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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the demographic information and personal constructs which define excellent head counselors at a camp for children with multiple disabilities. The ten head counselors were students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville who were enrolled in a 1996 spring semester course on outdoor education for children with disabilities. The study examined secondary data collected either in class, or at the end of the one week camp program, and included evaluation forms and background information. The head counselors were rated by approximately ten counselors in their cabin group. A one-way ANOVA followed by post hoc comparison found that two head counselors were significantly different from other counselors in the group based on mean global scores derived from the evaluations. It was concluded from the data that leadership and reliability are the two constructs that distinguish the least excellent head counselors from the most excellent. Since all ten head counselors were rated excellent, and all ten were upperclassmen, it was concluded that the maturity level of the more experienced student is a benefit in the supervisory position of head counselor.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Camp Koinonia is a residential camp for children with multiple disabilities in the east Tennessee area. The camp environment focuses on outdoor education and fosters independence and personal growth through community living. A variety of experiences are provided including, horseback riding, canoeing, nature crafts, music and dance, sports and games, ropes activities, and special events. The children who attend the camp have disabilities including, cerebral palsy, autism, mental retardation, auditory and visual impairments, spina bifida, and joint disorders.

The camp program takes place for one week in the spring at the Clyde M. York 4-H Training Camp in Crossville, Tennessee. It is the culmination of a course at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville, in which students are trained to fill the various staff roles at camp. The course covers background information on various disabilities, wheelchair techniques, behavior modification, goal setting, and caring for children with disabilities in activities of daily living. Approximately 130 students fill the staff roles at Camp Koinonia, consisting of 100 counselors, 10 head counselors, and 20 activity staff. The 100 counselors are involved in one-on-one care for the same number of children with disabilities. The head counselors are in charge of cabin groups consisting of 10 counselors and 10 campers. The administrative staff includes a camp director and program director. Additional staff include medical, kitchen, and maintenance staff.
Camp programs traditionally include a process for evaluation of the camp staff at the close of the season. Evaluation is important in providing feedback, recruiting, and in determining direction for future staff training and development. Little information is available which examines the best way to conduct evaluations for camp staff. Armand and Beverly Ball (1990) point out that the area of evaluation and supervision in camp environments has been neglected for some time. Questions also arise as to what qualifies an individual to fill the staff roles at camp. It would be valuable to know if particular factors emerge, either from the evaluation data, or from the demographic information, that define the most highly rated individuals, especially in the supervisory role of head counselor. Considering that camp staff will most often work with, and influence children, it is necessary to perform further study in the area of evaluation of these individuals.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the demographic information and personal constructs which defined excellent head counselors at a camp for children with multiple disabilities. Due to the supervisory nature of the head counselor position, and its inherent responsibilities, it was important to determine what qualities were demonstrated by those individuals who received the highest ratings on evaluations at the end of the camp program.
Statement of the Problem

The problem for this study was to determine what factors defined excellent head counselors. The following subproblems were examined:

1. The demographic profile of excellent head counselors was examined including, age, year in school, gender, major in college, and experience.
2. Personal constructs as defined on the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale were examined for those rated as excellent head counselors.

Research Questions

The research questions to be answered in this study were:

1. What demographic information including age, year in school, gender, major in college, and experience, defined the excellent head counselors?
2. What personal constructs, as listed on the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale, defined the excellent head counselors?

Definition of Terms

Head counselor. Responsible for supervising and facilitating a cabin group consisting of approximately ten counselors, and ten campers with multiple disabilities.

Counselor. Directly responsible for one camper with multiple disabilities. Assists camper with activities of daily living, and in participating in a variety of educational and enjoyable activities.

Cabin counselor evaluations. For the purposes of this study, cabin counselor
evaluations are defined as counselor ratings of the head counselor, on the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale.

**Excellent head counselors.** For the purposes of this study, excellent head counselors are defined as those counselors who achieve a global rating of 1.0 to 1.5, based on the mean of assessment scales completed by counselors in the cabin group.

**Personal constructs.** Personal constructs are defined as the six subsections on the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale, including, personality and attitude, administrative ability, leadership, reliability, personal attributes, and facilities. The 25 items on the scale are divided amongst these six subsections.

**Demographic profile.** A profile of excellent head counselors based on the most frequently appearing data on age, year in school, gender, major, and experience.

**Camp Koinonia.** A residential outdoor camp experience for children with multiple disabilities in the east Tennessee area.

**Counselor Performance Assessment Scale (CPAS).** The scale used for evaluation of head counselors, consisting of 25 items divided among the six constructs of personality and attitude, administrative ability, leadership, reliability, personal attributes, and facilities. Each counselor in the cabin group completed a CPAS form, at the end of the week at camp, in order to evaluate the head counselor (Appendix A).

**Student Information Sheet (SIS).** Contains demographic information such as age, gender, year in school, major, and experience. This sheet was filled out early in the semester, in class (Appendix B).

**Camp Koinonia Staff Interview Sheet (CKSI).** Provides information on the
background experience of each head counselor. This sheet was filled out early in the semester, in class (Appendix C).

Assumptions

This study was conducted based on the following assumptions:

1. It was presumed that all head counselors performed to the best of their ability.
2. It was also presumed that counselors filled out evaluations honestly and accurately.
3. It was assumed that the demographic data was stated accurately by each head counselor on the Student Information Sheet, and on the Camp Koinonia Interview Sheet.
4. It was assumed that the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale could determine excellence in head counselors.

Limitations

The study was limited by the following factors:

1. There was no control over the nature of persons who selected the University of Tennessee course on outdoor education for children with disabilities, in the spring of 1996.
2. There was no control over the nature of persons who chose to become involved as camp counselors for children with multiple disabilities.
3. The experience level of the counselors in each cabin group who evaluated their head counselor was not controlled.
4. There was no control over how completely the counselors in the cabin groups filled
out the CPAS form.

**Delimitations**

The study was delimited by the following factors:

1. The study was delimited to head counselors serving at Camp Koinonia in April 1996.  
2. The study was further delimited to one factor: cabin counselor evaluations of the head counselor.

**Significance of the Study**

Camp programs are available for a wide variety of age groups and covering a wide range of purposes. The traditional camp program focuses on children who may seek out and realize new potentials in themselves. This growth process is dependent upon camp counselors who are competent in knowledge, skill, and leadership domains. Shivers (1989) points out that, “the work of guiding, leading, and being responsible for the health, safety, and well-being of children cannot be done successfully by uninformed, apathetic, incapable individuals of drab personality and limited life experiences” (p. 155). Leadership, emotional maturity, and competence factors become even more essential in camp programs that provide experiences for children with multiple disabilities.

Since these qualities are even more important at the supervisory level, it becomes essential to examine past evaluations to determine whether certain factors emerge as representing the most highly rated (excellent) head counselors. Since college students are a resource for many camp programs, analysis of factors such as age, gender, year in
school, major, and experience can provide information that can be used in recruiting efforts, and for determining training and development needs. Such a study could provide further information on age requirements for head counselors. Recruiting efforts could become more selective and geared toward college departments that have traditionally supplied the most highly rated counselors. The type of past experience could also be examined in relation to ratings.

Camp programs in general could benefit from the examination of evaluation methods and the demographic profile of counselors. Camp programs that are geared toward children with multiple disabilities have a more urgent need to uncover any essential qualities of camp counselors that emerge from evaluation data. Camp counseling is not babysitting, but rather, a highly interactive process in which counselors guide behaviors, teach new skills, resolve conflict, promote problem-solving, and generally enhance the growth and development of campers. The responsibilities involved in this role mandate the search for persons with particular qualifications. Further study in these domains will enhance the professionalization of camping organizations.

Summary

This chapter introduced the topic for the study and detailed the problem, subproblems, and research questions. Important terms were defined, and the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study were discussed. Finally, the significance of the study was presented.

The rest of the study is organized as follows. Chapter 2 covers the review of the
literature pertaining to the study. Chapter 3 presents the specific methods used, followed by the analysis of the results in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 outlines the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The purpose of the literature review is to examine formats used for performance evaluation of camp staff. It is also utilized as a means of gathering information on essential characteristics of camp counselors. The literature is examined over a ten year period from 1986 to 1996. Since no scientific studies could be located for these areas, the review contains material collected from textbooks and professional journals that examined the underlying principles connected with these topic areas.

Following the introduction, the review is organized into sections covering the basic concepts of camp staff evaluation, evaluation in leisure services and education, and an examination of camp counselor characteristics deemed essential by various authors. Implications for the field of camp counseling are examined within these sections, including the provision of direction for recruiting efforts, the establishment of reliable evaluation methods, and the importance of obtaining qualified individuals to fill the multiple roles of the camp counselor. Camp counselors play a vital role in providing growth and development experiences for children of all ages and abilities. The importance of conducting studies that examine the traits of effective counselors cannot be understated. The benefits of such studies for other camp organizations are provided including the enhancement of a professional image for the camp environment.
Camp Staff Evaluation

The following paragraphs summarize a section from a book by Ball and Ball (1990). The book functions as a textbook for two camp director courses that are sponsored by the American Camping Association. There is no information about the authors. The chapter summarized in the following paragraphs concerns supervision of staff and presents a pragmatic approach to evaluation of camp counselors, administrators, and support staff. The area of supervision, evaluation, and feedback is considered by the authors to be a highly neglected area in camp environments, yet it is vital for retaining staff, and building quality relationships.

Ball and Ball (1990) present three guidelines in supervision, the first of which is trust. Trust is necessary for building a sound relationship with staff members, and for ensuring confidentiality and objectivity with regard to job performance reviews. Rapport is the second guideline, which is evident in a genuine concern for people, and an ability to promote relaxed communications. Third, sharing is an important component in supervision. Supervisors should share their appreciation of staff members on an individual and regular basis.

Following staff training, Ball and Ball (1990) suggest individual conferences between supervisors and staff members. This short conference is designed to help the supervisor gain additional knowledge about the counselor and his or her ability to handle the defined position. Information should be obtained about job skill areas in which the counselor feels either confident or apprehensive. The counselor can also be consulted for preferences in working with particular age groups. The personal goals of the
counselor can be addressed, as well as an assessment from both sides about the counselor’s ability to develop relationships with other staff members.

According to Ball and Ball (1990), informal observation is a valuable tool for supervisors. Notes should be taken, dated, and placed in the counselor file. The conditions and location of the observation should be noted. The supervisor can collect information about the counselor’s abilities in relation to the camper with regard to activities of daily living, program activities, and in teaching specific skills. These notations should include both positive feedback and critical reviews.

For camp programs that are three weeks or longer, it is suggested to hold a conference with individual counselors after about two weeks (Ball & Ball, 1990). Positive appraisal and job performance problems or conflicts can be addressed, and the counselor can be given the chance to re-assess personal goals. For full summer camp programs, the authors suggest that evaluations be sought from other personnel that the counselor may have interacted with during the camp program, such as the medical staff, business director, or food service personnel. The closing conference at end of summer should include all of these evaluations, and should allow the counselor to review his or her experiences and attainment of personal goals.

Ball and Ball (1990) offer a sample staff evaluation form using a number system to indicate the counselor’s position on a horizontal scale. A sample item is “understanding of campers,” the lowest rating (1 or 2) for which states that the counselor has no close relationships with campers and has a limited understanding of individuals or groups. The rating of 3 or 4 entails a beginner level of communication and
comprehension of individuals or groups. The next level, 5 or 6, identifies good communication, development of friendships with campers, and an understanding of group dynamics. A rating of 7 or 8 entails close relationships with campers and a limited recognition of individual potential. The highest rating of 9 or 10 identifies a deeper understanding and respect for campers, and extensive involvement in relationships. Other items that Ball and Ball (1990) evaluated include motivation, manner, attitude, appearance, and the teaching of specific skills.

Evaluation of administrative staff should be done by counselors as well as supervisors, according to Ball and Ball (1990). Rather than a rating scale, the evaluation form suggested for use with administrators includes open-ended questions regarding job abilities, efficiency, attitude, congeniality, and support for counselors.

Ball and Ball (1990) conclude that a solid, pre-planned evaluation program will stimulate individual growth, allow for relationship-building among staff levels, and will increase job performance. It can also help to retain staff for future seasons.

Accurate job descriptions are an important part of any evaluation process. Karla Henderson is an associate professor at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill in leisure studies and recreation administration. She is also the editor for a column known as “Research in Action” in Camping Magazine, an American Camping Association publication. The purpose of this article is to review the advantages of job descriptions and to offer suggestions on how to write them. Henderson reports from her research conducted in 1989 that an analysis of job descriptions from camps across the United States revealed few that were well-written.
Henderson (1990) outlines the many uses of job descriptions, including delineating responsibility for particular tasks, helping persons understand their role, and providing information about skills and knowledge required for the job. On an administrative plane, they legitimize the organization to external agencies, and offer structural information on the division of labor.

Job descriptions require careful thought and continuous revision. Henderson (1990) states that the most effective and practical approach to use is one suggested by the Bureau of Law and Business (1982) which directly addresses duties and responsibilities. The first step is to perform job-content analyses in which accurate descriptions of duties, expected behaviors, functions, working conditions, and required skills, are gathered.

According to Henderson (1990), the job title is a critical component of the job description. Titles should address status and offer an accurate reflection of assigned duties. Camp job titles can be divided into the four general categories of administrator, counselor, activity specialist, and support staff.

Job specifications and job qualifications should be thoroughly addressed in job descriptions (Henderson, 1990). Job specifications address overall responsibilities including daily and irregular duties, physical and emotional demands, and records maintenance. The amount of supervision and amount of human interaction required should be clearly stated as well as what standards will be used for measuring performance. Organizational relations should be outlined, including reporting structures and key co-workers. Job qualifications outline required education and training levels,
specific certifications, personal factors, knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the position.

In summary, Henderson (1990) states that job descriptions are used in recruiting, and training. As well, they are an important component in performance evaluation. Well-written job descriptions assist camp directors in managing the camp effectively, and in establishing positive staff relations.

Staff evaluations are an important factor in total program evaluations. The purpose of an article entitled, "Evaluation: What to measure and why" is to outline an evaluation process that can be used to measure the success and limitations of camp programs (1994). The authors, Debra J. Jordan, Christopher P. Edginton, and Susan R. Edginton are associated with the School of Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services at the University of Northern Iowa. Susan R. Edginton is the program development coordinator for Camp Adventure. Aspects of this camp are used as examples in discussing vision statements and staff responsibilities in camp programs.

Jordan et al. (1994) state that program evaluation begins with a vision or mission statement which provides program direction and a standard for measurement. Formative (ongoing) and summative (end of program) evaluations are described as two basic types of evaluation that yield useful information for future programming.

Jordan et al. (1994) suggest that evaluation of camp programs should encompass four areas: administration, facilities and grounds, programming, and staff. Three functional areas must be considered in evaluation, i.e., human relations functions, technical functions, and conceptual functions. Two tools for collection of data are
persons and paper. Persons can conduct interviews, whereas the paper tool is a standardized survey designed to be appealing to the audience. Either the interview or survey evaluation tool should encompass questions that address the three functional areas.

Evaluation has many benefits, including, increased success in meeting needs and goals, justifying funding for facilities, keeping administrative agencies informed, creating positive public relations, providing communication, and building staff morale (Jordan et al., 1994). In addition, evaluation provides information necessary to prevent problems or to solve them early, enables recognition of outstanding staff members, provides information for future planning, gauges cost effectiveness, and establishes priorities for new direction in programming efforts. Jordan et al. (1994) conclude that, although time-consuming, evaluation is a necessary effort to strengthen and ensure the success of the camp program.

An important component of staff evaluation is the measurement of attitude. Emmalou Norland, associate professor in the Department of Agricultural Education at Ohio State University, offers a practical guide for measuring attitude. The purposes of the article are: (a) to analyze how attitude can affect job performance, and (b) to provide a Likert scale example for attitude measurement. The article stems from a discussion between the author and a camp director who experienced an unresponsive, yet capable, staff. The underlying problem is noted as an attitudinal problem.

Norland (1995) states that there are four interrelated areas from which information can be gathered for a staff needs assessment. They are cognitive,
psychomotor, affective, and demographic. When measuring attitude, demographic variables must be considered such as age, gender, and educational background.

The nature of attitudes must be accounted for in the measuring scale. Norland (1995) notes that attitudes have direction, strength, an object or target, and they endure. In other words, they are difficult to change, once formed. Attitudes are formed through direct experience with the target, through experience with a similar target, or through the social learning process. Persons develop attitudes through interpretation of information and individual experience. Attitudes can often be developed as a result of misinformation or too little information. In order to assess the needs of staff, information should be gathered on how attitudes were formed, as well as measuring the attitude.

Norland (1995) suggests a Likert scale for measuring the direction and strength of attitudes, specifying the object, and assessing formation of the attitude. A set of statements is accompanied by a scale where respondents can indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement, such as in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements should be either positive or negative (i.e., not neutral). They should encompass contemporary attitudes and should be written in language, familiar to the staff, that is neither too strong nor too weak. Content validity can be ensured by including the entire object of the attitude within 6-10 selected items. For example, covering focus, satisfaction, and diversity are all important components of assessing
attitudes about camp activities. Scores are analyzed by totaling responses for each subsection that deals with a particular attitude, and dividing by the number of statements (Norland, 1995). Reverse scoring must be used for statements that use negative wording. Scores are interpreted such that scores that fall below the midpoint on the scale are considered negative, and those that fall above, positive.

In conclusion, Norland (1995) notes that cognitive information tells whether or not the person has the knowledge to perform the duties. The psychomotor domain addresses skill areas. The affective domain, which encompasses attitude, yields information as to whether they will actually perform the duties. All of this information is necessary to assess staff needs in relation to developmental requirements.

**Evaluation in Leisure Services and Education**

Since camp programs fall into the general category of leisure services, much information on performance evaluations can be gleaned from an examination of accepted procedures utilized in the leisure industry. David Culkin and Sondra Kirsch teach a management course that is geared toward park, recreation, and leisure service professions at North Carolina State University. The authors note that besides managing full and part-time employees, managers in the leisure services also manage seasonal and volunteer workers. Their book is used as the text in their course and is designed to provide management information adapted specifically for leisure professionals.

Chapter 8 in *Managing Human Resources in Recreation, Parks, and Leisure*
Services (Culkin & Kirsch, 1986) focuses on performance appraisal. The need for a formal appraisal system within leisure service organizations is addressed. A structured appraisal evaluates the effectiveness of personnel in accomplishing job-related duties. The performance appraisal process fulfills many purposes including determining employee compensation, providing feedback, and recognizing promotable staff. It is also a communications tool, aids in identifying goal areas, and provides information about staff training needs.

Culkin and Kirsch (1986) promote the study of performance appraisal in leisure services since, at all levels of the hierarchy, every employee is evaluated in some manner. In addition, persons in managerial positions will evaluate employees that report to them directly. Few persons receive adequate training in appraisal procedures resulting in limited knowledge of the proper use of forms, interviews, and feedback processes. Persons on the administrative level may have the responsibility of designing an appraisal system, hence, a thorough understanding is essential.

The job description which details specific duties is the basis by which employees are appraised, and therefore entails the first step in the appraisal process. In step two, evaluators then utilize specific criteria to make judgements regarding an employee’s performance. Culkin and Kirsch (1986) specify that the three types of criteria that are commonly used in performance appraisal are: “(1) personality traits required to perform the assigned work (what the employee is), (2) job behaviors and work characteristics (what the employee does), and (3) outcomes or results expressed in terms of achievement of predetermined objectives (what the employee achieves)” (p. 170).
Personality traits utilized as performance criteria must be clearly defined and related to the job (Culkin & Kirsch, 1986). Attitude, leader capability, and enthusiasm are often used as criteria, yet are open to subjective interpretation. Job behaviors include ability to communicate, knowledge and skill areas, safe conduct, and following directions. Outcomes focus on specific objectives related to goals generated between the employee and his or her supervisor. Clear objectives reduce subjectivity and open communication lines between levels of the hierarchy.

According to Culkin and Kirsch (1986), appraisal forms enforce the organization and documentation of information. The collection of data constitutes the third step in the evaluation process. Several styles for recording are in use as appraisal forms in agencies. Rating scales have criteria listed down the left side of the page with numbered indicators or one-word statements (from excellent to poor) across the top. Unless the one-word indicators include a clarifying statement, they are open to subjective interpretation.

Rankings are another style used which place all employees on a ranked scale from best to worst (Culkin & Kirsch, 1986). Weighted checklists are a style appropriate for short term employees whereby items that identify the employee’s accomplishments are checked. The method of critical incidents is used in long term evaluation settings in which notes are recorded over time and then summed just prior to the scheduled evaluation. Lastly, accomplishments can be compared against goals and objectives to determine effectiveness of the employee. Some agencies use a combination of these styles in designing appraisal forms.
According to Culkin and Kirsch (1986), supervisors, peers, and subordinates can all provide appraisal information. Some agencies will use a combination of information sources. The authors recommend that subordinate appraisals of supervisors be conducted anonymously. Otherwise, employees may not appraise supervisors accurately due to fear of retaliation. In addition, employees can appraise themselves, which may yield information on staff development needs.

The bottom line for appraisal data comes from a comparison to some type of standard, whether compared to previously collected data, or to the standard of other employees’ performance (Culkin & Kirsch, 1986). In addition, managers must determine whether they are looking for improvement or actual performance. The evaluation of the collected data fulfills the fourth step in the process.

In step five, the appraisal process culminates in the interview. Culkin and Kirsch (1986) recommend separate interviews for the discussion of salary, and future training and developmental issues for the employee. The interview process is followed by step six, goal setting, yielding new material for the next appraisal.

In conclusion, Culkin and Kirsch (1986) restate the importance of full training in performance appraisal procedures. Employees should be made to understand job responsibilities and how they will be evaluated. Sufficient time should be set aside to thoroughly accommodate these procedures. Finally, the authors state that even though there is a formal evaluation procedure, informal evaluations should take place on a continuous basis so that employees are regularly informed of both positive and negative feedback (Culkin & Kirsch, 1986).
A similar step-wise evaluation procedure is suggested in an article entitled, "How do you evaluate everyone who isn’t a teacher" (1994). James H. Stronge is the Project Director, and Pamela Tucker is a Research Assistant, for the College of William and Mary. Virginia Helm is a Project Consultant for Western Illinois University. The purpose of the article is to present an evaluation model that can be used with professional support personnel within the education system. These persons are not directly involved in teaching students, nor are they administrative personnel. The roles encompassed by this model include counselors, psychologists, special education personnel, nurses, and others. The article is a review of CREATE Project 22, a response to state mandates for district-wide evaluation plans within the school system. It is noted that evaluation improvements have traditionally focused on the teaching staff. However, school systems have become very complex and now employ many kinds of non-teaching professionals that work with students. The Professional Support Personnel Evaluation Model (PSP) is a method devised to fill the gap for support personnel evaluation.

Stronge et al. (1994) state that the PSP evaluation tool focuses on two areas. First, it identifies commonalities across the various educational specialty areas so that evaluations for all support personnel can become more standardized. Second, it allows for the development of lists of job responsibilities specific to each type of employee position. Special services personnel, instructional support personnel, academic development personnel, and special education personnel are the four identified groups who will benefit from such an evaluation model.

There are seven steps in the PSP Model (Stronge et al., 1994). The first two
steps are based on the concept of balance between the individual and the institution. Step one identifies system needs with respect to the organizational mission. Step two identifies specific job responsibilities or duties and is based on the mission. The third step involves selecting performance indicators or behaviors that are measurable and indicative of key job responsibilities. Step four sets the performance standards by defining an acceptable level of performance. The following step involves documenting job performance through observation, interviews, and analysis of performance.

Step six in the PSP model involves evaluating performance. This portion of the process is designed to be a two-way conference between evaluator and employee (Stronge et al., 1994). Discrepancies between performance standards and documented job performance are discussed. The evaluation can be either summative or formative, and should focus on areas for improvement or new objectives to be incorporated. Step seven brings the process full circle with its focus on improving and maintaining professional service. Continuing professional development is a key aspect of this step, the result of which is continuous improvement of both the individual and the institution.

As addressed earlier, Stronge et al. (1994) state that this model fills the gap in evaluation of professional support personnel within school systems. The PSP model offers a practical system for gathering information important to personnel evaluation. It is based on communication and leads to skill enhancement and improved performance. In addition to systematic correction of discrepancies between expectations and performance, the PSP Model identifies ways to attain higher standards, thus creating a continuous cycle of improvement for both employee and institution.
As purported in another recent article, staff evaluations should be tied to needs assessment. The article carries no information about the authors, Jerry Herman, Ph.D., and Janice Herman, Ph.D. except for their academic degree. The purpose of the article is to examine the benefits of a systems approach whereby staff evaluation is used as a needs assessment, yielding direction for staff development. The article is based on the educational environment within school systems, with the goal of improving this environment, and ultimately improving the productivity of students in the system.

Herman and Herman (1995) state that staff development should focus on the individual employee, based on needs which are identified regularly. As a result of needs assessment through staff evaluation a Personal Improvement Plan (PIP) can be developed for each individual. The Integrated Model for Individualized Staff Evaluation and Staff Development is designed to achieve these results through two-way communication and the use of external resources. A formative or ongoing evaluation system is employed with the goal of improving the individuals' knowledge or skills. The PIP which results is a cooperative effort between employee and supervisor.

Several steps are identified in the Needs Identification Process beginning with the frozen state or status quo (Herman & Herman, 1995). The frozen state becomes unfrozen when the employee recognizes needs and wants to improve in those areas. The needs can then be diagnosed, alternate solutions are developed, and a preferred solution is chosen. Revisions can be made in the implemented solution, if necessary. This cycle repeats each time new areas of need are identified.

Herman and Herman (1995) note that the amount of success achieved through
this process depends on the employee's attitude. If the employee strives for self-actualization, desires performance feedback, and wants to improve, the process will produce excellent benefits for both and employee and the organization.

Resources must be allocated for this process to work such as time, human resources that can assist in the development process, and financial resources allocated for continuing education (Herman & Herman, 1995). External resources that can contribute to achievement of developmental areas include professional associations, personnel from other districts, as well as community, college and university resources.

In summary, Herman and Herman (1995) discourage a segregated approach of staff evaluation that is not tied to development of need areas. The systems approach presented in the article will lead to a more competent staff who in turn will produce better educated children for the community.

**Counselor Characteristics**

Jay Shivers, author of *Camping: Organization and operation*, is located at the University of Connecticut. The book is based on his personal and professional experience in all aspects of camp counseling and directing. The purpose of the following two sections is to review sources for camp counselors and to discuss the required qualifications for these individuals.

The success of any camp depends mostly on the quality of staff that is recruited to carry out the mission and responsibilities of the camp (Shivers, 1989). Competent counselors require more than just job-related skills. Leadership and maturity are
important factors that are sought and developed in camp counselors. The camp staff is built first by recruiting past counselors. Secondly, college students from departments such as recreation, outdoor education, elementary, secondary, and physical education can be another valuable source. College placement bureaus and high school guidance centers can also be contacted for potential candidates.

Shivers (1989) states that the camp counselor should be a high school graduate and be at least 18 years of age. It is also helpful to have some college and camp experience. Besides having particular skills, the camp counselor should be intelligent and have good character. Character is broken down into many other traits including maturity, reliability, and ability to handle conflict. Sensitivity is an essential characteristic for camp counselors. Trusting relationships with campers are built upon the counselor’s ability to recognize and fulfill needs. Hence, it is necessary that counselor’s have a good knowledge of the different developmental stages of children and youth in order to respond in an appropriate manner.

Concern is another important character trait that is evidenced in the counselor’s attention to the physical and emotional well-being of campers (Shivers, 1989). This concern also shows in the counselor’s attempt to gain knowledge of the camper before they meet at camp. Enthusiasm is a character dimension that allows counselors to lead others with a sense of fun and enjoyment. Campers reap the benefits from learning new skills, as well as performing trivial tasks, when encouraged by an enthusiastic counselor.

Counselors require good communications skills so that information is transmitted clearly and concisely (Shivers, 1989). He or she must be attentive to mood changes in
the campers, and must maintain good humor at all times. Imagination is an asset for
moments when things do not go right, or a camper needs a dose of cheerfulness.

According to Shivers (1989), intelligence is the most important attribute that
counselors must possess. Intelligence goes hand-in-hand with problem-solving ability,
independence, and understanding. Competence in particular skill areas is necessary to
ensure that campers get the most out of every experience. Competence in understanding
individual and group behavior is also essential. Physical fitness is required for all
counselors since endurance will be necessary on a daily basis. Finally, personality is
necessary to ensure that counselors can interact well with a variety of persons.

Shivers (1989) summarizes by stating that counselors who recognize weak areas
in themselves can work under guidance to obtain the missing skills. The successful
counselor is able to come outside of him or herself and recognize and value camper
issues from their perspective. They can also see how environmental factors can have a
major effect on camper behavior. The successful counselor always acts and interacts
with maturity, compassion, and understanding.

Besides character considerations, there are more specific age and experiential
requirements for camp counselors. In Appendix A of Basic Camp Management, Ball and
Ball (1990) list qualifications and responsibilities for the camp counselor. To be qualified
for the position, the minimum standards require a candidate who is at least nineteen years
old, and has a high school diploma. At least one year of college experience is preferable.
The authors also seek past camp experience or leadership experience with children, and
good health.
The job responsibilities include living in the cabin with campers and being responsible for guiding activities of daily living for campers such as safety, hygiene, planning activities, getting to meals on time, and ensuring that the camper participates in all camp activities (Ball & Ball, 1990). The counselor’s appearance, hygiene, and language must always be appropriate since he or she acts as a role model for campers. As well, the counselor must clarify and interpret rules and policies of the camp to campers.

Particular college majors and/or departments can offer a good supply of qualified individuals for camp staff positions. Janet Marquis is an intercollegiate coach and a certified athletic trainer. She holds a B.S. in sports medicine and a M.S. in athletic administration. She is also employed as a camp director by the Covered Bridge Girl Scout Council. Her article is based upon personal experience. The purpose of the article is to point out the traits of coaches, athletes and trainers that qualify them as good camp counselors.

Marquis (1990) begins with a discussion of the yearly schedule for employed coaches which revolves around a ten month program. Except for a possible summer sports camp of one week’s duration, the coach is generally free for the summer. The qualities that coaches possess are excellent public relations skills, experience in counseling and guidance, budgeting, and recruiting skills. Marquis states that the benefits of the camp experience for coaches are “two months of rest, relaxation, supplemental income, and enough excitement and adventure to entice their often outgoing personalities” (p. 48). Coaches can be recruited by contacting them via their
Marquis (1990) notes the fact that college students are a resource utilized by many camp directors for fulfilling camp counselor roles. Although recreation and leisure departments are often the department of choice for many directors, Marquis chooses to recruit student athletes from athletic departments. These students are usually on scholarships and deal with heavy academic loads, travel, and practice sessions throughout the school year. In the summer, they are ready for “fun and relaxation” (Marquis, 1990, p. 48). Student athletes have sports-related skill areas that contribute to the total camp program. Besides the financial reward of a small salary and room and board, athletes can be enticed by the fun aspects of camp and a chance to experience a new environment. Coaches will also be happy that their athletes can learn how to handle stress and problem-solving, while they build organization and time management skills.

Athletic trainers are another valuable resource for camp staff (Marquis, 1990). Besides long hours in practical experience, athletic trainers are certified in cardiopulmonary resuscitation and first aid, qualifications that, according to Marquis, satisfy requirements set by the American Camping Association. They are a valuable asset in situations involving injuries.

In conclusion, Marquis (1990) states that the addition of athletes, trainers and coaches “may add an exciting new dimension to your camp” (p.49). She suggests contacting the athletic department directly to recruit these individuals as camp counselors.

Good camp counselors often display some of their key traits during aspects of the
hiring process. Robert A. Brockman is a student at the University of Arizona with a B.S. in child development and a B.A. in psychology. The purpose of the article is to present steps for finding good camp counselors. Brockman is the assistant program director for Friendly Pines Camp in Prescott, Arizona. Although not directly stated, it is assumed that the suggestions presented are based on his experience in this camp program.

Brockman (1990) begins with a description of the camp counselor as someone who has genuine interest in the camper. He endorses a qualification by Blackstock and Latimer (1975) that the counselor must like and understand children. This seemingly simple statement highlights attitudinal factors that are often overlooked in the hiring process. Brockman notes that the counselor must do more than like children. The responsibilities of the job require an understanding of behavioral factors and interest areas for different age groups of children.

Since most camp counselors are college students or graduates, they will most likely submit a cover letter and resume (Brockman, 1990.) The first step in the hiring process involves examining these documents for experience, abilities, and expectations of the applicant. Motivations and priorities of the applicant can be uncovered by reviewing past accomplishments and experiences. How quickly an applicant completes and returns an application can also render useful information. Brockman suggests checking references before interviewing to eliminate undesirable applicants.

The personal interview is essential for an exchange of information from both sides (Brockman, 1990). The interviewer conveys information about the importance of
people and interpersonal relationships. Information about motivation and attitude can be gleaned from the applicant by presenting the negative aspects of camp, and asking what they expect to get out of the experience. The applicant should be encouraged to speak about past experiences, either at camp or with counselors, if they attended camp as a child. Hypothetical situations can be presented to see how the applicant would respond in different situations.

Brockman (1990) suggests that the interviewer should judge how children might react to the applicant as counselor. While mature and responsible, the applicant should also be energetic and personable. The overall appearance of the applicant, including attire and body language, can convey how important the job is to the applicant.

In conclusion, Brockman (1990) states that the counselor is a leader and above all else, a role model. Careful selection is essential since counselors are fully responsible for the campers' experiences, and for running the camp all season.

**Similarities and Contrasts**

Several articles in the literature review address basic guidelines for determining camp staff evaluation procedures. A common thread exists among authors in the need for clearly written job descriptions as a basis for evaluation of camp staff (Culkin & Kirsch, 1986; Stronge et al., 1994; Henderson, 1990). Evaluations are compared to job responsibilities which yields information on the effectiveness of the counseling staff. Other commonalities include the importance of the interview process to establish communications between supervisor and employee (Ball & Ball, 1990; Brockman, 1990;
Several authors suggest a numbered scale as a way to measure employee performance (Ball & Ball, 1990; Culkin & Kirsch, 1986; Norland, 1995). However, both one-word indicators, and qualifying statements that explain those numbers, are suggested as ways to reduce subjectivity and misunderstandings on the forms.

There are strong similarities in the six step evaluation procedure suggested by Culkin and Kirsch (1986) and the more recent seven step Professional Support Personnel Evaluation Model (PSP) utilized by Stronge et al. (1994) for support personnel in the education field. The similarities entail identification of job responsibilities, selecting criteria for measuring performance, documentation of data, interviews, and the setting of new goals.

Jordan et al. (1994) and Norland (1995) emphasize the importance of evaluation for needs assessment, providing direction for staff training and development, and in providing direction for future programming. Several authors espouse the benefit of increased staff morale, and the building of good relations between levels that result from a thorough, structured evaluation process (Ball & Ball, 1990; Jordan et al., 1994). Four articles discuss the measurement of attitudinal factors in staff (Ball & Ball, 1990; Brockman, 1990; Culkin & Kirsch, 1986; Norland, 1995). Attitude determines motivation for performance of tasks and for striving toward personal improvement and self-actualization.

One article which promotes the recruitment of staff from athletic departments (Marquis, 1990) may represent an area of conflict. The promise of fun and relaxation is
suggested to entice athletic students and trainers to join a camp counseling team. Although camp environments do provide a fun and stimulating environment, it is the opinion of this author that these promises may mislead individuals, and perhaps even attract the wrong type of individual. There is no doubt that camp environments are stressful. In addition, campers depend on counselors to provide guidance, direction, enthusiasm, skill enhancement, and solutions to problems. All of this requires maturity, competence, intelligence, and a respect for the ideals set forth by the camp mission. With this in mind, it would be useful to investigate how persons from athletic departments are rated at the end of the camp season.

After an exhaustive search, no studies could be found that assess camp counselors on the basis of age, year in school, gender, major, or experience. There are suggestions that college experience and experience with children are a necessary component for successful counseling (Ball & Ball, 1990; Shivers, 1989). One article recommends sport-related individuals as a source for counselors (Marquis, 1990), and one author recommends recreation and education majors as another source (Shivers, 1989). However, no study was found that comprehensively examined which of these traits might be correlated with the most highly rated counselors. If these correlations were known, recruiting efforts could be geared toward the particular sources that yield the best counselors. In addition, a red flag could be raised for applicants that have traits traditionally associated with the lowest rated counselors, hence, indicating the need for a more careful perusal of the applicant’s qualifications.

No studies were found which examined the best way to conduct camp staff
evaluations. Armand and Beverly Ball (1990) point out that the area of evaluation and supervision in camp environments has been neglected for some time. Considering that camp staff are generally responsible for children, it is necessary to perform further study in the area of evaluation of these individuals. It is also necessary to determine whether certain factors emerge from the evaluation data, or from demographic data, that define the underlying characteristics of these persons, especially at the level of head counselor.

**Summary**

This chapter reviews general methods used for evaluation of staff in camp environments and in the fields of leisure services and education. A review of important character traits, and some demographic variables of camp counselors are presented, as well. The specific methods and procedures to be used in the analysis of data for this study are presented in the following chapter.
Chapter 3

Methods

The problem for this study was to determine what factors define excellent head counselors at a camp for children with multiple disabilities. Both demographic data and personal constructs were examined for these head counselors. The chapter begins with the rationale for the study, the procedures used, and a description of the subjects. The description of the forms, and evaluation of the data are detailed in the final two sections.

Rationale

A quantitative design was chosen since secondary data, including staff assessment scales, and student information and interview sheets, were analyzed. A group of ten head counselors was selected as the focus of the study because of the importance of this position to the camp program, and because each head counselor was evaluated by approximately ten counselors from the cabin group, providing a comprehensive set of data for each head counselor. Data for the spring 1996 semester were analyzed since this was the first year that the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale was used for evaluation of head counselors.
Procedures

This study involved the analysis of secondary data. The data were collected as a regular part of the college course which prepares students for their roles at camp. The assessment scales were collected at the end of the one week camp program in April 1996. Counselors in each cabin group were instructed to evaluate their head counselor using the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale and to turn in the form by 10:00 p.m. on the evening before the final day of camp (Appendix A). This scale was located in the Camp Koinonia: 1996 Class Manual (Hayes & Brown, 1996). Counselors were allowed to fill out the forms anonymously, although some did choose to supply their name. The Student Information Sheet was passed out in class, and completed by students at the beginning of the spring semester. This form gathered the students demographic information such as age, year in school, gender, major, and experience (Appendix B). The Camp Koinonia Staff Interview sheet was filled out early in the semester by students applying for the head counselor position and provided information on background experience (Appendix C).

Description of the Subjects

The head counselors were students at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville, who selected the course on outdoor education for children with disabilities, in the spring of 1996. The sample consisted of ten individuals, five males, and five females, pursuing various majors at the university. The study focused on secondary data provided by the students as a regular part of the course. Head counselors were selected for their role at
camp following an application process early in the semester. Evaluation of the head counselors was performed by each counselor in the cabin groups. Approximately ten counselors evaluated each head counselor.

Random letters were assigned to each head counselor to preserve the confidentiality of these staff members. Throughout this study, head counselors will be referred to by the capital letter assigned to them.

**Description of the Forms**

The form used for evaluation of head counselors was the Counselor Performance Assessment Scale (CPAS). There were 25 items on the scale divided among the six constructs of personality and attitude, administrative ability, leadership, reliability, personal attributes, and facilities. For each of the 25 items the rater checked either the number 1 (excellent), 2 (good), 3 (satisfactory), 4 (needs improvement), or 5 (not observed), indicating their evaluation of the head counselor. These ratings were further clarified by the following statements:

1. **EXCELLENT** - Demonstrates exemplary skills and professional competency in fulfilling requirements of the position.

2. **GOOD** - Performing all tasks in a professional manner.

3. **SATISFACTORY** - Meeting minimal performance standards required for the position.

4. **NEEDS IMPROVEMENT** - Performance must improve for individual to function at an acceptable level.

5. **NOT OBSERVED**.
The second form used was the Student Information Sheet (SIS) for head counselors, which contains demographic information such as age, gender, year in school, major, and experience. The third form used was the Camp Koinonia Staff Interview Sheet (CKSI), which provides information on the background experience of each head counselor.

**Evaluation of the Data**

The Counselor Performance Assessment Scales were first summarized by averaging the counselor ratings for all items. This number is the mean score for the head counselor, as evaluated by one counselor. Categories 1 to 4 (excellent to needs improvement) were included in determining the mean score for the head counselor. Category 5 (not observed) was not included in determining the mean score. If all ratings for the individual items were between 1-4, then the sum was divided by 25, the full number of items. If a 5 was used for any item rating, these items were subtracted from the total number of items in the denominator, in determining the mean score. In other words, if one item had a rating of 5, it would be excluded from the sum of item ratings, and the sum would be divided by 24.

Next, all mean scores, by all counselors in the cabin group, were averaged to determine the mean global score for that head counselor. Those individuals scoring between 1 and 1.5 were considered to be excellent head counselors.

The Student Information Sheet for each of these head counselors was examined for data on age, year in school, gender, major, and experience. Further information on
experience was gathered from the Camp Koinonia Staff Interview Sheet. All head counselors were divided into categories representing year in school, such as, junior, senior, or graduate students. They were also divided according to age, major, and experience. There were two categories for major. Recreation/Education included recreation, sport management, and special education majors. Business/Communication included broadcasting, business, and speech communication majors. Experience included experience with children, experience with persons with disabilities, prior experience at Camp Koinonia, or other camp experience. The number of students in any category was converted to a percentage. The same descriptive, categorical information, was also divided by gender into male and female head counselors.

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine whether there were significant differences between the mean global ratings for the head counselors. This ANOVA tested the null hypothesis of no differences among the mean global scores derived from the CPAS ratings. A post hoc analysis using Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test was performed on the mean global scores to determine whether there was any particular pattern to the differences found in the ANOVA. The personal constructs on the CPAS, and the demographic data, were then examined for those head counselors that were significantly different from the rest.

Summary

This chapter examined the rationale, procedures, and description of the subjects in the study. Details on the forms used were provided, as well as, how the data were
analyzed for the study. The results of the data analyses are presented in the following chapter.
Chapter 4

Analysis of Data

The problem for this study was to determine what factors define excellent head counselors at an outdoor educational camp for children with multiple disabilities. Descriptive data such as demographics, and personal constructs as defined on the CPAS, were examined. The determination of excellent head counselors was the first portion of the analysis. This was followed by the demographic breakdown for all excellent head counselors. Since all ten head counselors were rated excellent according to their mean global scores, a one-way Analysis of Variance was performed on these scores to determine if there was any statistically significant difference between the means. Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test was used to determine which head counselor scores were significantly different from each other. The scores for personal constructs were then examined for those head counselors that were found to be different from the rest of the group.

Excellent Head Counselors

The mean global score was used for determining which head counselors were excellent. This score was calculated by first obtaining a mean rating of the head counselor by each counselor in the cabin group. The mean ratings were then averaged to
obtain the mean global score for that head counselor. Those head counselors scoring between 1.00 and 1.50 were considered to be excellent head counselors. The higher this final number was, the lower the global rating for that head counselor. The final scores for the head counselors ranged from 1.00, most excellent, to 1.44, least excellent (Table A-1). All of the ten head counselors, A-J, achieved a rating of excellent (Table A-2).

**Demographics**

The demographic breakdown showed that all head counselors were in their final years of school, i.e. junior, senior, and graduate levels (Table A-3). The ages ranged from 19 to 37 years, with the highest number in the category of 21-22 years. Six of the head counselors were Recreation/Education majors, and four were Business/Communication majors. Eight of the ten head counselors had attended Camp Koinonia as counselors the previous year (1995).

All five of the female head counselors had previous experience with persons with disabilities other than at Camp Koinonia, as compared to only one of the male head counselors (Table A-3). Four of the female head counselors had other camp experience; one of the male head counselors had the same. All five of the male head counselors had attended Camp Koinonia in the past, as compared with only three of the female head counselors.
Statistical Procedures

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to test the null hypothesis of no differences among the mean global scores derived from the counselor ratings on the CPAS. A significant difference among the ten excellent head counselors was found, \( F(9, 81) = 2.78, p < .05 \) (Table 1), hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. A post hoc analysis using Duncan’s New Multiple Range test revealed that head counselor J was significantly different from head counselors A, C, D, E, F, G, H and I (Table 2). It also showed head counselor B to be significantly different from head counselor A.

Levene’s test showed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was not met with this set of data, \( F(9, 81) = 5.44, p < .001 \). This was probably due to the fact that head counselor A showed no variance at all. All counselor ratings for head counselor A were perfect scores of 1.00. ANOVA is known to be robust to the problem of not having homogeneity of variance. However, for those who prefer confirmation, a non-parametric analysis of the same data was performed, which does not make the same equal variance assumption (chi-square = 28.10, df = 9, p = .0009). A Kruskal-Wallis analysis confirmed a significant difference between head counselor J and head counselors A and D (Table A-4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3031</td>
<td>.1448</td>
<td>2.7779</td>
<td>.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.2218</td>
<td>.0521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.5249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Analysis of Variance of Excellent Head Counselor Global Scores
Table 2. Duncan's Multiple Range Test
Showing Significant Differences for Head Counselors J and B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Counselors (Ranked)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J * * * * * * * * *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Constructs**

The most significant difference was shown to exist between head counselor J and eight of the other head counselors. An examination of the personal constructs showed that head counselor J had the highest rating (least excellence) in the constructs of administrative ability, leadership, reliability, and personal attributes (Table A-5). Within the construct of personality and attitude, head counselor J showed the highest rating for being assertive in enforcing policy and safety regulations, and for consistency in offering praise and discipline. Under administrative ability, the highest ratings (least excellence) were for being on time, following the scheduled program for activities, and submitting reports promptly. Three areas under the leadership category carried scores that were within the rating of good (1.51 - 2.50), rather than excellent. These areas were, being an example to others, constantly trying to improve the program and himself/herself, and
being well organized and always prepared. Under the same construct, head counselor J scored highest or close to highest in the areas of providing leadership, and striving to see that others are successful, although these ratings still met the requirement for excellence (both scores were 1.44). Under the construct of reliability, head counselor J scored at least a half point higher than all other head counselors for punctuality in meeting time schedules, and did not meet the criteria for excellence. Under personal attributes, head counselor J showed the least excellence in verbal communication skills, and had the second highest score for demonstrating mature judgement and being a team player, and the third highest score for presenting a good personal appearance, and being polite and courteous at all times.

In summary, head counselor J showed the highest score in 11 out of the 25 items on the CPAS. Seven of those items were in the rating category of good, not excellent. Three items were scored 2.00 or higher. The two highest item scores for head counselor J both deal with punctuality and meeting time schedules. The third highest item is in being well organized and always prepared.

For 7 of the items where head counselor J was not the highest, head counselor B showed the highest rating. This head counselor showed statistical difference only from A, who had perfect scores of 1.00 for all items. Head counselor B scored second highest, after J, for the constructs of leadership and reliability.

The top twenty-five percent of the head counselors having the lowest numerical rating (highest excellence) included head counselors A, C, D, and G. Head counselor A was rated 1.00 by all counselors, for all constructs. For head counselors C, D, and G,
perfect scores were obtained for the following items: cheerful and friendly with everyone, cooperative attitude, following the scheduled program for activities, and receptive to suggestions from superiors. Accepting their full share of responsibility, personal appearance and demonstration of mature judgement were also rated with a perfect score, for each of these three head counselors.

Summary

Chapter 4 reviewed the determination of excellent head counselors, and their demographic breakdown. The statistical procedures used were discussed as well as the personal constructs for those head counselors shown to be different from the rest of the group. The following chapter summarizes the study, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
Chapter 5

Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter summarizes the study, and presents the findings, and conclusions. Recommendations for further study, and for improvements in the evaluation procedures for head counselors at Camp Koinonia, are also discussed.

Summary

Purpose and Limitations

The purpose of the study was to examine the demographic information and personal constructs that define excellent head counselors at a camp for children with multiple disabilities. The study was limited by the nature of persons who selected the University of Tennessee course in the spring of 1996, which prepared them for the various roles at camp. It was also limited by the nature of persons who chose to become counselors for children with multiple disabilities. The experience level of the counselors in each cabin group who evaluated their head counselor was also a limiting factor.

The study was delimited to head counselors serving at Camp Koinonia in April 1996 and involved analysis of the cabin counselor evaluations of their head counselor. The sample size was ten head counselors, five males, and five females.
**Procedures**

This study involved the analysis of secondary data including the CPAS, SIS, and CKSI. Both demographic and personal construct information were examined for counselors who achieved a rating of excellent (1.00 - 1.50), as determined by the mean of ratings from counselors in the cabin group. The six personal constructs on the CPAS were personality and attitude, administrative ability, leadership, reliability, personal attributes, and facilities. The demographic information that was examined included age, gender, year in school, major, and experience.

**Analysis of Data**

The mean global score for each of the head counselors was determined by averaging the ratings from the counselors in the cabin group. Since all ten head counselors were excellent according to the category limits of 1.00 - 1.50, a one-way ANOVA was performed on the data to determine if there was a significant difference among the head counselors. A significant difference was shown to exist at the .05 level of significance. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test revealed that head counselor J was significantly different from the majority of the other head counselors.

**Findings**

Within the specific limitations and delimitations of the study, the following findings were reported:

1. Although all ten head counselors were rated excellent according to the average of counselor ratings, head counselor J was shown to be significantly different
from the majority of the group.

2. The lack of variance in the counselor ratings for head counselor A probably caused the assumption for homogeneity of variance not to be met.

3. The non-parametric analysis of the same data, in which homogeneity of variance is not assumed, shows again the significant difference of head counselor J.

4. Head counselor J showed the highest rating (least excellence) in the constructs of administrative ability, leadership, reliability, and personal attributes.

5. Head counselor J showed the highest score in 11 out of 25 items on the CPAS. Three of the item scores were 2.00 or higher, and 7 of the 11 high scores were in the category of good, rather than excellent.

6. Head counselor B was significantly different from head counselor A, and overall, scored highest in 7 items where J was not the highest. Head counselor B scored second highest, after J, for the constructs of leadership and reliability.

7. The head counselors who scored in the top twenty-five percentile, A, C, D, and G, showed consistency in having the highest ratings for two items in each of the constructs of personality and attitude, administrative ability, and personal attributes. Under the construct of reliability, all three showed perfect ratings for the item involving accepting their full share of responsibility. These head counselors also had high mean scores for the leadership construct.

8. Eight of the ten head counselors had attended Camp Koinonia the previous year as counselors, directly responsible for a child with multiple disabilities.

9. All ten of the head counselors were upperclass men and women at the junior
level or higher.

10. Five of the female head counselors had previous experience with persons with disabilities as compared with only one male head counselor. For other camp experience the ratio is 4:1, female head counselors having more experience than males.

11. The average global scores for male and female head counselors were almost equal, 1.19 and 1.18, respectively.

12. The demographic profile for head counselor J showed that this person was female, 25 years or older, a graduate student, with experience with children, and persons with disabilities. This person had experience at other camps, but no prior experience at Camp Koinonia. Head counselor J was a Recreation/Education major.

13. The demographic profile for head counselor B showed that this person was a male, age 23 - 24, a senior, and had prior experience as a counselor at Camp Koinonia. Head counselor B was a Recreation/Education major.

14. The demographic profile for the two head counselors, A and D, with the lowest mean global scores (most excellence) showed that they were both females and 21 - 22 years old. Both of these head counselors also had prior experience as counselors at Camp Koinonia the previous year (1995). Head counselor A was a Recreation/Education major, and a junior. Head counselor D was a Business/Communication major, and a senior.

15. The average mean global score for those persons that were Recreation/Education majors was 1.22, and for Business/Communication majors was 1.13.
16. The average mean global scores for head counselors that were juniors, seniors, and graduate students were 1.15, 1.16, and 1.32, respectively.

17. The average mean global score for the age categories for the head counselors were as follows: 20 years and younger, 1.18; 21 - 22 years, 1.10; 23 - 24 years, 1.29; and 25 years or older, 1.32.

Conclusions

It was concluded from the findings that leadership and reliability are the two constructs that distinguish the most excellent head counselors from the least excellent head counselors. Head counselors J and B showed the least excellence in these two areas, and A, C, D, and G scored very high in these areas. Even though these were peer evaluations, the bonds of friendship were not enough to overlook these areas as being important to the supervisory position of head counselor.

Head counselors A, C, D, and G had the four lowest scores (most excellence) for the construct of personal attributes. Head counselor J had the highest score (least excellence) for this construct. Other attributes that defined head counselors A, C, D, and G were their cheerful and cooperative attitude, acceptance of full responsibility, personal appearance, and mature judgement.

The demographic profile showed that the most excellent head counselors, A and D, were slightly younger than the least excellent head counselors, J and B. Both A and D had prior experience at Camp Koinonia, whereas only B had that experience of the two least excellent head counselors. There did not appear to be anything remarkable in
the category of major, since A, D, and J were all Recreation/Education majors. In fact, the mean global scores for all head counselors were only slightly different between the two majors.

When all head counselors were divided according to year in school, there was a slight increase in the mean global score as the year in school increased. In other words, less excellence was demonstrated according to the mean global scores, as the year in school advanced. A similar phenomenon was observed in the age categories in that, less excellence was demonstrated by the mean global scores for head counselors who were older.

In conclusion, it was important to remember that all ten of the head counselors were rated excellent. Since all ten as a group were in their final years in school, it was concluded that the maturity level of the “older” and more experienced student is a benefit in the supervisory position of head counselor. The small sample size in this study was not sufficient to reach further conclusions based on age, or year in school. As well, since these were peer evaluations, there exists the potential that counselors who are younger and more inexperienced may have a tendency to rate head counselors who are closer in age to them more favorably than they might rate an older student. Similar results from a larger sample size would help to fortify the conclusions drawn from this study.

Recommendations

Performance appraisal can be used to provide direction for staff training and development (Jordan et al., 1994; Norland, 1995). The findings in this study suggest a
new area for staff training with regard to the CPAS evaluation form and the proper way to fill it out. First and foremost, honesty and accuracy should be stressed. The nature of peer evaluations brings with it the possibility that peers will be rated high regardless of their performance, simply because they are peers. On the opposite end of the spectrum, there is the possibility that a personality conflict will reveal itself as a lower rating for that head counselor, instead of an accurate assessment of performance. The counselors should be instructed to fill out the form accurately, based strictly and objectively on the head counselor’s performance, regardless of the relationship between them.

Training would also help to eliminate the problem of counselors placing a 1.00 at the top of the page and drawing an arrow or line through all items. This phenomenon was noted on several CPAS forms, making it doubtful that the counselors read and rated each item individually and accurately. Culkin and Kirsch (1986) have noted that few persons receive adequate training in evaluation procedures, which can result in the improper use of forms.

Secondly, it should be made clear to the students whether the CPAS form is to be filled out based only on the week of actual performance at camp, or on the entire semester. The semester affords many opportunities to observe attitudes and personality factors during team building exercises, and in-class activities. There is no way of knowing whether head counselors were rated solely upon their camp performance, or based on their semester performance. If evaluation is based on the full semester, then a mid-semester conference between head counselor and individual counselors would allow an opportunity to discuss problem areas while there is still time to correct them, and
before actual contact with the camper occurs (Ball & Ball, 1990; Culkin & Kirsch, 1986; Stronge et al., 1994). Ball and Ball (1990) suggest that the interim conference also helps to build quality relationships between levels of personnel.

Thirdly, the data suggest that there was some confusion among the counselors on how to fill out the CPAS form. Most counselors filled it out one time, at the end of the week at camp. A small percentage of the students filled it out for each of the five days at camp. These scores had to be averaged together in order to determine their rating of the head counselor. A class that instructs the students in the above matters is suggested as the best way to clear up these problems, and to ensure that accurate assessments will be submitted. An added benefit will emerge in that, a thorough look at the CPAS form will help to increase the camp staff's understanding of their job roles (Culkin & Kirsch, 1986).

Another point with regard to the evaluation form, is that most counselors did not submit their CPAS forms anonymously, although they were supposed to have done so. It has been suggested by Culkin and Kirsch (1986) that when subordinates rate their supervisors, unless they are allowed to do so anonymously, the ratings may not be accurate due to fear of retaliation by the supervisor. The information regarding anonymous submission of the forms must be disseminated to counselors to ensure accurate ratings.

Some improvements are suggested for the CPAS form. Two items appear to overlap. Under administrative ability, "is on time" appears to be similar to "is punctual in meeting all time schedules" under the reliability construct. If they are intended to have
different meanings, then more explanation is needed for each of these two items. In addition, the sixth personality construct is entitled “Facilities.” A title such as “Responsibility” for this construct would be more in line with personality constructs, and would adequately cover the duty of keeping supplies and facilities in good condition.

Further information could be gleaned from a study involving a larger sample size. Now that the CPAS form is being used for head counselors, the study could be repeated in future years. This replication may provide more information that could be used for recruiting and selection of head counselors. The study could also be replicated with counselors from the same camp program.
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Appendices
### Appendix A

**COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT SCALE**

**CAMP KOINONIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Head Counselor</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>EXCELLENT</strong> - Demonstrates exemplary skills and professional competency in fulfilling requirements of the position.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>GOOD</strong> - Performing all tasks in a professional manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>SATISFACTORY</strong> - Meeting minimal performance standards required for the position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</strong> - Performance must improve for individual to function at an acceptable level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>NOT OBSERVED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Personality and Attitude
- A. Cheerful and friendly with everyone
- B. Cooperative attitude toward fellow workers, supervisors, and patrons
- C. Assertive in enforcing policy and safety regulations
- D. Consistent in offering praise and discipline
- E. Voluntarily assists others with problems

### 2. Administrative Ability
- A. Is on time
- B. Follows the scheduled program for activities
- C. Receives suggestions from superiors
- D. Submits reports promptly
- E. Works well and encourages counselors

### 3. Leadership
- A. An example to others
- B. Not content with the status quo; constantly trying to improve both the program and himself/herself
- C. Has an ability to provide leadership
- D. Is enthusiastic
- E. Is well organized and always prepared
- F. Strives to see that others are successful

### 4. Reliability
- A. Is punctual in meeting all time schedules
- B. Accepts full share of responsibility
- C. Carries out in cooperative spirit, policies and requirements

### 5. Personal Attributes
- A. Presents a good personal appearance
- B. Possesses good verbal communication skills
- C. Demonstrates mature judgment
- D. Is polite and courteous at all times
- E. Is a “team” player

### 6. Facilities
- A. Keeps facilities and supplies in good condition

### REMARKS:

---

Appendix B

University of Tennessee
Recreation and Leisure Studies
CAMP KOINONIA
STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

Name: ___________________________ Local phone: ________________
Local address: ________________________________________________
______________________________________________

Home address: ___________________________ Home phone: ____________
______________________________________________

Social security number: ___________________________ Age: ______ Sex: □ male □ female:
Major: ___________________________ Year in school: □ Fr □ So □ Jr □ Sr □ Grad

PLEASE INDICATE BELOW ANY SPECIAL TALENTS, SKILLS, CERTIFICATIONS YOU HAVE:

- Guitar
- WSI
- Piano
- First Aid
- Rifle
- Other:
- Lifeguarding
- Dance
- EMT
- Sing
- CPR

Please indicate below your first (3) three choices of what you would like to do at camp this Spring (1=first choice, 2=second choice, 3=third choice)

___ Head Counselor
___ Counselor
___ Activity Leader
___ Activity Staff
If you want to work in an activity area please indicate below your first three (3) choices from the entire list below. (1=first choice, 2=second choice, 3=third choice)

___ Nature crafts
___ Archery
___ Horseback Riding
___ Computer Lab
___ Rifle
___ Special Events (field day, etc)
___ Sports and Games
___ Canoeing
___ Music/Movement
___ Outdoor Education
___ Overnight Camping
___ other:____________________

IF YOU HAVE SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES PLEASE WRITE THEM IN THE SPACE BELOW:

In the space provided write the experience you have had in camping activities and in working with individuals with disabilities. We will use this information to help select class members for specific camp responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>DUTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you attended Camp Koinonia? YES ___ NO ___

IF YES, LIST THE YEAR AND YOUR SPECIFIC ROLE:
Year(s):
Role:

How did you learn about Camp Koinonia?

T-SHIRT SIZE: □ SML □ MED □ LG □ XL

NUMBER OF T-SHIRTS: LONG SLEEVE ___ SHORT SLEEVE ___

Appendix C

Camp Koinonia Staff Interview

Name of Applicant ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Most Desired Position: HC  C  AL  AS ___________________________

Other Positions of Interest: HC  C  AL  AS ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Appointed Position ___________
Interviewer Initials ___________

Table A-1. Mean Global Score for Head Counselors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Score</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-2. Mean Global Score for Head Counselor Converted to Overall Rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Counselor</th>
<th>Global Score</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1.00-1.50 = Excellent; 1.51-2.50 = Good; 2.51-3.50 = Satisfactory; 3.51-4.00 = Needs Improvement.
Table A-3. Demographic Breakdown for All, Male, and Female, Excellent Head Counselors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Area</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Head Counselors</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># head</td>
<td>% head</td>
<td># head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20 yrs and younger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-22 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-24 yrs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 yrs and older</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Recreation/Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business/Commun.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>With children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With disabilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Koinonia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Camp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-4. Kruskal-Wallis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>Z Stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - B</td>
<td>3.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - H</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - J</td>
<td>4.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - J</td>
<td>3.37**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Critical Z = 3.06 for Overall Alpha of .10. **Critical Z = 3.26 for Overall Alpha of .05.
Table A-5. Construct Ratings for Head Counselors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality/attitude</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Cheerful/friendly</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Cooperative</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Assertive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Praise/discipline</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Voluntarily assists</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative ability</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. On time</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Follows schedule</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Receives suggestions</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Submits reports</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Works with counselors</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Example to others</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Constantly improving</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Provides leadership</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Enthusiastic</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Organized/prepared</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Others successful</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Punctual</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accepts responsibility</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Carries out policies</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal attributes</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal appearance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Communication skills</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mature judgement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Polite/courteous</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Team player</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Good condition</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLOBAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1.00-1.50 = Excellent; 1.51-2.50 = Good; 2.51-3.50 = Satisfactory; 3.51-4.00 = Needs Improvement.
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