ED 141 651

CG 011 465

AUTHOR TITLE

Bollet, Robert; Dziuban, Charles The Validation of a Counselor Behavior Congruency Scale - Technical Supplement.

PUB DATE

Nov 76 NOTE -10p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Personnel and Guidance Association (Orlando, Florida, November 18-20, 1976)

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS MP-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage. Adult Characteristics: \*Behavior Rating Scales; Counseling Effectiveness: \*Counselor Characteristics; \*Individual Characteristics: Individual Dsychology: Measurement Instruments: \*Psychological Characteristics: Research Profects: Self Actualization: \*Self Concept Tests: \*Self Congruence

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to gather preliminary evidence regarding the properties of an instrument designed to assess the behavior congruence responses of adults/(Congruency Behavior Scale-CBS). The instrument, in its present form, consists of 45 items. Subjects were 195 graduate students. Responses were subjected to a number of analytical procedures. Congruency scores for each item are presented. The following items elicit predominantly congruent responses: lacks self-confidence; easily led; always giving advice; acts important; bossy; and dominating. These items elicit predominantly incongruent responses: self-respecting; firm but just; capable of complaint if necessary; resentful of being bossed; and hard to impress. Categorical responses to the items demonstrate that generally incongruent responses are dominated by "I am and should not be, ideally" while congruent classifications are dominated by "I am and I should be, ideally". All items met the criterion for acceptable discrimination. The mean congruency score was 22.6 with a standard deviation of 13.5. The KR-20 reliability coefficient was .96 with a concomitantly small standard error of measurement. These results suggest that it is possible to assess the construct of congruency behavior. Such information may facilitate future counselor training. (Author/JLL)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

The Validation of a \*\*
Counselor Behavior Congruency Scale - Technical Supplement

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO ERIC AND SPIGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMINTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

and \_

Florida Technological University

Charles Dziuban

Robert Bollet

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OF ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Personnel and Guidance Association

Orlando 4 November 18-20, 1976

Not to be cited or reproduced vithout permission of the authors.

# The Validation of a Counselor Behavior Congruency Scale - Technical Supplement

### Robert Bollet and Charles Dziuban

#### Introduction

It was the purpose of this study to gather preliminary evidence regarding the properties of an instrument designed to assess the behavior congruency responses of adults (Congruency Behavior Scale - CBS). The instrument in its present form consists of forty-five (45) items to which an individual may signal one of the following response patterns:

I am and I should not be ideally
I am not and I should be ideally
I am and I should be ideally
I am not and I should not be ideally

The first two represent incongruent responses while the final two signal congruent behavior. Pelser (1975) using a longer version of the scale (CBS-I) was able to demonstrate a substantial increase in the mean congruency responses of a group of subjects who underwent counseling. Her research was the first indication of the instrument's validity.

## The Present Study

Forty-five (45) items randomly selected from the CBS-I were used as the basis of the present form (CBS-II). It was administered to one hundred thirty-five (135) graduate students at Florida Technological University. Those responses were subjected to the following analytic procedures:

- 1) The proportion of responses for each category per item was determined.
- 2) The item difficulties were determined in the sense of congruency.
- 3) The item total score correlations were determined.

- 4) The internal consistency (KR-20) reliability coefficient was determined.
- 5) The standard error of measurement was determined.

### Results

The congruency scores for each of the items are presented in Table 1.

If 59% were arbitrarily used as a cut-off point, the following items would be classified as eliciting predominantly congruent responses:

Lacks self-confidence
Lasily led
Always giving advice
Acts important
Bossy
Dominating

while the following would comprise predominantly incongruent responses:

Self-respecting Firm but just Can complain if necessary Resents being bossed Hard to impress

The remaining items were approximately proportional so that no predominance emerged. There is presented in Table 2 the categorical responses to the items.

It may be observed that generally the incongruent responses were dominated

by "I am and should not be ideally." Twenty-seven (27) of the items in the congruency classification were dominated by the response pattern "I am and I should be ideally."

There is presented in Table 3 item total score correlations as well as a summary of the measurement properties of the instrument. It may be observed that all of the items (mot the criterion for acceptable discrimination. The

mean congruency score was 22.6 with a standard deviation 13.5. The KR-20 reliability coefficient was .96 with a concomitantly small standard error of measurement.

These preliminary results seem to suggest that it is indeed possible to assess the construct of congruency behavior. Additional research is necessary, but we view these results with cautious optimism and feel that such information might facilitate counselor training.

## Congruency Scores for Each of the Items

		. 3				
Item		•		· Congruent	Inco	ngruent %
Well thought of	1			69 50.7	.67	49 3
Able to give orders	4			52 38.2	84	61.8
Self-respecting				68 50.0	68	50.0
Independent				60 / 44.1	76	55.9
Able to take care of	colf .	•		69 50.7		49.3
Can be indifferent t		4	<i>i</i>	60 44.1	76	55.9
	o others		*			
Firm but just			TV.	47 34.6	•	65.4
Can be frank and hor				69 50.7	67	49.3
Can complain if nece			• .	54 39.7	82	60.3
Able to criticize se	1f		•	68 50.0	.68	50.0
Apologetic '.				60 44.1;		55.9
Can be obedient				63 46.3	.73	,53.7
Usually gives in				57 41.9	79	58.1
Appreciative			,	72 *52.9	64	47.1 .
Affectionate and und	erstanding			68 50.0	68	50.0
Considerate				75 55.1	61	44.9
Encourages others				69 50.7		49.3
Helpful .				77 56.6	59	
Big-hearted .		•		65 47.8		52.2
		141		. 63 46.3		53.7
Respected by others						
Likes responsibility	<b>3</b> 03	. 1		. 60 44.1		`55.9
Self-reliant	74			67 49.3		50.7
Likes to compete wit				59 43.4		56.6
Hard-boiled when nec	essary			62 45.6		54.4
Stern but fair	*	( -		64 47.1		52 -9
Resents being bossed	•	1		51 37.5		.62.5
Skeptical	•			55 40.4	. 81	<b>59.</b> ⁴6
Hard to impress	•			71 52.2	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	47.8
Touchy and easily hu	rt			71 52.2	65	47.8
Easily embarrassed				64. 47.1	72	52.9
Lacks of self-confid	ence .		: .	.86 63.2	50	36.8
Easily led	•		,	- 89 65.4	47	34.6
Modest,				67 49.3	69	50.7-
Very respectful to a	uthority			68 50.0		
Trusting and eager t				63 46.3		53.7
Always pleasant and	agreeable			61 44.9	75	55.1
Wants evéryone to li	ko him			70 51.5		
Sociable and neighbo				66 48.5		
	rly			10.00	_	
Warm .				69 50.7		49.3
Tender and soft-hear			. •	74 54.4		
Gives freely of self		•		57,41.9		
Always giving advice	,		,	87 64.0		
Acts important	. '			110 80.9		
Bossy . \			.1	101 74.3		25.7
Dominating _	-			95 69.9	41	30.1

Frequency Distributions for the Item Responses

							-	
	' :	KO	(	OX.	2	ΚX	(	00*
Item	N	%	N	%	• N	%	. N	% .
Well thought of	60	44.4	7	5.2	64	47.4	4	3.0
Able to give orders	50	37.0	33	24.4	41	30.4	11	8.1
Self-respecting	4.8	35.6	19	. 14.1	66	48.9	2	1.5
Independent	53	39.3	23	17.0	54	40.0	5	3.7
Able to take care of self	57	42.2	9	6.7	67	49.6	2	1.5
Can be indifferent to others	62	45.9	14	10.4	11	.8.1	48	35.6
Firm but just	-40	29.6	48	35.6	41	30.4	. 6	4.4
Can be frank and honest j	44	32.6	22	16.3		45.9	7	5.2
Can complain if necessary	64	47.4	17	12.6	47.	34.8	7	5.2
Able to criticize self	53	39.3	14	10.4	59	43.7	9	6.7
Apologetic /	63	46.7	12	8.9	35	25.9	25	18.5
Can be obedient	68	50.4	4	3.0	45	33.3	18	13.3
Usually gives in	58	43.0	20	14.8	6	4.4	51	37.8
Appreciat/ive	56	41.5	8	5.9	67	49.6	4	3.0
Affectionate and understanding	50	37.0	1,7	12.6	65	48.1	3	2.2
Considerate	51	37.8	9.	6.7	71	52.6	4	3.0
Encourages others	55	40.7	11	8.1	67	49.6	2	1.5
Helpful	51	37.8	7:	5.2	72	53.3	5	3.7
Big-hearted /	48	35.6	22	16.3	47	34.8	18	13.3
Respected by others	48	35.6	24	17.8	56	41.5	7	
Likes responsibility	. 38	28.1	37	27.4	44	32.6	16	11.9
Self-reliant	48	35.6	20	14.8	54	40.0	13	. 9.6
Likes to compete with others	42	31.1	34	25.2	20	14.8	39	28.9
Hard-boiled when necessary	* 37	27.4	37	27.4	24	17.8	37	27.4
Stern but fair	44	32.6	28	20.7	37	27.4	26	19,3
Resents being bossed	67	49.6	18	13.3	14	10.4	36	26.7
Skeptical /	62	45.9	19	14.1	12	. 8.9	42	31.1
Hard to impress	45	33.3	20	14.8	13	9.6	57	42,2
Touchy and, easily hurt	54	40.0	10	7.4	4	3.0	67	49.6
Easily embarrassed	, '60	44.4	11	8.1	3	2.2	61	45.2
Lacks self-confidence	, 36	26.7	13	9.6	1	ò.7	85	63.0 .
Easily led	30	22.2	16	11.9	1	0.7	88	65.2
Modest	5,4	40.0	14	10.4	19	14.1	48	35.6
Very respectful to authority	54	40.0	13	9.6	38	28,1	30	22.2
Trusting and eager to please	65	48.1	7	5.2	34	25.2	29	21.5
Always pleasant and agreeable	19	14.1	55.	40.7	19	14.1	42	31.1
Wants everyone to like him	51	37.8	14	10.4	20	14.8	50	37.0
Sociable and neighborly	41	30.4	. 28	20.7	49	36.3	17	12.6
Warm	50	37.0	16	11.9	56	41.5	13	9.76
Tender and soft-hearted	54	40.0	7	5.2	41	30.4	33	24.4
Gives freely of self.	44	32.6	34	25.2	40	29.6	17	12.6
Always giving advice	34	25.2	15	11.1	3	2.2	83	61.5
Acts important •	10	7,4	16	11.9	2	1.5	107	79.3
Bossy	19	14.1	16	11.9	3	2.2	97	71.9
Dominating		19.3	13	9.6	• 4	3.0	90	66.7

<sup>\*</sup>XO I am and I should not be ideally
OX I am not and I should be ideally
XX I am and I should be ideally
OO I am not and I should not be ideally

Table 3

## Summary Item Analysis Data for the CBS-II

tem		Discrimination	Index
Well thought of		.71	
Able to give orders		.55	
Self-respecting.		.79	
Independent		. 66	
Able to take care of self		.80	
Can be indifferent to others	,	.39	
Firm but just		.63	
Can be frank and honest		.67	
Can complain if necessary	. ,.	.65	
Able to criticize self		75	
Apologetic .		.50	
Can be obedient		.60	
Usually gives in		.44	•
Appreciative			
Affectionate and understanding		, .78	
Considerate		1	
		.80	•
Encourages others		'.77	1
Helpfül	`	. 78	4
Big-hearted	* .	.74	
Respected by others	•	.72	•
Likes responsibility	ï	.60	
Self-reliant	0	.71	•
Likes to compete with others	•	.52	
Hard-boiled when necessary		.57.	
Stern but fair	•	.65	
Resents being bossed		.50	
Skeptical		. 42 '	
Hard to impress		.53	/
Touchy and Easily hurt	4	50	/
Easily embarrassed		.50	,
Lacks of self-confidence		<b>.</b> 4 <b>,</b> 5	
Easily led		.43	
Modest		.56	
Very respectful to authority		. 65-	a
Trusting and eager to please		.65	
Always pleasant and agreeable	7	.44	,
Wants eyeryone to like him		.56	
Scoiable and neighborly		.67	
Warm		.76	2
Tender and soft-hearted		.70	•
Gives freely of self-		.62	
Always giving advice		.44	1
Acts important		.58	
Bossy	,	50	
Dominating ·	••	.40	, .

X = 22.59 KR-20 = .96 S.D = 13.50 S.X = 2.64

Pelser, N. The Standardization of a Congruency Scale for Counselor Trainees. (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Florida Technological University, 1975).

Cumulative Percentage Points for the Congruency Scores

	. 1	1	Ċ	umulat	íve	
	Score	,	I	ercent	age	
		. ,	-	, ,	•	1
	0			4.4 8.8		
1	2 -	•	-	9.6		
	3		•	11.0		1
	4 .		•	14.7	,	1
	. 5			15.4	,	1
	6			16.9	1	1
	.7			17.6		1
	. 8		•	20.6		1
	9			22.8	٠	
	10 ,			25.0		1
	11 ' -			. 26.5		١,
	. 12	,		° 29.4		
	13			31.6		
	14			35,3		
	15			38:2		
	16	1		39,7	·	-
	18	-	1	41.2	I	
	-20 21	,		43.4 44.1		
	21			44.1	•	
	23	-		46.3		
	24			47.8		ĺ
	25			49.3	/	
:	26			52.2		
	27			53.7		
-	28	•		55.1		
	.29			59.6		
	30		•	.64.0		l
	31			66.2		
	32			67.6		
	33			73.5		1
	34			76.5		
	35	•		78.7		
	36 - 37 -			83.1 86.0	`~	
	38			89.0		
	- 39			91.2		
	40			92.6	-	-
	41			94.1		
	42			97.1		
	43			97.8		
1	. 45			100.0		
١						