The sample obtained was mostly female, 89% ($n = 40$), with 11% ($n = 5$) male (see Table 1). Concerning ethnicity, the sample was 60% White ($n = 27$), 31% Hispanic ($n = 14$), 4% Asian ($n = 2$), and 4% Multiple Heritage ($n = 2$) (see Table 2). Respondents reported their age as follows, 20% ($n = 9$) were 18-24, 62% ($n = 28$) were 25-34, 9% ($n = 4$) were 35-44, 4% ($n = 2$) were 45-54, 2% ($n = 1$) were 55-64, and 2% ($n = 1$) were 65-74 (see Table 3). When asked about sexual orientation, respondents identified themselves as 96% ($n = 43$) heterosexual, 2% ($n = 1$) gay, and 2% ($n = 1$) bisexual (see Table 4).

Data Collection

Before data collection could proceed, I first obtained approval to conduct my study from the Sam Houston State University Institutional Review Board. After permission was granted to commence the study, I contacted the departments at the universities I planned to use to obtain permission to contact their students. After departmental approval was granted, I either emailed the practicum professors directly so that they could distribute my study to their students, or I asked for the department to send out a department-wide email soliciting responses for my study. The assessments were stored on a SurveyMonkey secure webpage where participants could log in and complete them, along with a brief survey to gather demographic information. SurveyMonkey uses Transport Layer Security encryption to encrypt all data transmitted to the website. Furthermore, all survey data was password protected and destroyed after use. After the required number of participants completed the assessments, SurveyMonkey was used to

compile the data where was then imported into SPSS, at which time I conducted statistical analyses to answer my research questions.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began after all of the data is collected. Analysis of this quantitative study was conducted using SPSS version 23. This analysis sought to find the answers to the research questions guiding the study.

Research Question 1

First, the data analysis was used to find the answer to the question, “Are the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised valid assessments for use with master’s level practicum students?” To answer this research question, SPSS was utilized to determine the internal consistency of the assessments for sample population. Cronbach’s alpha was used to help determine the internal consistency and whether the assessments are valid for the sample population.

Research Question 2

Next, the data analysis was used to find the answer to the question, “what is the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy?” To answer this research question, a series of Pearson’s *rs* was conducted using SPSS to examine what relationships existed between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy. From this, I was able to determine if a student’s dogmatism was related to their level of locus of control or their level of counselor self-efficacy, and vice versa.

Research Question 2

Lastly, the analysis was used to find the answer to the question, “to what degree does dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy significantly affect counseling theoretical orientation among master’s level counseling students?” To answer this research question, a MANOVA was conducted using SPSS to examine whether students’ levels of dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy had an effect on what counseling theoretical orientation they choose. A Pillai V was used to help answer this research question

Summary

In this chapter we have discussed the methodology of the study. First of all, a brief introduction with the purpose of the study was begun. Then, the research questions that this study addressed were presented. Following the presentation of the research questions was a brief discussion of the instrumentation used in the study. There are three main research questions and four variables. To address these variables and answer the research questions, four instruments were used in this study. The Internal Control Index was used to measure the locus of control of the participants, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale was used to measure the perceived counselor self-efficacy of the participants, the DOG scale was used to measure the dogmatism of the participants, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised was used to measure the theoretical orientation of the participants. This was followed up by a discussion of the participants that were used in the study. This study examined a sample of the population of master’s level practicum students in Texas. Specifically, four universities programs were used to collect the needed participants. Following the participant section was a discussion of the data

collection procedures used in the study. Finally, the analysis of the data was discussed.

The first research question was examined using a Cronbach's alpha. A series of Pearson r analyses were used to analyze the data and answer the second research question. A Pillai V was used to analyze the data and answer the third research question.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy, and counselor theoretical orientation in a sample of master's level practicum students.

To conduct the study, I used four assessments, the DOG Scale to measure the level of dogmatism, the Theoretical Orientation Scale-Revised to determine the theoretical orientation of participants, the Internal Control Index to measure the level of locus of control, and the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale to measure the level of counselor self-efficacy. These instruments are valid and reliable based on the literature, and measure the variables I want to examine. In this chapter I will discuss details of the sample obtained in the study, the instruments used in the study, the procedure used to obtain the sample, statistical methods I used to analyze the data, and the results from the analysis.

The study was conducted to answer the following research questions:

1. Are the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised valid instruments for use with master's level practicum students?

For this research question, Cronbach's alphas will be obtained for each of the instruments.

2. What is the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy?

Null Hypothesis: There are *no* statistically significant relationships between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy.

Alternative Hypothesis: There are statistically significant relationships between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy.

For this research question, I will be running a series of Pearson r correlations to determine if there are any correlations between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy.

3. To what degree does dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students?

Null Hypothesis: Dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy does *not* affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students.

Alternative Hypothesis: Dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy does affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students.

For this research question, because my predictor variables (DV) were measured on a continuous scale, and my outcome variable (IV) was measured on a nominal (or categorical) level, I used a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) to analyze the data to address this research question.

Description of the Sample

After recruiting students from the four selected universities over a period of four semesters, I received responses from 101 students. Of those students, 59 completed the

study. This produced a response rate of 58% ($n = 59$). Out of the 59 completed surveys, one participant declined to participate, one participant identified a theoretical orientation of Feminist, one participant identified a theoretical orientation of Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic, one participant indicated that he or she had not started practicum yet and was thus ineligible, and 10 participants identified two primary theoretical orientations. This left a useable response rate of 44.6% ($n = 45$).

Demographics

The sample obtained was mostly female, 89% ($n = 40$), with 11% ($n = 5$) male (see Table 1). Concerning ethnicity, the sample was 60% white ($n = 27$), 31% Hispanic ($n = 14$), 4% Asian ($n = 2$), and 4% Multiple ethnicities ($n = 2$) (see Table 2). Respondents reported their age as follows, 20% ($n = 9$) were 18-24, 62% ($n = 28$) were 25-34, 9% ($n = 4$) were 35-44, 4% ($n = 2$) were 45-54, 2% ($n = 1$) were 55-64, and 2% ($n = 1$) were 65-74 (see Table 3). When asked about sexual orientation, respondents identified themselves as 96% ($n = 43$) heterosexual, 2% ($n = 1$) gay, and 2% ($n = 1$) bisexual (see Table 4).

Table 1

Gender

Gender	N	%
Female	40	88.9
Male	5	11.1

Table 2

Ethnicity

Ethnicity	N	%
White	27	60
Hispanic	14	31
Asian	2	4
Multiple Ethnicities	2	4

Table 3

Age

Age	N	%
18-24	9	20
25-34	28	62
35-44	4	9
45-54	2	4
55-64	1	2
65-74	1	2

Table 4

Sexual Orientation

Sexual Orientation	N	%
Heterosexual	43	96
Gay	1	2
Bisexual	1	2

According to their responses to the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised, 23 respondents identified as Humanistic/Existential, 14 respondents identified as Cognitive/Behavioral, 4 respondents identified as Family Systems, and 4 identified as Multicultural (see Table 5). There were also ten respondents who had equal scores in 2 or more subscales and were not included in the statistical analysis because they did not have a clear identification with a single theoretical school. One participant identified as Feminist and another identified as Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic. These were also not included in the statistical analysis because the categories failed to meet the assumptions for a MANOVA.

Table 5

Theoretical Orientation

Theoretical Orientation	N	%
Humanistic/Existential	23	51
Cognitive/Behavioral	14	31
Family Systems	4	9
Multicultural	4	9
Feminist*	1	
Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic*	1	
More than one Theoretical Orientation*	10	

*Note: These participants were not included in the analysis because either they did not have a clear theoretical orientation, or there were not enough participants in the categories.

Instruments

In this study, I utilized the DOG Scale (Altemeyer, 2002) to measure levels of dogmatism in participants in the sample. The instrument consists of ten protrait and ten contrait questions focusing on accommodating beliefs. The instrument is scored on a 5-point Likert scale with choices of either strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree, with the contrait questions being reverse-scored. The responses were summed to compute the total dogmatism score for the participants.

To identify the level of locus of control in the participants, I used the Internal Control Index (Duttweiler, 1984). It consists of 28 Likert-like scale questions that ask whether the respondent would behave in a certain way either rarely, occasionally, sometimes, frequently or usually. Individual items are scored from 1 = rarely to 5 = usually. All individual item scores are summed, and total scores range from 28 to 140, with higher scores indicating a higher internal locus of control.

Counselor self-efficacy was calculated using the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996). It consists of 20 questions scored on a five point Likert scale with 10 questions being reverse-scored. Total scores range from 20 to 100.

The theoretical orientation of master's practicum students was determined using the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised. Developed by Worthington and Dillon (2003), the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised consists of 18 items that cover six different theoretical schools: psychoanalytic/psychodynamic, humanistic/existential, cognitive-behavioral, family systems, multicultural, and feminist. Three items address how closely the participant identifies with each of the theoretical branches. The questions

are measured on a 10-point Likert scale (1 is not at all/never and ten is completely/always). Each of the six subscales are scored from 0 - 30 to determine how much the respondent adheres to each of the six theoretical schools. The highest subscale score was taken as the theoretical orientation of the respondent.

Procedure

Before I began to collect data, I obtained approval to conduct my study from the Sam Houston State University Institutional Review Board. After permission was granted to commence the study, I contacted the departments at the universities from which I wanted to recruit students and asked for permission to contact their practicum students. After departmental approval was granted, I sent out a description of my study, a web link, and instructions on how to complete the assessments for distribution either through a listserv, departmental email, or by going through specific practicum professors. The assessments were stored on a SurveyMonkey secure webpage where participants could log in and complete them, along with a brief survey to gather demographic information. I also used GPower to estimate the needed sample size for my study. After the required number of participants had completed the assessments, SurveyMonkey was used to compile the data where it was imported into SPSS version 23. I then used SPSS to conduct statistical analyses to answer my research questions.

Research Questions

Before running the various statistics to answer the research questions, I first examined the data to determine if it met the assumptions for the statistical methods I intended to use. Scatterplots were created using SPSS to determine if the assumption for

linearity was violated. These scatterplots indicated that the assumption of linearity had not been violated.

Next, I examined normality. Tests using Shapiro-Wilk for normality indicated that the dogmatism and counselor self-efficacy scores were not normal, but that the locus of control scores were normal ($p < .05$). However, violations of normality should not cause major problems because the sample size was large enough. In addition, to check for multivariate normality, I examined Mahalanobis distances. My sample had a Mahalanobis distance maximum of 8.609, which is less than the critical value of 16.27 for three dependent variables. This test confirmed multivariate normality in my sample.

Furthermore, I checked the homoscedasticity/homogeneity of my sample. Levene's test for homogeneity showed that this assumption was met for dogmatism and counselor self-efficacy, but was not met for locus of control ($p < .05$). The assumption for homoscedasticity was also met (Box's M-test: $p = .045$). Because students could choose to participate independently, assumptions of independence and random sampling were met.

In order to determine the degree to which relationships exist between dogmatism, locus of control, perceived counselor self-efficacy, and theoretical orientation, participants were administered the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised. The following research questions were addressed:

Research Question One

Are the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised valid instruments for use with master's level practicum students? To answer this research question, a Cronbach's

alpha analysis was computed for each instrument. All instruments were found to be reliable. The DOG scale had a Cronbach alpha of .92. The Internal Control Index had a Cronbach alpha of .87. The Counselor Self Efficacy-Scale had a Cronbach alpha of .86. The Theoretical Orientation Scale-Revised had a Cronbach alpha of .82 (see Table 6).

Table 6

Reliability Tests

Instrument	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
DOG Scale	.915	20
Internal Control Index	.872	28
Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale	.860	20
Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised	.821	18

Research Question Two

What is the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy? To answer this research question, a series of Pearson's r correlations were conducted using SPSS to examine what relationships, if any, exist between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy, and to determine if there were any issues with multicollinearity.

The Pearson's r tests showed a statistically significant positive correlation between Counselor Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control, $r(45) = .538, p = .01$ with a large effect size (Cohen, 1998). Squaring the r value $(.538)^2 = .289$ revealed that 29% of the variability in Counselor Self-Efficacy was accounted for by Locus of Control. No other

statistically significant correlations were found between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy (see Table 7).

Table 7

Correlations

	Dogmatism	Counselor Self-Efficacy	Locus of Control
Dogmatism	1	.03	-.023
Counselor Self-Efficacy	.03	1	.538*
Locus of Control	-.023	.538*	1

* Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Research Question Three

At this point in my data analysis, I made several attempts, both over email and by phone, to contact the developer of the TOPS-R to determine if I could run the MANOVA with only four of the six subscales because my sample obtained low hit rates on the Feminist and Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic subscales. Because this study used three dependent variables, each theoretical orientation subscale must contain three or more responses in order to run a MANOVA correctly. After several attempts to make contact, I was unable to get a response and proceeded without the guidance from the assessment developer. I subsequently found another dissertation that used the TOPS-R with only two of the subscales in their sample (Burwell-Pender, 2009). This suggested the ability to analyze the TOPS-R data utilizing less than the entire subscales set. Because of a limited timeline and difficulties in getting participant responses for the Feminist and Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic categories, the Feminist and

Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic subscales were removed from the study. Moreover, because some participants identified more than one primary theoretical orientation, their responses were also removed. This process left me with 45 valid participants. According to GPower, with an alpha of .05, four groups, and three dependent variables, the needed sample size was 40. Therefore, my study obtained the needed sample size.

The data was then analyzed using a MANOVA to answer the following question: To what degree does dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students? A between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate differences between dogmatism, locus of control, perceived counselor self-efficacy, based on theoretical orientation. Preliminary assumption testing revealed a Box's Test Sig. value of .045, which indicated that the sample did not violate the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Furthermore, because MANOVA is sensitive to outliers, a Mahalanobis distance was checked. No outliers were found. When analyzing the results of the MANOVA, no statistically significant difference between dogmatism, locus of control, or perceived counselor self-efficacy was found among different theoretical orientations, $F(9, 123) = 1.079, p = .05$; Pillai $V = .383$; partial eta squared = .073 (see Table 8).

Table 8

Multivariate Tests

		Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta ²
Theoretical Orientation	Pillai's Trace		.220	1.079	9.000	123.000	.383	.073

Summary of Results

My study sought to determine what relationship existed between dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy and theoretical orientation in this sample of master's level practicum students. The independent variable was theoretical orientation as measured on the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised. The dependent variables were level of dogmatism, level of locus of control, and level of counselor self-efficacy. Below is a summary of my research questions and their findings.

Research question 1: Are the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised valid instruments for use with master's level practicum students? The analysis revealed high Cronbach's alpha levels for all instruments indicating that they were reliable for my sample population.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy? The analyses revealed a large, positive statistically significant correlation ($r = .538, p = .01$) between counselor self-efficacy and locus of control. No other statistically significant correlations were found.

Research Question 3: To what degree does dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students? The statistical analysis revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy based on theoretical orientation.

The next chapter includes a summary of my study and a discussion of the results. It ends with recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the previous chapter, I presented the research questions for the study, and the analysis of the data. This chapter begins with an overview of the study and findings. I then discuss implications for counselors, counselor educators, and researchers. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

Counseling theory and theoretical orientation is one of the first topics covered in counseling programs. Having a good grasp of theory is of utmost importance for counselors, both as beginners and as seasoned professionals (Myers, 2013). Furthermore, the nexus of a counselor's personality and his or her theoretical orientation is an area that is starting to be examined more (Freeman, 2003; Hawkins, 1988; Larson, 1980; Sundland, 1977; Ivanovic, 2011; Demir & Gazioglu 2012). In this study, I sought to further the research and examine the relationships between counselor theoretical orientation in master's counseling students at the practicum level and three facets of their personalities: dogmatism, perceived counselor self-efficacy, and locus of control.

In my study, 45 master's practicum counseling students from four CACREP accredited universities participated. The independent variable was theoretical orientation as measured by the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised (Worthington & Dillon, 2003). The dependent variables were dogmatism, as measured by the DOG Scale (Altemeyer, 2002), locus of control, as measured by the Internal Control Index (Duttweiler, 1984), and perceived counselor self-efficacy scale, as measured by the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996). I collected

data using an online link to the survey using Survey Monkey that was distributed by email to the students by their program or practicum professor. Then I analyzed the data using SPSS 23.0 to conduct the various statistical analyses needed to answer the research questions. I conducted a series of Cronbach's alphas to determine if the instruments I used were valid for my sample, answering research question one. Next, to determine if there were any relationships between the dependent variables, I ran a series of Pearson r correlations to answer research question two. For research question three, to determine if there was a relationship between participants' levels of dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy, and their theoretical orientation, I ran a MANOVA.

Discussion of Findings

I have organized my findings in order of my research questions. The summary of the research questions and relevant findings follows.

Research Question One

The first research question asked, "Are the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised valid instruments for use with master's level practicum students?" Statistical findings suggest that the DOG Scale, the Internal Control Index, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised were valid for the sample obtained.

First, a Cronbach's alpha was computed for the DOG Scale to determine if it was valid for the sample. The analysis in SPSS showed a Cronbach's alpha of .92, indicating that it was valid. This is consistent with past research (Altemeyer, 2002). Next, I found a Cronbach's alpha of .87 for the Internal Control Index, indicating that it was also valid

for the sample. This is consistent with previous research that found the instrument to have a Cronbach's alpha between .82 (Jacobs, 1993; Ghonsooly & Elahi, 2010), and .87 (Maltby & Cope, 1996). A Cronbach's alpha was then determined for the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale. I found a Cronbach's alpha of .86 for this instrument, which is consistent with previous research (Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996; Pasquariello, 2013), which indicated that it was also valid for the sample. Finally, I examined the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised and found it to have a Cronbach's alpha of .82 and to be valid for the sample, and consistent with previous research findings (Worthington & Dillon, 2003).

After running all Cronbach's alphas on the instruments, I found that they all were valid for the sample, which was consistent with past research results in studies either on the instruments or using them. This result meant that I could continue to analyze the data found in my research confident that what I found would be valid for the obtained sample.

Research Question Two

The second research question asked, "What is the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy?" To answer this research question, I ran a series of Pearson r correlation statistics to see if any of the variables correlated. I found a statistically significant positive correlation between Counselor Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control $r(45) = .538, p = .01$. This is a large effect size according to Cohen (1998) and indicates that approximately 29% of the variability in Counselor Self-Efficacy was accounted for by Locus of Control. This finding suggests that participants in the sample with higher (or more internal) loci of control also had

higher counselor self-efficacy. This result is consistent with previous research (Seeman, 1963; Kass-Shraibman, 2008; Harper, 2008).

Seeman, in his study in 1963, examined powerlessness in inmates in an institutional setting. He found that inmates with lower levels of powerlessness (or higher levels of internal locus of control) had better retention of parole material they were taught. This implied that they felt more control over events in their lives. While my sample included graduate students instead of inmates, I believe the same conclusion can be drawn from my study. Students with higher levels of internal locus of control will feel more control over events in their lives, take in material they are taught more effectively, and because of those factors will have a higher counseling self-efficacy, believing that they can conduct the counseling process effectively.

Furthermore, Kass-Shraibman surveyed accountants in her 2008 study. She found that CPAs with an internal locus of control had a higher level of job satisfaction and noted that “CPAs that are satisfied with their job believe that what happens to them is a result of their efforts” (p. 125). This study is closer to my study in that both her population and my population are higher socially functioning, although her study sampled practitioners further along in their practice than my study. However, the conclusion she drew is applicable to my study as well. Students with a higher internal locus of control may believe that what happens to them is a result of their efforts. Therefore, if they are learning how to be effective counselors, they might believe that their effectiveness is predicated on their efforts. If they are working to become effective counselors, they are more likely to believe they will be better counselors, and their counselor self-efficacy will be higher.

Finally, Harper (2008) studied 50 graduate doctoral clinical psychology students and their levels of locus of control, tolerance of ambiguity, and counseling self-efficacy. In her study, she found a positive relationship between internal locus of control and high counseling self-efficacy. She suggested that psychology students with an internal locus of control “perceive themselves as more effective counselors” (p. 90) than those with a more external locus of control. She further went on to say that those psychologists who believe that the outcomes of events are affected by the therapists themselves often see themselves as effective therapists. Her study and my study are very similar in size and population, although she surveyed doctoral clinical psychologists and I studied master’s counseling students. However, the results are similar in that those students who have a higher internal locus of control were more likely to see themselves as effective counselors and possess a higher counselor self-efficacy.

If a higher internal locus of control is correlated with higher counselor self-efficacy (Harper, 2008), better job satisfaction (Kass-Shraibman, 2008), and better retention of material (Seeman, 1963), then this suggests it may be important to identify and work to raise the locus of control of students. As counselor educators, if we work to raise the level of locus of control in our students, this may lead to better belief in themselves as counselors, better future job satisfaction, and better learning of the material we are teaching.

No other statistically significant correlations were found between the variables. This is a somewhat different outcome than I expected, considering that there was a significant amount of literature that found a positive correlation between self-efficacy and spirituality (Pollock, 2007; Matthews, 2004; Adegbola 2007, 2011). Pollock, in her study

of 135 graduate counseling students in 2007, noted a small positive correlation between spirituality, as measured by the Human Spirituality Scale (Wheat, 1991), and the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Melchert, et al, 1996). Matthews studied 423 counseling and social work graduate students in 2004 and found a small positive correlation between counselor self efficacy on the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale and spirituality as measured by the Psychomatrix Spirituality Inventory (Wolman, 2001). Adegbola studied 90 participants who had sickle cell disease and found a large positive correlation between their self-efficacy and their spirituality.

Because of this previous research that positively correlated spirituality and self-efficacy, including counseling self-efficacy specifically, I expected to find at least a small correlation between counseling self-efficacy and dogmatism, given that the literature has pointed to a correlation between dogmatism and spirituality. According to the results of my study, however, dogmatism and counselor self-efficacy are not correlated, $r(45) = .03, p = .847$. This result could imply several different things and come from several different factors.

First of all, the results suggest that for this sample how sure someone is of their beliefs does not predict how they feel about their ability to conduct counseling. In a way, this is a reassuring finding. For instance, if a counselor had an unhealthy view of human development, and he or she was very dogmatic about it, we would not want him or her to be an effective counselor by virtue of his or her rigid level of belief. How rigid a belief system a person has did not predict their confidence in their ability to do counsel others.

Second, this result could stem from the fact that level of dogmatism is at most an element of spiritual belief, as opposed to the spirituality that the previous studies focused

on. As has been previously discussed, ASERVIC and others have emphasized the need for counselors to be competent in addressing spirituality and spiritual needs in counseling (Cashwell & Watts, 2010). Therefore, it makes sense that someone who has a higher level of spirituality of himself or herself would also feel better about his or her ability to address those issues in counseling, and thereby have a higher level of counseling self-efficacy. Level of spirituality and counselor self-efficacy could be correlated. However, the rigidity of one's belief system does not necessarily indicate a higher level of spirituality. One can be very rigid about their lack of spiritual beliefs. Therefore, there may not be a correlation between dogmatism and perceived counselor self-efficacy.

Third, my study used different instruments than previous research, which could lead to a different finding. While the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale has been used in previous research around counselor self-efficacy, the DOG Scale has not. The fact that the DOG Scale has not been utilized in this type of study before, coupled with the previously mentioned differences between spirituality and dogmatism, could account for the lack of a correlation between dogmatism and perceived counselor self-efficacy.

Research Question Three

The third research question asked, "To what degree does dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy affect counseling theoretical orientation among master's level counseling students?" To answer this question I ran a MANOVA, with theoretical orientation, as measured by the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised, as the independent variable, and dogmatism, measured by the DOG Scale, locus of control, measured by the Internal Control Index, and perceived counselor self-efficacy, measured by the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, as the dependent variables. I found no

statistically significant main effect of theoretical orientation using these elements of personality.

The first possibility for this result is that it is accurate. I was able to obtain more than enough participants to adequately power my study, and I used reliable and valid instruments. Therefore, it could be that the personality traits I chose to study, dogmatism, locus of control, and counselor self-efficacy, are not related to the theoretical orientations of the participants of my study.

The finding of no significant relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, and counselor self-efficacy and theoretical orientation in my sample is consistent with recent research by Freeman (2003, 2007), who did not find any significant relationship between personality traits and theoretical orientation in beginning counseling students. Freeman studied 132 beginning counselor education students in an introductory counseling theories class using the Counseling Theory Survey that he developed, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998), and Self-Directed Search. Where I determined what traits I wanted to study, he used the MBTI and SDS to identify the personality traits of those participants he was sampling. I was hoping that by sampling students later in their program, and focusing on three specific personality traits, I might be able to find an effect where Freeman did not. However, because he was using a recognized personality assessment (the MBTI) and a recognized assessment in career counseling that helps to match vocations with personality traits (the SDS), he may have obtained a more full picture of the lack of correlation between personality traits and theory choice, and my study has confirmed Freeman's finding by using a smaller subset

of elements of personality, namely dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy.

Freeman noted, however, this is counter to older research (Hawkins, 1988; Larson, 1980). Hawkins surveyed 80 master's level counseling students using the Adjective Check List to identify personality traits, and a modified Smith Questionnaire to identify theoretical orientation. He found that there were relationships between personality traits and theoretical orientation in his sample. Two factors may have accounted for his findings versus the lack of findings in my study. First of all, he obtained a sample size almost twice as big as mine. With a larger sample size it is easier to find statistically significant results. The second factor that could be at play here is instrument choice. Hawkins chose to use the Adjective checklist to identify personality traits. This instrument has 37 total scales whereas my study utilized three scales for personality, and Freeman's study consisted of four Myers-Briggs scales, and six scales in the Self-Directed Search for a total of 10 scales. As Hawkins was able to elicit more specific personality data from his instrument, there was more opportunity for him to find statistically significant relationships above and beyond what Freeman or I were able to find.

Larson surveyed 339 therapists in 1980. He found that "therapeutic attitudes and practices" (p. 18) were related to the school of therapy that participants in the study adhered to. This suggests that personality traits and theoretical orientation are related, according to his findings. His larger, and more diverse sample may have been able to find more personality traits data that indicated correlations with theoretical orientation.

My study had a limited sample size and very specific elements of personality that I was looking for. At least in part because of these factors, no statistically significant main effect was found between the elements of personality that I examined: dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy, and theoretical orientation. The results of my study and its confirmation of Freeman's (2003) research, and contradiction of research by Hawkins (1988) and Larson (1980) suggest two things. First, because my study had adequate power, and had reliable and valid instruments, the variables I chose: dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy may not be related to theoretical orientation. Second, Larson's study was a national study whereas my study was geographically smaller, only drawing from four CACREP accredited universities in Texas. It could be that my sample became too homogenous in nature, as evidenced by the difficulty in getting any clear feminist or psychoanalytic/psychodynamic theoretical orientations. Casting a larger geographic net for the sample may have helped find more differences such as the ones Larson found.

Implications

The results of my study hold several implications for counselors, counselor educators, and researchers. First, the instruments used in the study are valid and reliable when used with counseling students. Personality and its elements have been, and continue to be, extensively researched. From specific facets of personality, to whether personality actually exists, researchers are always looking for ways to study it. For example, recent studies have examined personality and leadership (Lam, Lee, Taylor, & Zhao, 2016; Solaja, Idowu, & James 2016). Also, studies such as the Stanford prison experiment (Haney, Banks, & Zimbardo, 1973) have fueled the ongoing person-situation debate as to

whether personality as a construct exists. With more research moving forward, the instruments used for this study can be relied upon to examine students' levels of dogmatism, locus of control, and counselor self-efficacy. As research into these facets of personality continues, tools to examine the facets are needed, and the instruments used in this study appear to be good tools. Also, theoretical orientation is an important area of counseling (Halbur & Halbur, 2011), helping to define our professional identity (Jackson, 2010), and help counselors be effective when they practice (Skovholt, & Rønnestad, 1992). One of the first classes in a typical counseling curriculum covers different theories, and students are challenged to choose a theoretical orientation from which they can structure their approach and conceptualization of clients and the counseling process. To aid counseling students, counselors, and counselor educators, the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised appears to be a valid and reliable tool to help practitioners identify their theoretical orientation based on the results of this study. Furthermore, researchers might be able to use this instrument in future studies as they explore theoretical orientation. For instance, Hill et al. (2014) and Kivlighan, Hill, Gelso, and Baumann (2016) used the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised to select psychodynamic therapists for their studies on dreams and the therapist-client relationship. However, there are a couple of challenges that I faced when using this instrument that future researchers will want to keep in mind. First of all, a significant portion of my sample ended up with duplicate scores on more than one theoretical orientation and could not be used because their theoretical orientation was not clear. Second, I had difficulty in obtaining participants in my sample who identified as using the Feminist theoretical orientation. Finally, all of the personality instruments can be used in classes for self-

discovery to help students learn more about themselves and begin thinking about how aspects of their personality may affect how they work with clients and conceptualize the counseling process. Having more insight into one's theoretical orientation, level of dogmatism, level of locus of control, and level of counselor self-efficacy may give students ideas about how to improve themselves. If they find that they scored highly on the DOG scale, this insight from the information gleaned by the instrument may help them begin to work on being more flexible in their thinking if that is their goal. Also, if they have a lower locus of control or lower level of counselor self-efficacy than expected, they can then undertake efforts to raise their levels.

Second, the relationship found between locus of control and perceived counselor self-efficacy has implications for counselors, educators, and researchers. This study found a statistically significant, large, positive relationship between locus of control and perceived counselor self-efficacy. While this appears to be a fairly intuitive finding, it still can have affects in research and counselor education moving forward. For instance, if we know that locus of control correlates with how confident counseling students are in their counseling abilities, as counselor educators it may be helpful in our curriculum and class activities to build in activities and assignments that build the students' internal loci of control prior to their seeing clients in practicum. Activities such as individual and group projects, creating an open and cooperative class environment, and meeting with students to talk about things that get in the way of their learning can help bring about a higher internal locus of control, helping them feel in control of their educational life. If we can help students develop a higher locus of control, this could lead to more

confidence in counseling abilities and deeper understanding of both themselves and the counseling process while they are still in training.

Third, the findings of this study have implications for the areas of study of personality and theoretical orientation. The study of personality and its effect on theoretical orientation has been attempted on a number of occasions with various instruments and variables. Some, such as the current study and Freeman's (2003, 2007) studies have failed to find any significant connection between elements of personality and theory choice. Other studies (Hawkins, 1988; Larson, 1980; Sundland, 1977) did find linkages between personality traits and theoretical orientation. The conflicting research data here suggests a number of implications. First of all, in studying personality traits and theoretical orientation, it is important to have a large and diverse population from which to sample. In studies that failed to show significant connections between personality traits and theoretical orientation, such as the present study, and Freeman's (2003) study, the sample sizes were smaller or more geographically concentrated, where studies that found links between personality traits and theoretical orientation (Hawkins, 1988; Larson, 1980; Sundland, 1977), were larger or more geographically diverse. Second, at times there has appeared to be a connection between theory choice and personality, so there may be some elements of personality that do affect a counselor's choice of theory such as need for achievement, need to persist in performance of a task, and need to focus on diligence and duty in therapy as opposed to utilizing spontaneity (Hawkins, 1988). Identifying those elements more precisely and expanding to find other elements of personality that consistently affect theoretical orientation would be important to fill in the research, while also helping counselors achieve a better understanding of why they identify with a theory

the way that they do. This can be accomplished by conducting larger, more diverse studies incorporating a variety of personality measures and measuring correlations between various personality traits and theoretical orientation. Increasing insight for new as well as seasoned counselors could help them in their practices better understand themselves and their personality traits. By better understanding themselves and their personality traits they can better understand how they and their personality traits affect the counseling process. With a better understanding of how they affect the counseling process, they can be more aware of ways to improve the counseling process and better meet the needs of clients.

Limitations

This study had some limitations, in addition to the limitations mentioned earlier. The first limitation of the study is that the sample obtained may not be representative of the counseling field at large. For instance, in my sample no African American students' results were usable. One African American student completed the assessments but had to be discarded from the usable sample, and another started the assessments but did not complete them. This is a considerable deviation from the 2015 demographics CACREP has compiled that indicated African American students made up 19% of the student population in CACREP programs. Additionally, my sample included 31% Hispanic students, compared to 8% according to the 2015 CACREP demographics. Also, my sample had a slightly higher percentage of females students (89%) compared to the CACREP demographics (83%). The second limitation of the study was that the sample was potentially homogenous. All participants came from state universities in Texas. Therefore, it may not be generalizable outside of Texas. The fact that I was unable to

obtain enough participants who identified their theoretical orientations strictly as either Feminist or Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic could be evidence that the sample was not as diverse as I would have liked it. A third limitation was that the theoretical orientation of master's level counseling students may have been inchoate. A large portion of the respondents to my study identified two or more theoretical orientations as dominant. This could be because at this point in their studies they have not fully formed their theoretical orientation.

Recommendations for Future Research

While my study did result in some interesting findings concerning the validity of the instruments for use with master's practicum students, and a statistically significant positive correlation between locus of control and perceived counselor self-efficacy, some of the most interesting elements of the study revolve around non-statistically significant findings. This lack of findings in certain areas points to some limitations of the study and also suggests areas and directions for future research.

First, the finding that the instruments were valid for master's practicum students confirms past research, and gives researchers tools for future research. As a profession rooted in theory, counselors, counselor educators, and researchers should both be aware of tools that can be used to determine theoretical orientation, and tools that can be used to further our research and understanding of theoretical orientation. As a valid instrument with master's practicum students, the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised can be a good instrument in future studies of theoretical orientation.

Also, the DOG Scale, Internal Control Index, and Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale were all found to be valid in the sample of master's counseling practicum students. The

study of personality, and elements of personality, is a large field full of opportunity for further research. As researchers continue to refine their understanding of personality as a whole, and the various elements it is composed of, using valid instruments is important to locate and parse significant findings in the data. Using these instruments with college students to tease out important findings about the interplay between aspects of personality could lead to a greater understanding of personality and how the various elements of it fit together.

In this study, I also found a correlation between locus of control and perceived counselor self-efficacy. Further research might be directed in replicating this aspect of the study with different and larger samples. There appears to be some consensus among previous research that locus of control and perceived counselor self-efficacy are correlated, so future research, in addition to replicating these findings, might also work to examine practical effects of this correlation. One of the most important questions researchers can seek to answer is, “so what?” Finding a correlation between locus of control and counselor self-efficacy is interesting, but what difference does it make to the counselor, to the client, to society? Future studies would be wise to incorporate this correlation with some measures of counselor behavior, and even client behavior. Finding out how a higher locus of control and higher counselor self-efficacy affects what counselors do in therapy would be an interesting avenue of research to marry research and practice. Furthermore, researching whether counselors with a higher locus of control and higher self-efficacy do significantly different things, or behave significantly differently, in therapy has a significant difference in client outcomes would be very important to the field. If we know that higher locus of control and higher counselor self-

efficacy leads to better client outcomes, that might change some of the things we monitor in counselor education to make sure counseling students are progressing in ways that will materially help their practice and future clients.

Also, future research should examine multicultural aspects related to the variables used in this study. For instance, more studies on locus of control among men and women would help to deepen the research literature surrounding that variable. Additionally, the importance of having a strong internal locus of control may also be related to culture, so future studies that involve locus of control should also explore cultural differences on the perception and importance of locus of control. Finally, studies on the level of engagement with research of students from different cultures or ethnicities may also be helpful to find ways to raise participation rates in studies among underrepresented groups.

The results of my study indicate several weaknesses that have implications for future research. First of all, the major weakness of this study is a potentially homogenous sample that is not representative of the counseling field at large. In conducting the study, I contacted four counseling programs at CACREP accredited universities in Texas to draw my sample from. Future similar studies should recruit from a wider base in order to get potentially more diverse samples. Also, this study asked students to complete the instruments without any incentive. Students were asked to participate without any benefit except the benefit of adding to research literature. This could also have led to lower than expected response rates. Future studies that work with students should include an incentive, perhaps a raffle of some sort, or researchers might even get the instruments included as part of a curriculum where students receive some credit for participating. This incentive could have a significant affect in increasing response rates. Another issue with

the sample turned out to be low response rates in two of the six categories on the Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised. In my study there were not enough participants that identified as Feminist or Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic and the categories had to be dropped. When running a MANOVA it is important to get enough hits on all categories to be able to run it. The low hit rates in these two categories could have been for a number of reasons. First of all, there may have been low response rates due to the potential that my sample was too homogenous. All participants were students in Texas, from state schools. Drawing from a potentially fairly homogenous group of students could have lead to lower rates of students that identify with the Feminist and Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic theoretical orientations, as the sample grouped into the other four theoretical schools. Also, there could have been some confusion among participants regarding the Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic category. Some students may have seen Psychoanalytic in the questions and avoided ranking it higher because they did not see themselves as Freudian, even if they do see themselves as Adlerian, which is considered a Psychodynamic approach. Future research could address this issue in sampling by sampling from a larger geographical area in order to avoid the risk of getting too homogenous a sample that does not encompass a sufficient breadth of the theoretical orientation spectrum and by making sure that students are aware of what theories fall into the various theoretical schools.

Also, a large portion of the participants who completed the instruments had equal scores for more than one theoretical orientation. Because their scores failed to identify a dominant theoretical orientation, they were removed from the study. However, this points to challenges for future researchers, and more opportunities for further research. On one

hand, this could point to theoretical preferences that are not adequately clear or developed in practicum students. This could lead to challenges for future researchers if they want to study theoretical orientations in practicum students. On the other hand, the large number of students without a dominant theoretical orientation may suggest they are theoretically eclectic. Theoretical eclecticism is one of the most popular theoretical orientations among practitioners currently. As the results of my study bear out, a significant portion (18%) of the responses I received had more than one dominant theoretical orientation. Although these responses were counter to the aims of my study, the fact that such a large portion of the population I sampled answered this way means that more study is needed regarding theoretical orientation and how it might relate to the trend toward theoretical eclecticism. In addition to that, a similar study design to the current one could explore any relationships between aspects of personality such as dogmatism, locus of control, and perceived counselor self-efficacy with different combinations of theoretically eclectic participants.

Finally, my study focused on three elements of personality. Future research can either focus on a few elements of personality as I did, but with a much bigger and broader sample, or explore more personality traits. Studies that cover more specific aspects of personality and a greater number of those aspects appear, from the literature, to be more likely to find relationships between personality traits and theoretical orientation.

Conclusion

This study, both in the results that were found, and the results that were not found, can point to numerous avenues for future research. Future researchers can make sure and bolster their studies using different techniques than were used in this study and with more

geographically diverse samples, build on research correlating locus of control and perceived counselor self-efficacy, which in turn could lead to better counselor education outcomes and client outcomes. Researchers also have more evidence of the validity of the instruments used in the current study and can use them in future studies with confidence. Finally, new avenues of research concerning theoretical orientation, theoretical eclecticism, and personality can be explored to deepen the research base on all of those subjects.

REFERENCES

- Adegbola, M. A. (2007). *The relationship among spirituality, self-efficacy, and quality of life in adults with sickle cell disease*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3289109)
- Adegbola, M. (2011). Spirituality, self-efficacy, and quality of life among adults with sickle cell disease. *Southern Online Journal of Nursing Research*, 11(1).
- Adler, A. (1964). *Superiority and social interest*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his religion*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (2002). Dogmatic behavior among students: Testing a new measure of dogmatism. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 713-721.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2, 113-133.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (2004). A revised religious fundamentalism scale: The short and sweet of it. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 14, 47-54.

- Anchin, J., & Magnavita, J. J. (2008). Toward the unification of psychotherapy: An introduction to the journal symposium. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 18*(3), 259-263.
- Arredondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S., Sanchez, J., Locke, D. C., Sanchez, J., & Stadler, H. (1996). Operationalization of the multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 24*(1), 42-78.
- Bakar, A. R., Zakaria, N., & Mohamed, S. (2011). Malaysian counselors' self-efficacy: Implication for career counseling. *International Journal of Business & Management, 6*(9), 141-147.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986a). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*, 359-373.
- Bandura, A. (1986b). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist, 44*(9), 1175-1184.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 1-26.
- Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., Hardy, A. B., & Howells, G. N. (1980). Tests of the generality of self-efficacy theory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 4*, 39-66.

- Barbee, P. W., Scherer, D., & Combs, D. C. (2003). Prepracticum service-learning: Examining the relationship with counselor self-efficacy and anxiety. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 108-119.
- Barrio Minton, C. E., & Myers, J. E. (2008). Cognitive style and theoretical orientation: Factors affecting intervention style interest and use. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 30*(4), 330.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Burwell-Pender, L. (2009). *Process of identifying a guiding theory: An exploratory study*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (AAT 3399398)
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 306–307.
- CACREP. (2015). *Annual Report 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/about-cacrep/publications/cacrep-annual-reports/>
- Cashwell, C. S., & Watts, R. E. (2010). The new ASERVIC competencies for addressing spiritual and religious issues in counseling. *Counseling & Values, 55*, 2-5.
- Central intelligence agency. (2011, December 1). Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/xx.html>
- Charles, K. J. (2007). *African American male students of architecture at select HBCUs: Locus of Control, self-efficacy and triarchic intelligence*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3300820)

- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Second Edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Cohen, L. H., & Oyster-Nelson, C. K. (1981). Clinicians' evaluations of psychodynamic psychotherapy: Experimental data on psychological peer review. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 583-589.
- Coleman, D. (2004). Theoretical evaluation self-test (TEST): A preliminary validation study. *Social Work Research*, 28, 117-128.
- Constantine, M. G. (2001). The relationship between general counseling self-efficacy and self-perceived multicultural counseling competence in supervisees. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 20, 81-90.
- Constantine, M. G. (2002). Predictors of satisfaction with counseling: Racial and ethnic minority clients' attitudes toward counseling and ratings of their counselors' general and multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49(2), 255.
- Corsini, R. J., & Wedding, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Current psychotherapies* (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Crook, T. (2010). *Relationship between counseling self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy among school counselors*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3430606)
- Crowson, H. M., DeBacker, T. K., Davis, K. A. (2008). The DOG scale: A valid measure of dogmatism? *Journal of Individual Differences*, 29, 17-24.
- Crowson, H. M. (2009). Does the DOG scale measure dogmatism? Another look at construct validity. *The Journal of social psychology*, 149(3), 365-383.

- Curry, J. R. (2007). *An investigation of the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor wellness among counselor education students*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3256914)
- Davis, W. L., & Phares, E. J. (1967). Internal-external control as a determinant of information-seeking in a social influence situation. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 547-561.
- Day-Vines, N. L. (2007). Wellness in the midst of adversity and tragedy. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 46, 242-247.
- Demir, I., & Gazioglu, E. (2012). Theoretical orientations of Turkish counselor trainees: The role of thinking styles, epistemology and curiosity. *Psychology*, 3(7), 527-533.
- DiGiuseppe, R. A. (1971). Dogmatism correlation with strength of religious conviction. *Psychological Reports*, 28(1), 64.
- Dodd, N., & Bayne, R. (2006). Psychological types and preferred specific counseling models in experienced counselors. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 66(11), 98-113.
- Duttweiler, P. C. (1984). The internal control index: A newly developed measure of locus of control. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 44, 209-221.
- Eckhardt, W. (1991). Authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 12, 97-121.
- Ellis, A. (1980). *The case against religion: A psychotherapist's view and the case against religiosity*. Austin, TX: American Atheist Press.
- Ellis, A. (1985). *Overcoming resistance: Rational-emotive therapy with difficult clients*. New York: Springer Publication Company.

- Ellis, A. (2004). Post-September 11th perspectives on religion, spirituality, and philosophy in the personal and professional lives of selected REBT cognoscenti: A response to my colleagues. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 82, 439-442.
- Erickson, D. B. (1993). The relationship between personality type and preferred counseling model. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 27, 39-41.
- Erikson, E. (1972). *Young man Luther*. London: Faber.
- Fowler, J. W. (1981). *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Francis, P. C. (2016). Religion and spirituality in counseling. In I. Marini, M. A. Stebnicki, I. Marini, M. A. Stebnicki (Eds.), *The professional counselor's desk reference*, (2nd ed., pp. 559-564). New York, NY, US: Springer Publishing Co.
- Fredrickson, C. G. (1993). Psychological type and preferred counseling model characteristics in undergraduate students. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 25, 48-53.
- Freeman, M. S. (2003). *Personality traits as predictors of a preferred theoretical orientation in beginning counselor education students*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3081522)
- Freeman, M. S., Hayes, B. G., Kuch, T. H., & Taub, G. (2007). Personality: A predictor of theoretical orientation of students enrolled in a counseling theories course. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 46, 254-265.
- Freud, S. (1961). *The future of an illusion*. (J. Strachey, Trans. & Ed.). New York, NY: Norton.

- Freud, S. (1963). *Civilization and its discontents*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Friedlander, M. L., Keller, K. E., Peca-Baker, T. A., & Olk, M. E. (1986). Effects of role conflict on counselor trainees' self-statements, anxiety level, and performance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 73-77.
- Furnham, A., & Steele, H. (1993). Measures of locus of control: A critique of general, children's, health, and work-related locus of control questionnaires. *British Journal of Psychology, 84*, 443-479.
- Gallup, J. R. (2016). *Religion*. Retrieved April 1, 2017, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1690/Religion.aspx>
- Ghonsooly, B., & Elahi, M. (2010). Validating locus of control questionnaire and examining its relation to general English achievement. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 29*, 117-143.
- Giordano, A. L., & Cashwell, C. S. (2014). Entering the sacred: Using motivational interviewing to address spirituality in counseling. *Counseling And Values, 59*(1), 65-79. doi:10.1002/j.2161-007X.2014.00042.x
- Gil-Adi, D., & Newman, F. L. (1984). Patient information and its use by therapists differing in theoretical orientation. *Psychotherapy, 21*, 479-482.
- Glidewell, J. C., & Livert, D. E. (1992). Confidence in the practice of clinical psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 23*, 362-368.
- Glover-Graf, N. M., Marini, I., Baker, J., Buck, T. (2007). Religious and spiritual beliefs and practices of persons with chronic pain. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 51*, 21-33.

- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B., (1980). *The adjective checklist bibliography*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA
- Halbur, D. A., & Halbur, K. V. (2011). *Developing your theoretical orientation in counseling and psychotherapy*. Boston, Mass: Pearson.
- Haney, C., Banks, W. C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1973). A study of prisoners and guards in a simulated prison. *Naval Research Review*, 30, 4-17.
- Harper, E. A. (2008). *A quantitative study of internal and external locus of control and tolerance of ambiguity on perceived counseling self-efficacy among counseling trainees*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3299492)
- Harris, K. A., Randolph, B. E., & Gordon, T. D. (2016). What do clients want? Assessing spiritual needs in counseling: A literature review. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*, 3(4), 250-275.
- Harris, L. L. (2007). *An examination of the counseling self-efficacy of master's-level rehabilitation counselors-in-training*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3265952)
- Hawkins, D. E. (1988). *The assessment of behavior patterns, personality characteristics and theoretical orientations for master's level counseling students*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (AAT 8814584)
- Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Crook-Lyon, R. E., Hess, S. A., Miles, J., Spangler, P. T., & Pudasaini, S. (2014). Dreaming of you: Client and therapist dreams about each other during psychodynamic psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy Research*, 24(5), 523-537.

- Hummel, A. M. (2009). *How one helps: Personality, theoretical orientation, and helping skill preference*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 1465441)
- Hunter, S., Harris, M., & Trusty, J. (1998). Relationships among dogmatism, family ideology, and religiosity in master's-level counseling students. *Counseling and Values, 43*(1), 70-77.
- Injeyan, M., Shuman, C., Shugar, A., Chitayat, D., Atenafu, E., & Kaiser, A. (2011). Personality traits associated with genetic counselor compassion fatigue: The roles of dispositional optimism and locus of control. *Journal of Genetic Counseling, 20*(5), 526-540.
- Ivanovic, M. (2011). *Theoretical orientation and personality of the therapist: A graduate student sample*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (AAT 3448311)
- Jackson, J. L., Jr. (2010). *Theoretical counseling orientation: An initial aspect of professional orientation and identity*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (AAT 3422958)
- Jacobs, K. W. (1993). Psychometric properties of the internal control index. *Psychological Reports, 73*, 251-255.
- James, W. H., Woodruff, A. B., & Werner, W. (1965). Effect of internal and external control upon changes in smoking behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29*, 184-186.
- Jorn, P. M. (2000). *The relationship of self-efficacy, locus of control, and temporal attitude on career and major indecision*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses:

Full Text database. (AAT 1401196)

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The core self-evaluations scale: Development of a measure. *Personal Psychology*, 56(2), 303-331

Jung, C. G. (1964). *Man and his symbols*. London: Aldus Books.

Kass-Shraibman, F. (2008). *An examination of the job satisfaction of certified public accountants as it relates to their area of practice and their locus of control*.

Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3308301)

Kivlighan Jr., D. M., Hill, C. E., Gelso, C. J., & Baumann, E. (2016). Working alliance, real relationship, session quality, and client improvement in psychodynamic psychotherapy: A longitudinal actor partner interdependence model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 63(2), 149-161.

Lam, W., Lee, C., Taylor, M. S., & Zhao, H. H. (2016). Does proactive personality matter in leadership transitions? Effects of proactive personality on new leader identification and responses to new leaders and their change agendas. *Academy of Management Journal*, amj-2014.

Larson, D. (1980). Therapeutic schools, styles, and schoolism: A national survey. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 20(3), 3-20.

Larson, L. M., & Daniels, J. A. (1998). Review of the counseling self-efficacy literature. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26(2), 179-218.

Larsson, B. M., Kaldö, V., & Broberg, A. G. (2009). Similarities and differences between practitioners of psychotherapy in Sweden: A comparison of attitudes between psychodynamic, cognitive, cognitive-behavioral, and integrative therapists. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 19(1), 34-66.

- Leach, M. M., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (1997). Self-efficacy and counselor development: Testing the integrated developmental model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 37*, 115-125.
- Levitt, D. H. (2001). Active listening and counselor self-efficacy: Emphasis on one microskill in beginning counselor training. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20*, 101-115.
- Lichtenstein, E., & Keutzer, C. S. (1967). Further normative and correlation data on the internal-external (I-E) control of reinforcement scale. *Psychological Reports, 21*, 1014-1016.
- Lovinger, R. J. (1992). Theoretical affiliation in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy, 29*, 586-590.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Maltby, J., & Cope, C. D. (1996). Reliability estimates of the internal control index among UK samples. *Psychological Reports, 79*, 595-598.
- Masters, K. S., Bergin, A. E., Reynolds, E. M., & Sullivan, C. E. (1991). Religious lifestyles and mental health: A follow-up study. *Counseling and Values, 35*, 211-224.
- Matthews, P. J. (2004). *Spirituality and self-efficacy in counseling and social work trainees*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3149240)
- McClure, R. F., Livingston, R. B., Livingston, K. H., & Gage, R. (2005). A survey of practicing psychotherapists. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory & Research, 33*(1), 35-46.

- Melchert, T. P., Hays, V. L., Wiljanen, L. M., & Kolocek, A. K. (1996). Testing models of counselor development with a measure of counseling self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development* 74, 640-644.
- Meyers, L. S., & Wong, D. T. (1988). Validation of a new test of locus of control: The internal control index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 753-761.
- Moore, J. T., & Leach, M. M. (2016). Dogmatism and mental health: A comparison of the religious and secular. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 8(1), 54-64.
- Moore-Thomas, C., & Day-Vines, N. (2008, February 1). Culturally competent counseling for religious and spiritual African American adolescents. *Professional School Counseling*, 11, 159-165.
- Murdock, N. L., Duan, C., & Nilsson, J. E. (2012). Emerging approaches to counseling intervention: Theory, research, practice, and training. *Counseling Psychologist*, 40(7), 966-975.
- Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, K. J. (2013). Counseling theories converge: Person, client, therapist. *Counseling Today*. Retrieved March 12, 2017 from <http://ct.counseling.org/2013/11/counseling-theories-converge-person-client-therapist/>.
- Na, G. (2012). *Relationship between school counselor multicultural counseling competence and self-efficacy in working with recent immigrant students*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (AAT 3543596)

- Nielsen, S. L., Johnson, W. B., & Ellis, A. (2001). *Counseling and psychotherapy with religious persons: A rational emotive behavior therapy approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Norcross, J. C., Hedges, M., & Prochaska, J. O. (2002). The face of 2010: A Delphi poll on the future of psychotherapy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33(3), 316-322.
- Norcross, J. C., & Prochaska, J. O. (1982). A national survey of clinical psychologists: Affiliations and orientations. *The Clinical Psychologist*, 35, 1-6.
- Norcross, J. C., & Prochaska, J. O. (1983). Clinicians theoretical orientations: Selection, utilization and efficacy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 14, 197-208.
- Norcross, J. C., & Prochaska, J. O. (1988). A study of eclectic (and integrative) views revisited. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 19, 170-174.
- Norcross, J. C., & Prochaska, J. O. (1989). Clinical psychologists in the 1980's: II. theory, research and practice. *The Clinical Psychologist*, 42, 45-53.
- Norcross, J. C., & Prochaska, J. O. (1993). Psychologists conducting psychotherapy: New findings and historical comparisons on the psychotherapy division membership. *Psychotherapy*, 30, 692-697.
- Ogunfowora, B. O. (2006). *A study on the relationship between psychotherapists' personality profiles and their theoretical orientation preferences*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT MR24901)

- Ogunfowora, B., & Drapeau, M. (2008). A study of the relationship between personality traits and theoretical orientation preferences. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 8, 151-159.
- Parrott, G., & Brown, L. (1972). Political bias in the Rokeach dogmatism scale. *Psychological Reports*, 30, 805-806.
- Pasquariello, C. D. (2013). *Enhancing self-efficacy in the utilization of physical activity counseling: An online constructivist approach with psychologists-in-training*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (AAT 3611184)
- Phares, E. J. (1965). Internal-external control as a determinant of amount of social influence exerted. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, 642-647.
- Phares, E. J. (1976). *Locus of control in personality*. New Jersey: Silver Burdett Company.
- Pollock, S. L. (2007). *An investigation of the relationship between graduate counseling students' perceptions of spirituality and counselor self-efficacy in secular and faith-based universities*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3256938)
- Przytula, D. R. (2009). *Who is supervising the high school counselor? Analysis of job self-efficacy, job satisfaction and role analysis*. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (AAT 3323264)
- Pulver, S. E. (1993). The eclectic analyst, or the many roads to insight and change. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 42, 339-357.

- Rehn, R. A. (1982). *Relationship between dogmatism, self-esteem, locus of control and predisposition toward two instructional methods among female nursing students*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (8229228)
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mills.
- Rokeach, M. (1956). Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. *Psychological Monographs*, 70.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). *The open and closed mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rokeach, M., & Kerlinger, B. (1966). The factorial nature of the F and D scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 391-399.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1.
- Rotter, J. B., Chance, J. E., & Phares, E. J. (1972). *Applications of a social learning theory of personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Rowan, J. (1993). *The transpersonal: Psychotherapy and counselling*. London: Tavistock/Routledge.
- Rushlau, M. G. (1998). *An examination of self-efficacy in master's level counselor trainees*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (AAT 9911095)
- Sammons, M. T., & Gravitz, M. A. (1990). Theoretical orientations of professional psychologists and their former professors. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 21, 131-134.

- Sauermann, H., & Roach, M. (2012). Increasing web survey response rates in innovation research: An experimental study of static and dynamic contact design features. *Research Policy*, 42(1), 273-286.
- Scoles, M. A. (2011). *An examination of the impact of prior teaching experience on the self-efficacy of school counselors in the state of Ohio*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3493150)
- Seaman, J. M., Michel, J. B., & Dillehay, R. C. (1971). Membership in orthodox Christian groups, adjustment, and dogmatism. *Sociological Quarterly*, 12, 252-258.
- Seeman, M. (1963). Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69, 270-284.
- Seeman, M., & Evans, J. W. (1962). Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 772-783.
- Shafranske, E., & Maloney, H. (1990). Clinical psychologists' religious and spiritual orientations and their practice of psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 27, 72-78.
- Sharpley, C. F., & Ridgway, I. R. (1993). An evaluation of the effectiveness of self-efficacy as a predictor of trainees' counseling skills performance. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, 21, 73-92.
- Sid Nair, C. (2013). The effect of email notification on web-based questionnaire responses. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 35(4), 19-23.
- Skovholt, T. M., & Rønnestad, M. H., (1992). Themes in therapist and counselor development. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 505-515.

- Smith, D. S. (1982). Trends in counseling and psychotherapy. *American Psychologist*, 37, 802-809.
- Solaja, M. O., Idowu, E. F., & James, E. A. [2016]. Exploring the relationship between leadership communication style, personality trait and organizational productivity. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 11(1), 99-117.
- Steiner, G. L. (1978). A survey to identify factors in therapists' selection of a therapeutic orientation. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15, 371-374.
- Straits, B. C., & Sechrest, L. (1963). Further support of some findings about characteristics of smokers and non-smokers. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 27, 282.
- Strom, R. D., & Bernard, H. W. (1982). *Educational psychology*. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 477-486.
- Sundland, D. M. (1977). Theoretical orientations of psychotherapists. In A. S. Gurman & A. M. Razin (Eds.), *Effective psychotherapy: A handbook of research* (pp. 193-211). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Sun, S., Hoyt, W. T., & Zhao, J. (2016). Do received stereotypes about Asian clients apply to Chinese young adults? A survey of counselors in Chinese universities. *Professional Psychology: Research And Practice*, 47(1), 38-45.

- Tang, M., Addison, K. D., LaSure-Bryant, D., Norman, R., & Steward-Sicking, J. A. (2004). Factors that influence self-efficacy of counseling students: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*, 70-80.
- Tarakeshwar, N., Stanton, J., & Pargament, K. I. (2003). Religion: An overlooked dimension in cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*, 377-394.
- Troidahl, V. C., & Powell, F. A. (1965). A short form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. *Social Forces 44*, 211-214.
- Vasco, A. B., & Dryden, W. (1997). Does development do the deed? Clinical experience and epistemological development together account for similarities in therapeutic style. *Psychotherapy, 34*, 262-270.
- Villalba, J. A., & Redmond, R. E. (2008). Crash: Using a popular film as an experiential learning activity in a multicultural counseling course. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 47*, 264-276.
- Watkins, C. E., & Watts, R. E. (1995). Psychotherapy survey research studies: Some consistent findings and integrative conclusions. *Psychotherapy in Private Practice, 13*, 49-68.
- Watts, R. E. (2001). Addressing spiritual issues in secular counseling and psychotherapy: Response to Helminiak's (2001) views. *Counseling and Values, 45*, 207-217.
- Watts, R.E. (2007). Counseling conservative Christian couples: A spiritually sensitive perspective. In O. J. Morgan (Ed.), *Counseling & Spirituality: Views from the Profession* (pp. 165-186). Boston, MA: Lahaska/Houghton Mifflin.

Wheat, L. W. (1991). *Development of a scale for the measurement of human spirituality*.

Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (AAT 9205143)

Wheat, L. W., Cashwell, C. S., Young, J. S., Cashwell, T. H., & Belaire, C. (2001).

Human spirituality scale. *Counseling and Values*, 45, 145-153.

Worthington, R. L., & Dillon, F. R. (2003). The theoretical orientation profile scale

revised: A validation study. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and*

Development, 36, 95-105.

APPENDIX A

Summary Table

Summary of Research on Religiosity, Dogmatism, Locus of Control, Counselor Self-Efficacy, and Theoretical Orientation

Author(s)	Sample Size	Instrumentation	Results
Adegbola (2007)	90	Cell Self-efficacy Scale, Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General, Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy-Spirituality	Her study found statistically significant correlations between spirituality and quality of life, self-efficacy and quality of life, and self-efficacy and spirituality.
Altemeyer (2002)	781	Religious Fundamentalism Scale, Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale, DOG scale	Found the DOG scale to be valid and reliable.
Barbee, Scherer, and Combs (2003)	113	Demographic Questionnaire, CSES, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory	They found that counselor self-efficacy had a significant positive correlation with service learning in pre-practicum students, and that this might be due to the students getting experience with clients in clinical settings.
Charles (2007)	175	General Self-Efficacy Scale, Rotter's Locus of Control Scale, Sternberg's Triarchic Abilities Test	In her study she did not find a significant correlation between triarchic intelligence and locus of control.
Constantine (2001)	94	CCCI-R, CSES	She found that counselor self-efficacy contributed to multicultural counseling competence and that multicultural counseling training and supervision also helped improve multicultural counseling competence.

Author(s)	Sample Size	Instrumentation	Results
Crowson, DeBacker, and Davis (2008)	Sample 1: 415 Sample 2: 244 Sample 3: 254	DOG scale, Need for Cognition Scale-Short form, Need for Closure Scale, Personal Need for Structure Scale, Need to Evaluate, Rational Experiential Inventory, Troidahl and Powell's Dogmatism Scale, Shortened RWA Scale, Self-Related Political Conservatism and Ideological Polarization	They found evidence of discriminant validity, convergent validity, and criterion validity for the DOG scale.
Curry (2007)	88	Five Factor Wellness Evaluation of Lifestyle Inventory and, Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale	Curry examined the relationship between counselor self-efficacy and counselor wellness, but failed to find a significant link between the two.
Davis & Phares, 1967	84		People with an internal locus of control work to control their environment. Those with an internal locus of control asked for information more than those with an external locus of control.
Freeman (2003)	159	Myers/Briggs Type Indicator, Self-Directed Search, Counseling Theory Survey	Freeman's study found no statistically significant relationship between personality traits as measured by the SDS and MBTI and theoretical orientation.
Glover-Graf, Marini, Baker & Buck (2007)	95	Spirituality and Chronic Pain Survey	Religion and spirituality helped those with chronic pain to cope.
Harper (2008)	50	Work Locus of Control Scale, Norton's Measure of Tolerance and Ambiguity,	Found a positive relationship between internal locus of control and high counseling

Author(s)	Sample Size	Instrumentation	Results
		Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale	self-efficacy and high tolerance for ambiguity and high counseling self-efficacy. Also, she found a positive relationship between external locus of control and low counseling self-efficacy and low tolerance for ambiguity and low counseling self-efficacy.
Harris (2007)	59	Demographic questionnaire, counseling supervision received, prior counseling experience, Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory, Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales	She found that both beginning and advanced master's level rehabilitation counselors had high levels of counseling self-efficacy. Her study also suggested a link between both prior supervision and experience with counseling self-efficacy.
Jorn (2000)	116	Career Decision-Making Self-efficacy scale, Rotter's Locus of Control Scale, The Positive Attitude Subscale of Temporal Experience Inventory, demographic information form	He found that internal locus of control was positively correlated with a temporal perspective.
Kass-Shraibman (2008)	199	Demographic Questionnaire, Rotter's I-E Scale, Abridged Job Description Index	She found a small, but significant correlation between an internal locus of control and job satisfaction.
Levitt (2001)	5	Active Listening Measures, Self-efficacy questionnaire	She found that beginning counselors that had active listening emphasized in their supervision and instruction developed better active listening skills with clients.
Melchert, Hays,	138	Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale	Reliability and Validity of the measure

Author(s)	Sample Size	Instrumentation	Results
Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996)			
Matthews, 2004	423	Spirituality Awareness survey, Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, Psychomatrix Spirituality Inventory	The study showed a relationship between the Counselor Self Efficacy Scale and each element of the Psychomatrix Spirituality Inventory except in the case of Childhood Spirituality. Furthermore, the results showed a statistically significant relationship between CSES scores and PSI Total Factor scores.
Ogunfowora, 2006	493	HEXACO Personality Inventory, Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised	Found a relationship between a counselor's personality and his or her theoretical orientation.
Pollock, 2007	135	Demographic Questionnaire, Human Spirituality Scale,	She found some significance, with between 11% and 13% of the variance of counseling self-efficacy accounted for by spirituality level with a small effect size. Also, she found there was a statistically significant relationship between counseling self-efficacy and the demographic variables of age, gender, practicum or internship status, and number of hours completed.
Przytula (2009)	303	Adapted survey including demographic information, supervision style and frequency, The Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory, and counselor role analysis	He examined counseling self-efficacy and supervision in school counselors, but was unable to find a correlation. In the course of his study he did find a correlation between

Author(s)	Sample Size	Instrumentation	Results
			supervision and job satisfaction.
Rehn (1985)	159	Dogmatism Scale, Internal-External Scale, Self-esteem Inventory	Rehn found that self-efficacy correlated with better learning but did not report an effect size. Also, while dogmatism was not found to be significant in the study, group dogmatism appeared to be significant when measuring learning success.
Seeman, 1963	85	Alienation measure, Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale,	People with internal locus of control tended to try to get more control over their lives than those with an external locus of control.
(Shafranske & Maloney, 1990)	100	Demographics, adapted Four Dimensions of Religiosity Scale, extrinsic-means scale, intrinsic-ends scale, interactional-quest scale, measure of non-doctrinal belief, scale assessing attitudes and practices regarding specific counseling interventions	The majority of psychologists in their sample held religious beliefs and were of the opinion that religious beliefs were positive for people to have
Tang, Addison, LaSure-Bryant, Norman, and Steward-Sicking (2004)	116	Demographic Questionnaire, Self-Efficacy Inventory	They found that students with more coursework and clinical experience were more confident in their abilities.

APPENDIX B

IRB Initial Approval



Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
903 Bowers Blvd, Huntsville, TX 77341-2448
Phone: 936.294.4875
Fax: 936.294.3622
irb@shsu.edu
www.shsu.edu/~rgs_www/irb/

DATE: April 13, 2016

TO: Andrew Benesh [Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Richard Watts]

FROM: Sam Houston State University (SHSU) IRB

PROJECT TITLE: *The Relationship between Dogmatism, Locus of Control, Perceived Counselor Self-Efficacy and the Theoretical Orientation of Students in a Master's Level Counseling Practicum [T/D]*

PROTOCOL #: 2016-01-25703

SUBMISSION TYPE: INITIAL REVIEW

ACTION: FINAL DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS

DECISION DATE: April 13, 2016

REVIEW CATEGORY: Category 2—research involving survey/interview procedures usually has little, if any, associated risk, particularly if subject identifiers are removed from the data or specimens.

Thank you for your submission of Initial Review materials for this project. The Sam Houston State University (SHSU) IRB has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records.

*** What should investigators do when considering changes to an exempt study that could make it nonexempt?**

It is the PI's responsibility to consult with the IRB whenever questions arise about whether planned changes to an exempt study might make that study nonexempt human subjects research. In this case, please make available sufficient information to the IRB so it can make a correct determination.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB Office at 936-294-4875 or irb@shsu.edu. Please include your project title and protocol number in all correspondence with this committee.

Sincerely,

Donna Desforges
IRB Chair, PHSC

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Sam Houston State University IRB's records

APPENDIX C

IRB Amendment Approval



Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
903 Bowers Blvd, Huntsville, TX 77341-2448
Phone: 936.294.4875
Fax: 936.294.3622
irb@shsu.edu
www.shsu.edu/~rgs_www/irb/

DATE: April 25, 2016

TO: Andrew Benesh [Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Richard Watts]

FROM: Sam Houston State University (SHSU) IRB

PROJECT TITLE: *The Relationship between Dogmatism, Locus of Control, Perceived Counselor Self-Efficacy and the Theoretical Orientation of Students in a Master's Level Counseling Practicum [T/D]*

PROTOCOL #: 2016-01-25703

SUBMISSION TYPE: AMENDMENT

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS

DECISION DATE: April 25, 2016

REVIEW CATEGORY: Category 2—research involving survey/interview procedures usually has little, if any, associated risk, particularly if subject identifiers are removed from the data or specimens.

Thank you for your submission of Initial Review materials for this project. The Sam Houston State University (SHSU) IRB has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records.

*** What should investigators do when considering changes to an exempt study that could make it nonexempt?**

It is the PI's responsibility to consult with the IRB whenever questions arise about whether planned changes to an exempt study might make that study nonexempt human subjects research. In this case, please make available sufficient information to the IRB so it can make a correct determination.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB Office at 936-294-4875 or irb@shsu.edu. Please include your project title and protocol number in all correspondence with this committee.

Sincerely,

Donna Desforges
IRB Chair, PHSC

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Sam Houston State University IRB's records

APPENDIX D

SHSU Support Letter



Sam Houston State University

MEMBER THE TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELOR EDUCATION

March 18, 2016

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77341

Re: IRB Letter of Support for Andrew Benesh

I am writing this letter as a statement of support and to grant permission for Andrew Benesh to conduct research with students in Department of Counselor Education at Sam Houston State University. An overview of Mr. Benesh's research is stated below.

Research Overview:

1. Project Summary:

This research study will examine three areas of personality in master's level practicum students (dogmatism, locus of control, and counselor self-efficacy), and if there are any relationships between those and theoretical orientation.

2. Objectives:

To determine if there are any relationships between the specified elements of personality and theoretical orientation.

3. Background & Rationale:

Researchers have suggested that a counselor's theoretical orientation significantly influences case conceptualization and choice of techniques used in counseling. Also, many researchers have seen a relationship between a counselor's personality and his or her theoretical orientation. The purpose of this study is to fill a gap in the literature by examining the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy, and counselor theoretical orientation in a sample of master's level practicum students. Previous research suggests a link between personality and theoretical orientation, but I observed no research examining all of the constructs together.

Please let me know if you need additional information or have questions concerning Mr. Benesh's research or permission granted from the faculty in the Department of Counselor Education.

Sincerely,

Mary Nishter, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair, Department of Counselor Education

Sam Houston State University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

Huntsville, Texas 77341-2119 • 936.294.4148 • Fax 936.294.4277

APPENDIX E

UNT Support Letter



October 13, 2015

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville Texas, 77341

Re: IRB Letter of Support for Andrew Benesh

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to grant permission to Andrew Benesh to conduct research (described below) with UNT counseling program students. Please accept this letter as permission for Mr. Benesh to conduct his research with the full support of the counseling program's faculty and staff. I appreciate your cooperation in this matter. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Research Overview

1. Project Summary:

This research study will examine three areas of personality in masters level practicum students (dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy), and if there are any relationships between those and theoretical orientation.

2. Objectives:

To determine if there are any relationships between the specified elements of personality and theoretical orientation.

3. Background & Rationale:

Researchers have suggested that a counselor's theoretical orientation significantly influences case conceptualization and choice of techniques used in counseling. Also, many researchers have seen a relationship between a counselor's personality and his or her theoretical orientation. The purpose of this study is to fill a gap in the literature by examining the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy, and counselor theoretical orientation in a sample of master's level practicum students. Previous research suggests a link between personality and theoretical orientation, but I observed no research examining all of the constructs together.

Sincerely,

Natalya Ann Lindo, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Program Coordinator, Counseling & Higher Education

1155 Union Circle #313829 940.565.2910 www.ore.unt.edu
Denton, Texas 76203 5017 940.565.2905 fax

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS LIBRARY

APPENDIX F

Texas State Support Letter



March 30, 2016

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville Texas, 77341

Re: IRB Letter of Support for Andrew Benesh

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to grant permission to Andrew Benesh to conduct research (described below) with the Texas State University Professional Counseling Program's students. I have spoken with the program faculty and they are willing to participate in the research. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Research Overview

1. Project Summary:

This research study will examine three areas of personality in masters level practicum students (dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy), and if there are any relationships between those and theoretical orientation.

2. Objectives:

To determine if there are any relationships between the specified elements of personality and theoretical orientation.

3. Background & Rationale:

Researchers have suggested that a counselor's theoretical orientation significantly influences case conceptualization and choice of techniques used in counseling. Also, many researchers have seen a relationship between a counselor's personality and his or her theoretical orientation. The purpose of this study is to fill a gap in the literature by examining the relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, counselor self-efficacy, and counselor theoretical orientation in a sample of master's level practicum students. Previous research suggests a link between personality and theoretical orientation, but I observed no research examining all of the constructs together.

Sincerely,

Kevin A. Fall, Ph.D., LPC-S
Professor and Program Coordinator
Professional Counseling Program

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING, LEADERSHIP, ADULT EDUCATION AND SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
601 UNIVERSITY DRIVE | SAN MARCOS, TEXAS 78666-4684 | phone 512.245.3083 | fax 512.245.8872 | WWW.TXSTATE.EDU/CLAS

Texas State University-San Marcos, founded in 1899, is a member of The Texas State University System.

APPENDIX G

UTSA Support Letter



The University of Texas at San Antonio
College of Education and Human Development - Downtown
Department of Counseling

April 13, 2016

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77341

RE: IRB Letter of Support for Andrew Benesh

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to grant permission to Andrew Benesh to conduct research with UTSA counseling students. Please accept this letter as permission for Mr. Benesh to conduct his research with UTSA counseling students.

If you have further questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Heather Trepal, Ph.D.
Graduate Advisor of Record
Department of Counseling

APPENDIX H**Subject Information Sheet**

My name is Andrew Benesh, and I am Doctoral Student of the Department of Counselor Education at Sam Houston State University. I would like to invite you to participate in a research examining the personalities of master's counseling practicum students and their counseling theoretical orientation. I hope that data from this research will show that various aspects of one's personality are related to the counseling theory a person chooses. You have been asked to participate in the research because you are currently enrolled as a master's practicum counseling student.

The research is relatively straightforward, and we do not expect the research to pose any risk to any of the volunteer participants. If you would like to participate in this research, you will be asked to take some online surveys. Any data obtained from you will only be used for the purpose of determining the relationship between personality and counseling theory choice. Under no circumstances will you or any other participants who participated in this research be identified. In addition, your data will remain confidential. This research will require about 20-30 minutes of your time. Participants will not be paid or otherwise compensated for their participation in this project.

Participation is voluntary. If you decide to not participate in this research, your decision will not affect your future relations with Sam Houston State University. Also, if at any point during the research you decide to withdraw, or do not wish to, participate in the remainder of the research you are free to withdraw your permission and to discontinue

participation at any time without affecting that relationship. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask me using the contact information below. If you are interested, the results of this study will be available at the conclusion of the project.

Your survey responses will be kept confidential to the extent of the technology being used. SurveyMonkey collects IP addresses for respondents to surveys they host; however, the ability to connect your survey responses to your IP address has been disabled for this survey. That means that I will not be able to identify your responses. You should, however, keep in mind that answers to specific questions may make you more easily identifiable. The security and privacy policy for Survey Monkey can be viewed at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/policy/privacy-policy/>.

If you have any questions about this research, please feel free to contact me, Andrew Benesh or my Faculty Sponsor, Dr. Richard Watts, using our contact information below.

Andrew Benesh
Department of Counselor Education
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77341
Phone: (936) 294-4148
E-mail: ACB012@shsu.edu

Dr. Richard Watts/
Department of Counselor Education
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77341
Phone: (936) 294-4658
Email: REW003@shsu.edu

☐ I understand the above and would like to participate.

☐ I do not wish to participate in the current study.

APPENDIX I

Demographic Information Survey

1. What is your gender?
 - a. Female
 - b. Male
2. What is your age?
 - a. 18-24 years old
 - b. 25-34 years old
 - c. 35-44 years old
 - d. 45-54 years old
 - e. 55-64 years old
 - f. 65-74 years old
 - g. 75 years or older
3. What is your ethnicity? (open response)
4. Which best describes your sexual orientation?
 - a. Heterosexual
 - b. Lesbian
 - c. Gay
 - d. Bisexual
 - e. Another sexual orientation (open response)
5. How many semesters have you been in the masters program?
 - a. 2

- b. 3
- c. 4
- d. 5
- e. 6

6. What counseling track are you pursuing?

- a. Addiction Counseling
- b. Career Counseling
- c. Clinical Mental Health Counseling
- d. Marriage, Couple and Family Counseling
- e. School Counseling
- f. Student Affairs and College Counseling

7. What is the theoretical orientation of your practicum professor (if identified)?

8. What is the theoretical orientation of your department or program (if identified)?

9. What is your theoretical orientation?

- a. Psychoanalytic/Psychodynamic
- b. Humanistic/Existential
- c. Cognitive-behavioral
- d. Family systems
- e. Multicultural
- f. Feminist

APPENDIX J

Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale-Revised

The following items have been devised to assess the extent to which you identify with, conceptualize from, and utilize techniques consistent with several theoretical schools of counseling and psychotherapy.

1. I identify myself to others as Psychoanalytic or Psychodynamic in orientation.

Not at all |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Completely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. I conceptualize client problems from a Psychoanalytic or Psychodynamic perspective.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. I utilize Psychoanalytic or Psychodynamic therapy techniques.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. I identify myself to others as Humanistic or Existential in orientation.

Not at all |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Completely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. I conceptualize client problems from a Humanistic or Existential perspective.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. I utilize Humanistic or Existential therapy techniques.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. I identify myself to others as Cognitive or Behavioral in orientation.

Not at all |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Completely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. I conceptualize client problems from a Cognitive or Behavioral perspective.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. I utilize Cognitive or Behavioral therapy techniques.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. I identify myself to others as Family Systems in orientation.

Not at all |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Completely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11. I conceptualize client problems from a Family Systems perspective.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

12. I utilize Family Systems therapy techniques.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

13. I identify myself to others as Feminist in orientation.

Not at all |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Completely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

14. I conceptualize client problems from a Feminist perspective.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15. I utilize Feminist therapy techniques.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

16. I identify myself to others as Multicultural in orientation.

Not at all |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Completely
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

17. I conceptualize client problems from a Multicultural perspective.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

18. I utilize Multicultural therapy techniques.

Never |----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----| Always
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completed items within each theoretical school are summed. Items not rated are dropped.

Scores on each of the six subscales range from 1 to 30 and provide an indication of the extent to which respondents adhere to each specific theoretical orientation. There are no reverse scored items.

APPENDIX K

The DOG Scale

X. I may be wrong about some of the little things in life, but I am quite certain I am right about all the BIG issues.

Y. Someday I will probably think that many of my present ideas were wrong.

1. Anyone who is honestly and truly seeking the truth will end up believing what I believe.
2. There are so many things we have not discovered yet, nobody should be absolutely certain his beliefs are right.
3. The things I believe in are so completely true I could never doubt them.
4. I have never discovered a system of beliefs that explains everything to my satisfaction.
5. It is best to be open to all possibilities and ready to reevaluate all your beliefs.
6. My opinions are right and will stand the test of time.
7. Flexibility is a real virtue in thinking, since you may well be wrong.
8. My opinions and beliefs fit together perfectly to make a crystal-clear “picture” of things.
9. There are no discoveries or facts that could possibly make me change my mind about the things that matter most in life.
10. I am a long way from reaching final conclusions about the central issues in life.
11. The person who is absolutely certain she has the truth will probably never find it.
12. I am absolutely certain that my ideas about the fundamental issues in life are correct.

13. The people who disagree with me may well turn out to be right.
14. I am so sure I am right about the important things in life there is no evidence that could convince me otherwise.
15. If you are “open-minded” about the most important things in life, you will probably reach the wrong conclusions.
16. Twenty years from now, some of my opinions about the important things in life will probably have changed.
17. “Flexibility in thinking” is another name for being “wishy-washy”.
18. No one knows all the essential truths about the central issues in life.
19. Someday I will probably realize my present ideas about the BIG issues are wrong.
20. People who disagree with me are just plain wrong and often evil as well.

Responses will be taken using a 9 pt Likert scale

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Moderately disagree
- 4 = Mildly disagree
- 5 = Neither disagree or agree
- 6 = Mildly agree
- 7 = Moderately agree
- 8 = Agree
- 9 = Strongly agree

Questions 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 19 are reverse scored.

The first two statements, X and Y, are not scored, but are to familiarize the participant with the format of the assessment.

APPENDIX L

Internal Control Index

1. When faced with a problem I _____ try to forget it.
2. I _____ need frequent encouragement from others for me to keep working at a difficult task.
3. I _____ like jobs where I can make decisions and be responsible for my own work.
4. I _____ change my opinion when someone I admire disagrees with me.
5. If I want something I _____ work hard to get it.
6. I _____ prefer to learn the facts about something from someone else rather than have to dig them out for myself.
7. I will _____ accept jobs that require me to supervise others.
8. I _____ have a hard time saying “no” when someone tries to sell me something I don’t want.
9. I _____ like to have a say in any decisions made by any group I’m in.
10. I _____ consider the different sides of an issue before making any decisions.
11. What other people think _____ has a great influence on my behavior.
12. Whenever something good happens to me I _____ feel it is because I’ve earned it.
13. I _____ enjoy being in a position of leadership.
14. I _____ need someone else to praise my work before I am satisfied with what I’ve done.

15. I am _____ sure enough of my opinions to try and influence others.
16. When something is going to affect me I _____ learn as much about it as I can.
17. I _____ decide to do things on the spur of the moment.
18. For me, knowing I've done something well is _____ more important than being praised by someone else.
19. I _____ let other peoples' demands keep me from doing things I want to do.
20. I _____ stick to my opinions when someone disagrees with me.
21. I _____ do what I feel like doing not what other people think I ought to do.
22. I _____ get discouraged when doing something that takes a long time to achieve results.
23. When part of a group I _____ prefer to let other people make all the decisions.
24. When I have a problem I _____ follow the advice of friends or relatives.
25. I _____ enjoy trying to do difficult tasks more than I enjoy trying to do easy tasks.
26. I _____ prefer situations where I can depend on someone else's ability rather than just my own.
27. Having someone important tell me I did a good job is _____ more important to me than feeling I've done a good job.
28. When I'm involved in something I _____ try to find out all I can about what is going on even when someone else is in charge.

Questions are scored on a five point Likert scale where:

1 = Rarely

2 = Occasionally

3 = Sometimes

4 = Frequently

5 = Usually

Questions 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27 are reverse scored so that high total scores on the instrument correspond with high internal locus of control.

APPENDIX M

The Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale Items

1. My knowledge of personality development is adequate for counseling effectively.
2. My knowledge of ethical issues related to counseling is adequate for me to perform professionally.
3. My knowledge of behavior change principles is not adequate.
4. I am not able to perform psychological assessment to professional standards.
5. I am able to recognize the major psychiatric conditions.
6. My knowledge regarding crisis intervention is not adequate.
7. I am able to effectively develop therapeutic relationships with clients.
8. I can effectively facilitate client self-exploration.
9. I am not able to accurately identify client affect.
10. I cannot discriminate between meaningful and irrelevant client data.
11. I am not able to accurately identify my own emotional reactions to clients.
12. I am not able to conceptualize client cases to form clinical hypotheses.
13. I can effectively facilitate appropriate goal development with clients.
14. I am not able to apply behavior change skills effectively.
15. I am able to keep my personal issues from negatively affecting my counseling.
16. I am familiar with the advantages and disadvantages of group counseling as a form of intervention.
17. My knowledge of the principles of group dynamics is not adequate.
18. I am able to recognize the facilitative and debilitative behaviors of group members.

19. I am not familiar with the ethical and professional issues specific to group work.
20. I can function effectively as a group leader/facilitator.

The assessment is scored using a 5 pt Likert scale where:

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Undecided

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

Questions 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19 will be reverse scored so that high scores will indicate high counselor self-efficacy.

VITA

EDUCATION

PhD	Counselor Education	Sam Houston State University Huntsville, TX	In Progress
-----	---------------------	--	-------------

Dissertation: The relationship between dogmatism, locus of control, perceived counselor self-efficacy, and the theoretical orientation of students in a master's level counseling practicum.

M.Ed.	Community Counseling	Baylor University Waco, TX	May 2007
-------	----------------------	-------------------------------	----------

M.T.S.	Theological Studies	Baylor University Waco, TX	May 2007
--------	---------------------	-------------------------------	----------

BBA	Business Administration Information Systems	Baylor University Waco, TX	May 2001
-----	--	-------------------------------	----------

LICENSES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Licensed Professional Counselor, Texas State Board of Examiners of Professional Counselors

Affiliate Sex Offender Treatment Provider, Counsel on Sex Offender Treatment

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2011–Present	Therapist	Texas Department of Criminal Justice Huntsville, TX
--------------	-----------	--

2009–2011	Volunteer Staff Counselor	Good Shepherd Mission Huntsville, TX
-----------	---------------------------	---

2011-2011	Teaching Assistant	Sam Houston State University Huntsville, TX
-----------	--------------------	--

2007-2011	Doctoral Fellow	Sam Houston State University Huntsville, TX
-----------	-----------------	--

2005-2006	Career Counselor	Baylor University Waco, TX
-----------	------------------	-------------------------------

2004-2007	Graduate Assistant	Baylor University Waco, TX
2001-2003	Programmer	Baylor University Waco, TX
2001-2001	Activity Center Receptionist	Columbus Avenue Baptist Church Waco, TX
1997-1998	Math Tutor	Texas State Technical College Waco, TX

HIGHLIGHTS OF QUALIFICATIONS

- Licensed Professional Counselor
- Affiliate Sex Offender Treatment Provider
- Almost 5 years of experience working with incarcerated sex offenders in a rehabilitation program as part of their parole requirements.
- Several years of counseling experience working in a wide range of settings with a very diverse client base, including extensive experience helping clients through addiction recovery.
- Worked with college students from many different countries mentoring them as they adjusted to college and provided career counseling.
- Extensive experience using the Strong Interest Inventory and Myers-Briggs Type Indicator assessments to help students choose a major.
- Experience teaching and maintaining online counseling courses.
- Extensive experience in clinical settings, including running a clinic and supervising counseling students.
- Volunteered as an individual and group counselor in a community agency specializing in substance abuse counseling.
- Published or in the process of publishing articles in the areas of multicultural counseling, male development, group counseling techniques, and counseling theories.
- Maintained an active research agenda that includes multicultural issues in counseling, counseling theories, and religion and spirituality in counseling.
- Multiple presentations at state and national conferences on topics including counseling techniques and the challenges of working with helicopter parents.

RELEVANT COURSE WORK

- Career Counseling
- Theories of Counseling
- Community Counseling
- Marriage and Family Theories
- Marriage and Family Techniques
- Play Therapy
- Psychopathology
- Religion and Spirituality in Counseling
- Child and Adolescent Development

PRESENTATIONS

Watts, R. E., Harris, K., & Benesh, A. (June, 2008). Filial therapy in Adlerian context: Building strong families through parent-child relationship training. Presented at the North American Society for Adlerian Psychology (NASAP) Annual Conference, Harrisburg/Hersey, PA (refereed).

Watts, R. E., Harris, K., & Benesh, A. (June, 2008). Expanding the acting “as if” technique: An Adlerian/constructivist integration. Presented at the North American Society for Adlerian Psychology (NASAP) Annual Conference, Harrisburg/Hersey, PA (refereed).

Watts, R.E., Harris, K., & Benesh, A. (November, 2008). Reflecting as if: Helping clients create preferred realities. Presented at the Texas Counseling Association Annual Conference, Houston, TX (refereed).

Stark, M., Benesh, A., (2008, March). Helicopter Parents: An Asset or Liability in Career Counseling? Presented at the American College Personnel Association Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA (refereed).

Henriksen, R. C., Jr., Sharma, B., Benesh, A., & Harris, K. (2010). The no hiding place group format: Helping to increase group participation. Presented at the Association for Specialists in Group Counseling 2010 Conference, New Orleans, LA (refereed).

Benesh, A. (2016, April). Pedophilia. Training presentation for Texas Department of Criminal Justice Sex Offender Rehabilitation Programs, Huntsville, TX.

PUBLICATIONS

Benesh, A. C., Henriksen, R. C. (2009). Intersecting Socially Constructed Identities With Multiple Heritage Identify. In R. C. Henriksen & D. A. Paladino (Eds.), Counseling

multiple heritage individuals, couples, and families (pp. 145-156). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Eckstein, D., & Benesh, A. (2009). Male development. In B. Erford (Ed.), *ACA Encyclopedia of Counseling* (pp. 327-328). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Henriksen, R. C., Benesh, A., & Sharma, B. (2016) The No Hiding Place group format: Helping to increase group participation. Manuscript in preparation.

HONORS

Chi Sigma Iota	Counselor Honor Society	2006-2007
Gamma Beta Phi	Member, Freshman Honor Society	1998-1999

SERVICE

Work Service

Sex Offender Rehabilitation Program Curriculum Workgroup	2016-2017
Member	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated as a member of a workgroup to update the counseling curriculum used by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice in the Sex Offender Rehabilitation Program 	

University Service

Welcome Week-Freshman	Helped freshmen adapt to and lead a	1998-2000
MinCon Leader	balanced college life	

Community Service

Face to Face Ministries		1999-2001
Student Leadership Team		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helped lead the ministry and its various functions on the Baylor University campus Worked to ensure the ministry stayed focused on its Mission Statement and Vision 		
Good Shepherd Mission	Volunteered as an individual and group	2009-2011
Volunteer Staff	counselor in a community agency	
Counselor	specializing in substance abuse counseling.	

Boy Scouts of America

Boy Scout and
Assistant
Scoutmaster

Developed leadership potential
and team experience while attaining
my Eagle Scout rank

1991-Present