Happy New Year AACE colleagues! I hope this past holiday season was a pleasant one for you and your families. As we begin another new year, I am excited about the activities and events we as a division have planned. By now you should have received your election ballot from ACA. I am appreciative of each of the individuals who have volunteered to run for office this year (Carl Sheperis and Amanda Healey for President-Elect; and Andrew Burck, Stephanie Crockett, and Dayle Jones for Treasurer). Each has been an active member of the division and I am confident that our future looks bright under their leadership. I encourage you to submit your ballot by the January 31, 2011 deadline and let your voice be heard.

For those of you planning on attending the ACA conference this March in New Orleans, I would like to invite you to attend one of our many division sponsored events. On Friday, March 25th we will co-host a reception with AADA, ASERVIC, C-AHEAD, and IAAOC. If past receptions are any indication, this should be a good time had by all. Our annual awards breakfast and general membership business meeting will be held the following morning on Saturday, March 26th. Tickets are still available for the awards breakfast but supplies are limited. Please contact ACA to purchase your tickets and ensure your seat at the table. In addition to these annual staples, I am pleased to announce AACE’s participation in a new collaborative effort this year. On Saturday March 26th we our division will be co-sponsoring two special events. The first is titled Unity through Dialogue: The Intersections of Different Entities into One Mission and features the participation of half of the ACA member divisions. The second event is titled Striving for Global Unity: Multiple and Diverse Approaches for Emerging Professionals Forum and Reception and it is scheduled to follow the initial forum. Please check the ACA program for additional information about all of these events.

As you will see in reading this newsletter, we have many activities planned and several ways to get involved. As we start the New Year, I would urge each of you to consider becoming more involved in your professional home, AACE. We have several committees on which you can serve and are always looking for our next generation of leaders to run for office. To learn more about the opportunities available for getting involved please check out our website at www.theaaceonline.com or contact me directly at jwatson@meridian.msstate.edu. I look forward to seeing many of you in New Orleans!
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Call for Award Nominees

AACE is now taking applications for two awards

The first award is the Donald Hood Student Research Award for 2011. This award is an annual grant designed to recognize someone who wishes to complete a research investigation seen as promising and holds potential to be an outstanding contribution to the counseling profession. It comes with a $500 stipend.

The second award is the Exemplary Practices Award to acknowledge the rendering of important service in assessment or examples of outstanding assessment practice which have significance for the counseling profession.

Applications must be postmarked by Friday, February 11, 2011
Criteria for both nominations can be found at [http://theaaceonline.com/awards](http://theaaceonline.com/awards)

Call for MECD Journal Editor

The ACA Division of Association for Assessment in Counseling and Education (AACE) is seeking applications for the position of editor of the journal Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development (MECD). MECD is a national, peer reviewed journal with a readership comprised of counselors, educators, and other professionals interested in providing leadership, training, and research in the creation, development, production, and use of assessment and diagnostic techniques. Its mission is to promote and recognize scholarship, professionalism, leadership, and excellence in the development and use of assessment and diagnostic techniques in counseling. The appointment of editor is a 3 year term beginning July 1, 2011. More information is available at [http://www.theaaceonline.com/](http://www.theaaceonline.com/).

Appointment is conditional upon the following qualifications:

1. Experience as an editorial board member of a professional publication or similar experience (associate editor or editor of another publication).
2. A record of scholarly publications in refereed journals.
3. Demonstrated expertise in assessment and research methods (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, SSRD, etc.).
4. An understanding of and commitment to the mission of AACE, including AACE membership and involvement if selected.
5. Preference for those with a history of involvement with AACE/ACA affiliated organizations.

Interested individuals should submit formal application materials containing the following by January 10, 2011:

1. A current curriculum vitae,
2. A complete list of publications and reprints of no more than five of the applicant's most significant publications,
3. A statement of vision for the editorial direction for the MECD
4. A statement from an administrator of the applicant's institution or organization describing support for the appointment (if applicable). Reviews of the candidates will begin January 10, 2011 and continue until filled. The appointment will be announced as soon as possible, with the editor-elect expected to begin working with the current editor about March 1, 2011 so as to facilitate the official transition on July 1, 2011.

Materials should be submitted electronically (MS Word or PDF) to:

Dale Pietrzak, Ed.D., Member-at-Large Publications, AACE
dale@drpietrzak.com
Thursday, March 24th  8:00am—4:30pm  AACE Executive Council Meeting

Friday, March 25th  8:00am—12:00pm  AACE Executive and New Executive Council Meeting

Friday, March 25th  6:30pm—8:30pm  AACE, AADA, ASERVIC, C-AHEAD, and IAAOC Joint Reception

Saturday, March 26th  7:30am—9:00am  AACE Breakfast and Business Meeting

Saturday, March 26th  4:00pm—6:00pm  Unity Through Dialogue: The Intersections of Different Entities into One Mission

Saturday, March 26th  6:30pm—9:00pm  Striving for Global Unity: Multiple and Diverse Approaches for Emerging Professionals Forum and Reception
There are numerous advantages for conducting research through web-based surveys (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant, 2003). For instance, data collection through web-based surveys tends to be more efficient than through traditionally mailed surveys. As one example, Shannon and Bradshaw (2002) found an average response rate of 10.95 days for web-based surveys as compared to 15.58 days for traditionally mailed surveys. They also found that within 24 hours, 45% of the web-based surveys that were sent out were already completed. Archer (2003) found that researchers spent an average of $681 for a traditionally mailed survey per every 300 participants. In contrast, he found web-based surveys cost researchers virtually nothing. Research conducted through web-based surveys may also help to reduce the effects of social desirability that may occur during telephone or face-to-face surveys (Greene, Speizer, & Wiitala, 2008). For instance, when comparing the administration of the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) over the phone versus through the Internet, web-based survey participants were more likely to report binge drinking.

The use of web-based surveys is not, however, all positive. For instance, it may be difficult to generalize results, as the Internet may not be readily available to all potential participants, including professionals who choose not to be members of Listservs where many surveys are generated, those who lack of computer literacy, those who may be weary of responding to surveys due to confidentiality issues, and low socioeconomic status (SES) participants who may not have access to a computer (Mitra et al., 2008; Sax et al., 2003). In addition, for some Internet surveys, researchers cannot control if respondents can take a survey more than once or if the intended participant is even the person responding (Cobanoglu & Cobanoglu, 2003; Mitra et al.). Also, a study completed by Kwak and Radler (2002) found gender differences in the completion of Internet surveys with males responding at rate of 59.6% while females responded at a significant lower rate of 49.6%. Sax et al. researched response rates among college students using both web and paper modes of administration of the Your First College Year (YFCY) survey (2003). Although they found little difference, based on gender, between a paper only group and a web only group (22% and 20% respectively) they did find significant differences based on ethnicity: Asian American (30.8%), Whites (22%), African Americans (15.4%) and Indian Americans (16.5%).

A mixed mode design often increases response rates to surveys as multiple methods of data collection (e.g., paper based, web-based, telephone surveys) allow participants to choose how they will respond (Cobanoglu & Cobanoglu, 2003; Mitra et al., 2008; Sax et al., 2003). In addition, if researchers send a reminder postcard or a reminder e-mail to participants, response rates may increase (Kaplowitz, Hadlock & Levine, 2004; Kwak & Radler, 2002). Interestingly, the research on the use of incentives to increase response rates is mixed (Cobanaglu & Cobanaglu, 2003). For instance, Cobanaglu and Cobanaglu randomly assigned 300 participants to each of four web-based survey groups: control, luggage tag, prize draw for a personal digital assistant (PDA), and luggage tag plus prize draw for a PDA. They found a 20.5% response rate when researchers entered participants into a prize drawing for a PDA, a 23.9% response rate when researchers did not offer incentives, a 31.4% response rate when they offered a luggage tag, and a 41.7% response rate when participants were entered into a prize drawing for a personal digital assistant (PDA) in addition to offering them a luggage tag.
Other attributes might also increase response rates. For instance, when web-based surveys were preceded by a traditional mail pre-notice, the surveys had an analogous response rate to mail surveys preceded by a pre-notice (Kaplowitz, Hadlock & Levine, 2004). Finally, research indicates appearance of web-based surveys may also affect response rates (Walston, Lissitz & Rudner, 2006). Walston et al. found that 80.2% of participants who received surveys with slider bars exited immediately compared to 61.6% to 64.7% of participants receiving different formats. This may be due to the increased time it takes for surveys with slider bars to load. In this same study, web-based surveys using many graphics yielded a higher response rate when compared to plain text web-based surveys.

Overall, web-based surveys are effective if distributed and analyzed correctly. With the advance of technology these types of surveys assist researchers in gathering data in a more efficient and cost effective manner. However, because researchers may not always know their sample when posting web-based surveys to forums such as listservs, they should be cautious in their analysis of results and note this as a limitation of their research.
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Review of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent

By Justina Fieldsend, University of South Dakota

General Information

Title: Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent (MMPI-A)
Authors: James N. Butcher, Carolyn L. Williams, John R. Graham, Robert P. Archer, Auke Tellegen, Yossef S. Ben-Porath, and Beverly Kaemmer
Publisher: University of Minnesota Press
Date of Publication: 1992 with revisions in 2006

Forms, groups to which applicable: The MMPI-A targets adolescents ranging from fourteen to eighteen years old (Butcher, et al., 1992). The test includes 478 dichotomous items. It comes in many formats including audiocassettes, CD’s, paper and pencil, or computer (Pearson, 2009). When taking or administering the test, one must keep in mind the conditions in which they are taking the assessment. The area should be quiet, well lit, and spacious. The MMPI-A can be administered in a group as long as there are enough proctors. Assistants should remain professional and respectful of the testers (Butcher, et al., 1992).

General Type: The purpose of this test is to help in the assessment of adolescence and their psychopathology (Butcher, et al., 1992). It touches on a number of pressing adolescent topics.

Practical features: This test is used for adolescents in clinical, school, and in counseling settings. The test has a reading level of 4.9 (Pearson, 2009).

Cost: By use of the Pearson testing website (2009), the cost for ten soft cover test booklets is $38.00. The interpretive user’s guide is $39.00. The MMPI-A Manual is $55.00. Answer sheets range in price depending on the quantity. For a package of twenty five answer sheets it is $22.00. To mail in your reports for scoring it is $18.00 for five or less. A package of fifty hand scoring answer sheets is $50.00 (Pearson, 2009).

Time required to administer: The MMPI-A takes 45-60 minutes to complete (Pearson, 2009).

Purpose and Nature of the Instrument:

Stated Purpose: The purpose of the MMPI-A is to help in the assessment of potential psychopathology (Pearson, 2009). The MMPI-A uses language that better relates to adolescents. This assessment can be used in range of settings including school, clinical, and counseling (Pearson, 2009).

Description of test items and scoring: The test includes 478 dichotomous items. the MMPI-A are tailored to fit the adolescent lifestyle addressing topics such as “family issues, eating disorders, and chemical dependency” (Butcher, et al., 1992).
The basic scales were developed by empirical item selection. There were originally sixteen content scales in the MMPI-A, but one content scale was dropped in order to shorten the test. Some scales were changed and new scales were added that better suit adolescence (Butcher, et al., 1992). The standard validity scales of the MMPI-A are “Cannot Say (?)”, “Lie (L)”, “F, F1, and F2 (infrequency)”, “K (defensiveness)”, and “VRIN (Variable Response Inconsistency)” and TRIN (True Response Inconsistencies)” (Table 1). The Cannot Say (?) measure is not a formal scale as it is not a fixed item pool (Butcher, et al., 1992). The clinical scales test hypochondriasis, depression, hysteria, psychopathic deviate, masculinity/femininity, paranoia, psychasthenia, schizophrenia, hypomania, and social intervention. There is some speculation as to why the masculinity/femininity scale is included. It is questioned as to whether or not it deals with psychopathology or personality (Claiborn, 1995). The MMPI-A also includes the clinical subscales of Harris-Lingoes, Si, Adolescent Content, and Supplementary subscales. These scales look at items such as shyness, anxiety, obsessiveness, cynicism, poignancy, ego inflation, and familial discord to name a few.

Scoring can be done through National Computer Systems, Inc. for computer scoring (Butcher, et al., 1992). Hand scoring is also an option. If hand scoring is done there are keys for the scales, subscales, and content scales as well as hand scoring answer sheets for the true and false portion. The scores found from the scales and subscales create a profile scale. This profile is then coded by number so the administrator is not easily confused by the testing results (Butcher, et al., 1992).

**Practical Evaluation:**

Adequacy of directions, training required to administer: There is no specific training needed for the test administrator. They must be knowledgeable about the test and the appropriate testing conditions (Butcher, et al., 1992). The adolescent taking the test must be able to understand the directions and comprehend the questions being asked.

**Technical Considerations:**

Norms and Scoring: The MMPI-A subjects were taken from junior and high school students (Butcher, et al., 1992). They were sampled in many geographic regions of the United States. These areas were chosen in order to best represent “geographic region, rural-urban residence, and ethnic background” (Butcher, et al., 1992, p. 9). The tests were given in both schools and clinical settings. The test was administered to 805 males and 815 females (Pearson, 2009). Age and grade level were also well represented. Students aged 14-16 were well represented, while ages 17-18 weren’t represented as well due to the lower number of 18 year old participants. The grade level of the participants ranged from nine-twelve, with some 7th and 8th grade participants (Butcher, et al., 1992).

Adequacy of Norms: The normative sample of junior high and high school students were sampled from many geographic regions in the United States. The test is for children ages 14-18 therefore it is important to keep in mind that this may be inappropriate for children under the age of 14. It is suggested that the MMPI-2 is used for 18 year olds that are out of high school (Pearson, 2009).

Reliability: A test-retest study was given to 45 boys and 109 girls. They returned a week later to take the test again. The standard of error is four to six points on the basic scales (Butcher, et al., 1992). If the subject were to take the test again, the scores would fall within a plus or minus one of the first score 50% of the time. The Hs and Sc scales showed strong internal consistencies such as .78 or .88. Some scales did show moderate coefficients like .40 or .57 (Butcher, et al., 1992). MMPI-A content scales had internal consistencies that ranged from .55-.83 as well as .63-.89 in the clinical samples (Butcher, et al., 1992). Many of the content scales are unique to the MMPI-A making them different from the content scales used in the MMPI. The MMPI-A content scales scoring levels are considered high if they are above 65, moderate at 60-64, and low at 55 and below (Butcher, et al., 1992).
Student Perspectives is a new column for the AACE Newsletter developed in response to a recommendation from the AACE executive council to increase participation by student members. In the age of managed care and limited fiscal resources, research-based practice is a growing need among counselors. In order to facilitate counselor development, students are encouraged to integrate assessment and research best practices throughout their education and emerging practice as counseling professionals. AACE assists students by providing resources for developing efficacious standards-based counseling practice among students. However, counselor educators and long-time practicing counselors often have a different perspective than those of new professionals and students who are in the process of becoming professional counselors.

Student Perspectives fills an important gap in the organization’s existing services by providing an outlet for students to identify, discuss, and make recommendations regarding research-based practice that may be less evident to experienced professional counselors. In this light, both master’s and doctoral level students are encouraged to submit contributions to column editor, Rebekah Byrd, at rebekah.byrd@gmail.com. Submissions should highlight issues related to the process of research proposal development; teaching methods they have experienced that have assisted their development as researchers and as users of assessment measures; topics related to research design, dissertation writing, and presentation of research; experiences as students learning research methods; perspectives on assessment use among counselors, particularly related to training and professional development in using assessment measures; experiences with finding funding support and writing small grants; as well as locating and participating in professional development activities related to the AACE mission. Submissions should range between 500-800 words, with a writing style that is consistent with the APA 6th edition Style Manual, and clearly indicate a student-based perspective on the topic featured. Further questions and comments regarding this column may be forwarded to the column editor. If you have thoughts about a particular experience or if you are unsure about a topic, you may email the column editor for assistance with further idea development. The approach taken will be developmental in nature, assisting emerging professionals with their first efforts at writing and publication in a less formal context, although with the opportunity for national exposure.
Validity: The standard validity scales of the MMPI-A are “Cannot Say (?)”, “Lie (L)”, “F, F1, and F2 (infrequency)”, “K (defensiveness)”, and “VRIN (Variable Response Inconsistency)” and TRIN (True Response Inconsistencies)” (Table 1). The Cannot Say (?) measure is not a formal scale as it is not a fixed item pool (Butcher, et al., 1992). According to Lanyon (2004) “the procedures used in the original development of the MMPI were technically advanced for their time, they are simplistic by today’s standards”. The MMPI-A “retains the essence of the MMPI” (Lanyon, 2004) and therefore the clinical scales are considered to be valid due to the vast amount of research that supported the MMPI.

Cross-cultural fairness: The MMPI-A is available in Spanish and English. The testing pool was taken from many geographic areas in the United States that were chosen to best represent ethnic and rural-urban areas (Butcher, et al., 1992).

Evaluation:

Practicality and Aids to user: The language of the MMPI-A is adolescent age appropriate and has been revised to pertain to adolescents more thoroughly. For example, the MMPI contained the question “My sex life is satisfactory” (Butcher, et al., 1992, p. 2), the MMPI-A removed this question in light of using more age appropriate questions such as “I think school is a waste of time” (Butcher, et al., 1992). The MMPI-A is still working on scale development as most scale development has been done with adults in the MMPI-A and MMPI-2. The MMPI-A is a useful tool as there are few personality tests for adolescents specifically. This test is easily administered and takes a thorough look into adolescent psychopathology.
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**Review of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, Fifth Edition**

*By Susan McGilloway, Walden University*

**General Information**

**Title:** Analysis of 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, Fifth Edition

**Authors:** Susan McGilloway

**Publisher:** Pearson, Inc.

**Date of publication:** 1956, 1962, 1967-69, 1993

**Forms, groups to which applicable:** Forms A-E, Adults (ages 16 through 92 years) paper & pencil or computer administered. Applicable in clinical/counseling, industrial/organizational, research, schools, incarcerated females, couples, police officers, clergy, suicide attempters, military personnel, medical students. Individual or group administered.

**General Type:** Pencil and paper or computer based.

**Practical features:** The 16PF Questionnaire may be hand or computer scored. Reliability and detail of the technical manual provides valuable instructions and reliability information for test administrators. The 16PF Questionnaire has a strong reliability coefficient, standard error of measurement within range for the test, well-defined rationale, normed sample.

**Cost:** The 16PF Questionnaire Technical Manual may be purchased for $75. The test booklets are $22.50 for diverse uses within the clinical, human resources, and couples counseling setting. Report User’s Guide ranges between $28.50 - $31.50. Test booklets and answer sheets are available at bulk pricing.

**Time required to administer:** Assessment time is 35-40 minutes with paper scoring and 25-35 minutes when administered on the computer.

**Purpose and Nature of the Instrument:**

**Stated Purpose:** The 16PF Questionnaire: Fifth Edition is designed to assess standard population samples within a clinical/counseling, industrial/organizational, research, and schools. Some additional uses were in relation to career decision making, marriage stability, compatibility of couples, determining personality characteristics of police officers, clergy members, and suicide attempters (Carducci, 2009).

**Description of test items and scoring:**

Practical Evaluation:

Adequacy of directions, training required to administer:

The technical manual provides clear, detailed directions for administration, scoring, interpretation, as well as statistical information regarding reliability and validity. Administration qualification requirements are: Certification by or full active membership in a professional organization (ASHA, AOTA, APA, AERA, ACA, AMA, NASP, NAN, INS) that requires training and experience in a relevant area of assessment or a master’s degree in psychology, education, occupational therapy, speech-language pathology, social work, or in a field closely related to the intended use of the assessment, and formal training in the ethical administration, scoring, and interpretation of clinical assessments.

Technical Considerations:

Norms and Scoring:

According to Carducci (2009), “the 16PF continues to be a leader among published personality tests” (Murphy & Davidshofer, 2005, p. 408) (p. 276). Scoring protocol consists of raw score counting, raw score conversion from the General Population Norms (McClellan, 2004, para 3), transfer of scores to the record form, conversion of raw to sten scores, transfer of factor scores to the record, charting of the sten scores, calculation of the five global factors, and interpretation. The technical manual provides detailed instructions for scoring and interpretation. Table 1 illustrates the 16 primary factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>High Range</th>
<th>Low Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Warmth</td>
<td>Warmhearted</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Reasoning</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Emotional Stability</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Dominance</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Referential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Liveliness</td>
<td>Lively</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Rule-Consciousness</td>
<td>Rule-Conscious</td>
<td>Expedient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Social Boldness</td>
<td>Socially Bold</td>
<td>Shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sensitivity</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Vigilance</td>
<td>Suspicious</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Abstractness</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Privateness</td>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>Unpretentious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Apprehension</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Self-Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Openness to Change</td>
<td>Experimenting</td>
<td>Not Likely to Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Self-Reliance</td>
<td>Self-Sufficient</td>
<td>Group Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Perfectionism</td>
<td>Compulsive</td>
<td>Careless of Social Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Tension</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the 16 Primary Personality Factors, the Five Global Factors are scored, converted, and transferred to the record as well. Table 2 illustrates the high and low range descriptors for the Five Global Factors. Within the Global Factors, high and low descriptors of Primary Factors appear. Dancer and Woods (2006) support the construct validity of the Five Global Factors in its alignment with the Big Five factor structure. These findings contradict previous research of Costa and McCrae (1992) as cited in Dancer and Woods (2006) suggesting that the Global Factors aligned with four factors.

Table 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Global Factors</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Extraverted</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Introverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX</td>
<td>High Anxiety</td>
<td>Anxiety Neuroticism</td>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tough-Minded</td>
<td>Tough Mindedness</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Accommodating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>Unrestrained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3 illustrates the Response Style of the test taker. Response Styles are indications of the manner in which the individual answered the questions. Impression Management expresses the degree that the test taker responses are socially desirable or undesirable. Infrequency indicates the number of middle or noncommittal responses on the part of the test taker. Acquiescence indicates the degree to which the test taker agreed to items no matter what the question asked.

Table 3

Three Response Style Indices (Cattell, 2003, p. 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Style</th>
<th>High Score</th>
<th>Low Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Impression Management</td>
<td>Socially Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>Infrequency</td>
<td>Frequent Middle Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>Acquiescence</td>
<td>True Response Repeated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stark, Chernyshenko, Drasgow, and Williams (2006) suggest that the Likert (1932) as cited in Stark, Chernyshenko, Drasgow, and Williams (2006) Item Response Theory (IRT) bases the test takers response upon the mismatch between the item and the self perception of the test taker. They suggest instead that an ideal point model in which the test taker responds to an item according to how closely it matches self-perception may be more accurate thereby providing more psychometrically reliability and predictive validity.

According to Carducci (2009), “the 16PF continues to be a be a leader among published personality tests” (Murphy & Davidshofer, 2005, p. 408)” (p. 276). Twenty-five hundred subjects randomly, selected from 4,449 individuals, comprised the normed sample. Demographics matched the 1990 U.S. Census figures. There are two discrepancies in age and education level (McClellan, 2004). Notably, “in the 15- to 17-year age group, the percent in sample was 13.2% and the percent in census was 4.6%” (McClellan, para 6). Additionally, there were a disproportionate number of college level graduates as compared to high school graduates (McClellan, 2004).

The Global Factors test-retest range at two weeks was .84-.91 indicating a strong reliability coefficient. The Primary Factors reliability coefficients ranged from .69-.87 – slightly lower than the Global Factors. Internal consistency ranged from .64-.85 with a mean score of .74 using Cronback’s coefficient alpha and values (McClellan, 2004). Hough (1990) as cited in Cattell & Schuerger (2003) indicated that criterion validity remained stable taking into consideration test taker distortion in responses.

Adequacy of norms:

Twenty-five hundred subjects randomly, selected from 4,449 individuals, comprised the normed sample. Demographics matched the 1990 U.S. Census figures. There are two discrepancies in age and education level (McClellan, 2004). Notably, “in the 15- to 17-year age group, the percent in sample was 13.2% and the percent in census was 4.6%” (McClellan, para 6). Additionally, there were a disproportionate number of college level graduates as compared to high school graduates (McClellan, 2004).

Reliability:

The Primary Factors reliability coefficients ranged from .69-.87 – slightly lower than the Global Factors. Internal consistency ranged from .64-.85 with a mean score of .74 using Cronback’s coefficient alpha and values (McClellan, 2004). The Global Factors test-retest range at two weeks was .84-.91 indicating a strong reliability coefficient.

Validity:

Hough (1990) as cited in Cattell & Schuerger (2003) indicated that criterion validity remained stable taking into consideration test taker distortion in responses. Stark, Chernyshenko, Drasgow, and Williams (2006) suggest that the Likert (1932) as cited in Stark, Chernyshenko, Drasgow, and Williams (2006) Item Response Theory (IRT) bases the test takers response upon the mismatch between the item and the self perception of the test taker. They suggest instead that an ideal point model in which the test taker responds to an item according to how closely it matches self-perception may be more accurate thereby providing more psychometrically reliability and predictive validity.

Cross-cultural fairness:

The assessment has been translated into numerous languages making it an internationally accepted tool. One exception is its translation into African languages (van Eeeden & Mantsha, 2007).

Significant weaknesses are the absence of validation reports in the technical manual, absence of published data, complexity of interpretation requiring advanced training (Rotto, 2004). McClellan (2004) suggests the use of the question mark as the middle response may encourage an infrequency response style. The complexity of the 16 factor personality structure may be intimidating to the novice user. Due to the complexity of the factor analytic approach, the 16PF has received some criticism of its replicability across dissimilar samples and diverse variables. Cattell (1946c) as cited in Revelle (2009) addresses the issue by suggesting the “principle of parallel proportional profiles” (p. 2) that permits the analysis of dissimilar samples and multiple variables.

The American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education (AERA, APA, NCME) (1999) applicable to employment testing are to be followed when the 16PF is used as a means of candidate selection. Applicable standards for candidate selection are 14.1 - 14.11. The test administrator is advised to consider all standards applicable to administrator competence, test selection and use, test environment, as well as diverse linguistic considerations. Civil rights legislation requires gender-normed scoring procedures. The 16PF meets this requirement (McClellan, 2004).

Aids to user:

Significant strengths of the 16PF are readability of the manual, explicable scoring procedure, (McClellan, 2004), quantitative measurement, and scientific approach (Carducci, 2009). Rotto (2004) suggests its longevity as a personality assessment is a significant strength. The 16PF is perhaps the most well known instrument for measuring personality characteristics of the normal adult population. Psychometric strengths are strong reliability coefficient, standard error of measurement within the range for the test, well-defined rationale and normed sample.
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In the medical field, First Do No Harm is a precept that is part of the basic ethical principles by which competent professionals operate. It recognizes that sometimes it is better to do nothing than employ an action that might cause harm to the patient. Often this idea is not transferred to other professions – like career development – particularly as it relates to the use of assessments.

Regardless of your title, career advisor, career navigator, career counselor, work workforce development professional, etc., you are likely to employ some career assessments from your tool kit to help individuals move forward in their career choice and development. There are so many assessments now available, both in paper-pencil and online formats, that it is easy to forget to take proper care to use quality assessments with your students, customers, and clients. Using a poor quality instrument, one without strong technical characteristics or using an instrument in which you are not trained, can cause harm to your clients despite your genuine intent to do otherwise.

Recently the National Career Development Association (NCDA) and the Association for Assessment in Counseling and Education (AACE) worked together to develop and agree on the competencies that are important for career development professionals to have when using assessment instruments. The competencies are designed to provide a description of the knowledge and skills that career counselors and practitioners must demonstrate in the areas of assessment and evaluation in order to be a competent user of assessments. These competencies are critical for career counselor practice and service to students, clients, and other customers.

The Career Counselor Assessment and Evaluation Competencies (http://tinyurl.com/2b85cq2) were recently endorsed by both organizations. They describe the behaviors of competent career counselors in each of the following eight areas. (Competency 1 includes an example of a few specific behaviors.)

**Competency 1:** Choosing assessment strategies.

Competent career counselors ...

...can describe the nature and use of different types of formal and informal assessments, including questionnaires, checklists, interviews, inventories, tests, observations, surveys, and performance assessments, and they work with individuals skilled in clinical assessment.

...can specify the types of information most readily obtained from different assessment approaches.

...can identity the type of information needed to assist the client and select the assessment strategy accordingly.

...are familiar with resources for critically evaluating each type of assessment and can use the resources to choose appropriate assessment strategies.
Competency 2: Identifying, accessing, and evaluating the most commonly used assessment instruments.

Competency 3: Using the techniques of administration and methods of scoring assessment instruments.

Competency 4: Interpreting and reporting assessment results.

Competency 5: Using assessment results in decision-making.

Competency 6: Producing, interpreting, and presenting statistical information about assessment results.

Competency 7: Engaging in professionally responsible assessment and evaluation practices.

Competency 8: Using assessment results and other data to evaluate career programs and interventions.

These competencies can be employed by career professionals as a basis for the development and evaluation of workshops, in-service, and other continuing education opportunities. They can act as a springboard for reflection and self-evaluation of our own capabilities leading to participation in professional development opportunities to upgrade our skills. Counselor educators can use the competencies and associated behaviors as a guide in the development and evaluation of career counselor preparation programs and assessment courses. Certainly Career Development Facilitator Instructors can use the competencies as part of the assessment module of the training program to emphasize the importance of competent assessment practices.

These competencies compliment and supplement the Career Counseling Competencies (http://associationdatabase.com/aws/NCDAb粢/asset_manager/get_file/3397/counselingcompetencies.pdf) approved by NCDA in 1997 and the Ethical Standards for Global Career Development Facilitators (http://www.cce-global.org/extras/cce-global/pdfs/gcdfcodeofethics.pdf). Other standards and guidelines that are pertinent to career development and assessment include:


These various documents form the foundation for quality assessment practice.

If you are looking for a resource that is a one-stop shop for pertinent documents and information on assessment, go to Assessment Resources (www.assessmentresources.pbworks.com). There you will find many useful documents in the following areas:

Assessment Related Associations  Assessment Related Organizations  Ethics, Position, and Policy Statements
General Assessment Resources  Evaluation Resources  Other Organizations and Committees
Major Assessment Companies  Articles on Assessment and Career Development
Book Resources  Training Opportunities  Parent Resources
Personnel and Workforce Assessment
Online Journals, Reports, and Newsletters

After reviewing the site, if you have assessment information that should be considered for inclusion as part of this compilation, please make the suggestions and recommendations to the author.

The Association for Assessment in Counseling and Education (AACE) is an organization of counselors, educators, and other professionals that advances the counseling profession by providing leadership, training, and research in the creation, development, production, and use of assessment and diagnostic techniques. The mission of AACE is to promote and recognize scholarship, professionalism, leadership, and excellence in the development and use of assessment and diagnostic techniques in counseling.
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