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ABSTRACT

DOES EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE MODERATE THE EFFECT OF FIELD WORK EXPERIENCE ON COUNSELING STUDENTS’ GROUP COUNSELING SELF-EFFICACY

By

John Scott Lewis

August 2019

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Jered B. Kolbert

Counselor educators and supervisors need a comprehensive understanding of counseling students group counseling development with the aim of assessing student learning outcomes and facilitating academic and supervisory interventions that support development. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and group counseling self-efficacy and determine the feasibility of using emotional intelligence to predict changes in group counseling self-efficacy. Results indicated that although there was significant increase in group counselor self-efficacy after a semester of fieldwork experience, the results showed no significant relationship between emotional intelligence and group counselor self-efficacy. Practical implications and future directions for research are also presented.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Emotional Intelligence (EI) refers to the characteristics and cognitive capacity associated with how one manages, understands, and uses emotions (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). Young Kaelber and Schwartz (2014) remarked that there is little doubt that counselors require EI. Specifically, EI relates to fundamental clinical counseling skills, such as reflecting feelings and building interpersonal relationships (Goleman, 2005; Young, 2013; Zalaquett, Chatters, & Ivey, 2013). In fact, Easton, Martin, and Wilson (2008) showed that counselor trainees had higher scores on the Emotional Judgment Inventory (EJI) compared with the general population, that EJI had a statistically significant relationship with counselor self-efficacy (CSE), and that CSE predicted EJI scores.

Although intense emotional reactions are routinely accepted as a part of individual counselor experiences, these types of reactions may be even more commonplace in group leader experiences. Thus, the skills required for conducting group counseling may vary somewhat from the skills related to individual counseling. For example, effective group facilitation consists of much more than applying individual counseling skills to a group setting. A group counselor must manage many tasks while facilitating a group. These include establishing group rules, ensuring that these rules are followed, assisting with client engagement, and managing challenging behaviors within the group. Further, the group leader must seek to complete these tasks while also attempting to deliver high-level helping responses (Kivlighan & Gold, 2015).

The research on group counseling indicates that the complex nature of conducting group counseling may be overwhelming, particularly for novice group leaders (Christensen & Kline, 2001; Duncan & Brown, 1996; Okech & Kline, 2006). Even if group counseling presents as a “highly threatening experience” (Yalom & Leszcz, 2005, p. 549), the group leader’s emotional
connection to the group is nonetheless regarded as essential. Bemak and Epp (2001) contended that accessing and managing one’s own emotions are central to effective group leadership. The novice counselor may, however, lack the confidence to manage these emotions.

Novice counselors who have higher EI may be better able to manage the challenging emotions associated with conducting group counseling. If novice counselors succeed in managing their emotions, they should also experience an increase in group counseling self-efficacy (GCSE) as they become proficient in leading counseling groups. To explore these theories, the proposed research will explore whether counselor-in-trainings’ EI is a predictor of novice counselors’ GCSE.

Self-efficacy theory has been used to explore the relationship between counselors’ efficacy in a variety of counseling skills and the outcomes they can achieve (Heppner, Multz, Gysbers, Ellis, & Zook, 1998; Larson et al., 1992). Counselors’ self-efficacy has been found to be positively related to counselor performance (Larson et al., 1992). The relationships among rehabilitation counselor efficacy in counseling skills and client outcomes, efficacy in counseling microskills (e.g., paraphrasing, confrontation), and efficacy in handling difficult client behavior (e.g., clients that lack motivation, clients in crisis) have been found to be positively correlated with successful client outcomes (McCarthy, 2014).

Studies have also shown a strong relationship between EI and CSE (Easton, Martin, Jr., & Wilson, 2008). Easton et al. (2008) conducted a 9-month study of the relationship between EI and counseling self-efficacy. They found that counselors with perceived low confidence in dealing with difficult client behaviors also had perceived low ability to use emotions in problem-solving. One of the most significant findings of the study was the importance of identifying one’s own emotions and skills related to counseling self-efficacy. The perceived ability to
identify one’s own emotions with clarity is essential within the counseling environment because of the variety of emotions counselors experience when working with clients as well as the significance that these emotions have on how they perceive, think about, and act in response to clients.

Although the research provides evidence that EI plays a role in counseling self-efficacy, the research does not specifically address students’ EI and CSE as it pertains to counselors’ confidence in conducting group counseling. As stated previously, there are unique skills sets and anxieties specific to group counseling that may challenge a students’ self-efficacy. This study will examine whether EI predicts changes in counseling students’ GCSE in the course of fieldwork.

**Statement of the Problem**

Knowledge of whether EI influences GCSE and if experiences in field placement might affect GCSE development has implications for training and supervision. Counselor education programs can use counseling students’ EI assessments and gains in GCSE as measures of training effectiveness. Additionally, GCSE assessments can provide useful feedback to students, empowering them as they advance through the phases of becoming a proficient group counselor. Finally, both faculty members and students can use the information to identify training needs and to individualize improvement strategies (Martin, Jr., 2004). Counselor training programs should also consider EI in selecting potential candidates for the programs and seek to incorporate activities in the curriculum that promote students’ EI.

In addition to helping assess suitability for admission to and progress through the training program, these results can help assess student learning outcomes, as required by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2016). The
CACREP standards state that counselor education programs “engage in continuous systematic program evaluation indicating how the mission, objectives, and student learning outcomes are measured and met” (p. 18–19). Nevertheless, limited studies have been published on methods for assessing students’ levels of counseling competencies (skills, dispositions, and behaviors) in a comprehensive and psychometrically sound manner (Swank, 2010; Swank, Lambie, & Witta, 2012).

Although previous research has shown a correlation between EI and CSE as it pertains to overall counseling experience (or more specifically, individual counseling experience), this study addressed the gap in the existing literature on the relationship between counseling students’ EI and their GCSE. The research problem, therefore, is to investigate whether EI predicts changes in students’ GCSE.

**Purpose of the Study**

Counselor educators and supervisors need a comprehensive understanding of student development for assessing student learning outcomes and facilitating academic and supervisory interventions that support development. Enhancing counseling students’ self-efficacy regarding clinical skills is an important developmental goal of preparation programs, with higher self-efficacy suggesting an increased likelihood of efficient and effective counseling services (Bandura, 1982, 1997; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between EI and GCSE and to determine the feasibility of using EI to predict changes in GCSE.

**Research Questions**

1. Do counselors-in-training experience changes in group counseling self-efficacy (GCSE) during the course of one semester of fieldwork?
2. Do initial levels of EI predict changes in the GCSE of counselors-in-training after one semester of fieldwork?

3. Will any one of the four subscales of EI, as measured by the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, Short Form, be more predictive than another of changes in GCSE?

**Significance of the Study**

Counselor education faculty members can use EI assessments and gains in GCSE as measures of training effectiveness and such student outcomes as competence and readiness. The associations between understanding one’s own emotions in relation to GCSE and emotional stability give some credibility to the importance of having counselor education goals related to strengthening the personal adjustment skills of students as they prepare to become counselors. Increased understanding of counseling trainees’ development may also aid educators’ ability to develop and deliver educational and supervisory interventions.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework that guided this study was Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory (SCT). Bandura posited that learning occurs in a social context with a dynamic and reciprocal interaction of the person, environment, and behavior. A unique feature of SCT is its emphasis on social influence and on external and internal social reinforcement. SCT proposed a unique way for individuals to acquire and maintain behavior while also considering the social environment in which individuals perform the behavior. The theory takes into account a person’s past experiences, which are a factor in whether certain behaviors will occur. These past experiences influence reinforcements and expectations, all of which shape whether a person will engage in a specific behavior and the person’s reasons for doing so. The goal of SCT is to
explain how people regulate their behavior through control and reinforcement to achieve goal-directed behavior that can be maintained over time.

Summary of Methodology

This study employed a quasi-experimental (i.e., no control group, no random assignment) pretest-posttest design to explore the relationship between counseling students’ EI and GCSE. Counseling students’ EI was measured at the beginning of a semester of fieldwork (e.g., practicum or internship), whereas GCSE was measured at both the beginning and end of the semester. The results of the measures were examined to determine whether EI predicts possible changes in GCSE.

Participants consisted of master’s-level counseling students attending an academic master’s-level counseling program. This study used the Group Leader Self-Efficacy Scale (GLSE) to measure GCSE (Appendix C) and the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire – Short Form (TEIQue-SF) to measure EI (Appendix B). A demographic questionnaire was used to collect data regarding participants’ self-identified gender, age, ethnicity, program track, and years of experience leading counseling groups (Appendix A).
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of the constructs of EI and GCSE. The first section discusses the theoretical framework of the study, defines self-efficacy (SE), and describes its relationship to counseling and its application to group counseling. The next section discusses EI and its relation to counseling self-efficacy (CSE) as well as GCSE. The last section looks at the effectiveness of group counseling, the variables associated with effective group counseling, and group counseling competencies.

Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1977) outlined a theoretical framework in which the concept of self-efficacy is assigned a central role in analyzing changes achieved in fearful and avoidant behavior. This theory is based on the principal assumption that cognitive interpretations, whatever their form, serve as a means of creating and strengthening expectations of personal efficacy. Within this analysis, efficacy expectations are distinguished from response-outcome expectancies.

An outcome expectancy is defined as a person’s projection that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes (Bandura, 1977). An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully exhibit the behavior required to produce the outcomes. Outcome and efficacy expectations are differentiated because individuals can believe that a particular course of action will produce certain outcomes, but if they entertain serious doubts about whether they can perform the action, the perceived connection between action and outcome will not influence their behavior. Not only can perceived self-efficacy directly influence the choice of activities and settings but also, through expectations of eventual success, it can affect coping efforts once they are initiated. Efficacy expectations determine how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences. The stronger the perceived
self-efficacy, the more active the efforts. Expectation alone will not produce a desired performance if the component capabilities are lacking. However, efficacy expectations are a major determinant of people’s choice of activities, the amount of effort they will expend, and the amount of time they will make a sustained effort to deal with stressful situations. In this social cognitive analysis, expectations of personal efficacy are based on four major sources of information: performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. This analysis provides a conceptual framework to study behavioral changes achieved by different modes of treatment (Bandura, 1977).

Performance accomplishment as a source of efficacy information is especially influential because it is based on personal mastery (Bandura, 1977). Successes raise mastery expectations, whereas repeated failures lower them, particularly if mishaps occur early in the course of events. After strong efficacy expectations are developed through repeated success, the negative impact of occasional failures is likely to be reduced.

People, however, do not rely on mastery as the sole source of information concerning their level of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Many expectations are derived from vicarious experience. Seeing others perform threatening activities without adverse consequences can generate expectations in observers that they, too, will improve if they intensify and persist in their efforts.

Verbal persuasion is widely used in attempts to influence human behavior because of its ease and ready availability. Through suggestion, people are led into believing they can cope successfully with what has overwhelmed them in the past. Efficacy expectations induced in this manner, however, are likely to be weaker than those arising from one’s own accomplishments because verbal persuasion does not provide an authentic experiential base. In the face of threats
and a long history of failure in coping with them, mastery expectations induced by suggestion can be readily extinguished by disconfirming experiences. Although social persuasion alone may have strict limitations in terms of creating an enduring sense of personal efficacy, it can contribute to successes achieved through corrective performance. That is, people who are socially persuaded that they possess the capabilities to master difficult situations and who are provided with provisional aids for effective action are likely to mobilize greater effort than those who receive only performance aids (Bandura, 1977).

Stressful and taxing situations generally elicit emotional arousal, which may have informative value concerning personal competency. Therefore, emotional arousal is another integral source of information that can affect perceived self-efficacy in coping with threatening situations. People rely partly on their state of physiological arousal in judging their anxiety and vulnerability to stress. Because high arousal usually debilitates performance, individuals are more likely to expect success when they are not affected by aversive arousal than if they are tense and viscerally agitated. Fear generates further fear of impending stressful situations through anticipatory self-arousal. By conjuring up fear-provoking thoughts about their assessed incompetence, individuals can exacerbate their levels of anxiety, which far exceed the actual fear experienced during the threatening situation. According to the social learning view, potential threats activate fear largely through cognitive self-arousal. Perceived self-competence can therefore affect susceptibility to self-arousal (Grusec, 1992).

**Cognitive Processing of Efficacy Information**

The efficacy discussion thus far has centered primarily on the many sources of information—enactive, vicarious, exhortative, and emotive—that people use to judge their level of self-efficacy. At this point, a distinction must be drawn between information on
environmental events and information as processed and transformed by the individual. The impact of information on efficacy expectations will depend on how it is cognitively appraised.

Cognitive appraisals of the difficulty level of tasks affect the impact of performance accomplishments on perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) seeks to clarify how self-efficacy judgment affects human action, thought, and affect rather than to treat perceived self-efficacy as a trait-like entity. Self-efficacy judgments influence human functioning through their impact on choice behavior, on effort expenditure and perseverance, on positive or negative thought patterns, and on affective and neurophysiological reactions to environmental demands (Bandura, 1986). The extent to which people alter their perceived self-efficacy on the basis of performance feedback depends on such factors as the difficulty of the task, the amount of effort they expend, the amount of external aid they receive, the situational circumstances under which they perform, and their mood and physical state at the time. To complicate the self-appraisal process further, the weight given to new experiences depends on the nature and strength of the preexisting self-efficacy into which these experiences must be integrated.

SCT posits an interactive, though uneven, relationship between perceived self-efficacy and fear arousal, with coping efficacy exercising the greater influence (Bandura, 1982, 1986). Perceived self-inefficacy causes people to approach intimidating situations anxiously, and their experience of disruptive levels of arousal may further decrease their belief that they will be able to perform well. However, whether or not perceived self-efficacy is affected by emotional arousal depends on how such information is cognitively processed. Many factors, including appraisal of the source of arousal, the level of activation, the circumstances under which arousal
is elicited, and personal experiences of how arousal affects one’s performance, influence the efficacy attributed to arousal (Bandura, 1986).

**Counselor Self-Efficacy**

In the early 1980s, researchers began to pay attention to counseling self-efficacy and the factors that contribute to it (Dunnewold, 1982; Johnson, 1985; Kopala, 1987; Sipps, Sugden, & Faiver, 1988). It was pointed out that to be an effective counselor, both skills and confidence are required. Because counselor education includes both skills training and initial counseling practices, studies conducted on counseling self-efficacy have focused exclusively on counselor trainees (Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998).

Counseling self-efficacy is defined as counselors’ beliefs about their capabilities for carrying out effective counseling sessions with a specific client in the near future (Larson et al., 1992). Effectively executing a counseling session means successfully demonstrating helping skills, managing session tasks, and coping with challenging client behaviors (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003). Larson (1998) expanded Bandura’s SCT to counselor training and presented the social cognitive model of counseling training. This model emphasizes the importance of counselors’ self-talk as much as their skills and responses. According to this theory, counseling self-efficacy beliefs are mediators between knowing what to do and executing the action. They are also seen as a primary element of effective counseling.

In the social cognitive model of counseling training, counselor trainees’ personal agency factors, training environment, and performances are interrelated. Counselors’ personal agency and training environment (counseling sessions and supervision environment) influence their actions in a counseling session and supervision environment. Further, counseling performance shapes counselor trainees’ environment and perception of personal agency during training. In
parallel with Bandura’s SCT, the interaction between these three concepts is called *triadic reciprocal causation* in the social cognitive model of counselor training (Larson, 1998).

According to Larson (1998), counseling self-efficacy beliefs can be affected by four sources of self-efficacy: mastery, modeling, social persuasion, and affective arousal. Mastery comes from experiences in successfully working with clients. The inability to experience positive counseling sessions at the beginning of one’s counseling career may affect career choices, commitment, and persistence while facing future counseling obstacles.

Modeling refers to observing oneself, another person, or a videotaped model perform the target behavior. Candidates who view someone else’s successful counseling sessions may think that they can succeed in counseling sessions, too. This especially occurs when a model has similar characteristics to the candidate.

Social persuasion, the third piece of efficacy information, includes the supervisor’s feedback, support, and encouragement. Because supervisors are seen as experts and trusted people by students, their feedback may be more persuasive and effective for a counselor’s self-efficacy beliefs.

The last source of efficacy, affective arousal, includes anxiety, fear, or excitement while seeing clients. It is clear that counselor training includes all of these four factors. For this reason, building a strong sense of efficacy mainly depends on the training process.

According to SCT, self-efficacy is a determinant of successful performance. Despite the fact that many studies in various fields have revealed a link between self-efficacy and performance, studies investigating the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance have obtained mixed results (Ho, Hosford, & Johnson, 1985; Johnson,

A considerable number of studies have concluded that the relationship between CSE and counselor performance is negative or questionable. In one of the earliest studies examining the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance, Johnson et al. (1985) compared the effect of self-observation and self-modeling video feedback methods on counselor trainees’ anxiety, recall, self-evaluations, and counseling performance. An unpublished self-efficacy scale and a self-efficacy inventory were administered to 17 counselor trainees, and the counselor evaluation rating scales were used to measure counseling performance. In the results, the Pearson product-moment correlations between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance ranged from -.39 to .84. These findings suggest that the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance may be affected by individual variations.

Johnson et al. (1989) also examined the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance among 50 master’s degree counselor trainees over an eight-week period. Counselor trainees were assigned to low and high self-efficacy groups, and later, these two groups were divided into counseling and no-counseling groups. The counseling group received counseling from doctoral students during the study, and the two groups’ levels of counseling self-efficacy and performance were compared. According to the results of the study, both the low and high self-efficacy groups improved in self-efficacy throughout the training. However, the relationship between post-training ratings of self-efficacy and counselor performance was insignificant, suggesting that the level of counseling self-efficacy is not related to performance success. Additionally, client experience did not affect the level of counseling self-efficacy.
Sharpley and Ridgway (1993) also examined the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance. Thirty-one counselor trainees participated in the study, and measurements of self-efficacy were taken before, during, and after the skills training program using an instrument the researchers developed. Counselor trainees were asked to indicate their expected grade (fail, pass, credit, distinction, and high distinction) and indicate their confidence on a 100-point probability scale (not at all confident to completely confident). Counselor performance was assessed via videotaped analogue interviews. The results indicated that only the level of confidence from the second-grade estimate significantly predicted counseling skills, and the relationship was negative. Thus, counselor trainees who were least confident in their grade midway through the skills training program obtained higher scores for the measure of counselor performance. This finding raised questions about the usefulness of counseling self-efficacy as a predictor of counseling performance.

In a similar vein, Heppner et al. (1998) examined the role of counseling self-efficacy in the career counseling process and outcomes, based on the client process outcomes among 24 counselor trainees. Results indicated that client scores on various career outcome measures (e.g., Career Decision Profile) significantly improved from pretest to post-test. At the same time, no apparent relationship was found between counseling self-efficacy and client process variables, suggesting that a more complex relationship existed between counseling self-efficacy and the career counseling process and outcome.

Although some of the studies obtained negative and doubtful results, a substantial number supported the findings of SCT and concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance. For example, Munson, Zoerink, and Stadulis (as cited in Iannelli, 2000) investigated the effects of training that focused
on developing a sense of self-efficacy and competence in basic attending and responding skills among 48 therapeutic recreation students. Forty-eight trainees were randomly assigned to three groups: microskills, mental practice, and control. The results showed that both the microskills and mental health groups were superior to the control groups in interpersonal skills efficacy and that these groups were significantly more competent at displaying attending and responding skills.

Likewise, in another study conducted with 184 counselors and psychologists, structural equation modeling was used to examine the relationship between CSE and counselor performance (Iannelli, 2000). Two different instruments, the counseling self-estimate inventory (COSE) and counseling self-efficacy scale, were used to measure CSE. Supervisors used the counselor evaluation rating scales and counselor trainees the newly developed self-rating instrument to assess counselor performance. The structural model with counselor trainees’ self-ratings of performance revealed a good model fit. Further, moderate support was found for the model with supervisors’ ratings of counselor performance.

In her dissertation, among other hypotheses, Kocarek (2001) examined the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance. Her sample consisted of 117 counselor trainees and 82 supervisors. Counselor performance was examined from the supervisors’ perspective using the counselor evaluation rating scales. The COSE was used as a measure of CSE. The findings revealed that CSE, anxiety, developmental level, number of courses, and amount of counseling experience together predicted counselor performance.

Hanson (2006), among other variables of interest, examined the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance. Fifty-eight counselor trainees completed the counselor activity self-efficacy scales (CASES), and supervisors evaluated counselor
performance using the counselor evaluation rating scales. The results indicated that CSE is positively related to counselor performance.

Researchers have discussed the reasons for such contradictory results. A prominent issue is the small sample sizes and various measures used to assess same or similar constructs. Despite the conflicting results, the bulk of the literature suggests that the sense of counseling efficacy influences counseling performance. Accordingly, any factors affecting the counseling self-efficacy beliefs of counselor trainees have become important.

**Counseling Student Self-Efficacy**

Training counselors to be good practitioners is the primary mission of graduate counselor education programs. Discussion in the literature regarding ideal pedagogy for counselors suggests that counselor competency is developed in settings where counselor trainees can develop critical-thinking skills related to real-world activities (Kaczmarek, Barclay, & Smith, 1996; Nelson & Neufeldt, 1998; Spruill & Benshoff, 2000). The ability of counselors to identify their counseling skills and to be confident in their ability to use these skills in real-life settings has a direct influence on the quality of counseling services they provide (Bradley & Fiorini, 1999). Hence, the curricula of counseling programs often have two components—theoretical foundations and clinical instruction and experiences. In fact, counselor education programs strive to bridge the gap between theory and practice (Fong, Borders, Ethington, & Pitts, 1997; Nelson & Neufeldt, 1998; Woodard & Lin, 1999).

A practicum and internship are both common clinical experiences for students. The expectations of counselor educators during these field experiences provide students with learning opportunities that help them develop competence in practicing counseling. Fieldwork experience functions as the vicarious learning and task performance that Bandura (1986) identifies as the
sources for individuals’ self-efficacy. Watson (as cited in Larson & Daniels, 1998) reported that counseling coursework and related work experience accounted for 43% of the variance in CSE. Internship experience was found to have a positive impact on students’ self-efficacy in practicing counseling (Heidel, 1999).

Mei Tang et al. (2004) examined whether age, prior work experience, number of courses taken, and number of internship hours have a positive relationship with counseling self-efficacy. The results of correlation and multivariate analyses of covariance revealed that the length of internship hours and prior related work experience were positively correlated with counseling self-efficacy.

Bischoff, Barton, Thober, and Hawley (2002) conducted a qualitative study with 39 counselor trainees. The purpose of the study was to identify the external events and experiences affecting the development of confidence during initial contact with clients. Thirty-nine master’s degree counselor trainees were asked about their clinical development during a 12-month practicum via telephone interviews. As a result, events and experiences affecting the development of clinical self-confidence were grouped under four headings: supervision, contact with clients, contact with peers, and personal life stress.

Although general self-efficacy is a well-researched construct, Bandura (2006) posited that efficacy beliefs are domain specific, suggesting that people are likely to feel differently about their abilities across different skillsets. Though potentially influential in the identity development of counseling students, general CSE may not be consistent with all counseling interventions.
Group Leader Self-Efficacy

Group counseling is an important therapeutic modality; hence, it is important for counseling students to develop group leadership self-efficacy (GLSE). GLSE can be described as a group facilitator’s confidence in his or her ability to lead a group effectively to achieve positive client outcomes. The educational process by which counselor education students develop the necessary skills in group leadership typically has four aspects: (a) didactic, (b) observational, (c) experiential, and (d) supervisory (Corey, 2011; Gladding, 2011; Yalom & Leszcz, 2005).

Research suggests that group leadership development may not always receive equal attention compared to individual counseling skills across the curriculum (Ohrt, Ener, Porter, & Young Kaelber & Schwartz, 2014; Yalom & Leszcz, 2005). Although published studies have investigated CSE in the context of school counseling (Holcomb-McCoy, Ileana, & Georgina, 2009), career counseling (Garcia, Restubog, Bordia, Bordia, & Roxas, 2015), feedback and supervision (Motley, Reese & Campos, 2014; Reese et al., 2009), and counseling training (Barbee, Schrerer & Combs, 2003; Goreczny, Hamilton, Lubinski, & Pasquinelli, 2015), very little research has been conducted on CSE in the context of group work. Because of the limited amount of available research, the following section will explore both group counseling leadership and general leadership self-efficacy research.

School counselors have an important responsibility to support all students in the academic environment by promoting knowledge, skills, and attitudes that address the academic, career, and social/emotional needs of their respective populations (American School Counselor Association, 2014). Group counseling is one treatment modality used to deliver services that address the needs of all students. It is becoming increasingly important to provide opportunities
to reach students beyond the dyadic relationship, given the rising student-to-counselor ratio (Akos, Hamm, Mack, & Dunaway, 2007). This includes offering preventative and targeted psychoeducation and creating counseling groups that support the social/emotional, academic, and career development of K–12 students (ASCA, 2012).

Research suggests that to successfully incorporate group counseling interventions, it is important for school counselors to feel equipped with the knowledge and skills to perform small group counseling in schools (Akos, Goodnough, & Milsom, 2004; Bore, Armstrong, & Womack, 2010; Gunduz, 2012). Unfortunately, evidence indicates that preservice school counselors may not feel as confident in their group leadership skills when applying them to practice (Bore et al., 2010; Steen, Bauman, & Smith, 2007).

Fieldwork placements themselves are “crucial to students’ counselor development” as they potentially offer a wealth of supervised opportunities that can affect counselor confidence, including designing, observing, and leading group counseling with children and adolescents (Akos et al., 2004; Furr & Carroll, 2003). As such, preservice school counselors’ site supervisory experiences may be the most opportune time for trainees to develop the confidence needed to initiate and maintain group counseling interventions upon graduation.

Kane, Zaccaro, Tremble, and Mesuda (2002) defined one’s perceived self-capability to perform the cognitive and behavioral functions necessary to effectively carry out a specific leadership task as leadership self-efficacy (LSE). This definition is conceptually similar to Bandura and Wood’s (1989) definition of self-efficacy, as LSE is also task specific (i.e., leading a specific group on a specific task); however, the mediating presence of groups distinguishes it from task self-efficacy. Group leaders regulate not only their own thoughts and actions but also the activities of group members. As such, LSE is likely shaped by perceptions that leaders have
of their own task competencies (e.g., technical and procedural knowledge, task strategies),
general leadership competencies (e.g., to provide motivation, foster group strategies, provide
direction, coordinate group activities), the group’s composition, group processes, and the
performance environment (e.g., emotional stability, available resources).

In the past few years, the role of leader self-efficacy in the relationships between
relatively stable individual differences, such as personality traits and leadership, has garnered
significant attention. It is well known that the earliest stages of leadership research focused on
identifying individual traits that distinguish leaders from non-leaders. These efforts were mostly
unsuccessful until the emergence of the Big Five personality framework, in which the personality
traits identified are extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism.
Subsequent meta-analysis uncovered significant relationships between Big Five traits and
leadership (Judge et al., 2002). However, it is not well understood how variables such as
personality ultimately influence leader performance.

In addition to the Big Five traits, other individual difference variables have been
proposed and tested as LSE characteristics. Positive relationships with leader self-efficacy have
been reported for EI (Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007).

**Emotions**

Theories of emotional experience typically seek to account for how different emotional
states arise and can be grouped into several broad categories: feedback, central, arousal, and
cognitive theories (LeDoux, 1996). Though very different in some ways, each of these theories
proposes that emotional experiences are the result of prior emotional processes. Feedback and
arousal theories posit that the brain detects emotionally significant events and produces
responses appropriate to the stimulus; these responses then serve as a signal that determines the
content of emotional experience. Many emotional responses are hard-wired in the brain circuitry. Nevertheless, in humans and animals, the environmental events that trigger these responses are often learned through experiences in which emotionally neutral stimuli come to be associated with emotionally charged stimuli. One important aspect of emotional processing, therefore, involves the way the brain forms, stores, and uses associations between meaningless and meaningful stimuli (Fendt & Fanselow, 1999; LeDoux, 2000).

Emotion can be described as the subjective experience of a combination of physiological, psychological, and mental states that are closely tied to other characteristics such as temperament, personality, mood, and motivation as well as various physiological antecedents and consequences (Mauss et al., 2005). Gross and Thompson (2007) described three characteristics of emotions: (1) they are complex phenomena that affect psychological, physiological, and behavioral domains, (2) they are generated in response to the meaning attributed to a situation, and (3) despite their potentially powerful and compelling influence, they are malleable and subject to regulation.

Psychologists have stated that emotions are a key part of working with clients, regardless of one’s theoretical orientation (Wester, Vogel, Pressly, & Heesacker, 2002). Being able to recognize and reflect client emotion has been described as one of the most important tools of psychologists who practice counseling (Ivey, Ivey, & Zalaquett, 2010). Understanding the role of emotions can help all mental health practitioners to be more in tune with clients’ emotions and can further assist in the helping process (Egan, 2010).

Whereas most of the literature addresses emotion regulation for clients, it has increasingly focused on the importance of emotion regulation and related concepts for the helping professionals as well (Batten & Santanello, 2009; Donati & Watts, 2005; Gaubatz &
Vera, 2002; Safran & Muran, 2006; Zeddies, 1999). Some studies have indicated that effective counseling relies on the counselor’s capacity to understand and manage his or her emotional reactions (Donati & Watts, 2005; Gaubatz & Vera, 2002; Safran & Muran, 2006). This ability may be crucial in responding to clients during counseling.

Treatments that focus on emotions may offer important tools. Emotion-focused therapy (EFT) is designed to help individuals change problematic emotions that are related to psychological disorders. The theoretical foundations of EFT are well-developed (Greenberg & Watson, 2005), and outcome research has found EFT to be helpful in treating such problems as depression (Wanuk, 2015). The core theoretical assumption of EFT is that emotions are innately adaptive and that they provide important information. Through learning, emotions are organized into emotion schemes, networks of cognition, bodily sensation, and action urges triggered by internal or external stimuli specific to the individual (Greenberg, 2002). The central goal of EFT is to transform maladaptive emotion schemes by increasing awareness of and expressing emotion, learning to regulate emotions, and activating adaptive emotions (Greenberg, 2002; Greenberg & Watson, 1998). Once maladaptive emotion schemes are transformed, psychological symptoms recede and disappear because they are no longer required to cope with emotion.

Although intense emotional reactions are routinely accepted as a part of the individual counselor experiences, these types of reactions may be even more commonplace in group leader experiences. The literature indicates that a complex group work environment may be overwhelming, particularly for novice group leaders (Christensen & Kline, 2001; Duncan & Brown, 1996; Okech & Kline, 2006). Additionally, numerous group development theories imply that functioning groups go through periods of conflict and heightened emotion (Kline, 2003).
Group workers may struggle to manage reactions to the hostility directed towards them (VanWagoner, 2000; Yalom & Leszcz, 2005). However, an emotional connection to the group by the group leader is seen as essential (Kline, 2003; Yalom & Leszcz, 2005), even as group leaders are charged with processing large amounts of information. Further, Bemak and Epp (2001) contended that accessing and managing one’s own emotions are central to effective group leadership and should be central to group work in training.

**Emotional Intelligence**

In his seminal research on EI, Salovey (1990) described emotions as organized responses crossing the boundaries of many psychological subsystems, including physiological, cognitive, motivational, and experiential systems. Emotions typically arise in response to an event, either internal or external, that has a positive or negative emotional meaning for an individual. Intelligence, meanwhile, as defined by Wechsler (1975), is one’s collective capacity to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with one’s environment. Salovey (1990) defined “EI” as the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions.

Mayer (2008) described four branches of EI: managing emotions as they pertain to one’s goals, understanding emotions, using emotions to facilitate thinking, and using the ability to perceive emotions accurately in oneself and others. Mayer’s research showed that individuals with high emotional intelligence are better able to recognize and reason about emotional consequences of events. Salovey (1990) argued that because coping inevitably involves managing emotions, it is not surprising that EI would be associated with an increased ability to manage distressing emotions.
Attending and responding to clients are among the most important counseling strategies that helping professionals use (Capuzzi & Gross, 1995). These strategies rely heavily on accurately understanding and interpreting a client’s feelings and feedback. Areas of EI that are essential to attending and responding to clients are being aware of emotions, being able to identify others’ emotions, and managing these emotions constructively within the therapeutic environment. Additionally, having the ability to identify and manage one’s own emotions is a significant factor in recognizing and managing the frequent transference and countertransference that happen in the therapeutic relationship.

**Trait EI Versus Ability EI**

In the rush to create measures for the emotional intelligence construct, researchers and theorists have overlooked the fundamental difference between typical versus maximal performance (Ackerman & Heggestad, 1997). Thus, whereas some researchers developed and used self-report questionnaires, others developed maximum-performance tests of EI. All of them, however, assumed they were operationalizing the same construct. Unsurprisingly, this led to conceptual confusion and numerous, seemingly conflicting, findings. To address the misconceptions that caused the conflicting results and help organize the literature, Petrides and Furnham (2001) proposed two distinct EI constructs: trait EI (or trait emotional self-efficacy) and ability EI (or cognitive-emotional ability). This differentiation was based on the type of measurement used in the operationalization process.

Trait EI relates to behavioral dispositions and self-perceived abilities, and is measured through self-report, whereas ability EI concerns actual emotion-related abilities and must be measured through maximal-performance tests. Trait EI should be investigated with reference to personality hierarchies, whereas ability EI should be investigated in the context of cognitive
ability hierarchies. It should be emphasized that trait EI and ability EI are two different constructs conceptually, methodologically, and empirically. Research evidence has consistently supported this distinction by revealing low correlations between the two (O’Connor & Little, 2003; Warwick & Nettelbeck, 2004).

Trait EI is defined as a constellation of emotion-related self-perceptions and dispositions at the lower levels of personality hierarchies (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). It is important to understand that this construct is not related to intelligence as traditionally defined in cognitive ability. The trait EI framework aims to provide a comprehensive coverage of personality facets relating to affect. A growing body of evidence supports the predictive validity of trait EI in different areas, including educational (Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2004), experimental (Austin, 2005), and organizational (Wong & Law, 2002) psychology. The discriminant and incremental validity of the construct has also been demonstrated in many different studies (Mikolajczak, Luminet, & Menil, 2006; Petrides et al., 2007). Other correlates include goal orientation and reduced depressive symptomatology (Martinez-Pons, 1997), life satisfaction and loneliness (Palmer, et al., 2002), and depression and affect intensity (Dawda & Hart, 2000).

**The Factors and Facets of Trait EI**

Trait EI consists of the following factors: well-being (self-esteem, happiness, and optimism), emotionality (emotion perception, emotion expression, relationship skills, and empathy), self-control (emotion regulation, stress management, and impulsiveness), and sociability (social competence, emotion management, and assertiveness) and the facets that lie outside the four factors: namely, adaptability and self-motivation (Petrides & Furnham, 2001).

Trait EI is a constellation of emotion-related, self-perceived abilities, and dispositions at the lower levels of personality hierarchies (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). Individuals with high
trait EI scores believe they are “in touch” with their emotions and that they can regulate them in a way that promotes well-being.

**Well-being.** This section of the chapter explores the facets of well-being, according to Petrides and Furnham’s (2001) model, namely self-esteem, happiness, and optimism.

**Self-esteem.** Self-esteem has been defined as a global feeling of self-worth or adequacy as a person, or generalized feelings of self-acceptance, goodness, and self-respect (Crocker & Major, 1989). This global, personal judgment of worthiness is characterized as the evaluative component of the self (Campbell, 1990) and is separate from collective or racial self-esteem (Crocker & Major, 1989). According to Epstein (1973), people have a basic need for self-esteem, and at least in Western cultures, they use numerous strategies to maintain it (Diener & Diener, 1995). Self-esteem is formed early in the course of development, remains fairly constant over time, and is relatively immune to change (Campbell, 1990).

In Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, self-esteem is listed in the fourth level of needs called esteem, which humans inevitably move toward once they have gratified their basic needs, given the necessary environmental conditions (Maslow, 1943). Self-esteem is therefore a higher level of need that has a strong relation to happiness (Diener & Diener, 2009).

Self-esteem is concerned with a person’s own perception of his/her achievements, value, and self-respect. Individuals with elevated self-esteem are confident, view themselves and their achievements positively, and are satisfied with most domains in their life. According to the trait EI model, low self-esteem is due to a challenge that arises in one or more of the essential areas of life (Petrides, 2009).

**Happiness.** Within the trait EI model, happiness is seen as an element of well-being (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). Although happiness may have different meanings for different
people, most agree that it refers to a pervasive and lasting sense that life is fulfilling, meaningful, and pleasant. To study this sometimes elusive construct, researchers have reached at least a loose consensus on how it should be measured and defined. One widely accepted definition of happiness is subjective well-being (Diener, Sandvik, & Pavot, 1991). Subjective well-being is a combination of overall self-perceived satisfaction with one’s own life on the cognitive level and a degree of positive or negative affect on the emotional level.

Seligman (2002), an advocate of positive psychology, theorized that happiness has three components: pleasure, meaning, and engagement. He also uses the terms “happiness” and “subjective” and “psychological well-being” interchangeably. Seligman (2003) proposed using happiness to refer to an individual’s subjective judgments on life. These judgments are based on three domains, cognitive, positive, and negative affective experiences, in addition to the degree of satisfaction (Diener, Kesebir, & Lucas, 2008). According to Ryff and Singer (1998) happiness, or psychological well-being, is a multi-dimensional process that involves intellectual, social, emotional, and physical health. This process includes having purpose in life, having worthwhile connections with others, having self-regard, and having mastery. Seligman (2008) suggested that happiness results in various positive outcomes, including superior attention, longevity, recovery from illnesses, and protection against the onset of diseases. Further, happy people are more productive, have higher self-esteem, and are generally more satisfied with life (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998).

Peterson, Nansook, and Seligman (2005) suggested three routes to happiness: pleasure, meaning, and engagement. The pursuit of pleasure is often seen as the first route to happiness and is also called the hedonic path, according to Ryan and Deci (2001). Seligman, Parks, and Steen (2004) stated that increasing pleasure will not increase happiness indefinitely. This is
because people have a genetically determined setpoint for pleasure, which means they will quickly adapt to pleasure, and the utility of increased pleasure will decrease. Ryan and Deci (2001) suggested that the second route to happiness is finding meaning in what one is doing. The third route to happiness is engaging in a task, hobby, or relationship (Seligman, 2003).

Persons are engaged when they feel fully involved and enthusiastic about their actions (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Engaging in the present leads to gratification rather than short-term pleasure. Engagement consists of three dimensions: physical (vigor), emotional (dedication), and cognitive (absorption; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Happiness, optimism, and self-esteem appear to be inextricably linked. In their daily experiences, happy individuals tend to feel good about themselves and therefore see positive possibilities, whereas people who lack self-worth and self-respect are generally unhappy (Lyubomirsky, Schkade, & Sheldon, 2005; Lyubomirsky, Tkach, & DiMatteo, 2006). Empirical evidence supports this observation, revealing moderate to high correlations between measures of happiness, optimism, and self-esteem (Diener & Diener, 1995; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005).

Petrides (2009) combined happiness with self-esteem and optimism to come up with the facets of well-being. He described the facet of happiness as a state naturally reasserting itself. It is reflected in a continuum between feeling content or cheerful and feeling blue and overly negative about things. This facet concerns pleasant emotional states, directed primarily toward the present rather than the past (life satisfaction) or the future (optimism).

**Optimism.** Evidence suggests that optimism is beneficial for physical and psychological well-being. It consists of a favorable adjustment of attitude to life challenges, which results in
swifter recovery from difficulties, both physically and mentally (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1992; Scheier & Carver, 1992).

Optimists expect good outcomes; therefore, they are likely to experience a more positive mix of feelings, whereas pessimists expect bad outcomes, so they are likely to experience more negative feelings such as anxiety, sadness, and despair. A good deal of research has found evidence of such emotional differences (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2001).

When compared with pessimists, optimists are liked more (Carver, Kus, & Scheier, 1994), have longer friendships (Geers, Reilly, & Dember, 1998), have fewer negative social interactions (Lepore & Ituarte, 1999), possess greater levels of social support (Park & Folkman, 1997), and experience greater increases in social support during stress (Dougall, Hyman, Hayward, Mc-feeley, & Baum, 2001).

Whereas happiness relates to pleasant emotional states in the present, optimism measures a positive view of the future (Petrides, 2009). High scorers look at the bright side and expect positive things to happen in their lives, whereas low scorers are pessimistic and view things from a negative perspective. They are less likely to be able to identify and pursue new opportunities, and they tend to be risk averse (Petrides & Furnham, 2001).

**Emotionality.** This section looks at the following facets of the emotionality factor based on Petrides and Furnham’s (2001) model: emotion perception, emotion expression, relationship skills, and empathy.

**Emotion perception.** Emotion perception includes skills related to identifying and differentiating emotions in oneself and others. The most basic aspect of this ability is being able to identify and differentiate emotions in one’s own physical states, feelings, and thoughts. On a more advanced level, this ability enables one to identify emotions in other people, designs, or
objects using cues such as sound, appearance, language, and behavior. The ability to discriminate between honest and false emotional expressions in others is considered an especially sophisticated perceiving ability (Rivers, Brackett, & Salovey, 2008).

Mayer and Salovey (1997) stated that EI involves the capacity to carry out reasoning with regard to emotions and the capacity of emotions to enhance reasoning. More specifically, EI is said to involve the ability to perceive and accurately express emotions, to use emotions to facilitate thought, to understand emotions, and to manage emotions for emotional growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The emotional ability to perceive, use, understand, and manage emotion contributes to optimal social functioning (Savage, 2002). For example, accurately perceiving a person’s emotions (type and intensity) facilitates the prediction and understanding of that person’s subsequent actions (Elfenbein, Marsh, & Ambady, 2002). Understanding the significance of the emotional states of the people in one’s environment guides attention, decision-making, and behavioral responses (Damasio, 1994). All of the above start with perceiving emotion within the other person.

Petrides (2009) defined emotion perception as a person’s emotional literacy—that is, how good one is at understanding one’s own and other people’s emotional feelings. Empathy is defined by how easy people find it to put themselves into another person’s situation. Emotion expression is a person’s ability to make his or her emotions clearly understood. In contrast, emotion perception looks at how well one can read emotions in any situation. Research shows that the inability to recognize emotions coupled with a lack of sensitivity to social situations (as measured in social awareness) can cause anti-social behavior and avoidable disagreements (Petrides & Furnham, 2003). These can hinder organizational effectiveness and happiness in
relationships, among other things. Emotion perception contributes to the smooth running of any group of people (Furnham, Petrides, Jackson, & Cotter, 2002).

This scale measures emotion perception in one’s own self as well as in others. High scorers on this scale are clear about what they feel and are able to decode other people’s emotion expressions (Petrides, 2009).

**Emotion expression.** Mayer and Salovey (1997) perceived emotion expression as one of the important components of EI and, therefore, emotional stability. Expressed emotions have important social functions and consequences (Keltner & Haidt, 2003), by which they may influence the behavior of not only those experiencing the emotion but also others (Levenson, 1994). At the interpersonal level, emotions convey information to others about an individual’s feelings (Ekman, 1993), social intentions (Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004), and orientation toward the relationship (Knutson, 1996). Further, emotional expressions may evoke reciprocal or complementary emotions in others that may help individuals in responding adaptively to social events (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). Finally, emotions can serve as positive or negative re-enforcers of other individuals’ behaviors (Klinnert, Campos, Sorce, Emde, & Svejda, 1983). More specifically, positive emotions may encourage others to continue their course of action, whereas negative emotions may serve as a call for behavioral adjustment (Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999).

Petrides (2009) postulated that emotion expression measures how fluent a person is at communicating personal emotions to others. People express their emotions in many different ways: through facial expressions, through posture and bodily actions, and through written and spoken words. People can express their emotions deliberately to create a desired effect, or naturally without any forethought.
Emotion is not a minor factor either at work or outside it. It contributes to work culture, problem-solving, motivation, trust, and building of effective teams. Being able to express how one feels can also prevent misunderstandings in relationships (Furnham et al., 2002).

**Relationship skills.** Bar-On (2000) distinguished between EI and social intelligence, with EI defined as self-management skills and social intelligence as relationship skills. Bar-On defined this interpersonal sub-factor as the ability to establish and maintain mutually satisfying relationships and to relate well with others. Mutual satisfaction describes meaningful social interactions that are potentially rewarding and enjoyable for those involved. Possessing good interpersonal relationship skills involves giving and receiving warmth and affection and conveying intimacy. This component of emotional-social intelligence is associated with not only the desirability of cultivating friendly relations with others but also the ability to feel at ease and comfortable in such relationships and to possess positive expectations concerning social interaction. This social skill is based on sensitivity toward others and a desire to establish relations as well as to feel satisfied with relationships.

The ability to develop close and personal relationships makes up part of the five steps that Boyatzis and McKee (2005) noted as integral to becoming a successful leader. Relationship skills are therefore a part of our social satisfaction and success.

Petrides (2009) argued that the relationship scale mainly relates to one’s personal relationships, including close friends, partners, and family; but it also concerns starting and maintaining emotional bonds with others. Petrides perceived people with a high relationship trait as usually having fulfilling personal relationships that positively affect their productivity and emotional well-being. They know how to listen and be responsive to the people close to them.
**Empathy.** Bar-On (2000) defined empathy as having the ability to understand other people. It is the ability to hear accurately and understand the unspoken or partly expressed thoughts, feelings, and concerns of others. It also implies taking an active interest in other people’s concerns and may include cross-cultural sensitivity.

Petrides (2009) stated that one exhibits empathy when one understands other people’s viewpoints and their reasons for feeling and acting the way they do. Those with high empathy will usually take other people’s motives and feelings into account when considering how to respond to them.

**Self-control.** This section examines the following facets of the self-control factor, based on Petrides and Furnham’s (2001) model: emotion regulation, stress management, and impulsiveness.

**Emotion regulation.** Mayer and Salovey (1990) found that people are able to monitor, evaluate, and regulate emotions. They argued that some emotional reactions are automatic, whereas others present an opportunity for manipulation. Choosing personal and contextual environments that individuals relate to has a regulating effect on emotions. Finally, they stated that the realization of control can negate the power that an emotion can have on a person. This ability therefore gives a person more control and effectively reduces the effect of the emotion.

Going even further, Mayer and Salovey (1995) proposed an emotion regulatory model, which stated that people should optimize their pleasures by foregoing short-term pleasures for long-term ones, strive toward emotions that are both pro-individual and pro-social, and be sensitive to the context. The combination of the above is believed to lead to a more holistic control of emotions and to constitute a higher EI.
Petrides (2009) stated that emotion regulation has to do with how people control their own feelings and internal states in the short, medium, and long term. Emotion expression, another facet in this factor, measures how one communicates one’s feelings and emotions to other people. Petrides stated that the two areas affect each other because what people feel and think may affect how they act. Nevertheless, emotional regulation concentrates on the internal state rather than its outward expression—for example, one’s ability to stay calm and focused in upsetting situations. Negative thoughts and disruptive emotions get in the way of our concentration and affect our performance. However, perceived positive emotions can potentially be as disruptive as negative ones. For example, one may get too happy or excited to think straight: these feelings may cause one to jump to conclusions rather than to take into account all the factors of a problem. Dwelling on the way emotions have affected us for too long may serve to make a problem worse rather than better.

People with a high emotion regulation trait are better able to recover after setbacks; they are able to prolong pleasant moods through personal insight and effort. These individuals can control anxiety and depression induced by circumstances (Petrides, 2009).

**Stress management.** Bar-On (1997) identified stress management as a meta-factor with subfactors of stress tolerance and impulse control. Stress tolerance is the ability to withstand and deal with difficult events and stressful situations without getting overwhelmed; this is achieved by actively and positively coping with stress. Impulse control is the ability to resist or delay an impulse, drive, or temptation to act. It entails a capacity for accepting our aggressive impulses; being composed; and controlling aggression, hostility, and irresponsible behavior.

Although stress has received a lot of attention, the stress management theme has not been addressed by other well-known theories as a part of EI models until Petrides (2009) made it a
facet of self-control. He argued that a person with a high stress management trait would be able to handle pressure calmly and effectively because the person would have developed successful coping mechanisms. More often than not, such people are good at regulating their emotions, which helps them tackle stress. These individuals confront situations that are potentially hectic and deal with the associated tension. Stress management is therefore connected to the ability to handle pressure and stress.

**Impulsiveness.** Bar-On (1997) theorized that impulsiveness or impulse control are a part of meta-factors for stress management and defined it as the ability to resist or delay an impulse or drive that tempts one to act. It entails a capacity for accepting aggressive impulses and being composed in controlling aggression, hostility, and irresponsible behavior. Bar-On suggested that problems with impulse control are manifested by low frustration tolerance, impulsiveness, anger control problems, abusiveness, loss of self-control, and explosive and unpredictable behavior.

In the same way, Petrides (2009) focused more on measuring mainly dysfunctional (“unhealthy”) rather than functional (“healthy”) impulsivity. He stated that low impulsivity involves thinking before acting and reflecting carefully before making decisions. High scorers on this scale weigh all the information before they make up their minds without, however, being overly cautious. Low scorers, meanwhile, tend to be impetuous and to give in to their urges. Much like children, such people want immediate gratification and have low self-control. They often speak without having thought things through, and they change their mind frequently.

**Sociability.** This section examines the following facets of sociability based on Petrides and Furnham’s (2001) model: social comprehension, emotion management, and assertiveness.
Social comprehension. Mayer and Salovey (1997) argued that managing emotions is a part of social management and vice versa; therefore, they are also a part of social comprehension.

Cherniss, Extein, Goleman, and Weissberg (2006) stated that social comprehension, which they referred to as social awareness, is a competency that can be developed and that is crucial for personal effectiveness. They linked excellence in customer service or conflict management to a high level of social awareness and relationship management. Cherniss et al. (2006) argued that empathy makes up an integral part of social comprehension. Further, the authors stated that people cannot demonstrate the competencies of influence, communication, conflict management, and so forth without understanding social comprehension.

Petrides (2009) stated that people with high levels of social comprehension have excellent social skills and are socially sensitive, adaptable, and perceptive. These people are good at negotiating, brokering deals, and influencing others. Further, they tend to have control of their emotions and the manner in which they express them, which enables them to function confidently in diverse social contexts, such as parties or networking events. They are comfortable in unfamiliar settings because they are sure about how to behave. They find it easy to express themselves clearly and to have a large circle of acquaintances. They are known for their well-developed interpersonal skills.

Emotion management. Other than the generally accepted understanding of emotion management—that is, managing one’s own emotions—Petrides (2009) referred to one’s perceived ability to manage other people’s emotional states as well. A person with a high trait score on the emotion management scale can influence other people’s feelings by calming them down, consoling them, motivating them, etc. They know how to make others feel better when
they need to. Low scorers can neither influence nor manage others’ feelings. People’s emotional outbursts do not overwhelm a person who has a high score in emotion management, and the latter is more likely to enjoy socializing and networking.

Bowlby (1982) made a classic observation about how 10-month-old infants appraise the affective expressions of others and modify their own actions based on that appraisal. The study showed that one can definitely have an effect on the emotions of others, even at a very young age.

Mackay, Soothill, and Melia (1998) also found that stewardesses are able to have a definite effect on the emotions of passengers on a plane through their behavior, which is controlled by the stewardesses’ thought processes and subsequent emotions. This result would mirror the trait of being able to influence other people’s feelings.

Lively (2000) introduced the concept of reciprocal emotion management and discussed the role it plays in the reproduction of status inequality in the workplace. Ironically, he found that if marginalized staff pursue acceptance by behaving in a way that is perceived to be required but does not come to the staff naturally, their behavior tends to perpetuate rather than alleviate their marginal or inferior status.

**Assertiveness.** Bar-On (1997) defined assertiveness as the ability to constructively express one’s feelings and oneself in general. It is the ability to express feelings, beliefs, and thoughts and to defend one’s rights in a nondestructive manner. Within this model, assertive people are not overly controlled or shy, and they are able to express their feelings outwardly (often directly) without being aggressive or abusive. Petrides (2009) referred to assertive people as forthright and frank. He stated that they know how to ask for things, to give and receive compliments, and to confront others when necessary. They have leadership qualities and can
stand up for their rights and beliefs. They do not tend to back down if they know they are right and have no difficulty saying “no” when they feel they should. As a result, they enjoy doing the things they do.

**EI Models**

The following section analyzes three major models of EI. These models were selected because they are associated with widely used instruments, each of which has a technical manual that presents evidence of reliability and validity. Each of the three instruments has been reviewed by the *Mental Measurements Yearbook*. This section will describe, compare, and contrast the models, as well as consider the pros and cons of their associated assessment tools. The three models include those developed by (1) Peter Salovey and Jack Mayer and further refined in collaboration with David Caruso, (2) Daniel Goleman, and (3) Reuven Bar-On. Each defines EI somewhat differently:

1. According to Salovey and Mayer (1989–1990), EI is the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

2. As summarized by Wolff (2005), the Goleman model holds that EI is the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions effectively in ourselves and others. An emotional competence is a learned capacity based on EI that contributes to effective performance at work.

3. Bar-On (1997) believed that EI is an array of noncognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures.
**Salovey, Mayer, and Caruso.** Salovey and Mayer saw EI as a form of innate intelligence, a largely inborn set of abilities that affect the ways in which people manage their own emotions, and understand and influence emotions in others. Although they believed that people can improve their EI skills, they argued that the extent to which they can do so is limited by the amount of ability to learn EI with which they are born.

They identified four branches within their overall concept of EI (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002). These branches describe the way people recognize and manage their own emotions and attempt to influence the emotions of others.

1. The perceiving emotions branch involves the ability to identify emotions in ourselves and others and in objects such as pictures, as well as the ability to express emotions accurately.
2. The emotional facilitation of thought branch involves the use of emotions to prioritize thought and to use feelings as aids to judgment. Changes in mood lead to changes in perspective.
3. The understanding and analyzing emotions branch involves the accurate labeling of emotions, understanding emotions and relationships, understanding complex feelings, and understanding transitions between emotions.
4. The reflective regulation of emotion branch involves the ability to stay open to feelings, reflectively engaging and detaching from feelings as appropriate, and managing emotions in oneself and attempting to influence them in others.

**Goleman.** Daniel Goleman is a Harvard-trained psychologist who studied under David McClelland and spent much of his career as a journalist for *The New York Times* writing on the brain and behavioral. Goleman is not an academic researcher, so the model he developed was
not based on his own basic research. He scoured existing psychological research as well as data from other fields such as business and education. Thus, he did not go through the kind of theory development and testing that characterizes traditional scientific research. His scientific method can be criticized as weak, and his model may be more vulnerable to the impact of bias than models derived from traditional science. It can be criticized for having the potential to cherry-pick information without having to deal with inconvenient findings.

Goleman’s model, as Wolff (2005) described it, defines four clusters as follows:

1. Self-awareness involves knowing one’s internal states, preferences, resources, and intuitions. The self-awareness cluster contains three competencies: emotional awareness (recognizing one’s emotions and their effects), accurate self-assessment (knowing one’s strengths and limits), and self-confidence (a strong sense of one’s self-worth and capabilities).

2. Self-management refers to managing one’s internal states, impulses, and resources. The self-management cluster contains six competencies: emotional self-control (keeping disruptive emotions and impulses in check), transparency (maintaining integrity, acting congruently with one’s values), adaptability (flexibility in handling change), achievement (striving to improve or meeting a standard of excellence), initiative (readiness to act on opportunities), and optimism (persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks).

3. Social awareness refers to how people handle relationships and awareness of others’ feelings, needs, and concerns. The social-awareness cluster contains three competencies: empathy (sensing others’ feelings and perspectives and taking an active interest in their concerns), organizational awareness (reading a group’s emotional currents and power
relationships), and service orientation (anticipating, recognizing, and meeting customers’ needs).

4. Relationship management concerns the skill or adeptness at inducing desirable responses in others. The relationship-management cluster contains six competencies: development of others (sensing others’ development needs and bolstering their abilities), inspirational leadership (inspiring and guiding individuals and groups), change catalyst (initiating or managing change), influence (wielding effective tactics for persuasion), conflict management (negotiating and resolving disagreements), and teamwork and collaboration (working with others toward shared goals, creating group synergy in pursuing collective goals).

Bar-On. Reuven Bar-On is a research psychologist who has held a number of academic appointments. Like Salovey, Mayer, and Caruso, Bar-On based his model on his own rigorous research. Unlike them, however, Bar-On saw the factors he identified as skills that can be learned and improved. His model was updated by Multi Health Systems, a publisher of scientifically validated assessments, in 2011. The refined model has 16 skills grouped into five composites, which, again, have some alignment with the other two models. The five broad composites in Bar-On’s model, and their definitions, are as follows:

1. Self-perception consists of self-regard (respecting oneself, confidence), self-actualization (pursuing meaning, self-improvement), and emotional self-awareness (understanding one’s own emotions).

2. Self-expression consists of emotional expression (constructive expression of emotions), assertiveness (communicating feelings and beliefs, non-offensively), and independence (self-directed, free from emotional dependency).
3. Interpersonal comprises interpersonal relationships (mutually satisfying relationships), empathy (understanding, appreciating how others feel), and social responsibility (social consciousness, helpful).

4. Decision-making consists of problem-solving (finding solutions when emotions are involved), reality testing (objectively seeing things as they really are), and impulse control (resisting or delaying the impulse to act).

5. Stress management consists of flexibility (adapting emotions, thoughts, and behaviors), stress tolerance (coping with stressful situations), and optimism (positive attitude and outlook on life).

Each model has value, but none seems to have the whole picture. The starting point for all of the theoreticians—that is, where they made their metaphorical cuts—is different. Salovey and Mayer were initially interested in expanding our understanding of intelligence. Goleman focused on bridging the gap between psychology and work, which led him to spotlight factors that spoke to that question. Bar-On wanted to go beyond traditional thoughts about IQ to see what additional factors account for success, and his research focused on this question. Regardless of which model one favors, it seems clear that some interplay between native ability and learning is involved in a full understanding of EQ.

**EI Measurement Tools**

**The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT).** Based on the belief that EI is an inborn intelligence or ability, the MSCEIT attempts to measure one’s capacity for learning EI skills, much as an IQ test measures one’s ability to learn cognitive material (Ackley, 2016). Like standard IQ tests, the MSCEIT has right and wrong answers. The Salovay,
Mayer, and Caruso model argues that EI is a form of intelligence. Therefore, it is appropriate to test EI in this manner. The challenge is determining whether or not the answers are truly “right.”

**ECI 2.0.** The ECI is designed to assess the emotional competencies of individuals and organizations. It is based on the emotional competencies identified by Dr. Daniel Goleman in his book *Working with EI* (1998) and on those from Hay/McBer’s *Generic Competency Dictionary* (1996), as well as Dr. Richard Boyatzis’s self-assessment questionnaire.

The ECI may be a reliable instrument. However, little empirical evidence has been offered to support this. Its validity, too, is questionable, given the many limiting factors of the studies reported in the test manual. The authors acknowledged these criticisms and purportedly addressed them through a revision of the ECI (i.e., the ECI 2.0). The inventory certainly shows promise, but much more work needs to be done to establish its psychometric properties as well as its applicability to a wider range of professions (Geisinger, Spies, Carlson, & Plake, 2007).

**TEIQue–SF.** A popular and well-supported measure of trait EI is the TEIQue–SF (Petrides, 2009). This measure, along with its corresponding full version (TEIQue; Petrides, 2009), has been shown to possess good psychometric properties in terms of item characteristics (Cooper & Petrides, 2010), factor structure (Perera, 2015), and concurrent and construct validity (Laborde, Allen, & Guillen, 2016).

The instrument is based on a sampling domain that aims to capture the affective aspects of personality in the form of self-perceptions, giving rise to a particular factor structure and, more important, a particular way of distributing and interpreting variance. The key benefits of trait EI theory and of the TEIQue as its assessment tool are to be found in conceptual content and explanatory power, rather than in predictive and incremental utility. The TEIQue–SF can be used in research designs with limited experimental time or wherein trait EI is a peripheral
variable. Although it is also possible to derive scores on the four trait EI factors from the instrument, these scores tend to have lower internal consistencies (around 0.69) than those derived from the full form of the inventory.

**EI and Counseling Self-Efficacy**

Aspects of EI that are essential for attending and responding to clients are being aware of emotions and being able to identify others’ emotions, as well as managing emotions constructively within the therapeutic environment. Additionally, having the ability to identify and manage one’s emotions is significant in terms of recognizing and managing the frequent occurrence of transference and countertransference in the therapeutic relationship (Martin Jr. et al., 2004).

Martin (2004) investigated the association between EI and counseling self-efficacy. The results showed that EI differentiated counselors from non-counselors but provided mixed results when differentiating counseling students and counselors. Moreover, EI factors aimed at identifying own emotions, expressing emotions adaptively, and using emotions in problem-solving successfully predicted counseling self-efficacy in both counseling students and practicing counselors. Martin’s findings also supported the notion that beliefs about one’s capabilities to counsel effectively increase as individuals gains more experience as counselors.

In addition to EI as an attribute for counselors and counseling students, counselors-in-training need to develop confidence and competence (Marshall & Andersen, 1995). Competence can be enhanced through a variety of methods, such as academic courses, practice, performance feedback, supervision, self-reflection, discussion, and reading. Further, counselors-in-training experience difficult counseling sessions, self-doubts regarding their skills, as well as setbacks.
because of the constant evaluation of skills they may experience and the unrealistic expectations they may have for themselves (Marshall & Andersen, 1996).

According to Bedwell (2002), to use emotions effectively in problem-solving, one needs to have the ability to integrate emotional information into planning, interpersonal interactions, motivation, decision-making, and other problem-solving tasks. Thus, EI-related abilities are critical if a counselor is to intervene effectively and problem solve with clients in crisis situations; with clients who may have a tendency to be nonverbal, unmotivated, unresponsive, and defensive; or with clients who are noncommittal and indecisive.

Easton (2008) conducted a study with 180 counseling students to examine EI and its implications for counseling self-efficacy. One of the most significant findings of Easton’s study was the importance of identifying one’s own emotions and skills that relate to CSE. Four out of the five COSE scales were significantly correlated with the identifying-own-emotions scale of the Emotional Judgement Inventory. The perceived ability to identify one’s own emotions with clarity is essential within the counseling environment because of the variety of emotions that counselors experience when working with clients. Additionally, identifying one’s emotions may be the key to recognizing and managing the frequent occurrence of transference and countertransference in the therapeutic relationship because it is important to regulate one’s own emotions in response to both (Jackson, 2002). Identifying others’ emotions also correlated significantly more often with the COSE scales than with any other EJI scale, suggesting that central to CSE is having the perceived ability to identify others’ feelings clearly, as well as being able to discriminate between observed emotions. The results of the current study support the notion that EI is a core characteristic of counselors overall.
Reick (2013) explored the relationship between EI and client outcomes. The research included 32 trainee clinicians and their respective 133 clients. His findings provided evidence that trainees who possessed high EI elicited greater, more positive client change, whereas those with low EI predicted the worst client outcomes. Salovey and Mayer (1989–1990) argued that the ability to learn EQ skills arises out of an inborn form of intelligence. They maintained that just as IQ predicts one’s ability to learn cognitive material, EQ predicts one’s ability to learn emotional skills. Their model is referred to as an ability model.

**Group Counseling Effectiveness**

Group counseling is widely accepted as an effective treatment modality that results in positive client outcomes in a variety of settings, populations, and diagnoses (Burlingame, Fuhriman, & Mosier, 2003; Fuhriman & Burlingame, 1999, 2001; McRoberts, Burlingame, & Hoag, 1998). In a meta-analysis of group effectiveness conducted by Birmingham (2003), 111 experimental and quasi-experimental studies published over the past 20 years were examined using several different variables associated with group counseling effectiveness. Settings for examination included university counseling centers and outpatient practices. Three different effect sizes were computed: active versus waitlist, active versus alternative treatment, and pre- to posttreatment improvement rates. The active versus waitlist overall effect size indicated that the average recipient of group treatment is better off compared to 72% of untreated controls. Improvement was related to group composition, setting, and diagnosis.

Kosters et al. (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of inpatient group psychotherapy. They examined 24 controlled studies and 46 with pre-post-measures published between 1980 and 2004. Diagnosis, theoretical orientation, and the role of the group in the particular treatment setting were used to examine differential effectiveness. Beneficial effects
were found for inpatient group therapy in controlled studies as well as in studies with pre-post-data.

Cuijpers et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 15 studies in which individual and group therapies were compared directly to each other. The mean effect size indicating the difference between individual and group therapies in depressive symptomatology at post-test was 0.20 in favor of individual therapies, with a lower dropout rate in individual interventions. However, at follow-up, no significant differences were found. Although individual therapy seems to be somewhat more effective than group therapy in the short term, it is not clear whether this observation is relevant from a clinical point of view. Because of the small number of studies and their limited quality, more research is needed to examine whether the difference between individual and group treatment is clinically relevant.

Orfanos et al. (2015) conducted a meta-analysis to assess group psychotherapeutic treatment effectiveness for patients with schizophrenia. Thirty-four studies were reviewed to (1) estimate the effect of different group psychotherapeutic treatments for schizophrenia and (2) explore whether any overall “group effect” was moderated by treatment intensity, diagnostic homogeneity, and therapeutic orientation. The results showed that group psychotherapeutic treatments can improve negative symptoms and social functioning deficits in treating schizophrenia. The effect occurs across different treatments and appear to be nonspecific. The study, however, did not identify the underlying mechanisms for the positive effect of participating in groups.

Sloan et al. (2013) conducted a meta-analysis of published randomized clinical group trials for adult survivors of trauma to examine the efficacy of the group format. Sixteen studies were included, with a total of 1686 participants. The results of a random-effects-model meta-
analysis indicated that group treatments are associated with significant pre- to posttreatment reduction in PTSD symptom severity and result in superior treatment effects relative to a waitlist comparison condition.

These meta-analyses provide a large body of research showing the positive effect of group therapy across different levels of care as well as across varying populations. It is important next to examine what variables predict this effectiveness.

**Variables Predicting Group Counseling Effectiveness**

Burlingame’s (2003) meta-analysis of group effectiveness examined 111 experimental and quasi-experimental studies published over the past 20 years using several different variables associated with group counseling effectiveness. Client variables included diagnosis, chronicity, inpatient or outpatient status, gender, and age. Therapist characteristics consisted of theoretical orientation, years of experience, and professional training (e.g., psychologist or social worker). Methodological variables included the source (self-report, therapist, independent observer, significant other, and objective indices such as physiological readings) and content (general, personality, social adjustment, somatic, and target measures) categories of outcome measures. The study sought to explore, in a systematic fashion, the relationship between improvement rates in group psychotherapy and several treatment, client, and methodological variables.

The results showed that of all the variables studied, those relating to the patient were the most robust. However, a high percentage of these studies failed to disclose sufficient data regarding the professional status of the leader, making assignment to a specific category impossible in 35% of the studies. In those studies where professional status was reported, the majority of providers were doctoral-level psychologists. Finally, the setting of group treatment...
was most often a university counseling center, followed by correctional institutions and outpatient mental health organizations.

These facts raise some interesting questions: for example, are these settings proportionately accurate as to where group therapy occurs? Are doctoral-level psychologists really the major deliverers of group treatment? The number of studies with small sample sizes contributes to these questions because small sample size may limit researchers’ understanding of the effectiveness of treatment with specific diagnoses. Perhaps what is clear from these questions and the studies’ features is the need for clinicians and researchers across various settings (including private practice and inpatient) to collaborate in their efforts to understand not only the efficacy of group treatment in general but also the implications for process variables such as counselor competencies and EI.

**Group Skill Competencies**

In summarizing the expert–novice literature, Glaser and Chi (1988) concluded that experienced practitioners differ from novices in the following ways: (a) perception of large, meaningful patterns of domain knowledge, (b) superior short- and long-term memory for domain-related information, (c) speed in executing basic skills, (d) time spent developing a problem representation, (e) depth of problem representation, and (f) effective use of self-monitoring skills.

Kivlighan (2010) explored the idea that trainees with knowledge structures more similar to those of experienced practitioners will be more effective group leaders. This assumption was tested, with the finding that group members were more satisfied when a trainee’s knowledge structure of group counseling leader interventions converged with the knowledge structure of experienced group therapists. For group leader trainees with higher knowledge structure
similarity, group members demonstrated less desire for any change in group leader behaviors in early group sessions, and this lessened desire even increased over the group sessions. These findings provide support for the validity of knowledge structure assessment as a measure of group leader effectiveness.

Shechtman (2004) compared processes in group and individual psychotherapy, with a focus on client behavior and therapist helping skills. The results indicated reduced resistance and increased insight and therapeutic change in both treatment formats, with few between-format differences. However, the frequency of therapist skills suggested that, in both treatment formats, questions would be the most frequent response, followed by guidance and facilitation, whereas self-disclosure, interpretation, and challenge would be rare. The use of questions was indeed the main therapist response in both formats, followed by guidance and facilitation, whereas challenge and interpretation were the skills used the least. A higher presence of cognitive rather than affective exploration was found. This finding may not be surprising because the latter is strongly related to experiencing (Hill et al., 1992), a most important component in the therapy process typically seen among experienced therapists. The lack of affective exploration in the current study may reflect the inexperience of the counselors, all of whom were beginners. This study seems to indicate that although the group format may not be different than individual therapy, counseling skills do play an active role in client outcomes.

McCarthy (2014) sought to identify the relationship between state vocational rehabilitation counselors’ efficacy in executing counseling skills and successful client outcomes. The results indicated that neither a linear nor a nonlinear relationship exists between efficacy in counseling skills and successful client outcomes. However, efficacy in counseling microskills (e.g., paraphrasing, confrontation) and efficacy in handling difficult client behavior (e.g., clients
who lack motivation, clients in crisis) are positively correlated with successful client outcomes. Counselor age was also found to be positively associated with self-efficacy levels.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between EI and GCSE, and to determine the feasibility of using EI to predict changes in GCSE. These changes in GCSE were tested after the counseling students had participated in a semester of fieldwork that included leading counseling groups.

Research Questions & Hypothesis

1. Do counselors-in-training experience changes in group counseling self-efficacy (GCSE) during the course of one semester of fieldwork?

2. Do initial levels of EI predict changes in the GCSE of counselors-in-training after one semester of fieldwork?

3. Will any one of the four subscales of EI, as measured by the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, Short Form, be more predictive than another of changes in GCSE?

To address each of these questions, the following hypotheses have been developed:

H01. There will be a growth in the GCSE of counselors-in-training after a semester of fieldwork leading groups, as measured by the Group Leader Self-Efficacy Instrument (GLSI). Tang et al. (2004) found that the length of internship hours was positively correlated with counseling self-efficacy.

H02. EI, as measured by the TEIQue-SF, will have a moderating effect on counselor trainees’ GCSE. Easton (2008) conducted a study with 180 counseling students to examine EI and its implications for counseling self-efficacy, and findings showed the importance of identifying one’s own emotions and skills in relation to counseling self-efficacy.
H03. Managing emotions, a subscale of the TEIQue-SF, will be accurate in predicting increases in trainees’ GCSE. Martin (2004) investigated the association between EI and CSE. The results showed that the EI factors—identifying own emotions, expressing emotions adaptively, and using emotions in problem-solving—successfully predicted the CSE of both counseling students and practicing counselors. Additionally, identifying one’s emotions may be the key to recognizing and managing the frequent occurrence of transference and countertransference in the therapeutic relationship because it is important to regulate one’s own emotions in response to both (Jackson, 2002).

**Research Design**

Descriptive statistics were used to report the participants’ EI and possible changes in GCSE. Multiple regression was used to examine whether EI, as measured with TEIQue-SF, in the pretest, predicts changes in GCSE.

For this study, a quasi-experimental, pretest, posttest research design was employed to explore the relationship between counseling students’ EI and GCSE. The design is “quasi,” as random assignment was not used, and there was no control group. The pre- and posttest measure was used to quantify changes in the participants GCSE after a semester of leading counseling groups. Pretest-posttest designs are widely used in behavioral research, primarily for the purpose of comparing groups or measuring change resulting from experimental treatments (Demitrov & Rumrill, 2003)
Participants

The participants were students enrolled in a master’s level counseling program from two different Catholic universities in Pittsburgh, PA. The participants were completing a semester of fieldwork experience which included leading counseling groups. One of the universities had a total enrollment of 9,344 students, and its counseling program is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The other university had a total student enrollment of 2,076 with a counseling program that is not yet CACREP accredited, though steps toward accreditation have been taken.

Procedure

Participant recruitment was initiated by contacting the faculty responsible for the internship students upon the approval of the study by both the Dissertation Review Committee and the Institutional Review Board. The researcher then presented the study during the first fieldwork class of the semester at each university. After the research was explained to the students, those who met the criteria for the study (that is, those who would be conducting counseling groups during their fieldwork experience) were asked to participate. Interested individuals were then provided with an “Informed Consent Form” that described the purpose of the study and the use of the data. The consent form also noted that participation was voluntary and that the students were under no obligation to participate or to complete the study. Participants were informed that their decision to participate or decline would not influence their grade in any course nor would their direct responses be shared with any individual beyond the researcher. In an effort to recruit and retain participants throughout the study, the researcher offered a $50-dollar Visa gift card as a prize that a random participant could win. Those who agreed to participate were then given the demographic survey, the TEIQue-SF, and the GLSI to
complete. The research then collected the completed surveys before the participants left the class.

The participants then entered their semester of fieldwork. At the end of the semester, the researcher returned to the classes to administer the GLSI survey to the participants again and collected the results before the participants left the class.

**Risk to Participants**

All potential risks were identified within the consent form and discussed with participants prior to conducting the experiment. Participants were reminded that they were not obligated to share more information than they were willing to, and that participation was voluntary. All participants were directed to contact their own university counseling center or the researcher if they experienced distress as a result of the study.

As part of a power analysis to estimate the sample size needed to detect statistical significance, three separate studies were reviewed (Easton et al., 2008; Lent et al., 2006; Martin Jr. et al., 2004). Easton et al.’s (2008) findings demonstrated that the highest correlations were found on two EJI scales: (a) managing own emotions for students \(r = .720\), professionals \(r = .776\), and the total group \(r = .749\) and (b) identifying own emotions for professionals \(r = .749\). Lent et al. found that the overall change in CASES-S scores between Sessions 2 and 4 reflected a medium effect size \(d = .67\). According to Martin Jr. et al. (2004), the EI factors used in the study successfully predicted counseling self-efficacy of both counseling students and practicing counselors \(R = .537\). Using the a-priori sample size calculator for multiple regression and using an effect size of \(R = .537\) showed that a sample size ranging from 33 to 61 participants is needed to determine a statistically significant effect.
Data Collection

Instrumentation

**TEIQue-SF.** The TEIQue-SF is a 30-item form that includes two items from each of the 15 facets of the TEIQue (see Appendix B). Items were selected primarily on the basis of their correlations with the corresponding total facet scores, which ensured broad coverage of the sampling domain of the construct. The -SF can be used in research designs with limited experimental time or wherein trait EI is a peripheral variable (Petrides, 2009).

**GLSI.** The GLSI is a 37-item form expressing self-efficacy in group leader skills. The items were formatted in a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, and 7 = strongly agree (see Appendix C). A low score indicated low self-efficacy in the skill described in the item, and a high score indicated high self-efficacy in that skill (Page, 2001).

The data collected from the surveys were then entered into an Excel spreadsheet to filter and clean the data, which were then exported from the Excel spreadsheet and analyzed using statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 25. Throughout data collection, 52 surveys were submitted, and after the data were filtered and cleaned, all 52 participants (100%) were included in the final analysis.

Data Analysis

A linear regression was used to assess if the independent variable (Pretest GCSE) and the moderator (EI multiplied by Pretest GCSE) explained a statistically significant amount of variance in the study’s dependent variable (Posttest GCSE). A useful aspect of linear regression is that it “examines the incremental as well as total explanatory power of many variables” (Hair et al., 1987, as cited in Heppner et al., 2008, p. 249). Essentially, linear regression helps to
reduce unexplained variance. SPSS 21.0 was used for this study because it is equipped to conduct linear regression analyses, among other tasks, and because its use has been well-documented since its inception over two decades ago (Cohen et al., 2003; Stevens, 2009).
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The results of the data collection and analyses are reviewed and discussed in detail here. This chapter includes a summary of participant demographic statistics, highlights from the data cleaning and coding process, and a statistical analysis of each of the study’s research questions.

Research Questions

Three primary research questions were examined in this study: (1) Do counselors-in-training experience changes in group counseling self-efficacy (GCSE) during the course of one semester of fieldwork? (2) Do initial levels of EI predict changes in the GCSE of counselors-in-training after one semester of fieldwork? and (3) Will any one of the four subscales of EI, as measured by the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, Short Form, be more predictive than another of changes in GCSE?

Data Cleaning Procedure

Data were cleaned and prepared for analysis using Excel software. Cleaning data included assessing for duplicate entries, out-of-range data (calculating z-scores), and extraneous characters. As a general rule, Z-scores that exceed 3 in absolute value are generally considered as outliers. This method is simple, and it is the same formula as the 3 SD method when the criterion of an outlier is an absolute value of a Z-score of at least 3 (Seo, 2002). That is, they are statistically significant outliers. After completing this process, no data were eliminated from the analysis.

Participant Demographic Data

There were 52 participants that met the criteria for inclusion in the study. Six demographic questions were included at the beginning of the survey to describe the makeup of the sample (see Appendix A). The results of these questions are displayed in Table 1.
Table 1

Demographics Characteristics Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22–33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34–44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Counseling</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Counseling</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Counseling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Field Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship I &amp; II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience Leading Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Participants were asked to complete two instruments: The TEIQue-SF and the GLSI. After the coding and cleaning processes, and prior to conducting the moderation analyses discussed below, each of the two instruments was examined and tested for reliability.

TEIQue-SF

In the present study, a Cronbach’s alpha of .87 was demonstrated, and internal consistency was determined to be sufficient. TEIQue-SF scores in the sample ranged from 4.03 to 6.67 ($M = 5.39$, $SD = .564$). Four facets, or subscales, from the TEIQue-SF were analyzed for internal consistency and reliability.

The internal consistency for the self-control subscale was poor, yielding a Cronbach’s alpha score was .61. Removal of any of the items resulted in lower internal consistency scores. The emotionality subscale had moderate internal consistency and yielded a Cronbach’s alpha score of .71. The sociability subscale also had poor internal consistency, yielding a Cronbach's alpha of .57.

GLSI

Cronbach’s alpha for the GLSI pretest was .96, which suggests a high level of internal consistency. The post-test GLSI yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .90.

Results of Analysis

Research Question 1

The first research question, *Do counselors-in-training experience changes in group counseling self-efficacy (GCSE) during the course of one semester of fieldwork?*, was answered by the use of a paired sample t-test to identify whether there was a significant difference in mean scores changes in group counseling self-efficacy from the data collection at Time 1 (beginning of
semester) to the data collection at Time 2 (end of semester). Participants completed one semester of field experience that included leading counseling groups prior to the post-test administration of the GLSI.

Participants exhibited higher levels of group counseling self-efficacy after a semester of field experience ($M = 174.5$, $SD = 11.85$) than at the beginning of the semester ($M = 149$, $SD = 23.42$). This difference, $M_\Delta = -25.35$, 95% CI [30.98, 19.71], was significant $t(51) = -9.03$, $p > .05$, and represented a large effect size, $d = 0.78$, as shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

**Paired Sample Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL Pre Total</td>
<td>149.5769</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.42727</td>
<td>3.24878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL Post Total</td>
<td>174.9231</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.85177</td>
<td>1.64355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

**Paired Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL Pre Total -</td>
<td>-25.346</td>
<td>20.2444</td>
<td>2.80740</td>
<td>-30.9822, -19.7100</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GL Post Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Research Question 2

The second research question, *Do initial levels of EI predict changes in the GCSE of counselors-in-training after one semester of fieldwork?*, was answered by conducting a hierarchical multiple regression. In the first step, the independent variable (IV; pretest GLSE) and the moderator (EI) variables were first centered to assess for any issues with multicollinearity. Scores are centered by subtracting the mean from all values so that the mean is zero. Multicollinearity diagnostics were assessed and were found to be within an acceptable range (i.e., .90 to .96). In the final step of the regression analysis, an interaction term was created between pretest GCSE scores and EI scores, and the linear aggression analysis was run. However, the overall model was found to be not significant ($p = .803$) to assess whether EI predicted changes in students’ GCSE.

Research Question 3

The third research question, *Will any one of the four subscales of EI, as measured by the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, Short Form, be more predictive than another of changes in GCSE?*, was first answered by centering the IV (pretest GLSE) and all four moderating variables (well-being, self-control, emotionality, or sociability, in this order) to assess for any issues with multicollinearity. Multicollinearity diagnostics were assessed as within an acceptable range (i.e., .954 to .974). Finally, four separate moderation analyses were conducted for each subscale, with a Bonferroni adjustment (i.e., make the critical $p$-value = .0125). However, the overall model was not significant ($p = .789, .842, .778, .777$) to assess whether any EI subscale predicted changes in students’ GCSE.
Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a description of the research participants’ EI, GCSE, and demographic information. The participants’ group counseling self-efficacy was obtained from scores on the GLSI, which were collected at the beginning and the end of semester. The participants’ baseline level of EI was measured using the TEIQue-SF. The data revealed significant changes in participants’ group counseling self-efficacy, which supported hypothesis one. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to determine if overall EI or any of its subscales were predictive changes in participants’ GCSE. The data revealed that neither the baseline EI or any of its subscales predicted any significant changes in participants’ GCSE.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This chapter presents a summary of the investigation into whether EI predicts changes in counseling students’ GCSE during the course of a semester in which fieldwork students conducted group counseling. The study also examined whether counseling students experienced changes in their GCSE during a semester of fieldwork and if any of the subscales of EI were able to predict changes in students’ GCSE. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents a discussion of the results of the study in relation to the identified research questions and the implications of the results. The second section discusses the limitations of this study. The third and final section presents recommendations and directions for future research.

Changes in GCSE

According to Bandura’s theory of social learning, performance accomplishments provide the most influential source of efficacy information because they are based on experiences of personal mastery (Bandura, Jeffreys, & Gaydoes, 1975). Bandura (1977) posited that the context in which mastery experiences occur, as well as the individual’s belief about whether their success was by chance or by skill, determines the extent to which these experiences of mastery influence self-efficacy. The results of the current study showed significant improvement in counseling students’ GCSE over a semester of fieldwork, which supports Bandura's (1977) contention that experience results in increased self-efficacy.

Discussion in the literature regarding ideal pedagogy for counselors suggests that counselor competency is developed in settings wherein counselor trainees can develop critical thinking skills that are related to real-world activities (Kaczmarek, Barclay, & Smith, 1996; Nelson & Neufeldt, 1998; Spruill & Benshoff, 2000). The ability of counselors to identify their counseling skills and to be confident in their ability to use these skills in real-life settings has a
direct influence on the quality of the counseling services they provide (Bradley & Fiorini, 1999). Bjornestad, Mims, and Mons (2016) explored the experiences of counselors-in-training via student reflection journals as part of a service-learning project in a group counseling course and found that students described increased confidence and self-efficacy as sessions progressed.

In the current study, over half (53%) of the participants were completing their initial practicum experience. Kozina, Grabovari, Stefano, and Drapeau (2010) reported that the primary goals and expectations of first-year practicum counseling students are to convey general, theoretical knowledge and practical skills through clinical experience. They also suggested that basic knowledge and skillsets of counseling are mastered with relative ease quite early in the training process. The increases in GCSE in the current study are consistent with these goals and expectations of practicum counseling students.

The remaining participants’ (47%) fieldwork was completed as part of their internships. The purpose of the internship is to provide the student with an opportunity to develop a formal understanding of the overall role of a counselor and to engage in practicing the activities of counseling (CACREP, 2009). These internship experiences function as the vicarious learning and task performance that Bandura (1986) pointed to as the sources of individuals’ self-efficacy. Mei Tang et al. (2004) confirmed Bandura’s idea with their finding that the length of internship hours and prior related work experiences were positively correlated with counseling self-efficacy. Halverson, Miars, and Livneh (2006) found that students showed significant gains in CSE over the first year, which consists of only academic courses, and then made more substantial gains over the second year, which consists of additional academic courses combined with an intensive year-long clinic experience.
Some additional factors may have contributed to increases in the participants GCSE in the current study besides performance accomplishments. Social learning theory posits that other contributors to self-efficacy include vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states (Bandura, 1977).

Many potential benefits come from vicarious experience. Seeing others perform threatening activities without adverse consequences can generate beliefs in observers that they, too, will improve if they persist in their efforts. Observers may conclude that if others can do it, they should be able to achieve at least some improvement in performance. These observed behaviors, which are more directly related to positive outcomes, have a larger impact on self-efficacy than if the effects of the modeled actions remain ambiguous (Bandura, 1977). Halverson et al. (2006) reported that when individuals are unsure of their abilities in a certain area or have no experience, perceiving the outcomes of others who have performed similar tasks may influence these individuals’ beliefs. Research also indicates that vicarious learning can positively influence students’ self-efficacy beliefs (Lau et al., 2016; Solar, 2019). In reviewing the sample from the current study, the majority of the sample was made up of students with no prior experience leading groups (59.6%) and were participating in their first experience leading groups through practicum (53.8%).

Another contributor to self-efficacy is verbal persuasion. Verbal persuasion is widely used because of its ease and ready availability (Bandura, 1977). In counselor education, novice counselors generally receive this type of feedback through clinical supervision. Clinical supervision is central to the training and development of therapists, as well as indispensable in establishing the core competencies of counselors and therapists (Bernard, 2006). Research indicates that counselors receiving regular clinical supervision report higher levels of counseling
self-efficacy than those who did not (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001).

The last contributing factor that may influence self-efficacy is physiological states. Stressful and taxing situations generally elicit emotional arousal that, depending on the circumstances, might have informative value concerning personal competency. Therefore, emotional arousal is another essential source of information that can affect perceived self-efficacy in coping with intimidating situations. When people judge stress and anxiety, they depend on their state of physiological arousal. Generally, it is very likely that individuals will succeed if they are not in the state of aversive arousal (Bandura, 1997). Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) reported that teachers who feel relaxed when teaching perceive the emotion as an indication of proficiency and anticipate future success.

**Relationship Between GCSE and EI**

Results of this study indicate that initial levels of EI did not predict or moderate changes in the GCSE of counselors-in-training. The data also shows that there was no significant correlation between EI and GCSE. These results are inconsistent with the research literature, which has generally indicated EI is a predictor of counseling self-efficacy (Easton et al., 2008; Gundlach, Martinko, & Douglas, 2003; Martin Jr. et al., 2004).

There are several plausible explanations regarding why there was no significant correlation between EI and GCSE. The first explanation concerns the varying ways in which EI is measured. As discussed in the literature review, there are a number of assessment devices to measure EI. These devices differ in two significant ways.

First, EI measures are based on different theoretical frameworks. This study focused on trait EI, a constellation of emotion-related self-perceptions and dispositions (Petrides &
A growing body of evidence supports the predictive validity of trait EI in different areas, including educational (Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2004), experimental (Austin, 2005), and organizational (Wong & Law, 2002) psychology. The discriminant and incremental validity of the construct has also been demonstrated in many studies (Mikolajczak, Luminet, & Menil, 2006; Petrides et al., 2007).

Second, measures of EI vary in format, and include performance tests, self-report inventories or, in some instances, observer ratings (Ciarrochi, Chan, Caputi, & Roberts, 2001). Not surprisingly, there has been considerable debate concerning the most appropriate approach for measuring the EI construct. It has been argued that performance measures are more valid if EI is conceptualized as a type of ability, whereas self-report instruments of EI tend to assess aspects of personality and other noncognitive characteristics (Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Schutte et al., 1998). As with measures of traditional intelligence, performance tests elicit responses that can be evaluated against objective, predetermined scoring criteria (Ciarrochi et al., 2001).

EI measurements as a self-report construct appear to be highly vulnerable to social desirability motives (Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000a; Schutte et al., 1998). It is easy for participants to identify the more emotionally intelligent response on self-report measures of EI as opposed to documenting how one actually responds to emotionally laden events via observational reports (Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Flury & Ickes, 2001; Tapia, 2001). Edwards (1953) found that the endorsement rate of a personality questionnaire item can be predicted with impressive accuracy ($r > .80$) from the item’s social desirability (SD). That is, the more the item is seen as describing a socially desirable quality, the more likely respondents are to endorse the item as true of themselves. Considering the possible issues involved in using self-report measures for EI as described above, one potential interpretation of the current study’s...
results is that they may not be valid owing to the self-report format of the EI measure used (i.e., TEIQue-SF).

However, despite the advantages of using performance-based measures of EI, the practicality of employing these instruments is limited because these tests are lengthy to administer, taking between 45 and 60 minutes to complete, and the costs for the use of these tests, even for research purposes, are high. In fact, most research examining the correlation between EI and CSE used self-report based EI measures (i.e., Akinlolu & Chukwudi, 2019; Easton et al., 2008; Martin Jr. et al., 2004). These measurement tools included the Emotional Judgement Inventory and Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale. In the current study, the TEIQue-SF EI self-report survey was used. This survey is typically used in research designs with limited experimental time or wherein trait EI is a peripheral variable (Mayer et al., 2003). This tool was used for the current study because of its cost effectiveness.

Another possible explanation as to why there was little correlation between EI and GCSE is that participants with lower EI scores may have been consciously or unconsciously choosing to work with group members on a more cognitive level. The construct of self-efficacy, defined as the degree to which individuals believe they possess the ability to perform the behaviors that are expected to lead to a desired outcome, can explain and predict human motivation, judgment, and behavior (Bandura, 1982, 1986). Self-efficacy can also explain the choices individuals make regarding whether to approach or avoid activities. Thus, this cognitive focus in group work may minimize the potential for strong emotions to develop in the group, which lower EI participants would find challenging to manage. Dies (1980) reported that on a survey of supervisor observations, the supervisors noted that trainees find it very difficult to move from a focus on content and matters external to the group to a more here-and-now, process
orientation. With this content-focused approach, facilitators can be the acknowledged “experts” in the room and may input large amounts of information as well as lead the group in a specific direction with the intent of influencing the outcome. This, in turn, would allow students to avoid or minimize the need to focus on group members’ emotions.

A common form of a “content-focused group” is psychoeducation groups. These groups often focus on factual knowledge that may be presented, discussed, or practiced (Torres Rivera et al., 2004). These types of groups are typically run using a didactic approach that focuses more on teaching or providing education or skill-building tools. Indeed, there is a strong likelihood that the groups the students led during their semester of fieldwork were psychoeducational groups, as this is a common form of group (Morgan, 2004). The structure of psychoeducational groups may provide students who have less confidence in their ability to manage potential adverse emotions, with the environment needed to minimize any emotionally arousing events.

In addition, Champ et al. (2013) discussed the term “experiential avoidance,” which is the effort to evade experiencing emotions. For group counselors, experiential avoidance may be manifested in a pattern of unwillingness to engage authentically during emotionally challenging group processes. When a group leader finds an emotional experience aversive, avoiding the experience for self-protective reasons also leads group members away from that experience. For example, a leader who fears being overwhelmed by sadness may employ experiential avoidance as a response modulation strategy. The leader may intentionally or unconsciously divert the group’s attention from sad topics, ignore members who exhibit sadness, or focus on other experiences. Based on this information, one could speculate that those students with EI scores that reflect difficulties managing emotions may use experiential avoidance during their semester of leading groups. If they continuously avoid strong emotions in the group, they avoid the need
to address and manage them. With no difficult emotions to manage, the students might equate this to running a “successful” group. If they continue to avoid difficult group member emotions and lead more cognitively focused counseling groups, they may interpret this group experience as positive and, in turn, assess their group counseling self-efficacy as improving.

One way to help students assess their group leader abilities more accurately and minimize misinterpreting their group leader skillsets is to employ effective and ongoing supervision and feedback. Supervision may be most effective if students are offered the opportunity to provide their own subjective experience as well as supervisory feedback via observation of other students running groups. For example, a study by Ohrt et al. (2014) that explored group leaders’ perceptions of their training and experience found that although participants viewed supervisory feedback as helpful, the amount, frequency, and intensity appear to vary greatly. Participants in that study voiced concerns over providing only their own subjective perspective on running groups in supervision, citing a desire for supervisors to watch supervisees lead groups, as well, and provide feedback based on their observations.

**Relationship Between GCSE and EI subscales**

Finally, the four EI subscales (wellbeing, self-control, emotionality, and sociability) were examined to see if they could predict changes in GCSE. However, results from the study show that none of the EI subscales did so. These results contradict the research, which typically shows that the TEIQue-SF subscales are correlated with general self-efficacy (Mikolajczak, 2008; Nikoopour, 2012) and leader self-efficacy (Harper, 2016). This finding was surprising, as one would think that physiological states and the trait EI subscales, particularly those relating to emotionality, would be comparable. With that rationale, it would stand to reason that those with high scores in trait EI subscale, emotionality, would be able to predict changes in GCSE.
However, this was not the case. One potential explanation for this may have to do with how trait EI is operationally defined.

As stated earlier, trait EI is defined as a constellation of emotional self-perceptions located at the lower levels of personality hierarchies. The domain of trait EI lies outside the taxonomy of human cognitive ability (Carroll, 1993). In other words, trait EI facets are personality traits, as opposed to competencies or mental abilities. Self-efficacy expectations, on the other hand, are influenced by how they are cognitively appraised (Bandura, 1986).

Perceived self-inefficacy leads people to approach intimidating situations anxiously. These experiences of disruptive levels of arousal may further lower one’s sense that one would be able to perform well. The hypothesis explored in this study suggested that the strength of counseling students’ trait emotional intelligence would influence how they effectively manage these potentially emotionally arousing situations. However, Bandura (1986) posits that people are much more likely to act on their cognitive appraisal of self-efficacy, as inferred from mastery experiences and social comparison of capabilities, than on their emotional interpretations. With this line of reasoning, it could be inferred that after a semester of leading groups, the counseling students’ GCSE might be influenced more by their cognitive appraisal of their experience leading groups than on their baseline trait EI. These experiences were more likely influenced by successfully leading groups (performance mastery), supervisory feedback of their group skills (verbal persuasion), and observing others successfully leading groups (vicarious experience), rather than their appraisal of how well they assess and manage emotions.

However, there is even a cognitive appraisal component to emotional arousal or physiological states, another self-efficacy facet. Stressful and taxing situations (like leading counseling groups) may elicit emotional arousal, especially with novice group counselors.
These stressful situations, depending on the circumstances, might have informative value concerning personal competency. Therefore, emotional arousal is another potential source of information that can affect perceived self-efficacy in coping with threatening situations. Bandura (1977) posits that emotional arousal to perceived threats can be diminished by modeling. In addition to diminishing vulnerability to aversive arousal, modeling can also teach effective coping skills by demonstrating effective ways of handling threatening situations. This is especially important when fear arousal results from behavioral deficits. Thus, it stands to reason that even those counseling students in the current study who scored lower on their baseline EI could still improve on their group counseling self-efficacy through observing others successfully leading and managing emotionally laden counseling groups.

**Limitations**

The study had several limitations stemming from the research design, format of the study, and the sample. Acknowledgment of the limitations will help the reader to interpret the results critically, as well as provide direction for future research.

The first limitation of this study is the research design. This study was quasi-experimental; thus, it lacked the random assignment and control group characteristic of a true experimental design. The lack of random assignment also presents a threat to internal validity owing to different subject characteristics (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

A potential factor that influenced the increase in counseling students’ GCSE in the current study relates to the participants’ self-evaluation of their group leader self-efficacy. Extensive literature shows that people generally view themselves and their abilities in an overly positive light, a phenomenon known as the “better-than-average effect,” which is considered a subtype of a more general “self-serving bias” (Alicke & Govorun, 2005; Dunning, Heath, &
Suls, 2004; Williams & Gilovich, 2008). For example, Alicke and Govorun (2005) cited a classic study of approximately one million high school students in which “70% placed themselves above the median in leadership ability, 60% above the median in athletic ability, and 85% rated themselves above the median in their ability to get along well with others” (p. 87). Research in education has revealed that students’ assessments of their performance are only moderately related to the assessments from their teachers and mentors for the same performance (Dunning et al., 2004). Students seem largely unable to assess accurately how well or poorly they have comprehended material they have just read. They tend to be overconfident in rating newly learned skills (Dunning, et al., 2004).

Research also indicates that GCSE tends be influenced by a phenomenon referred to as "response shift bias" (Burkhouse, 2012). The traditional pre-test–post-test design was used in this study to assess participants GLSE change scores. However, these traditional methods of evaluating change may be problematic. One major problem with self-report pre-test–post-test measures is that the student may reconceptualize the construct under investigation between the pre- and the post-test (Howard, 1980). This reconceptualization may lead students to evaluate the outcome from a different perspective in the post-test stage than they held in the pre-test stage. This change in perspective or “internal frame of reference” is a result of students’ being exposed to an intervention between the pre- and the post-test, leading to a shift in their response (Drennen & Hyde, 2008).

An example of this bias is shown in a recent study by Guiney, Harris, Zusho, and Cancelli (2014). Guiney et al. measured school psychologists' CSE over time, and the results suggested that the participants' CSE developed in a nonlinear trajectory. The findings reflect a response shift bias: before beginning consultation, training students rate their skills as relatively
solid, but as they begin to realize just how much there is to know about consultation, self-assessments become more critical, and ratings are lower. Over time, with additional experience and training, these ratings recover and eventually exceed pretraining levels. Because of response shift bias, it is possible that participants' assessment of their GCSE is not a linear process; rather, it may fluctuate during their semester of fieldwork as they continuously assess their experience leading groups, which may be particularly true for any participants who lack prior experience with conducting groups. A possible method to reduce the confounding effect of this response-shift is the use of retrospective pre-tests when evaluating student self-reports of change (Howard & Dailey, 1979). Additional methods to seek correlate changes in GCSE could include measures of effectiveness, such as supervisors’ and clients’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the counseling groups led by the students.

Another limitation is that one of the instruments has not been frequently used in research. The researcher’s search on the Group Leader Self-Efficacy Instrument (Page, Pietrzak, & Lewis, 2001) revealed no further studies beyond the initial development of this instrument. Although the psychometric properties reported were strong and were tested on a population similar to that of the present study, they have not been established beyond what was noted in Chapter 3.

A further limitation worth noting is the limited diversity included in this sample as well as the small sample size. The power analysis that was originally calculated to assess recommended sample size was incorrectly calculated (i.e., a sample size ranging from 33 to 61). This calculation was used to determine that only two of the original four universities could be used to collect the sample used. A power analysis conducted after the study using the correct values revealed that closer to 90 participants were needed.
The participants in this study were primarily cisgender, Caucasian females between the ages of 22 and 33. In addition, the sample was limited to two universities in Pittsburgh. Thus, the sample in this study may not be representative of other counseling programs throughout the United States. The low sample size may have also played a part in the lack of predictive results expected in the study. This small sample size may have undermined the internal and external validity of this study.

Although this study includes several limitations, it uniquely contributes to the literature on emotional intelligence and its moderating effects on group leader self-efficacy. Future research that includes improved designs may help to draw more causal inferences between group participation and outcomes.

**Implications for Counseling Preparation**

The findings in the present study suggest that counseling students’ GCSE increases when leading groups during their fieldwork experience. Given that Bandura (1986) suggests that the greatest predictor of self-efficacy may be performance accomplishments, these results were not surprising. The research on group leader self-efficacy improvements through practical experience also supports this study’s findings (Kivlighan, 2009; Midgett, 2016; Ohrt, 2014).

It may be useful to conduct periodic assessments of students group counseling self-efficacy during their fieldwork experience leading groups. Counselor education faculty could use this GCSE feedback as one measure of training effectiveness. Additionally, GCSE instruments could provide useful feedback to students, allowing them to reflect on their progress in the counseling program. Finally, both faculty members and students could use this assessment information to identify training needs and to individualize improvement strategies (Martin Jr. et al., 2004).
Bandura (1977) proposed that expectations of personal efficacy are also derived from verbal persuasion. Verbal persuasion is widely used to get people to believe they possess capabilities that will enable them to achieve what they seek (Bandura, 1982). In counselor education, novice counselors generally receive this type of feedback through clinical supervision. Supervisors can provide supervisees with information on theory and research that suggests the students’ GCSE will increase with experience. Supervisors can also address and work with the vulnerabilities that group trainees may experience when running groups. Some vulnerability examples include students’ struggle with leadership competency concerns, dissonance related to becoming aware of their own self-efficacy doubts, and the impact these vulnerabilities have on their leadership skills (Champe, 2013).

Larson and Daniels (1998) also recommended that supervisors help trainees see their anxiety as challenging rather than debilitating, focus on the changeable and positive aspects of performance, and attend to relevant and critical aspects of feedback. Supervisors need to be aware of their supervisees’ group counseling developmental level and provide interventions and feedback appropriate to that level. Helping trainees focus on their performance accomplishments will reinforce mastery experiences and at the same time provide verbal persuasion and encouragement (Kocarek, 2001). To enhance counseling students’ GCSE, supervisors may draw from the SCT model, attending to such things as stable counselor characteristics, personal agency, performance, and the supervision environment (Larson & Daniels, 1998). Employing this framework may provide structure and guidance for both the supervisor and the trainee.

This exploration of trainees’ GCSE assessment also has implications for the group program design within counselor education programs. A source for counseling education programs to assist students with self-efficacy growth is the opportunity for students to observe
successfully led counseling groups. Bandura (1977) identified this source of personal efficacy as vicarious experience. First, course instructors have a unique opportunity to model group leader skills in the classroom (Riva & Korinek, 2004). Although class discussions do not have to be therapeutic, instructors can model various group skills and processes. Instructors can also use videos to show experienced leaders facilitating actual groups (Torres-Rivera et al., 2004). Counselors-in-training may also benefit from co-leading a group with a more experienced leader at first so they can observe the leader in action.

Another implication of the study is assessing the meaning behind the finding that trait EI is unrelated to GCSE. One interpretation is that counselor education programs should not be overly concerned about assessing trait EI in counseling student applicants, as it may be unrelated to at least one dimension of conducting group counseling. As the current study indicated, practice running counseling groups increased students’ GCSE, even in those students who rated their trait EI lower than their peers. Such results provide support that educators could help group counseling students to better understand and process the emotion generation process, types of emotion regulation strategies, and their own emotion regulation practices. An understanding of emotion regulation provides students with a critical understanding of how these processes manifest in their groups and in themselves. This understanding may play a factor in counselor students’ GCSE if they are better equipped to assess and manage adverse emotional reactions in the group setting during their fieldwork.

This emotional assessment could also be addressed during counseling students’ fieldwork supervision. The most effective group work supervisors are likely to engage in a parallel process with their supervisees, wherein they, too, explore how their own emotion regulation processes affect the supervision experience (Champe, 2013). Supervisors who are familiar with the
emotion regulation literature and have reflected on their own emotion regulation practices to understand them better are likely to be effective in teaching, training, and supervising emerging group leaders. These supervisors will understand how emotion regulation processes may emerge in groups, and how to conceptualize these processes in a non-threatening and supportive environment for learning.

**Future Research**

Continuing to assess students’ GCSE and their EI during their fieldwork would enrich the existing but limited research on group counseling training, supervision, and students’ self-assessment of their ability to run effective counseling groups. Replicating the current study by addressing some of the limitations may prove useful.

Future studies may also consider examining and measuring EI as more of a performance or ability versus a personality trait. Proponents of the ability theory of EI believe that it can be dramatically improved through training and that it is not necessarily dependent upon one's natural ability. One approach to the abilities model is suggested by Salovey et al. (Mayer, 2004). This abilities-based model is typically measured with the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer et al., 2002), a performance-based assessment tool. With the ability-based EI model, future research could measure counseling students’ EI after each experience running groups and assess any growth in their EI over a semester of fieldwork.

Given the relationship between efficacy beliefs and behavior (Bandura, 1986, 2009; Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Larson et al., 1992), it is important for counselor educators also to consider how to foster counseling student’s self-efficacy across the curriculum. Further examining known predictors of self-efficacy is one way to inform this process. Assessing the impact of self-efficacy predictors—such as vicarious experience, verbal
persuasion, or physiological states—on changes to counseling students’ GCSE may further support Bandura’s (1986) position that these predictors are more reliable factors of capability than affective arousal. Moreover, whether or not perceived self-efficacy is affected by emotional arousal depends much on how such information is cognitively processed.

In regards to Bandura’s self-efficacy facet, verbal persuasion, and its effect on self-efficacy, a number of studies show a strong, positive correlation between the amount of regular clinical supervision counselors receive and their level of counseling self-efficacy, compared to those who did not get this supervision (Cashwell & Dooley, 2008; Kozina et al., 2010; Spring, 2016; Springer et al., 2018). This research reinforces Bandura’s (1977) theory that verbal persuasion can contribute to the successes achieved through corrective performance. That is, people who are socially persuaded that they possess the ability to master difficult situations and are provided with provisional aids for effective action are likely to mobilize greater effort than are those who receive only the performance aids.

Nonetheless, the current literature offers limited understanding of the specific mechanisms that mediate or moderate the relationship of supervision to CSE. The quality of students’ group counseling experiences and related supervision may be especially important to explore in order to further understand students’ supervisory experiences in relation to their group leader self-efficacy. Additional variables concerning supervision that have not been examined may include students’ satisfaction with supervision, the supervisory working alliance, and experiences in students’ faculty-led internship group supervision courses. Furthermore, the beliefs and experiences of the accompanying site supervisors (e.g., group leader self-efficacy, supervision self-efficacy, supervision training, interest in group counseling) might also have an impact on students’ experiences and beliefs. Researchers interested in maintaining a similar
research design to the current study might consider adding these specific variables into future models that examine group leader self-efficacy.

It is possible that research on the verbal persuasion topic may be aided by the application of new theoretical models. For example, Lent and Lopez (2002) presented a tripartite model of efficacy beliefs in close relationships that may be used to frame questions about how counselors develop and revise their sense of counseling efficacy, in part, through their interactions with supervisors and clients. The model assumes that self-efficacy exists within a network of relational beliefs that interact and complement one another. This network of beliefs is assumed to be particularly applicable to growth-promoting events that emerge within particular interpersonal relationships, such as those involving a counselor and a clinical supervisor. Future research may want to explore the effect of this tripartite model on counseling students’ GCSE in an effort to provide more robust data on the mechanisms that may influence the student/supervisor relationship.

While research findings suggest a link between how counseling students believe they are perceived by their supervisors and how they see their own self-efficacy in working with a challenging client, it would also be useful to study how GCSE beliefs of students relate to the verbal persuasion of other potentially influential relationships, such as the members of the group the students are leading. Client outcome assessment, or client feedback, refers to using a psychotherapy outcome measure every session to track client progress in psychotherapy. Future research may look to explore group member feedback about counseling students’ effectiveness in leading groups through continuous outcome feedback after each counseling group that the students lead. Lambert and Hawkins (2001) also discussed the potential advantages of using client outcome data for counselor training and supervision. They have suggested that
supervisees could use client outcome data to inform treatment and to discuss progress with their clients. Instead of imposing their own subjective standards, supervisors and trainees can refer to client feedback as a starting point for a discussion of the training counselor’s efficacy. For this reason, using client feedback in the supervisory process could prove to be a potent source of CSE, particularly for trainees who lack an experiential basis for judging their capabilities.

Furthermore, examining these self-efficacy constructs using alternative qualitative research designs may help future researchers to construct more meaningful and accurate experience, observation, and feedback composite variables. For example, a qualitative research study on the GCSE of counseling students could elicit students’ perceptions of their group counseling field work experience, including whether they thought any of Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy facets influenced their experience and changes in their GCSE. Examples of these facets may include the students’ experience with supervision, observing others successfully running groups, and their own emotional states while leading groups. A quantitative research design may look to explore any correlation between GCSE and Bandura’s self-efficacy facets.

Future research may also explore the physiological states of counseling students who are leading groups. Examination of the self-regulation context in which CSE beliefs are developed and maintained may offer counselor educators, supervisors, and trainees insight into several content- and process-related mechanisms that may facilitate the counselor development process. For example, examination of CSE-related processes may help counselor educators evaluate how well their trainees are able to engage in self-reflection and attend to important environmental and behavioral cues, such as their counseling working alliance and their ability to determine the implicit meaning underlying their clients' messages. Consider the following case study in which
a contextual examination of CSE beliefs may facilitate an effective counselor training intervention.

An additional area of future research might look at the demographic characteristics of counseling students, examining whether any of these variables may correlate with changes in students’ GCSE (i.e., prior experience running groups, age, or gender). For example, in the current study, approximately 60% of the sample used were students with no prior experience leading counseling groups. It may be worthwhile to run a moderation analysis and compare EI and GCSE between groups with and without prior group counseling experience.

Although it can be theorized that students who have higher levels of self-efficacy have a greater propensity to engage in the complex behaviors involved in group counseling, it is important to recognize that group leader self-efficacy is not a measure of how well group leader activities were actually performed. Future studies may investigate the relationship between group leader self-efficacy and actual measures of counseling performance. This performance measure could come via feedback from a site supervisor. Finally, research may also investigate the effects of group leader self-efficacy on client satisfaction and outcomes within the context of the group.

**Conclusion**

This study investigated the effects of EI on changes in counseling students’ GCSE. This study sought to add to counseling educators’ and supervisors’ comprehensive understanding of student development, with the aim of assessing student learning outcomes and facilitating academic and supervisory interventions that support the development of GCSE. Enhancing counseling students’ self-efficacy regarding clinical skills is an important developmental goal within preparation programs, with higher self-efficacy suggesting increased likelihood of
efficient and effective counseling services (Bandura, 1982; Bandura, 1997; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). The results indicated that participants showed a significant increase in their GCSE after a semester of leading counseling groups. Additionally, the results indicated that EI was not a moderating factor in the changes in students’ group leader self-efficacy scores. Further, subscales of emotional intelligence were not moderating factors in group leader self-efficacy.

Although this study has multiple limitations that warrant future research on this topic, the results do provide useful information for counseling programs. The findings support that experience gained in leading counseling groups during fieldwork improves counseling students’ GCSE. The lack of significant findings concerning a moderating effect from EI on group leader self-efficacy suggests that further research in this area is needed.
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APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is for you to provide some basic background information about yourself and your experience in running counseling groups. Please complete the following demographics questionnaire.

1. What is your gender identity? (Refer to definitions below)
   
   Cisgender: A person whose sense of personal identity and gender DOES correspond with their birth-assigned sex.

   Transgender: A person whose sense of personal identity and gender DOES NOT correspond with their birth-assigned sex

   [ ] Cisgender Female
   [ ] Cisgender Male
   [ ] Transgender Female
   [ ] Transgender Male

2. What is your racial or ethnic identification?

   [ ] American Indian or Alaska Native
   [ ] Asian
   [ ] Black or African American
   [ ] Hispanic or Latino
   [ ] Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   [ ] White
   [ ] Multiracial/Biracial
   [ ] Other
   [ ] Prefer not to answer

3. What is your age in years? ______

4. What Master's Program is this field experience associated with?

   [ ] Community Counseling
   [ ] Clinical Counseling
   [ ] School Counseling
   [ ] Other _________________

5. In the Fall 2018, I will be participating in:

   ___ Practicum ___ Internship I ___ Internship II

6. Years of experience running counseling groups:

   ___ 0 years ___ 1-2 years ___ 3-5 years ___ 6+ years
APPENDIX B: TEIQue-SF

Instructions: Please answer each statement below by putting a circle around the number that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement with that statement. Do not think too long about the exact meaning of the statements. Work quickly and try to answer as accurately as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from ‘Completely Disagree’ (number 1) to ‘Completely Agree’ (number 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often find it difficult to see things from another person’s viewpoint.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On the whole, I’m a highly motivated person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I generally don’t find life enjoyable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can deal effectively with people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I tend to change my mind frequently.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Many times, I can’t figure out what emotion I’m feeling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I often find it difficult to stand up for my rights.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I’m usually able to influence the way other people feel.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. On the whole, I have a gloomy perspective on most things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Those close to me often complain that I don’t treat them right.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I often find it difficult to adjust my life according to the circumstances.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. On the whole, I’m able to deal with stress.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I often find it difficult to show my affection to those close to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I’m normally able to “get into someone’s shoes” and experience their emotions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivated.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I’m usually able to find ways to control my emotions when I want to.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. On the whole, I’m pleased with my life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I would describe myself as a good negotiator.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I tend to get involved in things I later wish I could get out of.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I often pause and think about my feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I believe I’m full of personal strengths.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I tend to “back down” even if I know I’m right.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I don’t seem to have any power at all over other people’s feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I generally believe that things will work out fine in my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I find it difficult to bond well even with those close to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Generally, I’m able to adapt to new environments.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Others admire me for being relaxed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire – Short Form (TEIQue-SF). This 30-item form includes two items from each of the 15 facets of the TEIQue. Items were selected primarily on the basis of their correlations with the corresponding total facet scores, which ensured broad coverage of the sampling domain of the construct. The –SF can be used in research designs with limited experimental time or wherein trait EI is a peripheral variable. Although it is possible to derive from it scores on the four trait EI factors, in addition to the global score, these tend to have somewhat lower internal consistencies than in the full form of the inventory. The –SF does not yield scores on the 15 trait EI facets.

Scoring information for the TEIQue-SF is available at: http://www.psychometriclab.com/Home/Default/14 Please note that we cannot provide any advice on how to run the syntax in SPSS or other statistical software. Please make sure you read the FAQ section at http://www.psychometriclab.com/Home/Default/18. In particular, note that we do not provide free information regarding norms or free feedback reports. Norms and reports are available for a fee (email admin@teique.com for quotes).


For more information about the trait emotional intelligence research program go to: www.psychometriclab.com

Please note that any and all commercial use of this instrument, or any adapted, modified, or derivative works thereof, is strictly prohibited.
APPENDIX C: Group Leader Self-Efficacy Instrument

Directions: Please circle the number that represents your response to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am confident I can</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use my eyes to monitor group members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use my voice to set the tone of the group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change the focus from a topic, person, or activity to another topic, person or activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hold the focus on a topic, person or activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impart information or give mini-lectures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Draw out quiet members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cut off members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Use rounds effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Use linking to connect members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Encourage expression of differences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Give positive feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Give corrective feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Engage in appropriate self-disclosure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Develop a clear purpose statement for the group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Screen and select group members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Conceptualize the group based on theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Provide an atmosphere of support and caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provide structure of sessions (e.g. warm up, working focus, and processing and closure)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Help the group set productive norms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Provide moderate emotional stimulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Make interventions based on the purpose of the group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Make interventions based on theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Respond to the intrapersonal level of group process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Respond to the interpersonal level of group process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Respond to the group level of group process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Respond constructively to an attack by the group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Help members process the meaning of experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Help members integrate and apply learnings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Apply ethical and professional standards in group work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Help members relate to other members of a different social class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Help members relate to other members of a different sexual orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Help members relate to other members of a different ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Help members relate to other members of a different race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Help members relate to other members of a different age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Help members relate to other members of a different religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items in the Group Leader Self-Efficacy Instrument represent three factors therefore it may be useful to consider point total for the factors as well as a total score. A possible scoring plan is illustrated below.
## Group Leader Self-Efficacy Instrument Score Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Total score of items</th>
<th>Divided by number of Items</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills – Items 1-15</td>
<td>/15=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and Process – Items 16-29</td>
<td>/14=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting across aspects of Diversity – Items 30-35</td>
<td>/6=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>/35=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>