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ABSTRACT


The therapeutic working alliance has been identified as the most important factor in the outcome of counseling. The therapeutic working alliance is the relationship between the client and the counselor. It is the context in which the counselor builds hope, collaborates on treatment goals and uses selected treatment approaches to best meet the needs of the client. Scholars have suggested that the counselor’s personal characteristics contribute to the therapeutic working alliance. Further, researchers have identified wisdom traits as a set of cognitive, affective, and reflective personal characteristics that are interactive, as well as both interpersonal and intrapersonal, which are beneficial in counseling. Wisdom traits can be organized by six conceptual categories; cognitive ability, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, real-world skills, and emotional intelligence. Based on the review of literature, it is speculated that wisdom traits related to the person of the counselor are an important, but unnoticed factor in the counseling relationship.

Participants were 106 professional counselors, 83 female and 23 male, currently working with a client for at least three sessions. Wisdom was measured by Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, with three factors: the affective dimension, the reflective dimension, and the cognitive dimension; the Self Assessed Wisdom Scale, with five
factors: critical life experience, openness, reflection or reminiscence, emotional regulation, and humor; and the Wisdom Development Scale, with eight factors: self-knowledge, altruism, inspirational engagement, judgment, life knowledge, life skills, emotional management, and willingness to learn. The therapeutic working alliance was measured by the Working Alliance Inventory – Short Form, Therapist version.

The results indicated a significant amount of variability in the therapeutic working alliance was explained by the wisdom of the counselor. Additionally, three of the subscales of wisdom significantly explained a portion of the therapeutic working alliance; the cognitive dimension, emotional regulation, and life knowledge. The reflective dimension, inspirational engagement and life skills were close to significant, therefore indicated as important factors in the counselor’s wisdom and the therapeutic working alliance.

Even though some of the wisdom variables had a statistically significant impact on the therapeutic working alliance, together they made a more significant contribution. As counselor education programs move toward relying on research evidence to inform the educational experience, the focus on the counseling relationship and the person of the counselor becomes increasingly important. In the future, the development of a useful measurement for wisdom could help counselor educators to identify, evaluate and teach wisdom traits in future counselors.

*Keywords*: counselor education, person-of-the-counselor, therapeutic working alliance, wisdom
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CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION  

“It is unwise to be too sure of one's own wisdom. It is healthy to be reminded that the strongest might weaken and the wisest might err.”

Mahatma Gandhi (n.d.)

To err is human. Yet, how are mistakes related to wisdom? Wisdom is the human being’s ability to learn from mistakes, to remain open and self-reflective, and to maintain a sense of humor (Sternberg, 1985a; Webster, 2003). These wisdom abilities are essential for counselors to utilize within the counseling relationship. Counselors are people who can utilize the traits of wisdom gained from their critical life experiences to help others. They are insightful, have the courage to recognize the suffering of the heart, and can relate to others through their own woundedness. They become a source of life and hope for others (Nouwen, 1972).

Nouwen (1972) described the “wounded healer” as someone who has experienced personal suffering and reflected on life’s inner complexities (p. 38). Wise counselors become wounded healers not as a result of their wounds, but because of the utilization of wisdom traits to heal from those experiences. “Only he who is able to articulate his own experience can offer himself to others as a source of clarification” (Nouwen, 1972, p. 38). In this context, the counselor’s wisdom and insight into personal suffering lead to a healing interpersonal relationship. The counseling relationship is based on mutual trust and deep understanding, with the counselor empathizing and giving voice to another
person’s experience. This healing context of the therapeutic relationship represents the humanistic or contextually-based treatment model.

While most scholars would agree that the therapeutic relationship is important in counseling, a debate has been growing in psychotherapy between contextual and medical models of treatment (Lambert, 1992; Wampold, 2001). “The medical model focuses on the specificity of treatments. In this model, theoretical explanations for disorders, problems, or complaints are formulated, treatments contain specific ingredients that are theoretically purported to be necessary for change” (Wampold, 2001, p. xii). The contextual model is based on the therapeutic relationship as the healing context for understanding the client’s difficulties, hope and belief in therapy, and respect for the client’s worldview (Wampold, 2001). Each perspective is represented by scholars who argue that research supports their view of what works in psychotherapy (Barkham & Mellor-Clark, 2003; Bohart, 2005; Stegall & Nangle, 2005; Wampold, 2001).

**Medical versus Contextual Treatments**

Medical models of treatment are based on assessment, diagnosis, and specific treatment protocols to eliminate the symptoms of the patient. One example of treatment that is based on a medical model is behavioral therapy. A behavioral counselor treating a patient with anxiety would utilize specific techniques, such as systematic desensitization. Systematic desensitization involves the creation of a hierarchy of progressively anxiety-provoking stimuli, which are then imagined by patients under a relaxed state from least to most feared (Wampold, 2001). Practitioners follow written protocols, or manualized treatment, in a prescriptive manner for behavioral therapy (Stegall & Nangle, 2005). In
research, the manualized protocol must be followed in order to measure the effectiveness of behavioral therapy for mental disorders, such as depression and anxiety.

Experimental research controls for extraneous factors, such as the therapeutic relationship, so the outcome can be explained in terms of the specific therapy techniques. Some practitioners have argued that counselors who do not use techniques grounded in empirically based research are practicing unethically (Bohart, 2005). However, manualized approaches are controversial, because they are derived in experimental settings, and may not be transferrable into real-world settings (Stegall & Nangle, 2005). Further, due to the unpredictable nature of human relationships, the context of the therapeutic encounter can never be completely controlled.

Compared to the medical model of treatment, contextual treatment emphasizes the humanistic factors of the psychotherapy effort (Wampold, 2001). For example, the client-centered approach, as conceptualized by Carl Rogers, is based on the core conditions of therapy. The core conditions include the counselor’s ability to demonstrate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness in the context of the therapeutic relationship (Rogers, 1961). Central to the client-centered approach, the counselor’s use of self in the therapeutic relationship creates the context in which the client can experience healing.

From the contextual perspective, researchers believe specific therapy techniques are valuable, yet don’t explain the majority of what works in psychotherapy (Lambert, 1992; Wampold, 2001). The contextual approach to psychotherapy is focused on the beneficial factors common to different therapy approaches.
The Common Factors in Treatment

Common factors are identified as the common elements in the various treatment approaches which are responsible for the beneficial outcome of psychotherapy (Wampold, 2001). Wampold (2001) described the commonalities stating, “All therapies involve the relationship of the client and the therapist, each of whom believes in the efficacy of the treatment” (p. xii). After extensive research examining different therapeutic approaches, Wampold determined specific treatment approaches yield essentially the same outcome due to the common factors. Common factors can be conceptualized as factors attributable to the counselor, therapy procedures, and the client (Lambert, 1992). Specifically, all forms of psychotherapy share a small number of effective change ingredients, such as the therapeutic working alliance, change processes, client characteristics and positive expectancies, the opportunity for catharsis, and acquisition and practice of new behaviors (Grencavage & Norcross, 1990). There is a growing interest in the research of the common factors and their effect on the outcome of psychotherapy.

In his extensive research of scientific evidence, Wampold (2001) discovered that rather than supporting the medical model of treatment, the findings supported the contextual psychotherapy model which values the healing context, the understanding of the client’s difficulties, the belief in therapy, and the respect for the client’s worldview. Wampold stated, “Psychotherapy as a very personal, and life-changing experience, one that cannot be forced into a medical-like treatment without losing the essence of the endeavor” (p. xii). Further, one of the most consistently identified common factors to both the medical and contextual treatment is the therapeutic working alliance (Horvath
&Bedi, 2002; Lambert, 1992; Wampold, 2001). The therapeutic working alliance is essential to the contextual treatment approach.

**The Therapeutic Working Alliance**

The therapeutic relationship between client and counselor is also known as the therapeutic working alliance. The therapeutic working alliance consists of mutually agreed upon goals, necessary tasks to accomplish the goals, and the quality of the bond between counselor and client (Bordin, 1979). It is within the context of the therapeutic working alliance that the counselor builds the client’s hope, collaborates on treatment goals and uses selected treatment approaches to best meet the needs of the client.

Researchers examining client outcomes in psychotherapy have consistently identified the therapeutic working alliance as the most significant contributing factor (Lambert, 1992; Wampold, 2001). In fact, common factors research suggested that the therapeutic working alliance accounts for thirty percent of the client’s outcome in psychotherapy (Lambert, 1992; Norcross, 2002). Only fifteen percent of client outcome had to do with the selected intervention, such as systematic desensitization used in behavioral treatment. Another fifteen percent was the client’s hope or placebo effect of psychotherapy. The remaining forty percent was the environment, such as social support, and the context of the client, such as the client’s ego strength (Lambert, 1992).

Researchers have identified that the therapeutic working alliance as the single most significant factor in the therapeutic context. In order to further understand the benefits of the therapeutic working alliance, additional research is needed.
The-Person-of-the-Counselor

The personal attributes of the counselor potentially influence the therapeutic working alliance. Rosenzweig (1936) identified the “yet undefined effect of the personality of the good therapist” as an essential component of the common factors contributing to client change (p. 415). The characteristics of the counselor, also referred to as counselor abilities or the person-of-the-counselor, are thought to have a significant contributing effect on the therapeutic working alliance (Norcross, 2002). In a recent presentation entitled “Humanistic Psychotherapy IS Evidence-Based Practice,” Wampold (2010) suggested that it is the human abilities of the counselor that are utilized in the therapeutic relationship which explain the healing power of psychotherapy. Counselors must have certain cognitive, emotional, and reflective abilities to inform their practice. It is the characteristics of the counselor that determine the counselor’s ability to establish a working relationship with a client, the ability to come to an agreement on tasks and goals with the client, and the ability to inspire the client’s motivation to complete the necessary tasks, and to accomplish the goals of psychotherapy.

The research literature includes few studies examining the contribution of counselor traits to the therapeutic working alliance (Barkham & Mellor-Clark, 2003; Horvath & Bedi, 2002; Norcross, 2002; Okieski, Lambert, Nielson, & Ogles, 2003). Even with these limited studies, a few counselor traits contributing to the therapeutic relationship have been identified: empathy, warmth, flexibility, honesty, and openness (Ackerman & Hilsenroth, 2003). Upon examination of the available research, Horvath & Bedi (2002) concluded that “research on the counselor interpersonal variables as they affect the therapist’s ability to develop alliance are slowly emerging, but are not yet at the
stage where the evidence could be considered empirically reliable” (p. 60). Since the therapeutic working alliance has been identified as important to the client outcome, and the counselor contribution to the alliance is essential, counselor traits need to be further examined.

According to Wampold’s (2001) research on the counselor variables contributing to the therapeutic working alliance is urgently needed. To study the counselor traits that impact the therapeutic working alliance, researchers need a construct in which those traits can be conceptualized. So far, the most studied concepts are Roger’s (1957) facilitative conditions; accurate empathy, congruence or genuineness, and unconditional positive regard. Lambert (1992) noted, “Virtually all schools of therapy accept the notion that these or related therapist relationship variables are important for the significant progress in psychotherapy and in fact, fundamental in the formation of a working alliance” (p. 104). These related counselor relationship variables remain to be discovered. Indeed, there has not been a construct which comprehensively describes these related counselor relationship variables.

Wisdom: A Comprehensive Construct for Conceptualizing Counselor Traits

Wisdom is a construct which potentially provides a way to comprehensively conceptualize the personal factors which contribute to the therapeutic working alliance. Wisdom is described as a set of cognitive, affective, and reflective personal characteristics that are interactive, as well as both interpersonal and intrapersonal in nature (Sternberg, 1998). Sternberg (1998) identified wisdom traits as reasoning ability, sagacity, learning from the environment, judgment, expeditious use of information, and perspicacity. According to the research, wisdom emerges from interaction between
creativity, intelligence, and knowledge to the common good by balancing intrapersonal, interpersonal, and the interests of others (Sternberg, 1998). Sternberg’s (1998) balance theory of wisdom represents a person’s ability to use their knowledge in the real world.

In human development research, wisdom has been identified as a set of abilities which result in optimal human functioning (Sternberg, 1998) and as a character strength (Webster, 2003). As strength-based character traits, Webster (2003) identified characteristics such as emotional regulation, critical life experience, reflectivity, humor, and openness. Researchers have also identified cognitive, affective, and reflective traits which interact to comprise wisdom (Clayton & Birren, 1980; Ardelt, 2003). Wisdom has not only been linked to aging well (Ardelt, 2003), it is representative of knowledge used not only for the benefit of oneself, but for the benefit of others, and the common good (Sternberg, 2003). Although wisdom has been researched in human development, it has not been applied to counselor development.

Multiple components of wisdom have been identified through research. While the various components of wisdom can be overlapping, they can be conceptualized into a few interrelated categories. The components of wisdom are identified in six categories: cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others (Bluck & Glück, 2005) and emotional intelligence (Hanna, Bemak, and Chung 1999; Kramer 1990; Kunzmann & Baltes, 2003; Sternberg, 1998).

Cognitive ability is defined by the intelligence necessary for problem-solving, including logical thinking and good reasoning ability, as well as tacit or implicit knowledge and life experience (Sternberg, 1998). These cognitive abilities are realized through real-world skills, which require judgment and the tolerance of ambiguity, as well
as the ability to think about thinking, known as metacognition (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Sternberg, 1985a). Insight is defined in terms of perspicacity, or the ability to see through the obvious and grasp underlying meaning. It involves self-knowledge and reflectivity on one’s own ideas and motives, as well as the use of intuition to understand another’s perspective and motives (Sternberg, 1985a). A reflective attitude involves learning from ideas and the environment, receptivity or openness to new ideas, recognizing the importance of ideas, and learning from mistakes (Sternberg, 1985a).

Concern for others is defined by sagacity, or the deep understanding of another, a sense of humor, kindness and interest in others, the ability to see another’s perspective and understand the feelings of another person (Sternberg, 1985a). Emotional intelligence is defined in terms of self-awareness or the ability to know one’s emotions and self-management, which requires management of emotions and motivating oneself (Goleman, 1995).

These components comprise the intrapersonal aspects of an individual’s wisdom, as well as the interpersonal aspects which are important to the context of personal relationship development and functioning. Since wisdom-related abilities are essential in relationships, wisdom is an important construct to be examined in the therapeutic working alliance.

**Wisdom in Counseling**

Researchers have suggested that wisdom is a necessary component in effective counseling (Hanna & Ottens, 1995), as well as an essential ingredient in multicultural competence in counseling (Hanna, Bemak, & Chung, 1999; Phan, Rivera, Volker, & Maddux, 2009). In describing wisdom in counseling, Hanna, Bemak, and Chung (1999)
describe “a particular set of cognitive and affective traits that are directly related to the possession and development of life skills and understanding necessary for living a life of well-being, fulfillment, effective coping, and insight into the nature of self, others, environment, and interpersonal interactions” (p. 126). For example, a counselor’s ability to tolerate ambiguity, to identify hidden meanings, and to gain a deep understanding of another person’s experience is important in counseling. Wisdom traits, such as the ability to take another person’s perspective, can be identified as the missing ingredients in multicultural competence in counseling (Hanna, Bemak, & Chung, 1999; Phan, Rivera, Volker, & Maddux, 2009).

Research is necessary to establish the components of wisdom as the characteristics necessary for a therapeutic working alliance. Researchers can use the construct of wisdom to describe the traits of the counselor and examine the impact on the therapeutic working alliance.

**Problem Statement**

The therapeutic working alliance is the essential context in which the counselor can help the client. The traits of the counselor determine the quality of the therapeutic working alliance. The research literature examining counselor traits that impact the therapeutic working alliance is limited (Barkham & Mellor-Clark, 2003; Horvath & Bedi, 2002; Norcross, 2002; Okiiski, Lambert, Nielson, & Ogles, 2003). A variety of counselor traits contributing to the therapeutic relationship have been identified through research, such as being empathetic, warm, flexible, honest, and open (Ackerman & Hilsenroth, 2003). Even though these traits have been identified as beneficial to the
therapeutic working alliance, the construct of wisdom has not been researched in this way.

The construct of wisdom provides a comprehensive description of the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of the person of the counselor which are important to the therapeutic working alliance. Scholars have conceptualized wisdom as an essential component of counseling (Hanna & Ottens, 1995) and as the missing ingredient in multicultural competence in counseling (Hanna, Bemak, & Chung, 1999; Phan, Rivera, Volker, & Maddux, 2009). However, researchers have not designed studies to research the wisdom traits of the counselor and its impact on the therapeutic working alliance.

**Rationale**

Given the importance of the therapeutic working alliance in counseling outcome, further research needs to be conducted to examine how specific counselor characteristics impact the therapeutic working alliance. The construct of wisdom gives researchers a lens through which to examine the counselor characteristics that contribute to the therapeutic working alliance. Hanna & Ottens (1995) have theorized that wisdom is an essential component of counseling. Wisdom characteristics are the descriptors of the interpersonal and intrapersonal traits of the counselor contributing to the therapeutic working alliance which to date have not yet been examined specifically within the professional counseling population.

Although the field of Counselor Education and Supervision has identified wisdom as an essential component in effective counseling, no research has been conducted to establish this connection (Hanna & Ottens, 1995). No research has been done to date which directly examines the wisdom characteristics of the counselor and the therapeutic
working alliance. Understanding the specific contributions of the counselor will allow researchers to further examine these traits in terms of the impact on the therapeutic working alliance.

With this research, counselor educators and supervisors can integrate the wisdom concepts into counselor education. Counselor educators can intentionally train counselors in such wisdom traits as empathy, learning from critical life experiences, and dialectical thinking. Evaluations for counselors in training, which have not been research-based, could be designed to assess the development of wisdom throughout the training process. Ultimately, the wisdom that the counselor develops and utilizes within the therapeutic working alliance would become the character strengths the counselor encourages as an outcome for the client in counseling.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this survey-based study was to examine the wisdom of the counselor, which includes cognitive ability, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, real-world skills, and emotional intelligence (Ardelt, 2003; Bluck & Glück, 2005; Brown & Greene, 2006; Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Sternberg, 1985b; Webster, 2007). The wisdom of the counselor was measured by three surveys of wisdom: the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS; Ardelt, 2003), the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale (SAWS; Webster, 2007), and the Wisdom Development Scale (WDS; Brown & Greene, 2006). Although these assessments have been validated with other populations, they have not been validated with the counseling population. The factor structure of each of the scales measuring wisdom was examined for validity within the counseling population. Each of
the measures of wisdom was examined to determine the impact on the variability of the therapeutic working alliance.

**Research Questions**

Q1 Is the factor structure confirmed for the subscales of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, The Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale, and the Wisdom Development Scale for this data from the professional counseling population?

Q2 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale?

Q3 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale?

Q4 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Wisdom Development Scale?

**Definition of Terms**

**Common Factors**

Common factors are the universal elements, primarily the therapeutic working alliance, present in various counseling approaches which are responsible for the beneficial client outcome of counseling (Wampold, 2001).

**Therapeutic Working Alliance**

The definition of the working alliance is based on mutually agreed upon goals, necessary tasks to accomplish the goals, and the quality of the bond between the counselor and the client (Bordin, 1979).

**The Person-of-the-Counselor**

The person-of-the-counselor is referred to interchangeably with the counselor abilities, characteristics or traits, which are thought to have a significant contribution to the therapeutic working alliance (Norcross, 2002).
Wisdom

Wisdom is defined as a set of cognitive, affective, and reflective personal characteristics that are interactive, as well as both interpersonal and intrapersonal in nature (Sternberg, 1998).

Cognitive ability. Cognitive ability is defined by the intelligence necessary for problem-solving, including logical thinking and good reasoning ability, as well as tacit or implicit knowledge and life experience (Sternberg, 1998).

Real-world skills. The cognitive abilities identified above are realized through real-world skills. Real-world skill requires judgment, the tolerance of ambiguity, as well as the ability to think about thinking, known as metacognition (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Sternberg, 1985a).

Insight. Insight is defined in terms of perspicacity, or the ability to see through the obvious and grasp underlying meaning. Insight involves self-knowledge and reflectivity of one’s own ideas and motives, as well as using intuition to understand another’s perspective and motives (Sternberg, 1985a).

Reflective attitude. A reflective attitude involves learning from ideas and the environment, being receptive or open to new ideas, recognizing the importance of ideas, and learning from mistakes (Sternberg, 1985a).

Concern for others. Concern for others is defined by sagacity, or the deep understanding of another, a sense of humor, kindness and interest in others, the ability to see another’s perspective and understand the feelings of another person (Sternberg, 1985a).
**Emotional intelligence.** Emotional intelligence is defined in terms of self-awareness or the ability to know one’s emotions and self-management, which requires management of emotions and motivating oneself (Goleman, 1995).
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the literature review is focused on the characteristics of the counselor which could enhance the healing context for counseling and optimize the therapeutic relationship. The common-factors approach to counseling is highlighted, specifically in terms the characteristics of the person-of-the-counselor and the therapeutic working alliance. Wisdom is explored as a construct which is helpful in describing the traits of the counselor which are beneficial in the counseling relationship. The past and current literature on wisdom as it relates to the therapeutic working alliance is reviewed and synthesized. The implicit traits of cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, and emotional intelligence are described as they relate to the person-of-the-counselor and the counseling relationship. Consideration is first given to the research on medical and contextual treatments.

Medical versus Contextual Treatments

Research on the specific approaches to counseling flourishes towards creating evidence-based approaches that can be empirically validated (Wampold, 2001). The medical model of treatment emphasizes assessment, diagnosis, and evidence-based treatment for problems such as anxiety and depression. Evidence-based treatments such as cognitive behavioral counseling, use randomization, manualized treatment, a control condition, and specific inclusion and exclusion criteria (Barkham & Mellor-Clark, 2003). In research, these procedures draw causal inferences about the specific effects of specific
treatments. The belief is that “health care service provision should be based on sound evidence about which treatments lead to the best health outcomes for patients” (Bower, 2003, p. 328). Western cultures value the belief in the medical model, which is based in evidence and practices manualized treatment in counseling. However, even Bower (2003) suggested that evidence-based practice is necessary but not enough for effective treatment. In other words, the effective practice of a counselor requires more than going through the motions of a treatment manual. The counselor must have the ability to reflect on their practice in a systematic and non-threatening manner, as well as have a sense of ownership of the research which informs their practice (Barkham & Mellor-Clark, 2003).

Compared to the medical model of treatment, contextual treatment emphasizes the human factors in counseling (Wampold, 2001). For example, Carl Roger’s (1961) client-centered approach is based on the core conditions of counseling. The core conditions include the counselor’s ability to demonstrate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness in the context of the therapeutic relationship (Rogers, 1961). The counselor’s use of self in the therapeutic relationship creates the context in which the client can experience healing. While the core conditions have been identified as necessary in counseling, they are not sufficient to explain what works in counseling (Stubbs & Bozarth, 1994).

Researchers with the contextual perspective believe specific counseling techniques are valuable, but they don’t explain the majority of what works in counseling (Lambert, 1992; Wampold, 2001). The contextual approach to counseling is focused on the common factors which are beneficial to different counseling approaches.
Common Factors in Counseling

The contextual approach emphasizing the common factors has been suggested as an alternative to the medical model of counseling. Common factors are identified as the common elements in the various treatment approaches which result in a beneficial outcome in counseling (Wampold, 2001). In terms of common factors, all forms of counseling share a small number of effective change elements, such as the therapeutic working alliance, the process of change, client characteristics and hope expectancies, an opportunity for catharsis, and the acquisition and practice of new behaviors (Grencavage & Norcross, 1990). Wampold (2010) suggested that the human abilities utilized in the therapeutic relationship explain the healing power of counseling. According to Wampold, human abilities are the agent of psychological healing, as medication is to physical healing. Researchers of the common factors claim all of the various types of psychotherapies achieve virtually equal benefits because of a common core of curative processes (Wampold, 2001). Included within the research on the common factors is the belief that therapeutic relationship is essential to the client outcome.

The Therapeutic Working Alliance

Bordin (1979) defined the therapeutic working alliance as the mutually agreed upon goals, the necessary tasks to accomplish the goals, and the quality of the bond between counselor and client. The therapeutic alliance was identified as more important than counseling techniques in terms of therapeutic outcome (Lambert, 1992; Horvath & Bedi, 2002; Wampold, 2001). In other words, the client benefits from a counseling relationship characterized by a strong emotional bond and mutual agreement on tasks and goals more than the techniques used by the counselor. In terms of therapeutic outcome,
this relationship is a significant basis for which a client experiences the life change being sought by a client in counseling.

Research on the common factors has indicated that the therapeutic working alliance, including characteristics of the counselor, account for thirty percent of the client’s outcome in counseling (Lambert, 1992; Norcross, 2002). Only fifteen percent of the client outcome has to do with the selected treatment, such as systematic desensitization or cognitive behavioral treatment. Another fifteen percent is the client’s hope, expectancy for change or placebo effect of counseling. The remaining forty percent is the environment and the context of the client, such as the characteristics of the client and their lifestyle. Lambert (1992) suggested that the thirty percent of client outcome represented by the curative common factors in all approaches to counseling needs further study. Further research is needed to determine what contribution the person-of-the-counselor has on the therapeutic working alliance (Horvath & Bedi, 2002).

**The Person-of-the-Counselor**

The person-of-the-counselor is referred to interchangeably with the counselor abilities, characteristics or traits, which are thought to have a significant contribution to the therapeutic working alliance (Norcross, 2002). Research has identified counselor characteristics that contribute to the therapeutic working alliance, which include personal qualities such as warmth, encouragement, and empathy (Lambert, 1992; Norcross, 2002; Ottens & Klien, 2005). Aponte and Winter (1987) identified that counselors who most effective seek personal advancement for themselves and use that experience to relate to the client. This personal growth in the counseling process parallels their effectiveness in
counseling. The development of the counselor as a person is important to the therapeutic alliance and the effectiveness of the counseling experience.

The personal characteristics of the counselor contribute to the counselor’s ability to establish a working relationship with a client; including the ability to establish agreement on the tasks and goals of counseling and the ability to engage the client’s motivation to accomplish these tasks and goals. Researcher’s early attempts to look at counselor characteristics as they relate to therapeutic outcome involve the examination of such descriptive statistics as the counselor’s age, experience, and professional discipline. Whiston and Sexton (1991) noted that studies done on the demographic traits as related to counseling outcome remain unclear. The relationship between age and client outcome has little empirical evidence (Beutler, Crago, & Arizmendi, 1986).

In terms of counselor experience the results are contradictory. Lambert’s (1989) metanalysis found that experience level had little influence on outcome, while others found trends favoring more experienced counselors (Beutler, Crago, & Arizmendi, 1986; Luborsky, Crits-Christoph, Mintz, & Auerbach, 1988). Additionally, Lambert and Bergin (1983) found no evidence suggesting one professional discipline is better than another in terms of client outcome. In terms of counselor’s values, Lafferty Beutler, and Crago (1989) identified that more effective counselor’s value intelligence and reflectivity. Overall, Whiston and Sexton (1991) concluded that more complex research designs are necessary to explain the characteristics of an effective counselor.

Although researchers have suggested the counselor’s personal traits are necessary for effective counseling, relatively few researchers have studied the counselor characteristics which contribute to client outcomes (Barkham & Mellor-Clark, 2003;
Norcross, 2002). Horvath and Bedi (2002) identified the counselor qualities that contribute to the development of a good working relationship, such as interpersonal skills, communication-related skills, empathy, openness and exploration, experience and training. Interpersonal skill is described in terms of “the capacity to express sensitivity to the client’s needs through expressed responsiveness and the ability to generate a sense of hope” (p. 56).

Jennings and Skovholt (1999) conducted a qualitative study on the cognitive, emotional and relational characteristics of master counselors. They interviewed ten peer-nominated master counselors and found that they were voracious learners, drew heavily on accumulated experiences, valued cognitive complexity and ambiguity, were emotionally receptive, mentally healthy and mature, attended to their own well-being, were aware of how their emotional health impacted their work, possessed strong relationship skills, believed in the working alliance, and were experts at using their exceptional relational skills in counseling.

Other counselor's personal attributes have been identified as positively contributing to the alliance, such as flexibility, honesty, trustworthiness, confidence, warmth, interest, and openness (Ackerman & Hilsenroth, 2003). These traits seem to resemble the cognitive, affective and reflective traits necessary for an effective counselor; however researchers have not found a comprehensive construct as a basis for these traits.

Norcross (2002) advocated for “research based-conclusions that can lead, inform, and guide practitioners toward evidence-based counseling relationships and responsiveness to patient’s needs” (p.14). This suggests research is needed that specifically examines the counseling relationship in terms of the counselor characteristics
which impact the therapeutic working alliance. Horvath and Bedi (2002) and Wampold (2001) agree that information about the counselor variables is the most urgently and clinically needed. Horvath and Bedi concluded, “research on the counselor interpersonal variables as they affect the counselor’s ability to develop the alliance are slowly emerging, but are not yet at the stage where the evidence could be considered empirically reliable” (p. 60).

Since the therapeutic alliance has been determined to be essential to client outcome, studies which comprehensively examine the counselor traits contributing to the therapeutic working alliance are needed. Wisdom potentially provides a way to comprehensively conceptualize the traits of the counselor which contribute to the therapeutic working alliance.

**Wisdom: A Comprehensive Construct for Conceptualizing Counselor Traits**

The construct of wisdom gives researchers a lens with which to examine the counselor characteristics which contribute to the therapeutic working alliance. Wisdom is valuable in interpersonal relationships, and more specifically the counseling relationship. The personal qualities of wisdom, such as dialectical reasoning, perspicacity, and sagacity are valuable in interpersonal relationships (Sternberg, 1998; Hanna, 2002). Hanna (2002) suggested that “wisdom is a concept that accounts for the mostly unspoken and largely unspecified skills that differentiate the average counselor from the highly effective counselor” (p. 289). Although these skills seem essential for an effective counseling relationship, they are not a primary focus of research and teaching in counselor education.
Wisdom has been a topic of interest primarily in developmental psychology. Paul Baltes and his colleagues at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin, Germany continue to research explicit theories of wisdom and its manifestation in people’s lives (Baltes & Smith, 1990; Baltes, Smith, & Staudinger, 1992; Baltes & Staudinger, 1993; Baltes & Staudinger, 2000; Staudinger, Dorner, & Mickler, 2005). Robert Sternberg has examined the attributes of wisdom, the relationship between intelligence, creativity and wisdom (Sternberg, 1985a; 1985b), the balance theory of wisdom (1998), and teaching for wisdom, intelligence, creativity and success (2009). Developmental researchers have studied wisdom’s role in aging (Ardelt, 1997, 2000, 2003; Montgomery, Barber, & McKee, 2002; Sternberg, 2005), and more recently wisdom’s role in young adulthood (Brown, 2004; Brown & Greene, 2006; Greene & Brown, 2009; Webster, 2003, 2007, 2009).

While counselor education and supervision has been a developing field since the 1960s (White, 1983), there is little research related to wisdom and the development of the counselor. Hanna and Ottens (1995) introduced the topic in counselor education and supervision, in terms of wisdom’s connection to counseling. It was further studied as an omitted, yet necessary ingredient in competent multicultural counseling (Hanna, Bemak, & Chung, 1999; Phan, Rivera, Volker, & Maddux, 2009). To understand more about wisdom’s effect on counseling, research is needed to define the characteristics of wisdom, develop assessments, and teach the concepts in counselor education and supervision. While there is much research on wisdom, it has not addressed the specifics that connect the attributes of the counselor with the working alliance.
The History of Wisdom in Research Literature

Robert Sternberg (1998) classified the study of wisdom into philosophical, explicit, and implicit theories. Philosophical research includes spiritual and religious beliefs about wisdom. Implicit theories are informal folk ideas about wisdom which exist in people’s minds, while explicit theories are based on intentionally constructed models (Montgomery, Barber, & McKee, 2002). In an attempt to grasp the complexity of wisdom more effectively, multidimensional approaches which aim to combine perspectives have been introduced. Such models include culturally integrated (Takahashi & Overton, 2005), civilization (Targowski, 2006), balanced theory (Sternberg, 1998), and integrated process models (Yang, 2008). This review of research literature examined the theories of wisdom potentially relevant to the study of the wisdom of the counselor and the counseling relationship.

Philosophical Theories of Wisdom

Philosophical theories of wisdom include ancient, mythical and spiritual conceptualization of wisdom. The wise owl is an ancient symbol of wisdom; with “owl” a root of the word knowledge. In Greek mythology, the owl was the favorite bird of Athena, goddess of wisdom (Berger, 2009). According to Greek legend, Athena breathed soul into the world, and Sophia is identified with image of Godly wisdom in the world. Interestingly, the historical root of philosophy is the love (philia) of wisdom (sophia). Sophia in Greek mythology is the highest form of wisdom, also known as the Soul of the World.

Psychologist Robert Sardello (2008) suggested that as we develop our soul, we move from egotism to individuality through self-knowledge, which is actually knowing,
experiencing, feeling and sensing the world fully. He stated that “working toward individuality is indivisibly also working toward the Soul of the World” (p. 78).

According to Sardello’s spiritual approach to psychology, Sophia is experienced both internally and externally, and “her way is the way of wisdom transformed in love” (p. xv). Self-knowledge is something people need in order to fully know, experience, feel and sense in the world.

Philosophical wisdom is conceptualized by Aristotle within the five “states” or conditions which truth is obtained; art, scientific knowledge, practical wisdom (phronesis), philosophic wisdom (sophia), and intuitive reason. Osbeck and Robinson (2005) describe wisdom as the common factor in all five states: the rational aspect of the mind, or rational soul, which mediates the possibility for obtaining truth, and “this aspect in turn is the basis for the possibility of wisdom” (p. 67). For Aristotle, practical wisdom or phronesis is the application of knowledge which creates moral virtue, and ultimately encourages prosperous human development, either in relation to the individual or to human life in general (Phronesis, n.d.). Practical wisdom is necessary for someone to make decisions and engage in actions which benefit them as an individual, their loved ones and/or society at large.

Wisdom is mentioned throughout the Old Testament Bible. Proverbs 19:20 says, “Listen to counsel and accept discipline, that you may be wise the rest of your days” (New American Standard Bible). And Proverbs 24:3-4 reads, “By wisdom a house is built, and by understanding it is established; and by knowledge the rooms are filled with all precious and pleasant riches.” Brown (2005) described a typology of wisdom using the metaphor of a house with seven pillars based on Psalms 9:1; “Wisdom has built her
house she has hewn her seven pillars.” For Brown, the seven pillars are represented by appreciative wisdom, discernment, common behavioral wisdom, uncommon behavioral wisdom, communal wisdom, transcendent wisdom, and virtue. Brown advocates toward bridging the pillars of wisdom, which requires movement from the pragmatic, modern view of wisdom to the more post-modern transcendent values that wisdom represents.

From a feminist theological perspective, Jones (2000) described the seven pillars as good relating, discernment, cultivating our life energy, grounding in everyday life, good counseling, creative aging, and empathy with the rest of creation. According to Jones, studies have focused more on the pillars which represent the individual aspects of wisdom, while the communal aspects have been largely ignored. Both Brown (2005) and Jones (2000) ideas are consistent with current research on wisdom which views wisdom traits as an integration traits attending to the personal, relational, and society-at-large.

In terms of counseling, the pillars of wisdom can be viewed as the soul which is manifested through the therapeutic working alliance. Researchers have identified the common factors, namely the therapeutic relationship, as a primary avenue for bringing the soul back into counseling (Ottens & Klien, 2005). These researchers point out that the Greek root of the term psychotherapist is “attendant to the soul” (p. 33). The soul is defined in terms of one’s spirit, core beliefs, morals, ethics and faith (Becvar, 1997) and the soul is cultivated through relationships characterized by their attentive, caring, and nurturing qualities (Moore, 1992). Becvar (1997) concluded that one necessary psychotherapeutic element for nurturing clients’ souls is found in the therapeutic relationship. The wisdom of the counselor could therefore have a profound effect on client outcome, beyond mere symptom relief, but attending to the soul of the client. In
this context, wisdom is valued by many cultures (Hanna, Bemak, & Chung (1999). Studies which examine the cultural relevance of wisdom are necessary to contribute to researcher’s knowledge about wisdom in counseling.

**Culturally Integrative and Civilization Theories of Wisdom**

Cultural foundations of wisdom can be found in studies of Eastern and Western traditions. Western civilization tends to focus on practical wisdom, while Eastern traditions emphasize the philosophical aspects of wisdom. Cultural foundations of wisdom can be found in studies of Eastern and Western traditions. Upon examination of wisdom in Western history and culture, Takahashi and Overton (2005) concluded that although influenced by ancient Egyptian, biblical, and Greek literatures, Western thought remains primarily cognitively-based, emphasizing an extensive knowledge base and the ability to use that knowledge. The Judeo-Christian views wisdom as a life lived in relationship with the divine and in pursuit of absolute truth. According to researchers, wisdom as an understanding of the material world and the spiritual world and its relationship to the material world is a religious value, which is at odds with Western culture’s consumerism and materialism (Sternberg, 1998).

In contrast to the Western intellectualized view of wisdom, Eastern traditions emphasize the non-cognitive aspects of wisdom, such as the transformational and integrative features (Takahashi & Overton, 2005). Transformational features include the transcendental experiences associated with Eastern spiritual practices in Hinduism and Buddhism. Integrative aspects refer to the integration of various aspects of human consciousness, such as cognition, affect, intuition, and interpersonal (Takahashi & Overton, 2005). From the Eastern perspective, wisdom is less based on the rational,
intellectual decision making process, and based more on an intuitive personal, even emotional experience. For the person-of-the-counselor, the implications are that expert knowledge may not be sufficient for effective counseling, and the non-cognitive aspects of personal development may be more important than previously thought.

After reviewing the literature, Takahashi and Overton (2005) concluded that both the theoretical and applied definitions of wisdom can vary significantly between cultures. In an effort to study an integrated approach to wisdom, they introduced a cultural inclusive developmental model based on the synthetic-analytic framework. The synthetic aspect represents Eastern integrated and holistic thought, in which wisdom’s synthetic mode is dialectical in nature; meaning that it moves toward increased integration.

According to Overton (1997), the dialectic principle assumes that the mind is a self-organizing system, and through experience it becomes transformed into more advanced and qualitatively different forms of integration through human development. In terms of wisdom, the mind integrates different aspects of functioning, such as cognitive, affective, and motivational; and through experience becomes increasingly integrated. In terms of humanistic psychology, the movement is an innate self-actualizing tendency, which Rogers (1961) describes as a curative force or urge to expand, extend, develop and mature; a directional trend evident in all organic and human life. There seems to be an unexplored relationship between a person’s movement towards integration, self-actualization, and wisdom. Whether wisdom is an outcome or a requirement, it seems likely that wisdom is a necessary component of movement towards self-integration and self-actualization.
The analytic mode of wisdom is characteristic of Western thought which Takahashi and Overton (2005) describe in terms of two analytical components; the extent of knowledge and level of cognitive complexity. The cross-cultural study examined five fundamental wisdom components in two modes; the analytical mode (knowledge base and abstract reasoning) and the synthetic mode (reflective understanding, emotional empathy, and emotional regulation). The researchers concluded that the Western emphasis on the analytical aspect of wisdom was unfounded, and both the synthetic and analytic dimensions were equally important in the functioning of wisdom in late adulthood.

Targowski (2006) proposed a theoretical civilization model of wisdom, which incorporated social, reflectional, methodical, and individual wisdom. The author reviewed literature in these 4 categories, and identified subcategories of the approaches to wisdom; social (religion approach, legal approach, and medical approach); reflectional (philosophical approach and the great intellectuals approach); individual’s wisdom (great writer’s approach, folk people approach, great politician approach, great general’s approach, great businessman’s approach, great scientists approach, artists approach; and methodical (method approach, psychological approach, decision science approach, and semantic approach).

The study analyzed the main source of wisdom, the supportive source of wisdom, the result of wisdom and the time factor. Tagowski (2006) concluded there is no universal definition of wisdom, and that wisdom can be defined as a combination of all these areas. Finally, based on the results of this study, the application and practice of wisdom is something significant to the future of civilization, but left to future research.
wisdom is significant to civilization, then the application and practice of wisdom could have important implications for counselors.

**Explicit Theories of Wisdom**

Historically, the majority of empirical studies have approached wisdom-related research from an analytical perspective. Baltes and his colleagues emphasize an explicit theoretical approach which means the theory is constructed by the experts and researchers rather than laypeople. Baltes and his colleagues, known as the Berlin group, have studied wisdom extensively from Baltes’ dual process framework of intelligence, defining wisdom as an expert knowledge system and knowledge of the fundamental pragmatics of life. Baltes and Smith (1990) tested a five-component model of wisdom by giving adult participants a life problem, such as “A 14-year old is pregnant. What should she consider and do?” (p. 104).

These researchers identified wisdom-related criteria in terms of expert knowledge and the metalevel of expert knowledge (Baltes, Smith, & Staudinger, 1992; Baltes & Staudinger, 1993). The expert knowledge system is comprised of rich factual knowledge and rich procedural knowledge. The metalevel organization of expert knowledge is known as fundamental pragmatics of life, which is comprised of life span contextualism, relativism and uncertainty. This definition of wisdom from an explicit approach has remained consistent, and the data collected have generally been supportive of the model (Baltes, Smith, & Staudinger, 1992; Baltes & Staudinger, 1993).

Sternberg (1990) proposed an explicit theory of wisdom, first by differentiating implicit and explicit theories of wisdom, with implicit being more narrow and descriptive of the primarily cognitive abilities labeled as wise, intelligent or creative. For Sternberg,
explicit theories explain wisdom, creativity and intelligence in a broad sense. Implicit theories explain specific traits which comprise wisdom. He suggested six precursory components, which are knowledge, processes, primary intellectual style, personality, motivation, and environmental context. These six components can be understood in terms of the overlapping concepts of wisdom, intelligence and creativity.

Specifically, the construct of wisdom can be described as 1) knowledge and its limitations; 2) processes, including an understanding of what problems should be solved and what problems should not be solved; 3) a judicial thinking style, characterized by the desire to judge and evaluate things in an in-depth manner; 4) personality, including tolerance of ambiguity and the obstacles in life; 5) motivation, especially the motivation to understand what is known and what it means; and 6) environmental context, involving an appreciation of the contextual factors in the environment that lead to certain thoughts and actions.

Sternberg (1990) concluded that implicit theories account for people’s concept of wisdom, and lay the foundation for explicit theories each of which overlap with the six precursory components identified above. For Sternberg, wisdom and intelligence have more in common than wisdom and creativity, with the most unique component being that of sagacity and a metacognitive stance. In his definition, sagacity involves deep understanding of self and others, beyond cognitive skills, and metacognition implies the recognition of knowing the limits of knowledge (knowing about knowing). These wisdom concepts are identified by Hanna and his colleagues as important in counseling. The studies into the explicit and implicit theories on wisdom provide important
foundational background that can assist in linking wisdom to an effective therapeutic relationship.

**Implicit Theories of Wisdom**

While explicit theories of wisdom tend to examine what wisdom is, implicit theories assess how wise a person is. In other words, implicit theories of wisdom are the everyday or common-sense definitions people describe in their life experience. Sternberg (1990) noted that the discovery of these meanings occurs by simply asking people what wisdom means to them. Research from an implicit theoretical perspective of wisdom has yielded a variety of personal qualities worthy of further research, much of which has been done using multidimensional scaling. Multidimensional scaling provides internal validity, examining data without respect to an external measure. Several studies using multidimensional scaling techniques have found common factors in wisdom (Clayton & Birren, 1980; Birren & Fisher, 1990; Chandler & Holliday, 1990).

Clayton and Birren (1980) found three distinct factors which were cognitive, affective, and reflective dimensions of wisdom. In their empirical research study, 12 wisdom descriptors generated from an earlier research project were administered to 83 participants were grouped by age (young, middle, and older). The participants were asked to rate the similarity of all possible word pairs, in addition to the words wise, aged, and myself. The results yielded three factors; cognitive (knowledgeable, experienced, intelligent, pragmatic, and observant), reflective (introspective and intuitive), and affective (understanding, empathetic, peaceful, and gentle). These three factors have remained foundational to the study of wisdom (Ardelt, 2000).
From a balanced perspective, Ardelt (2003) conceptualized the reflective dimension as crucial to the development of the cognitive and affective dimensions. Based on this research, Birren and Fisher (1990) theorized that through the lifespan, wisdom develops as a balance of cognition, volition (motivation), and affect. Additionally, planning, decisions, and advice are the results of the process of wisdom. According to Birren and Fisher:

Wisdom is an emergent property of an individual’s inward and external responses to life experiences. A wise person has learned to balance opposing valences of the three aspects of behavior: cognition, affect and volition. A wise person weighs the knowns and unknowns, resists overwhelming emotion while maintaining interest, and carefully chooses when and where to take action. (p. 331-332).

Traditionally, the concepts of thought, feeling and behavior have provided the framework for understanding human behavior and the development of theoretical approaches to counseling (Corsini & Wedding, 2008). While theorists may focus on one aspect over another (e.g. cognitive-behavioral approaches, or emotion-focused therapy), perhaps the balance of all three is actually more consistent with wisdom and human behavior.

In another variation of multidimensional scaling, Holliday and Chandler (1986) researched approximately 500 participants across several studies. They used categorization theory models and prototype analysis (Rosch, 1975) as techniques to identify information about the ways in which people distinguish wise individuals from other closely related categories. A principle component analysis yielded five distinct factors, which include exceptional understanding, judgment and communication skills, general competence, interpersonal skills and social unobtrusiveness (Chandler & Holliday, 1990).
A limitation of this study, as well as with other implicit theory models, is that definitions of wisdom varied based on culture. Takahashi & Overton (2005) noted social unobtrusiveness appears to be a wisdom trait highly rated by Taiwanese Chinese (Yang, 2001), whereas American and Australian groups preferred experienced and knowledgeable as descriptors of the ideal self, while aged and discreet were ranked the lowest (Takahashi & Bordia, 2000). Baltes and Smith (1990) analyzed data from Holliday and Chandler’s (1986) study and found two factors which correlated with their factors, exceptional understanding and judgment and communication skills, which were subcategorized under wisdom as expert knowledge.

Sternberg (1998) also studied wisdom from an implicit theoretical model by comparing wisdom and creativity. In one study (Sternberg, 1985a), asked 40 college students to sort 40 behaviors into piles based on similarities. The 40 behaviors were identified in a previous study as top-rated wisdom, creativity and intelligence behaviors. The sorted piles were examined using multidimensional scaling and for wisdom six components were identified; reasoning ability, sagacity, learning from the environment, judgment, expeditious use of information, and perspicacity.

From this study, Sternberg (1985a) defined several important components of wisdom which have been linked to the wisdom of the counselor: 1) reasoning ability is the unique ability to look at a problem or situation and solve it; 2) sagacity is concern for others; considers advice; understands people; feels he or she can learn from others; a good listener; and willing to admit mistakes; 3) learning from the environment and ideas includes perceptivity; and the ability to learn from other people’s mistakes; 4) judgment is the ability to act within one’s own limitations; sensibility; and thinking before acting or
making decisions; 5) expeditious use of information means experienced; seeking information, especially details; maturity; learns and remembers from past mistakes and successes; and 6) perspicacity is intuition; the ability to offer solutions that are on the right side of truth, the ability to see through things, to read between the lines; and the ability to understand and interpret the environment.

Sternberg (1990) found similarity between his reasoning component and Clayton and Birren’s (1980) reflective dimension, as well as his sagacity component which resembled their affective dimension. Each of these traits has been identified as important aspects of wisdom in counseling (Hanna, 2002; Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Hanna, Bemak, & Chang, 1999).

In one of the few longitudinal studies on wisdom, Wink and Helson (1997) assessed two aspects of wisdom, practical wisdom and transcendent wisdom in a sample of college educated, primarily white and socially advantaged women and their spouses. The researchers identified the importance of the study as distinguishing the personality variables of wise people who seem to possess character that pervades their behavior and interactions with others (Achenbaum & Orwoll, 1991). Wink and Helson defined practical wisdom based on explicit theorists, who approach wisdom in terms of expert knowledge and expertise in the pragmatics of life (Baltes & Smith, 1990). Transcendent wisdom is defined in terms of the process of individuation in the second half of life, as described by Jung (1965), involving the inner awareness, integration of opposites and ego, leading to an increased awareness of the purpose and meaning of life and the unity of self and the universe.
The participants in the Wink and Helson (1997) study were administered the self-report Adjective Checklist (ACL; Gough & Heilbrun, 1983), and the Practical Wisdom Scale (PWS) which they created as a self-report checklist of adjectives which are indicative (e.g. insightful, realistic, reflective) and contraindicative (immature, intolerant, shallow) of practical wisdom. To measure transcendent wisdom, researchers used participants’ examples of wisdom that were personally meaningful to them, and coded them as Ratings of Transcendent Wisdom (TWS).

In the study, Wink and Helson (1997) identified the participants as 94 women and 44 men who completed both the ACL at ages 27, 43 and 52 and provided examples of wisdom which could be scored during the age 52-assessment. The researchers concluded that participants with high scores on the PWS and the TWS were cognitively complex, perceptive, insightful, and healthily self-directed. The PWS was correlated with social initiative, leadership, empathy and generativity, while the TWR was associated with openness to experience, intuition, and creativity.

Consistent with the Berlin group findings, those women who were counselors had a steeper increase in practical wisdom between ages 27 and 52, as compared with women who were not counselors. The researchers concluded that attributes of practical wisdom are particularly helpful to women who deal with negative experiences (such as divorce in this study) in a way that promoted personal growth and development. Since counseling involves the client’s personal growth and development, practical wisdom may also be important in counseling.

One of the limitations in wisdom studies thus far has been the lack of assessments available which are useful for larger populations. In an effort to develop a standardized
scale which could be used to assess larger populations, specifically for wisdom as a predictor for the attributes for aging well, Ardelt (2003) developed of the Three-Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS). Ardelt’s definition of wisdom was based on the Clayton and Birren (1980) study, which identified a combination of three factors; affective, cognitive, and reflective dimensions of wisdom. While based on Clayton and Birren’s empirical research on implicit theories of wisdom, Ardelt (2004) argued that the 3D-WS is compatible with implicit as well as explicit wisdom theories, emphasizing the balance the cognitive, reflective and affective components of wisdom, rather than primarily focusing on knowledge and analytical ability.

In order to develop and test reliability and validity of the 3D-WS, Ardelt (2003) conducted qualitative and quantitative interviews with a sample of 180 older adults (mean age 71). Confirmatory factor analysis was performed, and Crohbach’s alpha ranging from .71 to .85 was reported for the cognitive, reflective, and affective dimensions of the 3D-WS. The results indicated a fit for the three factor model, with significant factor loadings on all three factors ranging from .50 to .84. All three scales were significantly correlated with each other, with the highest factor loading on the reflective dimension. Ardelt concluded the 3D-WS is a promising scale, when used with older populations to measure wisdom based on the combination of cognitive, reflective and affective personality characteristics.

Correlations with psychometric tests provide a means for validating implicit theories of wisdom internally, as well as externally. Webster (2007) found five interrelated wisdom traits; experience, emotional regulation, reminiscence/reflection, humor, and openness. This study examined these wisdom traits as measured by the Self-
Assessment of Wisdom Scale (SAWS), the Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS; McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992), and the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998). The results supported the five component model, replicating results from Webster’s 2003 study, in which wisdom positively correlated with generativity and negatively correlated with attachment avoidance.

Contrary to expectations, wisdom positively correlated with attachment anxiety. Three follow-up research studies were conducted by Webster (2009). The first study with 61 young adults (mean age = 22) investigated wisdom, ego-integrity, values, and life attitudes. The results indicated wisdom was positively correlated with ego-integrity and other self/other-enhancing values, and negatively correlated with hedonistic values. The second study with 62 young adults (mean age = 21.7) looked at wisdom and attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, and life attitudes. The results for life attitudes replicated the findings in the first study, and found negative correlations between wisdom and attachment avoidance and (contrary to the 2007 study) with attachment anxiety. The third study included 27 males and 35 females with the mean age of 20.6, and showed that wisdom positively predicted attributional complexity, which is identified as a variable found to reduce social judgment biases.

Staudinger, Dorner, and Mickler (2005) recognize the validity of the SAWS as potentially measuring what they consider to be personal wisdom. According to Staudinger et al., personal wisdom combines the cognitive theory of Piaget (1972), adult attachment concepts related to psychoanalytic theory (Labouvie-Vief, 1982; 1990), and emotional intelligence. In a recent study, Labouvie-Vief and Medler (2002) were interested in personality development and maturation of self-regulation; specifically
personality styles based on affect optimization and affect complexity. Labouvie-Vief defined maturity as a combination of affect optimization, or the ability to balance emotion with values, and affect complexity or the management of affect towards differentiation and objectivity (Labouvie-Vief & Medler, 2002).

They studied a stratified sample of 400 participants, 168 were randomly selected (85 men, 83 women) and assessed on measures of positive-negative affect, cognitive-affective complexity, and measures of coping and defense. Four types of personalities emerged from the results of the study; defended, over-whelmed, complex, and integrated. The integrated group represented high levels of intelligence and adaptive coping patterns, while defended individuals were characterized by high positive affect, with repressive coping styles and lower intellectual ability. The over-whelmed type was lowest on affect, intellect and coping. The complex type, were lowest on repression and high on intelligence, representing the most “realistic” group and closest to what Staudinger, et al. believed to be personal wisdom.

These findings can be interpreted as consistent with Webster’s (2003) initial study on the measurement of wisdom, which indicated high wisdom scores correlated with low levels of attachment avoidance, but higher levels of attachment anxiety. One explanation for the negative affective experience could be that while comfortable with close relationships, a wise person recognizes that developing and maintaining close relationships can be difficult (Webster, 2003).

Staudinger, Dorner, and Mickler (2005) described maturity as grounded in self-concept, such that the mature self distinguishes between content and structure of the self. Maturity is based on both the content (cognitive, affective, conative) and structure
(number of self aspects, similarity of self aspects) of the self. They describe the basic self components (self-esteem, self-complexity, integration, and value orientation) as indicators of self-growth (Staudinger, et al., 2005). A study measured the relation of these traits to the Big Five personality trait measure (Costa & McCrea, 1992), Ryff’s measure of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995), Loevenger’s sentence-completion for assessing ego development, and a newly developed measure assessing self-related wisdom. The researchers found that social maturity and adaptation were related to integration, value orientation and self-esteem; whereas self-complexity and value orientation were more strongly related to personal wisdom (Mickler & Staudinger, 2003).

Staudinger, Dorner, and Mickler (2005) defined two types of maturity: social and personal, which emerge from Helson and Srivastava (2001) concepts of environmental mastery and personal growth. In their study four personality types emerged: conservers (low personal growth, high environmental mastery, depleted (low personal growth, low environmental mastery), achievers (high environmental mastery, high personal growth) and seekers (high personal growth and low environmental mastery).

Unexpectedly, they found a low correlation between achievers and indicators of wisdom, and rationalized that the achievers lives are characterized by productivity and more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions, with little time for reflection and privacy, which are necessary for the development of wisdom. Staudinger, Dorner, and Mickler (2005) concluded that seekers come closest to what they define as personal wisdom. Additionally, the correlational pattern identified by the 3D-WS more closely
represents what they identify as achieving personality or social maturity, rather than personal wisdom.

Brown’s (2004) model of wisdom incorporated implicit and explicit analysis of wisdom using a six-factor structure of wisdom development. Brown & Greene (2006) based their Wisdom Development Scale (WDS) on the conceptual model of wisdom created by Brown in an attempt to understand integrated learning outcomes in higher education. In this model, wisdom is the result of learning from life (reflection, integration, and application) which is influenced by orientation to learning, experiences, and interactions with others.

The six factors were initially identified as self-knowledge, understanding of others, judgment, life knowledge, life skills and willingness to learn. The WDS content was validated using a variety of focus groups with diverse student populations. 1188 surveys were collected electronically, with a response rate of 17%. The results indicated that two factors were better represented by the addition of two subscales; interpersonal understanding (altruism and inspirational engagement) and life skills (life skills and emotional management). Five of Brown’s (2004) six factors were confirmed by the data, while the factor willingness to learn was not confirmed as a factor in this study (Brown & Greene, 2006).

In a later study, Greene and Brown (2009) compared Brown’s model of wisdom development to the first four of Chickering’s seven vectors, which include achieving competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy to independence, and finally, developing mature interpersonal relationships (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Criterion validity was established in a follow-up study done by Greene and Brown (2009).
with over 3000 participants from a sample of professionals and a sample of college students who were given the WDS and the Iowa Student Development Inventory (Hood 1997), which is based on Chickering’s theory of college student development.

The results supported each of the eight subscales, including willingness to learn (Greene & Brown, 2009). Based on the results, the researchers identified eight subscales of wisdom; self-knowledge, emotional management, altruism, inspirational engagement or leadership, judgment, life knowledge, life skills, and willingness to learn. According to Greene and Brown (2009), Brown’s theory compares to Holliday and Chandler’s (1986) model, except for willingness to learn. Specifically, Holliday and Chandler’s five components of wisdom correlated to Brown’s model; exceptional understanding (life knowledge) and self (self knowledge), judgment (judgment), general competencies (life skills), and interpersonal skills and social unobtrusiveness (understanding of others).

**Process Models of Wisdom**

Process models of wisdom incorporate both implicit and explicit theories of wisdom. In an effort to further define the processes aspect of wisdom, Sternberg (1998) introduced a balance theory of wisdom, in which wisdom is defined as “the application of intelligence, creativity, and knowledge to the common good by balancing intrapersonal (one’s own) interpersonal (others’), and extrapersonal (institutional or larger other) interests over the long and short terms, through the mediation of values, so as to adapt to, shape, and select environments” (p. 287).

The balance theory of wisdom represents a person’s ability to use their knowledge in the real world. While explicit theories of wisdom explain wisdom in terms of expert knowledge (Baltes & Smith, 1990); implicit theories define wisdom in terms of
characteristics of the person, such as Ardelt’s (2003) integration of cognitive, reflective, and affective characteristics. Sternberg (2004) suggested that both are slightly off; in that wisdom is an interaction between the person, the task, and the context. He points out that wisdom is situational dependent, for example, a person who may be wise at work, may not be wise in relationships. According to Sternberg’s balance theory of wisdom; the “wisdom is in the balance -- knowing what to do on what task in what situation” (p. 287).

Yang (2008) builds on Sternberg’s process theory of wisdom by defining wisdom as a real-life process which consists of three core components; integration, embodiment, and positive effects. For Yang (2001), integration represents the person’s ability to integrate ideas, interests, modes of operation, and personality traits. Embodiment is described as the action intended to actualize what the person has integrated, whereas the positive effects are the personal goals, life mission or gains experienced by an individual or another as a result of the action taken by the wise person. In a two-part study conducted by Yang (2008), the three core components were analyzed qualitatively. In the first study, an open-ended questionnaire was used which asked 80 Taiwanese Chinese to nominate wise individuals, and they reasons for their nominations were analyzed. The results indicated the core components were present in the participant’s perceptions of wisdom. In the second study, 66 wisdom nominees were interviewed in a semi-structured format, and analysis of the transcripts yielded 220 wisdom incidents.

The results of the study indicated that wisdom rating were higher when the core components were made explicit, compared to the same incidents in which the core components were not explicit. Yang (2008) concluded that the process model of wisdom helps provide a broader definition of wisdom, “as a special kind of real-life process
which begins when a person in his/her mind integrates perspectives to form a vision, and ends only after the embodiment of the integrated vision brings forth beneficial effects to the acting self and others” (p. 73). The process approach to wisdom provides a framework for studying the complexity of wisdom, which could provide future direction for counselor educators to understand the relationship between wisdom and counseling.

More recently, Hall (2010) identified wisdom “as a process which can serve as a guide to helping us make the best possible decisions at junctures of great importance in our lives” (p. 7). A scientific journalist, Hall stated that wisdom requires action and identified eight neural pillars of wisdom; emotional regulation, knowing what’s important, moral reasoning, compassion, humility, altruism, patience, and dealing with uncertainty. Hall defined emotional regulation in terms of coping. Knowing what’s important involves establishing value and making judgments, while moral reasoning is the ability to judge right from wrong. Compassion is loving-kindness and empathy, and humility involves having perspective. Altruism is social justice and fairness, and patience is the ability to delay gratification and learning to wait for larger rewards. According to Hall, dealing with uncertainty requires the ability to adapt to change and balancing the cognitive and emotional parts of the brain. Hall discussed the importance of wisdom in education, the workplace, at home, and in politics. Hall stated we aspire to be wise because:

- wisdom counsels a goodness that extends beyond the membrane of ego and our utile self-interests, radiates outward in an enveloping generative energy that empowers loved ones, kin, students, our various tribes of affiliation, and if we’re particularly lucky and particularly wise, our larger body politic. It gives us a chance to perform the magic of being simultaneously selfless and self-improved (p. 270).
Wisdom and Counseling

The research on wisdom in counseling is limited, although there was a preliminary attempt to define wisdom and develop a scale to measure wisdom from the counseling psychologist’s perspective (No, 1993). In her qualitative dissertation study, No identified wisdom in counseling as an inclusive concept with nine dimensions of wisdom: 1) personality, 2) ethical responsibility, 3) attitude, 4) cognitive knowledge and intellectual skills, 5) knowledge based on experience, 6) training, 7) relationship styles, 8) understanding human differences, and 9) understanding human nature. No (1993) indicated that counseling psychologists define wisdom based on their unique personal experience, their philosophical and theoretical orientation in counseling, and their specialty, counseling psychology. These identified traits fit well with the academic content components of counselor education, such as coursework in human growth and development, legal and ethical issues, and micro-skill training.

The specific intrapersonal and interpersonal qualities which are hallmarks of wisdom as identified by other researchers are missing. For example, knowledge based on experience seems comparable to critical life experience (Webster, 2003) and life knowledge (Brown & Greene, 2006), and cognitive knowledge and intellectual skills could be compared to cognitive ability (Ardelt, 2003; Bluck & Glück, 2005) and reasoning ability (Sternberg, 1985a). However, critical wisdom traits which correspond with insightful application of cognitive ability such as expeditious use of knowledge (Sternberg, 1985a), metacognition, tolerance of ambiguity, perspicacity, and dialectical reasoning (Sternberg, 1985a; Hanna & Ottens, 1995) fail to be accounted for by the model.
Hanna and Ottens (1995) suggest that wisdom might be a common factor in effective counselors, regardless of their professional orientation. They reviewed the literature and linked wisdom to effective counseling primarily based on the work of Sternberg (1990). Empathy, dialectical reasoning, tolerance of ambiguity, metacognitive stance, sagacity, deautomatization, perspicacity, and problem solving and finding were named as major characteristics of wisdom. Empathy is defined as understanding of others from their subjective point of view and the ability to take another person’s perspective. Dialectical reasoning is defined as the recognition of context; the interdependence of phenomena, cognition and affect, presuppositions, the interplay of opposing views and orientation toward beneficial change. Tolerance of ambiguity is defined as the recognition of ambiguity as intrinsic to the nature of human beings and their interactions with the world. Deautomatization is defined as the resistance of tendencies toward habitual behavior patterns and automatic thoughts; stressing awareness and choice. Metacognitive stance is defined as concern with limits, presuppositions, and knowledge of knowledge and thinking.

Hanna and Ottens (1995) noted that other wisdom researchers such as Kramer (1990) and Pascual-Leone (1990) have suggested wisdom would be a valuable trait in a counselor. Jason, Reichler, King, Madsen, Camancho and Marchese (2001) concurred and added the emphasis that the counselor’s possession of these wisdom qualities is a greater determinant of effectiveness than the specific theories of techniques used in counseling. Hanna, Bemak, and Chung (1999) define wisdom as “a particular set of cognitive and affective traits that are directly related to the possession and development of life skills and understanding necessary for living a life of well-being, fulfillment,
effective coping, and insight into the nature of self, others, environment, and interpersonal interactions” (p. 126). This definition encompasses the concept of wisdom as defined for the purpose of the current study, as it relates most closely to the wisdom of the counselor and the counseling relationship. Hanna et al. propose that wisdom is a new paradigm for multicultural counseling, especially the counselor’s ability to think dialectically and recognize multiple meanings in human communication (Hanna, et al., 1999; Kramer, 1990).

In another study on multicultural competency in counseling, Phan, Rivera, Volker, and Maddux (2009) identify wisdom as the missing ingredient in competent multicultural counseling. They based their study on the definition of wisdom provided by Hanna, Bemak, and Chung (1999) and compared wisdom and multicultural competence of 45 counselors-in-training. Participants were administered the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991), to measure the multicultural competency of the counselor, and the sentence completion test for ego development (Hy & Loevinger, 1996) which measured the wisdom of the counselor. A statistically significant relationship was found between the multicultural competency and the wisdom of the counselor, and the researchers confirmed their assumption that “possessing wisdom is a primary tool used by ancient civilizations to teach healers about human conditions” (Phan, et al., 2009, p. 154).

**Comparison of Models**

Bluck and Glück (2005) noted that while implicit theoretical research has yielded many subcomponents of wisdom, there are conceptually few categories which can be identified. After reviewing several major studies (Clayton & Birren, 1980; Holliday &
Chandler, 1986; Sternberg, 1985a; Hersey & Farrell, 1997; Jason, Reichler, King, Madsen, Camancho & Marchese, 2001), they conceptualized five overlapping categories of wisdom, cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, reflective attitude, and concern for others. These five categories are used to organize the components of wisdom as identified by each theorist, most profoundly corresponding to Sternberg’s conceptualization of wisdom.

The first category, cognitive ability, was identified as a strong component of wisdom. Bluck and Glück (2005) defined cognitive ability as aspects of intelligence necessary for problem-solving, including logical thinking and good reasoning ability, as well as tacit or implicit knowledge and experience. Cognitive ability corresponded with Sternberg’s concept of reasoning ability. Real-world skills are also related to problem-solving abilities, as well as the use of all the other components in life situations. For example, using judgment in understanding problems, knowing one’s limitations, and the social skills required to advise others (Sternberg, 1985a; Bluck & Glück, 2005).

Insight is defined in terms of perspicacity, or the ability to see through the obvious and grasp underlying meanings (Sternberg, 1985a; Bluck & Glück, 2005). Insight involves self-reflectivity and knowledge of one’s own ideas and motives, as well as using intuition to understand another’s perspective and motives. Reflective attitude is categorized with Sternberg’s (1985a) concept of learning from ideas and the environment, which Bluck and Glück (2005) define as “the basic motivation to think deeply about things, people, and oneself, and to think before acting and speaking” (p. 95). Lastly, concern for others “contains an attitude of kindness and interest in others, the ability to see another’s perspective and understand their feelings, as well as fairness and
respect for others” (p. 96). Sagacity, or the deep understanding of another, is the concept most parallel to concern for others (Sternberg, 1985b; Hanna & Ottens, 1995). Concern for others can also be compared to Goleman’s (2006) concept of social intelligence, which is the combination of interpersonal awareness and social ability.

Although Bluck and Glück (2005) provide a usable framework for studying wisdom as it relates to counseling, the limitations of the Bluck and Glück conceptual model need to be addressed. While most traits identified predominantly in implicit theoretical research can be viewed in terms of the five subcomponents, Bluck and Glück admitted that the study did not represented is Jason, Reichler, King, Madsen, Camancho and Marchese (2001) in which five components of wisdom were identified, harmony, warmth, intelligence, nature and spiritual. The researchers questioned the definition of the wisdom components in the Jason, et al. (2001) study and how they were linked to the construct of wisdom. There are similar difficulties in comparing the nine dimensions identified in No’s (1993) study, as described earlier.

Another limitation to the Bluck and Glück (2005) model is the missing component for emotional intelligence. Using Clayton and Birren’s (1980) model, the three dimensions of cognitive, affective, and reflective, they place the affective dimension, under the subcategory of concern for others. This does not capture the personal dimension of emotional regulation or emotional self-management defined by other researchers (Ardelt, 2003; Brown and Greene, 2006; Hall, 2010; Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Sternberg, 1985a; Webster 2007).

Brown and Greene (2006) found emotional management as a subcomponent of life skills, which is more consistent with Bluck and Glück’s (2005) idea that real-world
problem solving requires social skills. This however, does not account for the individual’s own awareness of emotion, or differentiation between one’s own emotion and the emotion of others. Ideally, another subcomponent would encapsulate the wisdom concept of the individual’s emotional intelligence, which is related to, but different than concern for others or social intelligence. According to Goleman (2006), emotional intelligence requires self-awareness and self-management, which is similar to the affective dimension (Clayton & Birren, 1980; Ardelt, 2003), and the concepts of emotional regulation (Webster, 2007; Hall, 2010) and emotional management (Brown & Greene, 2006).

Additionally, Bluck and Glück (2005) account for humor in terms of concern for others, while few other researchers identify humor as a wisdom trait. Webster (2007) identified humor as the ability to recognize life’s ironies and the ability to laugh at oneself, the ability and willingness to make others feel comfortable and use humor as a mature coping strategy. Hanna (2002) mentioned humor as one of the skills necessary in the “precursors model of change” (p. 243), but not in relation to wisdom. Compared to Webster’s five components of wisdom, Brown’s (2004) traits compare on each level, except humor.

While not ideal, the five conceptual categories of wisdom provide a basis to study the subcomponents of wisdom as they relate to counseling. In the following table, the five conceptual categories proposed by Bluck and Glück (2005) in addition to emotional intelligence, are used to categorize and illustrate the wisdom traits relevant to the counseling relationship. The six subcomponents of wisdom: cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, and emotional intelligence
correspond with wisdom traits identified in research (Ardelt, 2003; Brown & Greene, 2006; Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Sternberg, 1985b; Webster, 2007). Table 1 displays the dimensions of wisdom which are hypothesized as relevant to the counselor and the counseling relationship. The proposed categories are defined and examined further in terms of their relevance to the counselor and the counseling relationship as identified in the following literature review.
Table 1

Wisdom Characteristics Important in the Counselor and the Counseling Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning Ability</td>
<td>Problem finding/solving; Dialectical reasoning</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Critical life experience</td>
<td>Cognitive ability</td>
<td>Life Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Metacognition; Tolerance of ambiguity</td>
<td>Cognitive/Reflective</td>
<td>Real-world skills</td>
<td>Life skills; Judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspicacity; Expeditious use of information</td>
<td>Perspicacity</td>
<td>Cognitive/Reflective</td>
<td>Reflection/Reminiscence</td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>Self-knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from ideas and the environment</td>
<td>Deautomatization</td>
<td>Cognitive/Reflective</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Reflective attitude</td>
<td>Willingness to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagacity</td>
<td>Sagacity; Empathy</td>
<td>Reflective/Affective</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Concern for others</td>
<td>Interpersonal understanding; Altruism; Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affective/Reflective</td>
<td>Emotional Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life skills; Emotional management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cognitive Ability

Practical wisdom or tacit knowledge has long been associated with wisdom traits. Cognitive ability as defined by Bluck and Glück (2005) earlier is identified with reasoning ability (Sternberg, 1985a), the cognitive dimension (Ardelt, 2003), life knowledge (Brown & Greene, 2006), critical life experience (Webster, 2007), and problem finding and solving and dialectical reasoning (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Hanna, Bemak, & Chung, 1999); see Table 1. Sternberg (1985a) described reasoning ability as
problem-solving, logical, and someone who has knowledge and is able to apply it effectively in life to solve life problems. Judgment and insight must also be used in order to appreciate cognitive ability as a real-life skill.

Ardelt (2003) defined the cognitive dimension of wisdom as “a person’s ability to understand life; that is to comprehend the significance and deeper meaning of phenomena and events, particularly with regard to intrapersonal and interpersonal matters” (p.278). The demonstration of cognitive abilities from a wisdom perspective benefits not only the individual in terms of solving life problems, but also benefits interpersonal relationships, as well as society as a whole. Ardelt conceptualized the cognitive component of wisdom as related to Sternberg’s (1985a) trait of reasoning ability. When the cognitive dimension is combined with the reflective dimension, other wisdom attributes emerge such as judgment, perspicacity, and learning from ideas and the environment (see Table 1).

Additionally, Ardelt identified tolerance of ambiguity in the cognitive dimension of her scale development, with the reverse coded items such as, “There is only one right way to do anything,” and “A person either knows the answer to a question or he/she doesn’t” (King & Hunt, 1975; Martin & Westie, 1959).

According to Greene and Brown (2009), life knowledge is the “recognition of the interconnectedness between people and the natural world, knowledge and ideas, and the ability to look at deeper meanings and questions in life” (p. 293). There are similarities in each of this researcher’s conceptualization of cognitive abilities, especially with regard to variety of life experiences, deeper understanding of meanings, dealing with life difficult choices and the connection between self, others, and the world.
In Webster’s (2007) five component model of wisdom, there is not a specific identification of cognitive ability, nor is there a differentiation between critical life experience and real-world skills or judgment. However, Webster defined critical life experience as “rich and varied experiences in interpersonal contexts, particularly those requiring resolution of difficult life choices; coping with important life transitions; and exposure to life’s darker side [e.g. dishonesty, hypocrisy]” (p. 172). From this view, critical life experience is knowledge which has evolved from experience with complicated life problems, which require wrestling with ambiguity and understanding that there are rarely right or wrong answers when it comes to decision-making and problem-solving. This perspective of critical life experience is consistent with Bluck and Glück’s (2005) concept of cognitive ability as derived from critical life experiences.

Wisdom related knowledge has been differentiated from general cognitive ability by most wisdom researchers (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Hanna, Bemak, and Chung 1999; Sternberg, 1985a). In his numerous previous studies Sternberg (1985a, 1985b, 1990, 1998, & 2003) compared wisdom, intelligence and creativity. In giving a historical account of his research on intelligence, Sternberg (2003) identified five stages of research: stage one was component analysis of analytical abilities; stage two the triadic theory of human intelligence (information-processing, experiential, and contextual) and the differentiation of practical and tacit knowledge; stage three the theory of successful intelligence; stage four is the investment theory of creativity and the propulsion theory of creative contributions, and stage five the balance theory of wisdom. Although the concept of wisdom did not emerge as a focus for Sternberg (1998, 2001) until later stages, the traits he attributed to the concept of wisdom emerged from his previous stages
of research. In this review of the literature on wisdom, the first, second and fifth stages are of primary interest.

In stage one, the component analysis and analytical abilities, Sternberg (2003) identified that the information-processing component of intelligence, and what he called the metacomponents or the higher order executive processes that help people decide what to do, how to do it, and how well it could be done. He identified the performance component as a subcategory of the information-processing and metacomponents, which instruct the person on how to do things (Sternberg, 2003). He concluded that people who were better at intellectual reasoning recognized the time and effort they needed and were able to plan accordingly to solve the details of the problem.

In the second stage of Sternberg’s (2003) research he formally identified the three subcategories of intelligence as information-processing (recognizing and defining problems), experiential (problem-solving), and contextual which specifies the real-world functions of intelligence (adapting, shaping, and selecting environments). At this point, Sternberg became interested in the creative component of intelligence, and found that individuals with higher levels of creativity were better able to switch between conventional and unconventional thinking (Sternberg, 1982; Tetewsky & Sternberg, 1986). At the end of the Sternberg’s second stage of research, he focused on practical knowledge, which he further defined tacit knowledge as procedural knowledge that is not necessarily taught or verbalized in the environment.

Tacit or implicit knowledge is action oriented; allowing individuals to achieve goals they personally value (Sternberg, 2003). Sternberg pointed out that his studies have shown that “tacit knowledge tends to increase with experience, but it is what one learns
from the experience rather than the experience itself that seems to matter‖ (p. 352).

Sternberg explained that cognitive ability is important in all the components of wisdom (reasoning ability, sagacity, learning from ideas and the environment, judgment, expeditious use of information, and perspicacity) and requires a balance in contrast to intelligence alone (Sternberg, 2003).

In concurrence, Hanna and Ottens (1995) not only distinguished wisdom from intelligence, but clarified that the two modalities are complementary, ideally operating in unison and not in opposition to each other (see also Hanna, Bemak, & Chung 1999). Wisdom includes intellect, yet it requires more than the ability to understand cognitively. Additionally, Baltes and Staudinger (2000) recognized that wisdom is ―a state of mind and behavior that includes the coordinated and balanced interplay of intellectual, affective, and motivational aspects of human functioning‖ (p. 123). Therefore in counseling, the wisdom of the counselor includes the ability to understand oneself and the client both cognitively and affectively.

The fifth stage of Sternberg’s (2003) research focused on the balance theory of wisdom. According to the balance theory, wisdom is viewed as “the value-laden application of tacit knowledge not only for one’s own benefit (as can be the case for successful intelligence) but also for the benefit of others, in order to attain a common good” (p. xviii). The balance theory of wisdom provides a view of wisdom that allows for the interaction between the characteristics of wisdom. The ability of a counselor to know when and how to apply their knowledge, for the benefit of others is essential for effective counseling.
The cognitive abilities aspect of wisdom is the most complex, since multiple traits are identified by researchers which include some cognitive aspect. Hanna and Ottens (1995), provide a description of wisdom as it relates to cognitive abilities by identifying specific aspects of cognitive ability such as problem-solving, dialectical reasoning, as well as metacognition and tolerance of ambiguity, each of which are critical aspects of wisdom in counseling. These aspects have a great deal of overlap with real-world skills, as described in the next section. For Hanna and Ottens, problem finding and solving is closely related to real-world skill and judgment by incorporating the ability to accurately identify and frame a problem, in ways that the solution does not lead to more problems. In order to demonstrate the ability to problem solve from this perspective, other wisdom components, such as dialectical reasoning, metacognition and tolerance of ambiguity are a foundational characteristics which need to be addressed.

Hanna and Ottens (1995) identified dialectical reasoning as an important aspect of wisdom in counseling. Although Sternberg (2003) doesn’t identify dialectical reasoning specifically within reasoning abilities, dialectical reasoning has been described as a synthesizing agent of different theoretical perspectives. Dialectical reasoning is “derived from the insight that knowledge about self, others, and the world evolves in an everlasting process of theses, antitheses, and synthesis” (Kunzmann & Baltes, 2005, p. 115). Relativism has also been associated with dialectical thinking. Kramer (1990) identified that “relativist and dialectical thinking can be seen historically as a characteristic of wisdom” (p. 288). Additionally, Kramer (1990) stated that “the advantage of relativistic thinking to making wise decisions is that it allows one to take into consideration individual needs and priorities even when they conflict with one’s own
and to consider the circumstances surrounding the problematic event—in other words allow for multiplicity” (p. 289). Baltes & Smith (1990) defined relativism in terms of “knowledge about differences in individual and cultural goals, values and priorities… individual differences in personal style, motives, values, interests, and ability imply that individuals will choose different life paths and interpret events in their lives from different perspectives” (p. 102).

Kramer (1990) proposed that ”relativistic and dialectical thinking would facilitate wisdom in five ways: 1) through the recognition of individuality; 2) by taking into account context; 3) by fostering cooperative, empathetic strategies for interpersonal interaction; 4) through the recognition of possibilities for change; and 5) through recognition of the necessity of integrating cognition and affect” (p. 300). Orwell and Perlmutter (1990) stated that when “empathy, understanding, and caring” combine with dialectical thinking, people are capable of “penetrating interpersonal insight and discernment” (p. 164). Hanna, Bemak, and Chung (1999) noted that it is precisely this type of penetrating personal insight Sternberg (1990) referred to as perspicacity.

Hanna and Ottens (1995) identified dialectical reasoning as an important aspect of wisdom in counseling. The characteristic of relativism or dialectical thinking enables a counselor to remain open and non-judgmental with clients; even while exploring opposing or conflicting views. In counseling, learning relativistic or dialectical ways of thinking can be the avenue to becoming aware of the projections (or polarized aspects of the self) and reintegrating aspects of themselves into a healthier functioning whole self (Kramer, 1990). Kramer identified that “the thought processes which are characteristic of wisdom which involve awareness of relativistic and dialectical principles could not
develop apart from affect” (p. 296). Consequently, relativistic and dialectical thinking are a prerequisites as well as a characteristic of wisdom. According to Kramer, the counselor must first be able to become aware of and transcend their projections before they can develop both the empathetic skills and the cognitive processes associated with wisdom.

Hanna and Ottens (1995) agreed with Sternberg’s (1985a) distinction between wisdom and intelligence, emphasizing that the metacognitive stance and tolerance of ambiguity are hallmark traits of wisdom. These researchers defined the metacognitive stance as the concern with knowing about knowing and the awareness of the limits and assumptions about knowledge. They explained that “wisdom is concerned with the depth of understanding, whereas intelligence is concerned with the extent and breadth of understanding” (p. 126). Sternberg (1990) defined metacognition as the “wise person’s ability to 1) know what they know, 2) know what they do not know, 3) know what they can know given the limitations of the present understanding and of knowledge itself, and 4) know what they cannot know, given the limitations imposed on them” (p. 152).

Sternberg (1990) recognized that a component of wisdom is the tolerance of ambiguity, which is the ability to not know, or recognize that there are grey areas when it comes to problem solving and decision-making in life. Hanna and Ottens (1995) noted quite the reverse is true of intelligence, where ambiguity is not tolerated and in fact “sees ambiguity as something to be resolved, preferably sooner than later” (Sternberg, 1990, p. 155). These wisdom traits are identified as important qualities of a counselor and effective counseling (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Hanna, Bemak, & Chung 1999).
Tolerance of ambiguity is an important aspect of the cognitive ability of the counselor. Clients enter counseling with problems, represented in their complex life stories. Clients struggle with internal conflicts and their interpretation of life events, which a counselor must be willing and able to explore with the client. In the counseling relationship, the counselor’s ability to tolerate, if not invite ambiguity into the relationship will set the stage for the client’s ability to deal with ambiguity. The counselor controls the extent to which ambiguity is allowed in the therapeutic relationship (Bordin, 1955). Bordin (1955) identified three relevant areas in which the counselor implicitly and explicitly addresses ambiguity in the counseling relationship by the topics they consider appropriate for the client to discuss, the closeness of the relationship expected, and the counselor’s values in terms of goals and values in general.

Ambiguity serves major functions in the therapeutic relationship. Bordin (1955) stated that counselors help:

clients find ambiguous stimuli as something that touches their own motivational and emotional life (sometimes major conflicted feelings) and this investment of the client’s motivational and emotional structure in the relationship enables the counselor to understand more fully and deeply the mainsprings of the client’s actions and by being ambiguous, the counselor provides a background against which the client’s irrational feelings will become more clear, and more readily brought to awareness (p. 146).

The counselor has control in terms of determining the ambiguity of the therapeutic relationship, and the potential powerful impact it could have in terms of allowing the client’s free exploration of feelings, motivations, and emotions; therefore, Bordin (1955) suggested that counselors “must be adequately trained and have sufficiently deep knowledge of human behavior and personality in counseling” (p. 150).
Clearly, the cognitive ability of the counselor is an important aspect of effective counseling. In order to be accepted into a master’s degree in counseling program, prospective students demonstrate the ability to complete undergraduate coursework, as well as the basic interpersonal skills necessary for counseling. In order to graduate, counselors-in-training must demonstrate basic cognitive abilities necessary to complete graduate level education as well as the development of counseling skills necessary to establish a working relationship with clients (CACREP, 2009).

In the field of counselor education and supervision, the concept of cognitive complexity is the trait most closely identified with the wisdom trait of cognitive ability. Granello (2010) identified cognitive complexity as the ability to learn, integrate, and utilize multiple perspectives. Elder and Paul (1994) noted that people who utilize cognitive complexity ask questions, admit uncertainty, examine their own beliefs, tolerate ambiguity, listen carefully without judgment, and adjust their opinions as new information is received.

According to developmental models of counselor training, the beginning stages of training are characterized by “black-and-white thinking, linear problem solving, and little self-awareness” (Borders, 1989, p. 163). In the middle stage of development, the counselor-in-training experiences confusion (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982), although they are gaining skills and confidence, they become increasingly aware of their limitations (Borders, 1989). In the advanced stages of development, the counselor becomes increasingly integrated in theory, practice and identity as a counselor, and with more years of experience increasing levels of cognitive complexity (Granello, 2010).
The developmental models counseling proposed by Stoltenberg (1981) and Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth (1982) have their basis in cognitive-developmental theories such as Piaget (1972), Perry (1970), and Loevinger (1976). Perry believed the cognitive assumptions made by students revealed their perception about the world of knowledge, as well as insight into the reasoning they used to organize and evaluate these perceptions. Perry’s conception of cognitive development can be compared to Sternberg’s (1985b) description of the components in his perception of intelligence (information-processing, experiential, and contextual), as described earlier.

Perry’s (1970) model of development has been useful in defining and assessing the cognitive development of counselors (Granello, 2010). Additionally, there have been connections made to ego development and wisdom (Borders, 1989; Kramer, 1990; Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Phan, Rivera, Volker, & Maddux, 2009). Kramer (1990) described the ability to coordinate cognition, affect and reflection as a synthesizing function of a healthy ego. When compared to Loevinger’s higher stages of ego development, wisdom is a likely outcome (Kramer, 1990). In terms of counselor education, the cognitive development of the counselor involves cognitive complexity and ego development, which are fundamental components of wisdom. Overall, the application of cognitive ability requires real-world skills.

Real-World Skills

Pascual-Leone (1990) noted that “the wise person is a good and sensitive counselor in personal life matters” (p. 247). While cognitive ability is identified with reasoning ability (Sternberg, 1985a), problem finding and solving and dialectical reasoning (Hanna & Ottens, 1995), life knowledge (Brown & Greene, 2006) and critical
life experience (Webster, 2007), cognitive ability as described earlier; it is realized through real-world skills (Bluck and Glück, 2005, emphasis added) as identified by judgment (Sternberg, 1985a; Brown & Greene, 2006), metacognition and tolerance of ambiguity (Hanna & Ottens, 1995).

It is implied that in order for a counselor to gain tacit knowledge, the counselor must be able to learn self-reflectively from their life experiences, and to find and solve problems as well as utilize effective coping skills and good judgment. Judgment is related to a person’s ability to act sensibly, recognize and act within their limits, and think before acting and speaking (Sternberg, 1985a). According to Ardelt (2003), the cognitive and affective dimensions of wisdom are developed through reflective dimension. From this perspective, real-world skills are the realization of the three dimensions working together.

A person who is wise has experience in the fundamental pragmatics of life, according to Baltes and Smith (1990). Effective coping skills are learned in part through managing experiences in life to gain an understanding or factual knowledge about human nature, development, variations in the development, interpersonal relations, social norms, important events in life, and knowledge about the well-being of oneself and others (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000). One of the wisdom properties that emerged from studies conducted by Baltes and his colleagues was the fact that wisdom addresses important and difficult questions and strategies about of life (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000).

Problem finding and solving is a characteristic that is adaptive through managing life challenges that are experienced throughout human development. It can be described in terms of the procedural knowledge involving “strategies and heuristics for dealing with
the meaning and conduct of life - for example heuristics of giving advice and for the structuring and weighing of life goals, ways to handle life conflicts and life decisions, and knowledge about alternative back-up strategies if development were not to proceed as expected” (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000, p. 125). Hanna, Bemak, and Chung (1999) stated that “wisdom is more concerned with finding solutions that do not cause more problems” (p. 128). In terms of Erikson’s (1963) stages of development, problem finding and solving helps an individual to accomplish necessary life tasks at each stage.

Judgment is an aspect or real-world skills which facilitates wise living. Judgment was identified as a wisdom trait by Sternberg (1985a), Holliday and Chandler (1986), and Brown and Greene (2006). Judgment emerged as a wisdom trait in Sternberg’s research on intelligence, as described earlier. Sternberg defined judgment as someone who acts within their limits, is sensible, and thinks before acting or speaking.

Holliday and Chandler’s (1986) interpretation of judgment included communication skills, describing judgment as vigilant of the world, balanced, tolerant, with problem-solving abilities and giving good advice. Brown and Greene (2006) defined judgment as the knowledge of multiple perspectives, and taking different viewpoints into account when decision making, including the past, and present context, as well as one’s personal background experience. Hanna and Ottens (1995) did not identify judgment as a separate wisdom characteristic trait per se, but their notion of problem finding and solving is closely related to real-life skill and judgment by incorporating the ability to accurately identify and frame a problem, in ways that the solution does not lead to more problems.
The counselor’s ability to learn from their own experiences and gain effective coping skills and the ability to identify and solve problems in their own lives can add to their effectiveness in the counseling relationship. Horvath and Bedi (2002) suggested that “the counselor’s own unresolved relational history may be a significant limiting factor in therapeutic potential” (p. 58). Many times a counselor’s role involves psycho-education about topics such as coping skills, human growth and development, and normalization of problems based on context and life development. From a solution-focused counseling perspective, counselors emphasize a solution orientation, instead of focusing on problems. This approach includes; joining, describing the problem, finding exceptions to the problem, descriptions of the problem, normalizing, and goal setting (O’Hanlon & Weiner-Davis, 1989).

Studies found that counselors tend to have more wisdom than those not in the counseling profession (Wink & Helson, 1997). Staudinger, Maciel, Smith, and Baltes, (1998) suggested that the reason for this is “individuals who by virtue of their profession [e.g. clinical psychology] receive training, guided practice [mentorship], and massed experience in fundamental issues of life and the human condition; accumulate higher levels of wisdom-related knowledge compared to individuals without access to this type of experiential setting” (p. 14). Training and experience were defined according to the counselor’s specific counselor training and experience, instead of personal life experience. The value in the experience and training of the counselor may be more closely related to their own life experience, their own ability to cope effectively with life, and their ability to reflect and learn from the difficulties they have faced.
Insight

Insight is necessary for someone to develop cognitively, learn from life experience and practice good judgment. Insight, as defined earlier by Bluck and Glück (2005), can also be described by perspicacity, or intuition which is the ability for someone to see through things, and understand concepts beyond what they appear to be (Sternberg, 1985a; Hanna & Ottens, 1995). Several researchers have identified intuition as a trait of wisdom (Clayton & Birren, 1980; Holliday & Chandler, 1986; Orwoll & Perlmutter, 1990; Sternberg, 1990).

Bluck and Glück’s (2005) subcomponent of insight overlaps with Webster’s (2007) concept of reminiscence or reflectivity which requires an individual to gain insight from their personal past and gain perspective as it relates with the present. Webster’s construct of reminiscence is used interchangeably with reflectivity, and it compares to Sternberg’s (1985a) concept of the ability to expeditiously use information, involving learning from experience and seeking information (Sternberg, 1985a). From this view, insight is required for a person to learn or gain knowledge and perspective from their past experiences. Insight is required for someone to learn from experience and apply life lessons to current or future circumstances.

Brown and Greene (2006) frame insight in terms of self-knowledge, which is a concept overlapping with a reflective attitude, in which a person is aware of personal interests, strengths and weaknesses and values. “Self-knowledge is characterized by personal authenticity and genuineness kept constant in a variety of contexts, and an internal locus of success/ fulfillment/ satisfaction in regards to their relationships and goals” (p. 292). Self-knowledge as defined by Brown and Greene is similar to Ardelt’s
(2003) reflective dimension, in which the practice of reflective thinking about experiences from multiple perspectives results in increasing self-awareness and self-insight. Ardelt specifically identified intuition as a measured component of the reflectivity dimension identifying with Sternberg’s wisdom concepts.

A counselor’s intuition can be powerful in the counseling process. “Whether intuition is your brain’s ability to assimilate a vast amount of information and deduce new information from those data, or whether you have some ability that science has yet to explain, intuition is something that is helpful in therapy” (Brew & Kottler, 2008, p. 20). The counselor who uses intuitive knowledge goes beyond interpreting the content of the client’s message, to understanding the context and underlying meanings. Intuition is described by Sternberg (1990) in terms of perspicacity, which “has intuition, offers solutions on the side of right and the truth; the ability to see through things, read between the lines; and has the ability to understand and interpret the environment” (p.146).

The counselor’s intuition in the counseling relationship is necessary, because the counselor must be able to discern the viability of therapeutic interventions. Hanna & Ottens (1995) stated that counseling tools used “without wisdom for the proper awareness, timing, judgment, and appropriateness, can be ineffective at best and harmful at worst” (p. 206). The counselor must be able to recognize when the interventions selected are responsive to and consistent with the client’s level of problem assimilation (Castonguay & Beutler, 2006). Additionally, Castonguay and Beutler (2006) pointed out that when counselors use relational interpretations they must be accurate if they are to facilitate improvement. Therefore, the counselor’s wisdom involves an intuitiveness which allows them to accurately assess the client’s ability to assimilate problems,
determine the appropriate tools to use, and deliver the intervention with sensitivity and flexibility based on the client’s responsiveness. If the client doesn’t respond, or there is a rupture in the relationship, the counselor must be able to respond appropriately to repair the alliance.

**Reflective Attitude**

The reflective attitude defined by Bluck and Glück (2005), is categorized with Sternberg’s (1985b) concept of learning from ideas and the environment, which he explained in terms of receptivity to new ideas, recognizing the importance of ideas, and learning from mistakes. Ardelt (2003) described reflectivity as the essential component which facilitates the development of a person’s affective and cognitive dimensions. Webster’s (2007) concept of openness, Brown and Green’s (2006) concept of willingness to learn, and the concept of deautomatization (Sternberg, 1985b; Hanna & Ottens, 1995) can be compared to the reflective attitude described by Bluck and Glück (2005).

In order to learn from the environment, one must be open to receiving and reflecting on new ideas and experiences. Openness involves the notion that while opinions and judgments can be formed, new information can be received, reflected, and integrated, and changing the previous opinion is a possibility and sometimes a necessity. Openness to alternate views, information, and potential solutions, while exploring possibilities, listening to different viewpoints and investigating new approaches to problems characterizes a wise person (Webster, 2007). In describing dogmatism as the opposite of openness, Webster (2007) stated, “instituting dogmatic solutions to complex, contextually embedded, psychosocially sensitive issues characterizes a closed, rather than open approach” (p. 166). Rigidity in thought and action is opposing to wisdom.
For Baltes and Smith (1990), openness is a quality that embraces uncertainty with curiosity, and overlaps with the ability to admit not knowing. Instead of resisting growth and change and thereby avoiding uncertainty, a wise person recognizes that the future is never fully predictable and not all aspects of the past or present can be known (Baltes & Smith, 1990). Therefore, a wise person recognizes there are no perfect solutions, and they are open to ways of optimizing their gains and losses through the application of their values in life situations.

According to Brown and Greene (2006), willingness to learn is defined by “the basic humility in what one knows and continual interest in learning about the world. Willingness to learn is a subcomponent of life skills, which encompasses the practical ability to manage multiple roles and responsibilities, day to day tasks, and problem solving. When considering reflective attitude in terms of life skills and willingness to learn, reflectivity is necessary for problem identification and in order to effectively solve problems, a person would need to be open to considering different options and multiple perspectives. The humility aspect of willingness to learn can also be associated with the wisdom trait of metacognition, thinking about thinking, and knowledge about knowledge, and recognition of the limits of knowledge. Learning and change can occur when one can reflect on the limits of knowledge, recognize limitations, and demonstrate openness and willingness to learn.

In terms of counseling, a counselor who is flexible, open and non-judgmental in counseling is more effective than one who is rigid, judgmental and closed to new ideas. Castonguay & Beutler (2006) identified that “the therapist is likely to increase his/her effectiveness if he/she demonstrates attitudes of open-mindedness, flexibility, and
creativity” (p. 358). Openness and exploration are identified as important counselor qualities that contribute to the effective therapeutic relationship (Horvath & Bedi, 2002, p. 57).

Deautomatization is defined as resistance to the tendency toward habitual, automatic thought and behavior patterns, stressing the awareness and choice (Hanna & Ottens, 1995). Hanna and Ottens (1995) identified deautomatization as a wisdom characteristic relevant to counseling. In order for an individual to be aware of their automatic responses, they must be mindful, reflective and introspective. Sternberg (1990) described a wise person as someone who “resists automatization of thought but seeks to understand it in others” (p. 153). Reflectivity is necessary in order for someone to learn from their experience and make a conscious decision to act differently. In the twelve-step program of alcoholics anonymous, the definition of insanity is identified as repeating the same behavior over and over, expecting different results.

Changes in thoughts and behaviors occurs more readily when a person reflects on what they are thinking and doing, opens themselves to a new and different approach, and chooses something different. Someone who is self-reflective has awareness of their responses, and can make a conscious choice to act, instead of acting based on unconscious processes. Pascual-Leone (1990) identified that “B.F. Skinner examined a paradox of the will in the sense that the human mind is strongly influenced by conditioning and its learning history; thus it cannot be free” (p. 255). In this sense, without reflectivity, humans are doomed to automatic responding. However, Pascual-Leone believed that as humans mature or evolve they can develop more advanced mental processing, and move beyond surface level mental processing into action that pushes
them into the direction they actually want to go. In terms of wisdom, reflectivity is the key to learning from the environment, beginning with the willingness to learn and openness to different ideas and experiences.

**Concern for Others**

Concern for others is defined by Bluck and Glück (2005) as “an attitude of kindness and interest in others, the ability to see another’s perspective and understand their feelings, as well as fairness and respect for others” (p. 96). Sagacity, or the deep understanding of another, is the concept most parallel to concern for others (Sternberg, 1985a; Hanna & Ottens, 1995). Interpersonal understanding, which Brown and Greene (2006) identify as including altruism and leadership as core concepts of wisdom traits, which are comparable to the trait of concern for others. Lastly, humor is identified by Webster as a component of wisdom, which Bluck and Glück (2005) mention in terms of concern for others, warmth, humor, kindness, and compassion (Jason, Reichler, King, Madsen, Camancho & Marchese, 2001).

Sagacity is an interpersonal quality derived from self-reflectivity, which has characteristics in common with areas of experience, emotional intelligence, and openness described in this study. Sternberg (1990) defined sagacity as “concern for others; considers advice; understands people through dealing with a variety of people; feels he or she can always learn from other people; knows the self-best; is thoughtful; is fair; is a good listener; is not afraid to admit making a mistake, will correct the mistake, learn and go on; listens to all sides of an issue” (pp. 146-147). Ardelt (2003) associated the affective component with emotional empathy and concern, acceptance of others, and compassion. Ardelt pointed out that in order for the affective dimension to represent
wisdom, the reflective component is necessary. For example, a person can feel empathy for self or another, while managing their emotions, giving or taking sound advice, and moving beyond the problem.

The identification, validation, and expression of feelings are central to the counseling process. A counselor’s ability to communicate empathy is a necessary component of the counseling relationship (Rogers, 1957; Hanna, 2002). Hanna (2002) pointed out that empathy in the counseling relationship increases the possibility for change. Hanna & Ottens (1995) stated that “therapist behaviors …are geared toward relationship building and ‘knowing’ the client in the sense of empathy, sagacity, and perspicacity” (p. 204). While the importance of empathy in counseling is obvious, definitions of empathy are vague. Teyber (2006) defined an accurate empathetic response as one that captures the central meaning of the client’s experience, and “goes beyond what the client has said and communicates that the therapist understands the core message, registers the emotional meaning, or distills what is most important from the client’s frame of reference” (p. 58).

Pascual-Leone (1990) described an emergent theme of wisdom as the “ability for empathetic, intuitive experiencing of the problems and issues of the Other or of nature – from a decentered perspective corresponding to Other’s and nature’s as much as one’s own” (p. 248, italics preserved). The client’s positive perception of the counselor’s ability to show empathy is beneficial to the therapeutic relationship (Bohart, Elliott, Greenberg, & Watson, 2002). Further, Castonguay & Beutler (2006) suggested that counselor attitudes and abilities to show empathy, caring, warmth, acceptance, congruence and authenticity help to promote a positive working alliance.
Concern for others can be compared to the interpersonal understanding described by Greene and Brown (2009), and demonstrated through such wisdom traits as altruism and leadership (see Table 1). Greene and Brown defined interpersonal understanding as:

A person’s deep understanding of a wide variety of people in varying contexts, a genuine interest in learning about others (attentiveness and empathy), the capability of engaging them (various approaches), a willingness to help them, and possession of advanced communication skills that enable one to articulate thoughts in a meaningful way to another person (p. 292).

This perspective of interpersonal understanding is similar to Brown’s (2004) model of wisdom development, which Greene and Brown compare to Chickering’s (1993) theory described earlier. Two of the seven vectors in student development relate directly to interpersonal understanding; one, which is achieving competence (intellectual, physical, and interpersonal) and four, which is developing mature interpersonal relationships (tolerance of interpersonal and intercultural differences, capacity for intimacy). These developmental stages are not only valuable in college student development, but they are essential in the counselor and the development of an effective counseling relationship. Additionally, Greene and Brown’s (2009) definition of interpersonal understanding accurately identifies many of the foundational interpersonal qualities necessary to be an effective counselor, and for entering the field of counseling.

Altruism and leadership (inspirational engagement) are subcategories of interpersonal understanding as identified by Greene and Brown (2009). Altruism is not clearly defined in Brown’s (2004) original study; however the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2010) defined altruism as the unselfish concern for the welfare of others. In their study in the development of the WDS, their hypothesis correlated the Iowa Developing Autonomy subscale of interdependence with the WDS scale of altruism. The
WDS scale measuring altruism included items such as, “I am sensitive to the needs of others” and “I show appreciation toward others.” Leadership is defined in terms of a person’s capacity to led, guide and direct (Merriam-Webster, 2010) which Greene and Brown identified as inspirational engagement. Inspirational engagement implies the style of leadership is relational and motivational. This quality was assessed through such questions as “I inspire others.” Sternberg (2005) also recognized the importance of leadership in the development of wisdom, suggesting the synthesis of wisdom, intelligence and creativity as the foundation for educational leadership.

Relationship maintenance and repair is also important interpersonally. Gottman and Silver (1999) described one of the essential characteristics of successful marriage relationships in terms of the ability to make and accept repair attempts after a conflict or disagreement. In terms of relationship maintenance and repair, the healthy functioning of the counseling relationship necessitates the counselor’s ability to recognize and accept their contributions to ruptures in the relationship (Bordin, 1994). The counselor must demonstrate the ability to handle this rupture in an empathic and flexible way (Castonguay & Beutler, 2006), with concentrated effort to overcome their own contribution to the rupture (Safran, 1990). Reflectivity is also necessary, since the therapeutic relationship works more effectively when the counselor demonstrates patience, self-awareness, self-responsibility and ability to resolve conflicts cooperatively.

Humor is identified by Webster (2003) as a component of wisdom, which Bluck and Glück (2005) mention in terms of concern for others; warmth, humor, kindness, and compassion (Jason, Reichler, King, Madsen, Camancho & Marchese, 2001). Humor has not been a focus of the wisdom research thus far, although Jason et al. in their
preliminary effort to measure wisdom, found humor related to warmth, which was one of five factors identified as wisdom. In the study results, warmth was comprised of humor, kindness, compassion and warmth for others, animation (rapture, joy, hope, and happiness), and being present. From this view, humor, as well as other aspects of warmth, such as kindness, compassion and being present, could be associated with concern for others and the interpersonal understanding comparable to the wisdom research identified by the present study (Sternberg, 1985b; Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Ardelt, 2003; Webster, 2007; Brown & Greene, 2006; Bluck & Glück, 2005).

Additionally, Brent and Watson (1980) identified wise individuals as concerned, compassionate, empathetic, and in possession of an excellent sense of humor in the face of adversity.

Webster (2003) suggested that a measurement of humor incorporates the “recognition of life’s ironies and a well-developed sense of humor, especially the self-effacing kind (ability to laugh at self); the ability and willingness to make others feel comfortable; and the use of humor as a mature coping strategy” (p. 173). Not all types of humor contribute to wisdom, as Webster noted, such as sarcasm, deprecatory teasing and caustic humor, which are not relevant to wisdom. Hanna (2002) identified humor as a strategy to build hope in clients and increase the possibility for change.

Kottler (2003) also cited the value of humor in the therapeutic relationship, “therapists use humor and parody to defuse tension with a client, to confront the client in a less threatening way, or to discuss taboo subjects that might be more difficult to approach from a more direct angle” (p. 253). Both Hanna (2002) and Kottler caution the inappropriate use of humor, by identifying laughter used at an inopportune moment, at
the expense of the client which would be counterproductive in counseling. Counselors must be intuitive and have the ability to guide their interventions in terms of choice, timing, and application, according to the client’s needs. Hanna also recognized the difficulty in teaching humor in counselor education, though potentially useful as an approach in counselor supervision.

Concern for others and the environment is an attribute of wisdom that lends itself to an effective counselor quality. Sternberg’s (1998) balance theory offered a view of wisdom that expands beyond self and others to the greater good of the world. In their study on wisdom-related knowledge and value orientations, Kunzmann and Baltes (2003) identified wisdom as “knowledge about ways of developing oneself not only without violating the rights of others but also coproducing resources for others to develop” (p. 1106). Their study affirmed that wisdom “values the complexity of life and a joint commitment to developing one’s own potential and that of others” (Kunzmann & Baltes, 2003, p. 1114). Pascual-Leone (1990) recognized that “wisdom involves restricting one’s interventions on others and on the world to those needed to restore harmonious relations among others and among elements of the world” (p. 265).

Counselor training viewed from a developmental model described the counselor moving from the ability to understand oneself, taking on another person’s perspective (Stoltenberg, 1981), and ultimately being an advocate in the greater community. Concern for oneself, others, and the world at large is seen through movement in the developmental lifespan (Erikson’s stages). In his theory of individual psychology, Alfred Alder (1970) identified that social interest is necessary for human cultural development, and the innate (metaphysical) human quality that every human being has the disposition for social
interest which must be developed. Eco-psychology is a modern movement in psychology that reflects the individual’s responsibility for growth in the awareness and concern for the environment.

**Emotional Intelligence**

Another wisdom trait identified by researchers is emotional regulation or affect sensitivity (Kramer 1990; Kunzmann & Baltes, 2003; Sternberg, 1998). Hanna, Bemak and Chung (1999) noted the concept of emotional intelligence as defined by Goleman (1995) can be viewed as a component of wisdom. Goleman (1995) defined emotional intelligence in terms of self-awareness and self-management which is the foundation for social intelligence. Social awareness is related to the wisdom trait concern for others (mentioned earlier) that is comprised of social awareness and social facility. Social awareness includes such characteristics as empathy, empathetic accuracy, listening, social cognition and social facility, which relate to synchrony, self-presentation, influence, concern (Goleman, 2006). Salovey & Mayer (1990) define emotional intelligence in terms of “the ability to know one’s emotions (self-awareness); manage emotions; motivating oneself; recognizing emotions in others (empathy); and handling relationships” (p. 189). Recognition of affect involves an individual’s self-awareness and their ability to differentiate thoughts and feelings.

Kunzmann and Baltes (2003) defined wisdom related-knowledge as “an expert knowledge system about how one can interpret and deal with difficult life problems that can often evoke negative feelings” (p. 1106). In their study, Kunzmann and Baltes predicted that at higher levels of wisdom, people would be aware of negative experiences and be able to deal with negative feelings. They found that wisdom-related knowledge
was associated with higher affective involvement and has a tendency for lower extremes of both negative and pleasant feelings. Kunzmann and Baltes concluded that wisdom involved emotional regulation along with reflectivity and an understanding of complexity. Lower levels of pleasant feelings correspond with the “reality principle [i.e., motivation to explore and understand the complexity of reality] rather than the pleasure principle [i.e., motivation to maximize pleasure experiences]” (p. 1114).

Researchers suggest that emotional intelligence is a framework for emotional abilities that relate to social functioning (Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, & Salovey, 2006). In three studies, researchers used self-report and performance measures to assess emotional abilities. In the first study, the relationship between self-rated (SREIS; Self-Rated Emotional Intelligence Scale) and performance measures (MSCEIT; Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test) was examined, and no significant correlation was found. In the second study, the measures were tested for validity in the prediction of social behaviors, in which men’s performance ratings (MSCEIT) were correlated with perceived social competence, when personality measures were held constant.

In the third study, the MSCEIT predicted social competence. The results validated evidence for performance measures that evaluated observable behaviors in a social environment. Men with higher MSCEIT scores were judged to be more socially engaged and socially competent. The self-report did not emerge as a valid instrument for measuring emotional intelligence. Researchers suggested one explanation, that in Western cultures, people receive little explicit feedback about their emotional abilities in comparison to their mental skills.
Savage (2002) noted that emotional abilities, such as the ability to perceive, use, understand, and manage emotion, contributed to optimal social functioning. The ability to handle emotions, as well as the emotions of another person is an important aspect of successful relationships. Gottman and Silver (1999) noted “the more emotionally intelligent a couple, the better able they are to understand, honor, and respect each other and their marriage (p. 3). Gottman and Silver also suggested emotional intelligence is a skill that can be taught.

In counseling, a counselor needs to be self-aware and able to recognize their own thinking, feeling, and behavior in the counseling relationship. When counselors are unaware of their emotional reactivity in counseling, then an unconscious reaction is apt to occur. This phenomenon is referred to as countertransference, which Rogers (1961) described as “characteristically one-way and inappropriate to the realities of the situation” (p. 82). In order for countertransference to be viewed as potentially helpful in the counseling relationship, the counselor must be able to practice reflectivity and self-awareness in order to effectively identify, process, and resolve his or her experience.

Researchers have identified that if counselors can manage their own emotion it will benefit the counseling relationship. Clients will experience a greater therapeutic benefit when counselors are more tolerant of negative feelings (Castonguay & Beutler, 2006). Rogers (1961) pointed out that the counselor’s positive feeling toward a client is one of the foundational conditions to a working therapeutic relationship. In an effective counseling relationship, counselors must be aware of their own emotional state, as well as be able to empathize with their client’s experience.
Wisdom is a construct which can be helpful in describing the qualities of an effective counselor. Clients enter counseling with a variety of complex and dynamic concerns (e.g. mood, personality, anxiety and substance abuse disorders). Clinicians need to recognize that “therapy is likely to be beneficial if a strong working alliance is established and maintained during the course of treatment” (Castonguay & Beutler, 2006, p. 359). Wisdom traits identified in research can be compared to other counselor traits associated with an effective working alliance. Baltes and Staudinger (2000) found, “wisdom is also associated with a high degree of personal and interpersonal competence, including the ability to listen, evaluate, and to give advice” (p. 123). Sternberg (1998) linked the concept of practical intelligence with the ability to be adaptive and the ability to work collaboratively with others. These characteristics of wisdom, including the ability to listen, to be flexible and to work collaboratively with others are consistent with the wisdom traits described by Horvath and Bedi (2002), when considering counselor traits that positively impact the working alliance.

One major area which requires the counselor’s sensitivity is the understanding of multiculturalism in counseling. Competence in multicultural counseling is essential in our diverse society, and requires the ability to enter into the perspective of a client’s world. Hanna, Bemak, and Chung (1999) identified wisdom as necessary for effective multicultural counseling. Given that counseling occurs in the context of the client’s environment, Brotherton (1996) stated: “people are seen in relation; that is in a societal and historical context, and that all counseling can be identified as cross-cultural” (Brotherton, 1996, p. 59). A counselor who practices counseling with wisdom is also practicing multicultural competence. Hanna et al. (1999) proposed that wisdom be a new
paradigm for multicultural counseling, especially the counselor’s ability to think
dialectically and recognize multiple meanings in human communication (Hanna, et al.,

Phan, Rivera, Volker, and Maddux (2009), based their study on the definition of
wisdom provided by Hanna, Bemak, and Chung (1999) in which forty five counselors-in-
training were administered the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey,
to measure the multicultural competency of the counselor (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck,
1991) and the sentence completion test for ego development (Hy & Loevinger, 1996)
which measured the wisdom of the counselor. A statistically significant relationship was
found between the multicultural competency and the wisdom of the counselor. The
researchers reaffirmed the assumption that possessing wisdom is a primary tool used by
ancient civilizations to teach healers about human conditions (Phan, et al., 2009);
therefore wisdom and multicultural competency are crucial for effective counseling.

Wisdom and Age

Wisdom has been identified as a predictor of aging well (Ardelt, 2000). Ardelt
(2003) found that wisdom, as measured by the cognitive, reflective, and affective
dimensions, was related to life satisfaction, physical health, and the quality of family
relationships. Sternberg (2005) reviewed the literature on the relationship between
wisdom and aging, and found results varied based on philosophical, implicit and explicit
theories of wisdom. He noted, “individual differences in and situational variables
relevant to the development of wisdom may overwhelm any trends represented by gross
group averages” (p. 5). Other researchers have found age is not necessarily a determinant
of wisdom (Baltes & Smith, 1990; Meacham, 1990). Similarly, age has not been
identified as an important characteristic of the counselor in a successful working alliance (Horvath & Bedi, 2002).

Although age isn’t necessarily a determinant of wisdom, a person’s ability to learn from experiences and from the experiences of others is important in the development of wisdom. In a comparison of two models, counselor development and cognitive science models of expertise, researchers noted that experience alone is insufficient for developing expertise, and that intentional feedback from a supervisor is also important in the development of counseling skills (Sakai & Nasserbakht, 1997). As indicated in the discussion on cognitive abilities, models of counselor development have indicated that the counselor progresses through stages of development, from novice to experienced professional. At the novice stage, the counselor is less confident and lacks an integrated sense of identity as a counselor. At the experienced professional stage, the counselor may be more confident in their ability and identity as a counselor (Stoltenberg, 1981; Loganbill Hardy & Dellworth, 1982). The association between the counselor’s wisdom, age, and level of experience is an area for future research.

**Implications for Counselor Education and Supervision**

Developmental psychology continues to advance from understanding how wisdom is defined and developed, and to how to teach wisdom concepts in education. Some argue that wisdom traits, such as intuition, common sense, and empathy are innate, that is, not able to be taught. Hedlund (1977) suggested that the problem of educating for wisdom in counseling is in personal meaning, which provides the context for living. He defined personal meaning in the following way:
Personal meaning is the realization that I am moving with my ground of being. When I experience personal meaning in my activities I have a sense of energy and direction, a feeling that my life is worthwhile and, at some level, connected with other people and of the universe. Personal meaning is the awareness that my present activity flows from and extends my personal history. When I experience personal meaning, I do not lack motivation because my life is an energy flow moving in the correct direction. (p. 602).

A student who experiences meaninglessness has little motivation for learning, and lacks hope or direction for his or her future. According to Hedlund (1977), personal meaning is developed from active symbols, such as religion. For counselors, development of personal meaning is related to the philosophical and religious or spiritual theories of wisdom, which points to the importance of the integrated models of wisdom, rather than theories focused only on the explicit and implicit theories of wisdom. Outside the context of personal life in relationship to self, others, and the universe, wisdom has no meaning. From an existential point of view, the counselor’s sense of personal meaning is the foundation to the development of wisdom as a counselor. From a philosophical perspective, Resenbrink (2004) suggested that wisdom is an activity, not a thing, stating “wisdom is sought, it is not possessed” (p. 199). Since wisdom is related to everyday activity, wisdom is a learning imperative.

Sternberg (2001) recommended that schools should teach for wisdom, and suggested application of the balance theory of wisdom in educational settings. From this approach, the basis of wisdom is in tacit or implicit knowledge which balances personal interests. Wisdom is defined as a value mediated through tacit knowledge which balances goals, responses and interests (Sternberg, 2001). The application of tacit and formal knowledge is for the common good, which involves “balancing of interpersonal, intrapersonal, and extrapersonal interests over the short and long terms to adapt to, shape,
and select environments‖ (p. 231). Related to personal meaning, values are the linchpin of wisdom, filtering what constitutes appropriate balance of interests, response to the environment, and the common good. Sternberg recognized differences in terms of religious, cultural or systemic value systems, but referenced the commonality of certain universal values such as respect for human life, honest, fairness, and enabling people to fulfill their potential.

Specifically, Sternberg (2001) suggested scaffolding as a teaching method in the development of wisdom and using case studies to help students learn how to think, rather than what to think. Kuhn and Udell (2001) question Sternberg’s vision of wisdom as an educational goal, and suggested teaching tools for wisdom, rather than wisdom itself. Similar to Sternberg, these researchers based their approach to wisdom as a developmental goal, and they are in agreement with Sternberg’s concept of scaffolding. The differentiated approach to teaching wisdom focused on the student’s personal context, as well as the broader social implications, and suggested frequent skill practice in a supportive social context. This personalized and supportive teaching approach could help bridge the gap between personal meaning (values) and the practice of wisdom.

Sternberg, Jarvin, and Grigorenko (2009) suggested that intelligence, creativity and wisdom are “key ingredients in a successful person’s life, and that it is very important in educational settings to help students build on these skills, in other words, synthesize them” (p. 2). Sternberg (2005) introduced a model of educational leadership based on wisdom, intelligence, and creativity, synthesized (WICS). The WICS theory of educational leadership is differentiated from other theories in that the leadership is not based on a fixed set of traits, but based on the leader’s ability to use wisdom, intelligence
and creativity to make decisions. Sternberg suggested that wise, intelligent and creative leaders make decisions to redefine problems, analyze solutions, sell solutions, recognize the limits of expertise, take sensible risks, surmount obstacles, tolerate ambiguity, and invest in life-long learning.

Sternberg, Jarvin, and Grigorenko (2009) identified that students need to be taught to understand what defines wisdom, since it does not matter what students know, what matters is how they use their knowledge. The researchers developed a model for teaching for wisdom, intelligence and creativity at the K-12 level, based on his theoretical model known as WICS (Wisdom, Intelligence, and Creativity, Synthesized). At the core of the WICS model, is the belief that “memory, analytical, creative and practical skills contribute to balancing interests and environmental responses, and positive values influence decision making” (p. 3).

The possibility of learning more about the wisdom abilities has not only been implied, but also directly suggested in counselor education and supervision. Sternberg (2001) mentioned the scaffolding method of teaching, which incorporates the cognitive abilities developed throughout counselor training, fostered by constructivist learning activities which include Bloom’s taxonomy of educational development (Bloom, 1956; Granello, 2010).

According to Bloom (1956), students need to go through stages of learning with activities geared towards each level: knowledge, comprehension, analysis, application, and synthesis. Counselor education involves activities requiring the student to articulate beliefs about change, the conceptualization of counseling, and the role of thinking, feeling and behaving. These concepts help students begin to develop a sense of identity
as a counselor. Insight is encouraged through self-reflective learning activities, such as journaling, in which personal life experiences, beliefs about problems and change are processed and recorded.

Hanna (2002) stated that such wisdom traits as empathy, can be developed through activities such as role reversal, where the counselor takes the role of the client with a peer or supervisor, in order to gain a deeper understanding of the client’s experience. Hanna, Gerber, and Wizer (1998) suggested educators blend their counseling skills and teaching skills, by teaching relationship building, facilitating group process, recognizing transference and managing countertransference in the classroom. In order to do blend these skills, wisdom traits such as cognitive abilities, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, and emotional intelligence should be included.

Since counselor education involves clinical training, teaching wisdom concepts applies to supervision as well. The purpose of counselor supervision is to provide education and support that ensures client welfare (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Supervisors can learn wisdom concepts and apply these to their work with supervisees. For example, supervisors can utilize cognitive abilities, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, emotional intelligence, and real-life skills within the context of supervision. The supervisor’s identity is based on the integration of professional identity (e.g. teacher, counselor, consultant), familial identify (e.g. parent-child) and gender and ethnic identities (Bernard & Goodyear).

The supervisor’s development and integration of identity requires the incorporation of wisdom traits such as learning from life experiences, emotional intelligence, self-awareness and reflection. According to Bernard and Goodyear’s
conceptual model of supervision, the supervisor must be able to integrate knowledge at the counselor developmental level (novice to expert practitioner), supervisor tasks and roles, and with parameters of supervision (evaluation, ethical and legal concerns, supervision models, individual differences, relationship processes). Just as Sternberg Sternberg, Jarvin, and Grigorenko (2009) pointed out earlier, it is not enough to know about counseling and supervision of counselors, the supervisor must be able to make decisions based on the integration of these concepts. Additionally, the supervisor’s wisdom abilities can provide a beneficial context for the supervisory relationship, if wisdom traits, such as the ability to empathize, the use of humor, critical reflection, and effective use of information and insight are provided when giving feedback to the counselor in training.

Possibly one of the most important implications for this study of the wisdom of the counselor is the application to assessment in counselor education. Assessments are used in counselor education both formatively and summatively to evaluate the progress of the counselor-in-training. Assessments are used, based on the educational program, which includes such items as basic counseling skills, professionalism, legal and ethical knowledge, knowledge and application of counseling theory, multicultural awareness, and effective use of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Although counselor education programs base their curriculum, assessments and outcomes on standardization by accrediting bodies such as the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009), those standards are not necessarily research-based (Bernard & Goodyear). The research based wisdom traits of the counselor could
be incorporated not only into counselor education program curriculum, but into formative and summative assessments in counselor education.

The Purpose of the Current Study

Arnkil (2006) wrote in terms of the counseling relationship “if relationships are the single most salient factor, analyzing wise ways of being responsive within them should be a key interest” (p. 137). Wisdom provides a framework to examine the traits of a counselor which are beneficial to the counseling relationship. Researchers in human development have identified wisdom as a character strength (Webster, 2007), set of abilities which result in optimal human functioning (Sternberg, 1990), and a factor in aging well (Ardelt, 2000). The field of Counselor Education and Supervision has only begun to recognize the powerful connection between wisdom and counseling (Hanna & Ottens, 1995).

Although research on the therapeutic working alliance has been well established (Horvath & Bedi, 2002), self-assessed wisdom instruments have not been established with the professional counseling population. Validation studies were conducted with young adults (Webster, 2007; Brown & Greene, 2006), and older adults (Ardelt, 2003), however, no measures of wisdom were validated for assessing the wisdom of the counselor.

Prior to the current proposed study, pilot studies were conducted to establish validity for the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale (SAWS; Webster, 2007) and the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS; Ardelt, 2003) measures (see Appendix A & B). In the first study, 38 counselors (median age 31-40) were administered the SAWS, and the results indicated the SAWS is likely a valid measure for the data for this sample of
counselors (see Appendix A). In the second study, 50 counselors (median age 21-40) were administered the SAWS and the 3D-WS, and the results supported the results of the first study in terms of the SAWS measure, and indicated validity, although not as strong, for the 3D-WS with this sample of counselors. The 3D-Ws provided some convergence evidence, with small to large effect sizes for four of the five SAWS factors, specifically; Reflection/Reminiscence, Openness, Humor, and Emotional Regulation (see Appendix B).

The purpose of this survey study was to examine the characteristics of the counselor in terms of wisdom as factors identified by Ardelt (2003), Webster (2007), and Brown and Greene (2006) based on the implicit theoretical models of wisdom proposed by Sternberg (1985a), Hanna and Ottens (1995), and Bluck and Glück (2005) which included cognitive ability, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, real-world skills, and emotional intelligence. The independent variable, the wisdom of the counselor, was measured by the self-assessments of wisdom; the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS; Ardelt, 2003), the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale (SAWS; Webster, 2007), and the Wisdom Development Scale (WDS; Brown & Greene, 2006).

The 3D-WS measured three dimensions of wisdom, the affective dimension, the reflective dimension, and the cognitive dimension. The SAWS measured five factors of wisdom, critical life experience, openness, reflection or reminiscence, emotional regulation, and humor. The WDS measured six components of wisdom, with two subcomponents; self-knowledge, interpersonal understanding (altruism, inspirational engagement), judgment, life knowledge, life skills (life skills, emotional management), and willingness to learn. The wisdom of the counselor was compared to the therapeutic
working alliance, measured by the Working Alliance Inventory – Short Form (WAI-S-T; Tracey & Kokotovic, 1989). The study examined the variability in the therapeutic working alliance explained by the wisdom of the counselor as measured by the 3D-WS, the SAWS and the WDS.

Based on the review of literature, the field of counselor education and supervision is strengthened by the valuable research provided by this study about the wisdom of the counselor and the counselor’s perception of the therapeutic working alliance.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter provides an explanation of the research design of the study. This includes a detailed description of the participants, variables, instruments, procedures, and data analysis. The traits of wisdom measured by the three factors of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, the five factors of the Self-Assessment of Wisdom Scale, and the eight factors of the Wisdom Development Scale were examined in relation to the professional counseling population. These factors are overlapping, therefore they are organized by six conceptual categories determined by the research literature, which include cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, and emotional intelligence. The wisdom of the counselor as measured by each subscale was compared to the counselor's perception of the therapeutic working alliance to determine the variability in the therapeutic working alliance explained by the wisdom of the counselor.

Research Design

The design was selected based on the research questions, which center on the wisdom traits being measured, as well as how strongly the independent variable, the wisdom of the counselor, is related to the dependent variable, the counseling relationship. The correlational design of this study was based on multiple independent variables and one dependent variable. A confirmatory factor analysis and multiple linear regression was used to analyze the data. Twenty-three predictors were used in this study. The
sixteen independent predictors of wisdom are measured by the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3 predictors), the Self-Assessment of Wisdom Scale (5 predictors), and the Wisdom Development Scale (8 predictors). The dependent variable is measured by the Working Alliance Inventory - Short Form Therapist. The six extraneous variables include the demographic items: gender, age, ethnicity, highest degree earned, years of counseling experience, and type of clinical license, if any. The Demographic Questionnaire is represented in Appendix D.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

**Q1** Is the factor structure confirmed for the subscales of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, The Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale, and the Wisdom Development Scale for this data from the professional counseling population?

**H1** The factor structure is confirmed for the subscales of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, The Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale, and the Wisdom Development Scale for this data from the professional counseling population.

**Q2** How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale?

**H2** More than zero percent of the variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the three factors of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale.

**Q3** How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale?

**H3** More variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the five factors of the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale than the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale.

**Q4** How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Wisdom Development Scale?

**H4** More variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the eight factors of the Wisdom Development Scale than the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale and the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale.
Participants

The target population was counselors who currently practice counseling. Counselors of all ages (over the age of 18 years), levels of experience, and educational background were represented in the sample. However, specific representation in each of these groups was not controlled. The sampling frame included counselors who are clinical members of the American Counseling Association (ACA). ACA was founded in 1952, and is identified as the world's largest association exclusively representing professional counselors in various practice settings. ACA is comprised of approximately 45,000 members divided amongst four geographical regions, the Midwestern, North Atlantic, Southern, and Western region of the United States. ACA was contacted and the membership database information was purchased, after approval from the University of Northern Colorado’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). ACA provided a list of randomly selected members, and the potential participant database was created by adding membership data directly into the SurveyMonkey© software.

The ACA members who were eligible for participation were currently working with clients. The working alliance was reported to be sufficiently established to be rated reliably at the third session (Hersoug, Høglend, Havik, von der Lippe, & Monsen, 2009). Therefore, in this study the respondents were eligible for the study if they were currently working with a client for at least three sessions. Since ACA membership does not indicate whether or not a counselor is currently working with clients, potential participants were informed of their eligibility to participate on the pre-survey letter (see Appendix I) and the informed consent (see Appendix C).
Electronic delivery of the surveys was cost effective and non-evasive. However, several contacts were necessary to increase the response rate (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000). Greene and Brown (2009) found better response rate with fewer items to respond. In their study, the surveys with 171 items resulted in lower response rates (11.4%), whereas the 84 item surveys yielded higher response rates (40%). Further, comparison studies have shown that response rates for e-mail distribution increased from 20.7% to 29.8%, almost equal to the mail response rates (31.5%) when a pre-survey postcard was sent prior to the e-mail contact (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004). The present study contained 164 items; therefore due to the higher number of items and the electronic delivery format, a conservative response rate was estimated at 11% (Cook, et al., 2000).

Methods were used which, in other studies, have been effective in yielding higher response rates (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000; Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004). Pre-survey letters were sent by postal mail one week prior to the e-mail distribution list (see Appendix I). One week after the survey was sent, a reminder e-mail was sent to potential participants. Additionally, participants were invited to enter a drawing for a chance to win 1 of 5 ten dollar Starbucks© gift card as an incentive for completing the survey.

Cohen (1992) suggested values for effect size, alpha, and power used in a wide range of social research areas, based on using multiple linear regression analysis. Therefore, the sample size was calculated based on a medium effect size f² equal to .15 which is R² equal to .13, alpha equal to .05, and a power of .80 (Cohen). When these values plus the total of 23 predictors was entered into G-Power© 3.1.2 software (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) the minimum sample size was calculated to be 56.
When the power, or probability of predicting error, was increased to the value of .95 (5% chance of error), the minimum sample size was 90. Based on the estimated 11% response rate, approximately 825 surveys were sent out in order to obtain the target sample size of 90.

The actual sample included 106 participants. The response rate of 22.55% was calculated based on 825 ACA members contacted, and 186 participants attempting to complete the survey. Out of 186 participants who responded, 106 participants (56.99%) completed the study. The completion rate of 7.78% was calculated based on 106 participants fully completing the study. Interestingly, 18 of the 186 participants (10%) responded to the pre-survey letter alone, with 15 participants completing the survey.

Most of those who started but did not complete the survey indicated they did not qualify for the study. Specifically, 38 of the 186 respondents (20.43%) indicated they were not seeing clients currently; and 50 of the 186 respondents (26.88%) indicated they had not seen their client for at least three sessions. It is likely the participants who were not eligible for the study were program faculty or graduate students not yet working with clients.

**Procedure**

Two pilot studies were conducted to validate the measures, as well as to perform and modify the procedures to be used in the present study (see Appendix A & B).

**Pilot Study One**

The purpose of pilot study one was to assess the validity of using the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale (SAWS; Webster, 2003) measure with the professional counseling population. Additionally, the wisdom of the counselor, measured by SAWS
was compared with the counselor’s perception of the working alliance, measured by the Working Alliance Inventory, Therapist Short Form (WAI-S-T; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). The participants were 38 adult counselors from the Rocky Mountain region, 76% female and 24% male, with masters or doctoral degrees in counseling and levels of experience ranging from one to over 20 years.

The results indicated the instruments were valid for this population, and reliability and validity information was reported on each instrument. While the sample size was too small for the results to have substantial statistical power (Cohen, 1988), the results indicated 25% of variability in the working alliance was explained by the traits of wisdom, as measured by the five subscales of the SAWS (see Appendix A).

Several important aspects of the procedural methods were taken into consideration for changes to future studies. First, a couple of the demographic questions were either unclear or too difficult to interpret for the purpose of this study. The question indicating the number of sessions the counselor had with the client was not clear, therefore data was frequently missing. Several participants started taking the survey, but could not complete the WAI-S-T because they were not currently working with a client. Additionally, the WAI-S-T measure had gender biased language. The SAWS measure did not have the scales listed with each question, requiring participants to write in numeric values beside each question, which was awkward and added to the potential for scoring error. Changes to the procedures and instruments based on these findings are detailed further in the proposed study.
Pilot Study Two

The second pilot study was conducted to implement the changes from the first pilot, as well as perform further validation research for the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS; Ardelt, 2003) measure of wisdom to be used with the professional counseling population. In this study wisdom was measured by both the 3D-WS and the SAWS. The wisdom measures were then compared with the counselor’s perception of the working alliance, measured by the Working Alliance Inventory, Therapist Short Form (WAI-S-T; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). The participants were 50 adult counselors from the State of Colorado, specifically 22% male and 78% female from doctoral and master’s degree students and faculty from two different universities in the Rocky Mountain Region of the United States and counselors who attended a National professional counselor organization conference on the Western coast of the United States.

The results indicated the instruments were valid for this population, and reliability and validity information was reported on each instrument. While the sample size was too small for the results to have substantial statistical power (Cohen, 1988), the results indicated 35% of variability in the working alliance was explained by the traits of wisdom, 13% of the variability was uniquely explained by the five subscales of the SAWS and 1% was explained by the 3D-WS (see Appendix B).

In this study, there seemed to be potential for a significant amount of the therapeutic working alliance explained by the wisdom of the counselor and the counselor’s perception of the counseling relationship. The results indicated more variance in the therapeutic working alliance was explained by the five scale measurement of wisdom (SAWS; Webster, 2003) rather than the three scales (3D-WS; Ardelt, 2003),
begging the question as to whether additional wisdom measurements may explain more variance in the therapeutic working alliance. Therefore in the future, additional measurements of wisdom could be added to determine if more variance in the therapeutic working alliance can be uniquely explained by the wisdom characteristics of the counselor.

**The Present Study**

One week after receiving the pre-survey letter via postal mail, the survey was electronically administered via SurveyMonkey© software. Participants received an e-mail with a link to the survey. Potential participants were asked to complete the survey, which took approximately 30 minutes to complete based on the time taken to complete the survey in the pilot studies (see Appendix A & B). The stated purpose was “to examine the relationship between the counselor’s characteristics and the counselor’s perception of the counseling relationship.” Participants were directed to click on a hyperlink which took them to the consent information (see Appendix C). The informed consent notified the potential participant that they qualify for the study if they are currently seeing a client for at least three sessions. They were informed that by clicking “CONTINUE” they are giving their consent to participate in the study.

Only participants currently seeing clients for three or more sessions were allowed to complete the survey. Following the informed consent, participants were asked the questions whether or not they are currently working with a client, and if they had seen the client for at least three sessions. If they answered “NO” to either question, they were directed out of the survey and the screen displayed the message that they did not qualify for the study. If they answered “YES” they were given directions to complete the survey.
At this point, the participant was instructed to provide a response to each item by clicking next to their selected answer. Before completing the Working Alliance Inventory Therapist Short Form, participants were prompted to think of a client with whom they are currently working for at least three sessions.

Participants were informed of the potential risks and benefits associated with participation in the research study. A potential risk as a result of completing the self-assessments could be increased self-awareness about personal characteristics and a potential heightened awareness of the level of satisfaction in the counseling relationship, which may feel uncomfortable if not satisfactory. A potential benefit from participation in the study could be an opportunity to reflect on personal traits related to counseling and satisfaction in the counseling relationship. The possibility of winning a Starbucks® gift card from the random drawing was another potential benefit.

In order to protect the participant’s confidentiality and privacy, SurveyMonkey® is equipped with Secure Sockets Layer® (SSL) encryption, specifically the Verisign® certificate version 3, and 128 bit encryption. The electronic results were encrypted for security and password protected to minimize risk of disclosure, and the database of contact information was not stored or associated with survey results. Duplicate submissions were prevented by settings used in the SurveyMonkey® software. Further, while participants needed to imagine a client they are working with to respond to the Working Alliance Inventory questions, they were at no point prompted or given the opportunity to disclose the identity of their client. Participants were offered information to contact the researchers by address/ mail, e-mail, or telephone, should they have any concerns about their selection or treatment as a research participant. Participants had the
option of providing their e-mail address to be entered into the drawing, and the 5 winners received the gift card by postal mail at the conclusion of the study.

**Variables**

There are limited self-assessment surveys available to measure wisdom, and not all of them are consistent with the most salient variables found in the literature (Bluck & Glück, 2005). For example, Jason, Reichler, King, Madsen, Camancho and Marchese (2001) used the Foundational Values Scale, which measured traits such as harmony and nature, which were inconsistent with other major research on wisdom. Based on the review of literature, the salient variables of wisdom appear to fall into six categories, cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others, and emotional intelligence (see Table 1).

Three survey instruments will be used to measure the independent variable wisdom, the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, the Self-Assessment of Wisdom Scale, and the Wisdom Development Scale. The Three-Dimensional Wisdom Scale is based on an interactive three factor model of wisdom, which include the affective dimension, the cognitive dimension, and the reflective dimension. The Self-Assessment of Wisdom Scale is based on five factors which are critical life experience, reflection/reminiscence, openness, humor, and emotional regulation. The Wisdom Development Scale is based on an eight factor model of wisdom which measures life knowledge, judgment, self-knowledge, willingness to learn, interpersonal understanding, divided into two subcategories of altruism and inspiration engagement/leadership, and life skills, with the subcategory of emotional management. The dependent variable will measured by the Working Alliance Inventory Therapist Short Form (Tracey & Kokotovic, 1989).
Instruments

The Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale

The affective dimension, cognitive dimension, reflective dimension are the three wisdom components measured by the Three-Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-SW; Ardelt, 2003). The survey is based on 39 items on a 5 point Likert-type scale with response options from 1 to 5, with 1 being the response “strongly agree,” and 5 being the response “strongly disagree.” On the cognitive subscale there are 14 items, 12 items (5 reverse scored) on the reflective subscale, and 13 items (3 reverse score) on the affective subscale. Some examples of subscale items include, “There is only one right way to do anything” (cognitive), “I don’t like to get involved listening to other people’s troubles” (affective), and “I would feel much better if my present circumstances changed” (reflective).

The survey was developed with a sample of older adults (age 52-plus years) and the results indicated that the scores from 3D-WS were reliable for the latent variable of wisdom (Ardelt, 2003). Ardelt hypothesized that wisdom traits studied by other researchers all described by either one or more of the affective, cognitive, and reflective dimensions. In the empirical study of the 3D-WS, the reliability was determined by the internal consistency and its individual dimensions based on the sample of adults 52 years and older, with the statistically significant Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .71 to .85.

The significant correlation between the indicators ranging from .30 to .50 were based on confirmatory factor analysis, with statistically significant standardized values ranging from .50 to .84., and the test-retest of the scale yielded insignificant differences between time measurements, with a 10-month test-retest correlation of .85. The subscale
reliability estimates for the first test yielded Cronbach’s alpha equal to .78 for the cognitive dimension, .75 for the reflective dimension, and .74 for the affective dimension. In the re-test, the subscale reliability estimates yielded Cronbach’s alpha of .85, .71, and .72 for each respective dimension. In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha was equal to .80 for the cognitive dimension, .74 for the reflective dimension, and .70 for the affective dimension. For all 39 items on the 3D-WS, Cronbach’s alpha was equal to .88.

**The Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale**

This self-assessment survey was developed by Webster (2003, 2007) measuring the wisdom traits based on five interrelated factors, with 8 items on each subscale: Experience, emotional regulation, reminiscence/reflection, humor, and openness. The SAWS survey was answered on a Likert-type scale with response options from 1 to 6, 1 being the response “strongly disagree”; six being the response “strongly agree.” Sample items include the following for experience, “I have experienced many moral dilemmas;” for emotions, “I am good at identifying subtle emotions within myself;” for reminiscence, “I often think about my personal past;” for openness, “I like being around persona whose views are strongly different than mine;” and for humor, “I often use humor to put others at ease.”

The SAWS was piloted in three studies as a 30-item self-assessment survey. Study one was intended to establish reliability and factor structure of SAWS, and participants were 78 men and 179 women with the mean age of 28.5 (SD = 13.37). The results indicated the total scale scores had acceptable reliability of alpha equal to .78, with factor loadings consistent but overlapping on the five dimensions. The reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales. Study two compared the traits of
wisdom to its opposite, foolishness. The participants were 45 men and 44 women with the mean age of 39 (SD = 17.67) asked to complete the SAWS as they thought a wise person would, then again as a foolish person would.

The results indicated a significant difference between the two tests, \( t \)-test (87) = 9.40, \( p = .000 \), establishing wisdom traits as a separate and discrete latent variable, despite overlap in the five hypothesized dimensions of wisdom. The replication of reliability findings in study one was done in study three, yielding very good scale reliability at alpha equal to .87 (Webster, 2003). Again, the reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales.

In a follow-up study, 73 men and 98 women ranging in age from 17-92, completed the SAWS, the Loyola Generativity Scale, and the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (Webster, 2007). Reliability estimates indicated a high to excellent reliability status for scores from the SAWS with a two-week test-retest reliability, \( r = .84 \) and Cronbach’s alpha = .90 for the total SAWS, demonstrating that the SAWS consistently measured the concept in question. Again, the reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales. Webster (2009) conducted another series of three overlapping studies using SAWS with young adults. Study one (42 women and 19 men, ranging in age from 19-36) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .89 for the total SAWS; study two (33 women and 27 men, ages 17-34) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .90; and the third study (27 men and 35 women, ages 17 to 52) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .88. Again, the reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales.

In the two pilot studies, the openness factor was less reliable with Cronbach’s alpha equal to .63 in the first pilot, and .67 in the second pilot (see Appendix A & B). In
the present study, Cronbach’s alpha was reported for the five subscales as follows: .79 for experience, .84 for emotional regulation, .87 for reminiscence/reflection, .82 for humor, and .74 for openness. For all 40 items on the SAWS, Cronbach’s alpha was equal to .92.

**The Wisdom Development Scale**

The Wisdom Development Scale (WDS) is a 70-item self-assessment which was developed by Brown & Greene (2006), and is comprised of six scales, and two subscales; self-knowledge (4 items), emotional management (5 items), altruism (12 items), inspirational engagement (leadership; 10 items), judgment (8 items), life knowledge (11 items), life skills (11 items), and willingness to learn (5 items) plus 4 demographic items. The responses are rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 7; one being strongly agree, and 7 being strongly disagree. In this study, the 66-items were used, and one of the demographics was omitted “What is your class year?” because it does not apply to the professional counseling population.

The WDS was developed by Brown and Greene (2006) based on Brown’s (2004) conceptual model of wisdom, developed to assist with learning outcomes at the undergraduate college level. Brown’s six-factor structure model of wisdom development included a person’s orientation to learning, experiences, and interactions with others which interact with each other and learning from life, which requires the traits of reflection, integration and application; all contributing to wisdom.

In their initial study, Brown and Greene (2006) created content validity for the WDS by using student and educator focus group interviews to explore Brown’s (2004) implicit model of wisdom, and created the 141-item self-assessment which was then
reduced to 79-items using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. They delivered 7050 surveys electronically, and received 1188 responses, with a response rate of 17%, of which 32.6% were male and 60.7% were female (6.7% did not report). The Cronbach’s alpha for the total WDS score was reported equal to .963 and for seven of the factors, they reported Cronbach’s Alpha of .84 for self-knowledge (6 items), .87 for altruism (14 items), .84 for life knowledge (9 items), .84 for emotional management (9 items), .88 for inspirational engagement (11 items), .88 for judgment (11 items), and .88 for life skills (11 items).

The factor willingness to learn was not found to be significant in this study. From this study, Brown and Greene (2006) concluded that wisdom is best captured by the eight factors of self-knowledge, judgment, life knowledge, willingness to learn, life skills (subscales of life skills and emotional management) and interpersonal understanding (subscales altruism and inspirational engagement).

In a further validity investigation study, Greene and Brown (2009) administered the WDS and the Iowa Student Development Inventory (Hood, 1997) to a sample of 2715 professionals and 338 college students. Greene and Brown chose the Iowa Student Development Inventory because it is based on the work of Chickering and Reisser (1993) and Chickering’s theory of student development had three subscales (developing autonomy, developing purpose, and managing emotions) which correlated with the WDS, as hypothesized.

The results for the professional population yielded Cronbach’s alpha for the total WDS score was equal to .93, and for each subscale Coefficient H was reported equal to .87 for self-knowledge, .90 for altruism, .88 for life knowledge, .84 for emotional
management, .86 for leadership (inspirational engagement), .87 for judgment, .87 for life skills, and .70 for willingness to learn. For the college student population, Cronbach’s alpha was also reported equal to .93 for the total WDS, and for each subscale Coefficient H was reported equal to .85 for self-knowledge, .92 for altruism, .85 for life knowledge, .84 for emotional management, .86 for leadership (inspirational engagement), .88 for judgment, .89 for life skills, and .74 for willingness to learn. From this study, Greene and Brown (2009) concluded that they found evidence of construct validity and reliability for the WDS with both the professional and college population.

In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha was reported for the eight subscales as follows: .91 for self-knowledge, .87 for emotional management, .90 for altruism, .88 for inspirational engagement, .87 for judgment, .87 for life knowledge, .86 for life skills, and .69 for willingness to learn. For all 66 items on the WDS, Cronbach’s alpha was equal to .96.

The Working Alliance Inventory – Short Form Therapist

The dependent variable will be measured by 12-item working alliance inventory (WAI-S) which was developed by Tracey and Kokotovic (1989), with parallel forms for clients and counselors. Participants complete the WAI-T by mentally filling in the blank with the client’s name and answering corresponding to the items based on their response on a seven-point Likert-type scale; one being the response “never” and seven being the response “always.”

The short form is based on the original 36-item Working Alliance Inventory (WAI) developed by Horvath and Greenberg (1989) to measure the working alliance as defined by Bordin (1979). Consistent with Bordin’s (1979) definition of the alliance, the
WAI-S assesses perceptions of three aspects of the therapeutic relationship in terms of agreement on task and goals, and the quality of the bond between counselor and client. The WAI-S produces a total alliance score, as well as scores for the three subscales (Goal, Task, Bond), where the total 12-items are comprised of 4 items from each of the subscales. Tracey and Kokotovic (1989) studied the factor structure of both the client and counselor versions of the WAI-S and concluded that both measures primarily support the general alliance factor, and secondarily the three subscales of goals, task, and bond. They reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .95 for the total score of the counselor’s version.

Busseri and Tyler (2003) have supported the interchangeability of the short and original forms for both the counselor and the client versions for the total and subscale scores, testing the similarities in both the short and original forms with counselors at two different points during counseling. They found high internal consistency reliabilities for both versions, and for the WAI-T, they reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .91 after the fourth session, and .96 at the final session. Carmel and Friedlander (2009) studied 50 men and 56 women counselors who counsel male clients who have committed a sexual offense and their perception of the working alliance and the relation to secondary traumatization. They used the WAI-T, and reported internal consistency reliability estimates Cronbach’s alpha equal to .93. In the present study, for the WAI-S-T Cronbach’s alpha was equal to .85.

Other recent researchers studied the counselor characteristics influencing the quality of the alliance, using both the counselor and client short versions of the WAI and although they did not report internal consistency estimates, they noted on average the counselor’s ratings of the working alliance were lower than the patient’s ratings.
(Hersoug, Høglend, Havik, von der Lippe, & Monsen, 2009). The implications for the current study could be that the use of the WAI-S-T (without the WAI-S-C) will be a conservative estimate of the working alliance, and therefore there could be less of a chance of committing type I error, should significant results be found. Additionally, the study conducted by Hersoug, et al. (2009) supported the use of the total sum score of the WAI-S-T, given that general alliance factor is primary, and the subscales are secondary. One of the limitations of the WAI assessment is that it measures the counselor (or client) perception of the goal and task agreement, rather than an objectively based assessment of this agreement (Long, 2001).

Data Analysis

The data was downloaded directly from the SurveyMonkey© server into an Excel© spreadsheet and imported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences© GradPack 18 (SPSS), which was used for all data analysis. Missing data was handled by replacing a missing value with a value determined by mean imputation, which was derived by taking the mean of all the other answers on that question (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). For the 106 completed surveys, few missing values were found. Surveys with more than 16 missing values, approximately ten percent of the 164 items, would be eliminated from the study. However, the most any one participant missed was 7 items. The total missing values from each instrument were 4 for the WAI-S-T, 21 for the 3D-WS, 22 for the SAWS, and 21 for the WDS.

The demographic information was examined using descriptive statistics in order to describe the sample. The frequencies, means, and percentages of the sample were
reported for gender, age, ethnicity, highest degree earned, years of counseling experience, and type of clinical license.

Violations of the assumptions necessary for multiple linear regression analysis were checked by identifying normality, equal variance, and linearity. For each instrument, the 3D-WS, SAWS, WDS, and WAI-S-T, the data frequencies were examined to look at the range of scores, to check for normality in the distribution of variables and to identify outliers (Cone & Foster, 2006). Outliers were noted, and included in the data analysis. For normality, the frequency distribution of the histogram was examined. For equality of variance and linearity, the scatterplot of standardized residuals and standardized predicted values were examined.

The proper scoring of reversed items was checked. Reversed items on each of the measures were transformed using the data analysis software program to reflect the accurate responses of participants. Reliability analysis was run on all scores in order to report Cronbach’s alpha for the total scores of the 3D-WS, the SAWS, the WDS and the WAI-S-T, as well as for each of the subscales of the 3D-WS, the SAWS, and the WDS.

The first research question and the corresponding data analysis are described as follows:

Q1 Is the factor structure confirmed for the subscales of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, The Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale, and the Wisdom Development Scale for this data from the professional counseling population?

Confirmatory factor analysis was done in order to verify that the factors identified by each instrument, the 3D-WS three factor structure, the SAWS five factor structure and the WDS eight factor structure were confirmed for this sample. In order to assess the factor structure of each instrument, a confirmatory factor analysis was run on each
instrument. Factor loadings were examined for each subscale on each instrument. For the 3D-WS, the reflective, affective and cognitive dimensions; for the SAWS, the critical life experience, humor, reflectivity/reminiscence, emotional regulation, and openness; and for the WDS, self-knowledge, judgment, life knowledge, willingness to learn, life skills (subscales of life skills and emotional management) and interpersonal understanding (subscales altruism and inspirational engagement).

Additionally, the amount of wisdom explained by each of the subscales was determined by reporting the Eigen values with a cut-off value of one (Tobachnek & Fidell, 2007). The hypothesis was that the factor structure is confirmed for the subscales of the 3D-WS, the SAWS, and the WDS for this data from the professional counseling population.

The remaining three research questions and the corresponding data analysis were similar to each other. To determine how much of the variance in the therapeutic working alliance was accounted for by the wisdom of the counselor, as measured by each of the instruments, the coefficient of determination was calculated. The coefficient of determination was obtained by using multiple linear regression analysis with multiple independent variables (scores from each subscale of each instrument) and a single dependent variable, the score from WAI-S-T measuring the working alliance.

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted by entering each of the subscale values for each of the instruments as the independent variable, and the WAI-S-T score as the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination, $R^2$, was reported, as a value and as a percentage of the variance of therapeutic working alliance explained by the total instrument score. For each of the subscales, the standardized coefficient (Beta) and
level of significance was reported. The stronger the value of the correlation, the higher the value of coefficient of determination, which means more variance explained by the independent variable (Kutner, Nachtsheim, & Neter, 2004). The value of $R^2$ ranges between zero and one hundred percent, with one hundred percent being the entire variance explained by the independent variable.

Q2 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale?

To determine how much of the variance in the therapeutic working alliance can be accounted for by the wisdom of the counselor, as measured by the 3D-WS, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted by entering each of the three subscale values for the 3D-WS as the independent variable, and the WAI-S-T score as the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination, $R^2$ was reported as a value and as a percentage of the variance of therapeutic working alliance explained by the total 3D-WS. For each of the three subscales, the standardized coefficient (Beta) and level of significance was reported. The hypothesis was that more than zero percent of the variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the three factors of the 3D-WS.

Q3 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale?

To determine how much of the variance in the therapeutic working alliance can be accounted for by the wisdom of the counselor, as measured by the SAWS, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted by entering each of the five subscale values for the SAWS as the independent variable, and the WAI-S-T score as the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination, $R^2$, was reported as a value and as a percentage of the variance of therapeutic working alliance explained by the total SAWS. For each of the five subscales, the standardized coefficient (Beta) and level of significance was reported.
The hypothesis was that more variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the five factors of the SAWS than the 3D-WS.

Q4 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Wisdom Development Scale?

To determine how much of the variance in the therapeutic working alliance can be accounted for by the wisdom of the counselor, as measured by the WDS, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted by entering each of the eight subscale values for the WDS as the independent variable, and the WAI-S-T score as the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination, $R^2$, was reported as a value and as a percentage of the variance of therapeutic working alliance explained by the total WDS. For each of the eight subscales, the standardized coefficient (Beta) and level of significance was reported. The hypothesis was that more variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the eight factors of the WDS, than both the 3D-WS and the SAWS.

The study was conducted according to the research design described in this chapter. After receiving approval from the IRB at the University of Northern Colorado, the researcher followed the described procedures for sampling and data analysis. Using multiple linear regression, the researcher examined the amount of variance in the therapeutic working alliance which was accounted for uniquely by each of the wisdom measurements, the 3D-WS, the SAWS, and the WDS.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The results from the research study are presented in terms of preliminary and primary analyses. The preliminary analyses addressed the demographic information and qualifying assumptions for using multiple linear regression analysis. The primary analyses were conducted to answer each of the research questions. For the first research question, the results of the factor analysis of each instrument, 3D-WS, SAWS, and WDS is described. For the next three research questions, the relationship between the therapeutic working alliance (WAI-S-T) and the wisdom of the counselor was examined using multiple linear regression analysis. Specifically, the wisdom of the counselor, as measured by each instrument, the 3D-WS, SAWS, and WDS, was reported as a percentage of variance of the therapeutic working alliance.

Preliminary Analyses

Demographic Information

The sample included 106 participants, 83 female (78.3%) and 23 male (21.7%). The race/ethnicity was identified by the 106 participants as follows: 89 Caucasian (84%), 7 African American (6.6%), 3 multiethnic (2.8%), 2 Asian American (1.9%), 2 Latino/Hispanic (1.9%), and 3 identified a race/ethnicity type of “other.” The mean age of the 106 participants was 44.2 years old, with a range of 23 years old to 78 years old.

The mean number of years of clinical experience was 8.1, ranging from no years of experience to 37 years of experience. In terms of highest degree earned, 81 held
masters degrees (76.4%), 15 doctoral (14.2%), and 10 bachelor’s (9.4%). The majority or 54 of the 106 participants were Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC, 50.9%) while 44 or 41.5% of the participants had no license. Other licenses held by participants varied, with one Alcohol Licensed Counselor (ALC, .9%), two Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSW, 1.9%), two Licensed Psychologists (LP, 1.9%), one dually licensed LPC/ LCSW (.9%), one Professional School Counselor (PSC, .9%), and one State Board for Educator Certificate (SBEC, .9%).

Analyses were conducted in order to determine whether age or years of experience significantly impacted the therapeutic working alliance, as measured by the WAI-S-T. One-way ANOVAs were conducted with the therapeutic working alliance, as the dependent variable, and age and years of experience as the independent variables. No significant correlation was found between the therapeutic working alliance and age, with the Pearson correlation coefficient reported at .167. Additionally, no significant correlation was found between the therapeutic working alliance and years of experience, with the Pearson correlation coefficient reported at .131. As expected, age and years of experience were significantly correlated at $r = .599$.

**Assumptions for Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**

The frequencies were distributed normally, with no significant skewness reported at the $<|3.0|$ level of statistical significance. Four of the subscales had slightly higher skewness. For the SAWS instrument the skewness for the experience subscale was -1.02, and for the WDS self-knowledge, emotional management, and altruism subscales the skewness was above one (-2.44, -1.57, and -1.35 respectively). However, the slight skewness was not considered to be severe enough to violate the assumption of normality
necessary for the multiple linear regression analysis. For equality of variance and linearity, the scatterplots of standardized residuals indicated equality of variance and linearity.

Internal consistency for each instrument was reported for total scores of the 3D-WS, the SAWS, the WDS and the WAI-S-T, as well as for each of the subscales of the 3D-WS, the SAWS, and the WDS. Table 2 represents the reliability of each instrument based on Cronbach’s Alpha for the instrument and each of the subscales, including the number of items on each scale and the Likert scale with the range of possible scores.
Table 2

Reliability of the WAI-S-T, 3D-WS, SAWS, and WDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Likert Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAI-S-T</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D-WS</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Dimension</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Dimension</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Dimension</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Regulation</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminiscence/Reflection</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Knowledge</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Management</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Engagement</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Knowledge</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Learn</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=106 for all instruments

Primary Analyses

Factor analysis was the method of data reduction used to identify the underlying variables (specific wisdom traits) that are reflected in the observed variable (wisdom).

To answer the first research question, the factor structure of each instrument was examined using varimax rotation with the maximum iterations of convergence set to 25.
Varimax rotation method was used because it is an orthogonal rotation method which does not allow factors to be correlated, as opposed to an oblique rotation method, such as promax rotation where factors are permitted to be correlated with one another (Tobachnek & Fidell, 2007).

The factor loadings were examined by looking at the rotated factor matrix and scree plot for the components on each instrument. To address multicollinearity, the rotated factor matrix was examined and items which did not load or cross-load onto several components were eliminated. A final principle component analysis with varimax rotation was conducted with the remaining items and the rotated factor matrix and scree plots for each instrument were examined. Lastly, the amount of wisdom explained by each of the subscales was determined by the Eigen values with a cut-off value of one (Tobachnek & Fidell, 2007). The specifics of each of these analyses and results are detailed below.

Q1 Is the factor structure confirmed for the subscales of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, The Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale, and the Wisdom Development Scale for this data from the professional counseling population?

H1 The factor structure is confirmed for the subscales of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale, The Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale, and the Wisdom Development Scale for this data from the professional counseling population.

Factor Analysis for the 3D-WS

The factor structure of the 3D-WS was expected to reveal 3 factors; the reflective dimension, the affective dimension, and the cognitive dimension. In order to determine whether the factor structure was confirmed for the 3D-WS, a rotated factor matrix was generated using the varimax rotation method, which revealed 17 iterations converging on
the rotation. Upon examination of the rotated factor matrix, several items for the reflective, affective and cognitive dimensions were either cross-loaded or did not load onto components. The items which loaded onto more than one component or did not load onto a component were removed, and the analysis was run again until there was no longer cross-loading or items that did not converge on any iteration. A total of 17 items were removed; 4 from the reflective dimension, 6 from the cognitive dimension, and 7 from the reflective dimension. This left a total of 22 of the original 39 items, 10 for the cognitive dimension, 6 for the reflective dimension, and 6 for the affective dimension.

A principle component analysis was conducted on the remaining 22 items, generating a rotated factor matrix using the varimax rotation method which revealed 7 iterations. The factor loadings for the first component were 3 items from the reflective dimension which ranged from .800 to .660 that explained 20.24% of the variance in wisdom. The second component had four items from the cognitive dimension which ranged from .720 to .527, which explained another 9.87% of the variance. The third component had three affective, two reflective dimension items, with factor loadings ranging from .698 to .504, and an additional 8.26% of the variance of wisdom explained. The remaining four components represented a mixture of 6 cognitive items, 3 affective items and 1 reflective item, with factor loadings ranging from .720 to .513. These 7 components described a total of 61.41% of the variance in wisdom. Table 3 shows the Eigen values for the 3D-WS.

The hypothesis was partially confirmed in terms of confirming the three factor model for the 3D-WS, since the scree plot was examined (see Figure 1) and four components were identified more clearly than the others. The four components most
closely resembled the reflective dimension, the cognitive dimension, the affective/reflective dimension, and a combination of the cognitive and affective dimension (Ardelt, 2003, 3D-WS). When the first four factors were examined, 44.93% of the total variance in wisdom was explained.
Table 3

*EigenValues for 3D-WS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigen values</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>20.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>30.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>38.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>44.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>51.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>56.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>61.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>65.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>69.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>73.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>76.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>79.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>82.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>85.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>87.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>90.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>92.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>93.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>95.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>96.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>98.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>99.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Factor Analysis for the SAWS

The factor structure of the SAWS was expected to expose 5 factors; experience, emotional regulation, reflection/reminiscence, humor, and openness. In order to determine whether the factor structure was confirmed for the SAWS, a rotated factor matrix was generated using the varimax rotation method, which revealed the rotation converged on 11 iterations. Upon examination of the component matrix, several items for the openness, humor and reflection/reminiscence dimensions were either cross-loaded or did not load onto components. The items from the five subscales which loaded onto more than one component or did not load onto a component were removed, and the
analysis was run again until there was no longer cross-loading or items that did not converge on any iteration. A total of 9 items were removed, 3 from openness, 2 from humor, 2 from reflection/reminiscence, 1 from experience and 1 from emotional regulation. This left a total of 31 of the original 40 items, 5 for openness, 6 for humor, 6 for reflection/reminiscence, 7 for experience and 7 for emotional regulation.

A rotated factor matrix was generated with the remaining 31 items using the varimax rotation method, and the rotation converged on 8 iterations. The principle component analysis exhibited clear factor loadings for two of the five subscales of SAWS; reflectivity/reminiscence and critical life experience. The rotated factor matrix for the items on the SAWS measure and corresponding scree plot (see figure 2) was examined and the first component was comprised of 7 items from the reflection/reminiscence subscale, with factor loadings ranging from .795 to .607. The reflection/reminiscence component described 28.14% of the variance in wisdom. The second component which emerged included 5 items from the critical life experience subscale, the factor loadings ranging from .771 to .545 which explained another 9.17% of the variance in wisdom.

The third component included 2 items from emotional regulation, 2 items from openness, and 1 item from critical life experience subscales. The factor loadings ranged from .779 to .535, explaining another 7.22% of the variance in wisdom. The fourth subscale emerging was comprised of three items from emotional regulation and one from the humor subscale with factor loadings ranging from .765 to .607 with another 5.99% of the variance in wisdom explained. Three humor items comprised the fifth component, with factor loadings ranging from .764 to .718, and explaining 4.54% of the variance in
wisdom. Three openness items loaded onto the sixth component, with values ranging from .757 to .591 and 4.33% of the variance in wisdom explained. Table 4 shows the Eigen values for the SAWS.

The hypothesis was confirmed for a five factor model for the SAWS, when the scree plot was examined (see Figure 2), and five components were feasible in the model. The five components closely resemble the SAWS subscales: reflection/reminiscence, critical life experience, emotional regulation, humor, and openness (Webster, 2007). The total of 5 components identified explained a cumulative 55.06% of the variance in wisdom as measured by the SAWS.
Table 4

*Eigen Values for SAWS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigen values</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.004</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>28.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.935</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>37.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>44.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>50.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>55.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>59.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>63.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>66.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>69.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>72.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>75.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>77.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>79.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>81.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>83.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>85.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>86.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>88.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>89.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>91.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>92.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>93.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>94.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>95.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>96.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>96.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>97.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>98.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>98.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>99.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>99.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Figure 2. Scree plot for SAWS.

Factor Analysis for the WDS

The factor structure of the WDS was expected to identify 8 factors; self-knowledge, emotional management, altruism, inspirational engagement, judgment, life-knowledge, life skills, and willingness to learn. In order to determine whether the factor structure was confirmed for the WDS, an initial rotated factor matrix was generated using varimax rotation which revealed 15 iterations. Several items from the eight subscales were either cross-loaded or did not load onto components. A total of 36 items were removed, 4 from self-knowledge, 3 from emotional management, 6 from altruism, 2 from inspirational engagement, 7 from judgment, 5 from life knowledge, 7 from life skills, and
2 from willingness to learn. The self-knowledge scale was completely removed (4 items), leaving 7 of the 8 subscales for the multiple regression analysis; a total of 30 of the original 66 items, 2 for emotional management, 6 for altruism, 8 for inspirational engagement, 1 for judgment, 6 for life knowledge, 4 for life skills, and 3 for willingness to learn.

A final rotated factor matrix was generated with the 30 items, using the varimax rotation method, which revealed a convergence of 6 iterations. When the rotated factor matrix was examined, the items which explain the first component were comprised of all 6 items from the altruism subscale, with factor loadings ranging from .789 to .634, with 40.41% of the variance in wisdom explained. The next component had the entire 6 items from the life knowledge subscale with values ranging from .811 to .523 and another 8.28% of the variance in wisdom explained by this component.

The third component explained an additional 6.19% of the variance in wisdom, with factor loadings ranging from .799 to .710. The third component was represented by the 2 items for emotional management and 3 items from inspirational engagement with factor loadings. The fourth component was made up of 2 out of the 4 items from life skills with values of .737 and .704, explaining 5.27% of the variance in wisdom. The fifth component had the remaining 2 items from life skills, 2 from willingness to learn and the only 1 (out of 8) from the judgment subscale. The factor loading values ranged .679 to .505 and 4.57% of the variance explained. The last component was 4 items from the inspirational engagement subscale with values ranging from .774 to .632, and another 3.91% variance in wisdom explained.
For the WDS, the 8 factor model was partially confirmed with a total of 6 components which explained a cumulative 68.63% of the variance in the independent variable wisdom. Factor analysis of the WDS indicated clear factor loadings for six subscales; altruism, life knowledge, emotional management, life skills, willingness to learn, and inspirational engagement (Brown & Greene, 2006). Judgment and Self-Knowledge were not identified clearly as distinct factors. The Eigen values the WDS are displayed in Table 5, and the scree plot represented by Figure 3.
Table 5

*Eigen Values for WDS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigen Values</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.315</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>40.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.317</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>48.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>60.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>64.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>68.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>71.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>74.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>76.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>79.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>81.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>85.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>86.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>88.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>90.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>91.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>92.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>93.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>94.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>95.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>96.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>97.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>98.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>98.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>99.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Summary of Factor Analysis

The hypothesis was partially confirmed for the factor structure of the subscales of the 3D-WS, the SAWS, and the WDS for the data from the professional counseling participants. The identification of the subscales was determined by the factor loading, the Eigen value, as well as the percentage of variance in wisdom explained by the subscale. For the 3D-WS, there were four factors, with the reflective dimension as the most pronounced component, explaining 20.24% out of the cumulative 44.93% of the variance in wisdom. The cognitive dimension was clearly the second factor explaining 9.87% of...
the variance in wisdom, however, six cognitive items also loaded onto the other factors. The affective dimension was pronounced as the third component, with two reflective items present. The fourth factor had items from both the cognitive, affective, and reflective dimensions.

For the SAWS, there were five factors and clarity in the factor loadings for the reflection/reminiscence and critical life experience subscales which explained a cumulative 37.31% out of a total 55.06% of the variance in wisdom. The other three components, emotional regulation, humor and openness explained less variance in wisdom (7.22%, 5.99% and 4.54%), although each had recognizable factor loadings. The WDS measure had a total of 6 factors, with three identifiable factor loadings for altruism, life knowledge, and inspirational engagement. The other three factors were less pronounced; emotional management, life skills, and willingness to learn. Judgment and self-knowledge were not identified.

When the most evident subscales from the resulting factor analyses of each instrument were compared, some items are similar, while others were not. For example, the reflective dimension from the 3D-WS contained few items comparable to the reflection/reminiscence dimension of SAWS. The items from the 3D-WS were comprised of perspective-taking, personal problem solving, and resentment items. The SAWS contained items more related to inward self-awareness, with items such as “I often think about my personal past.” Perspective taking was represented by openness (SAWS) and judgment (WDS). Personal problem solving was related to critical life experience (SAWS) and life skills (WDS). Life skills were represented by existential items such as “I have a sense of purpose in my life” and “I attend to the important matters in my life.”
While the WDS did not have a reflective dimension per se, the items comprising the life knowledge were comparable to the reflection/reminiscence subscale from SAWS. When the life knowledge (WDS) subscale was compared to the reflection/reminiscence (SAWS) subscale, there were similarities in the items. For example, on the WDS item 42 stated, “I reflect on my life regularly” and item 44 “I look for the deeper meaning of events in life.” For the SAWS, item 8 said, “I often think about my personal past” and item 28 “recalling my earlier days helps me gain insight into important life matters.” There were comparable items on the SAWS reflection/reminiscence subscale which included item 18, “Reviewing my past helps me gain perspective on current concerns” and item 3, “I often think about connections between my past and present.” These similarities indicated that life knowledge (WDS) was akin to reflection/reminiscence (SAWS).

Altruism was the most pronounced subscale for the WDS, which was represented by items similar to humor and emotional regulation (SAWS). For example, WDS item 18 stated “I have compassion towards others,” while the SAWS humor subscale item 39 said, “I can make fun of myself to comfort others.” And SAWS emotional regulation item 37 stated, “It seems I have a real talent for reading other people’s emotions.” The affective dimension (3D-WS) was more related to compassion towards others (interpersonal) than emotional regulation (intrapersonal); with the item, “Sometimes I feel a real compassion for everyone.”

In conclusion, the factor structures for each instrument were partially confirmed with the current data from the professional counseling population. The 3D-WS represented each of the 3 factors (reflective, cognitive, and affective dimensions), plus a
factor with a combination of the dimensions. SAWS had the five factors (reflection/reminiscence, experience, openness and humor), and WDS had six of eight factors which included altruism, life knowledge, emotional management, inspirational engagement, life skills, and willingness to learn. Judgment and self-knowledge were not identified clearly, perhaps due to the lack of items (0 for self-knowledge) and the only judgment item which loaded within the life skills component.

In order to answer the remaining three research questions, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted in order to determine the variability in the therapeutic working alliance accounted for by the specific wisdom traits represented in each of the three measures; the 3D-WS, SAWS and WDS. The variability in the therapeutic working alliance that could be accounted for by wisdom, as measured by each of the instruments, was reported in terms of the coefficient of determination. Multicollinearity diagnostics were checked by comparing of each of the variance inflation factors (VIF) for each subscale with the tolerance level of 10 for multicollinearity.

Q2 **How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale?**

_H2 More than zero percent of the variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the three factors of the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale._

The amount of variability in the therapeutic working alliance accounted for by the 3D-WS was reported as the coefficient of determination, which was $R^2 = .114$. In other words, 11.4% of the variance of therapeutic working alliance was explained by the total 3D-WS. A significant relationship between the 3D-WS and the therapeutic working alliance was reported at the level of significance of $p = .006$. For each of the three subscales, the standardized coefficients (Beta) were .238 ($p = .027$) for the cognitive
dimension, -.031 (p = .774) for the affective dimension, and .178 (p = .112) for the reflective dimension. The multicollinearity diagnostics indicated VIF’s below the tolerance level, specifically ranging from 1.29 to 1.37 for all three subscales, therefore multicollinearity was not significant.

The hypothesis was confirmed, with more than zero percent of the variability in the therapeutic working alliance explained by the three factors of the 3D-WS (11.4%). The cognitive dimension is significant at p = .027, and the reflective dimension is close to significance at p = .112, which indicated the importance of these two components of wisdom when explaining the variance in the therapeutic working alliance. The affective dimension was not as pronounced, which is expected upon examination of the factor analysis which identified the affective dimension with items loading onto a combination of several different factors.

Q3  How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale?

H3  More variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the five factors of the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale than the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale.

The amount of variability in the therapeutic working alliance accounted for by the SAWS was reported as the coefficient of determination, which was $R^2 = .179$. In other words, 17.9% of the variance of therapeutic working alliance was explained by the total SAWS. The level of significance was reported at $p = .001$. For each of the five subscales, standardized coefficients (Beta) were reported at .112 ($p = .348$) for experience, .387 ($p = .005$) for emotional regulation, -.103 ($p = .323$) for reminiscence/reflection, .126 ($p = .216$) for humor, and -.122 ($p = .307$) for openness. The multicollinearity diagnostics indicated VIF’s below the tolerance level, specifically
ranging from 2.21 to 1.25 for all five subscales, therefore multicollinearity was not a significant factor.

The SAWS was reported to have a significant relationship with the therapeutic working alliance at $p = .001$. However, four out of the five scales individually were not significantly correlated with the therapeutic working alliance. The emotional regulation subscale was significantly correlated with the therapeutic working alliance at $p = .005$. The importance of emotional regulation for professional counselors is consistent with the expectation that counselors have the ability to sufficiently identify and manage emotions. The significance of emotional regulation in wisdom is explored further in the discussion. The hypothesis was confirmed, with more variability in the therapeutic working alliance explained by the five factors of the SAWS (17.9%) than the 3D-WS (11.4%).

Q4 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the Wisdom Development Scale?

**H4 More variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the eight factors of the Wisdom Development Scale than the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale and the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale.**

The amount of variability in the therapeutic working alliance accounted for by the WDS was reported as the coefficient of determination, which was $R^2 = .257$. In other words, 25.7% of the variance of therapeutic working alliance was explained by the total WDS. For each of the seven subscales the standardized coefficients (Beta) and level of significance was reported at -.013 ($p = .911$) for emotional management, .052 ($p = .665$) for altruism, .052 ($p = .130$) for inspirational engagement, -.107 ($p = .367$) for judgment, .298 ($p = .028$) for life knowledge, .190 ($p = .159$) for life skills, and -.109 ($p = .432$) for willingness to learn. The multicollinearity diagnostics indicated VIF’s well below the
tolerance level, specifically ranging from 2.98 to 1.82 for all seven subscales, therefore multicollinearity was not a significant factor.

A significant relationship between the WDS and the therapeutic working alliance was reported at $p = .000$; additionally, the life knowledge component was significant at $p = .028$, and inspirational engagement (leadership) and life skills were close to significance at $p = .130$ and $p = .159$ respectively. The results indicate the importance of these three components of wisdom when explaining the variance in the therapeutic working alliance.

The hypothesis was confirmed that more variability in the therapeutic working alliance was explained by the WDS (25.7%), than both the 3D-WS (11.4%) and the SAWS (17.9%). Table 6 represents the variance in the therapeutic working alliance which is described by the 3D-WS, the SAWS and the WDS in terms of the coefficient of determination $R^2$. The standardized coefficients (Beta) and the level of significance were reported at the $p < .01$ and $p < .05$ levels of significance.
Table 6

The Variance in the Therapeutic Working Alliance Accounted for by 3D-WS, SAWS and WDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>(Beta)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3D-WS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>.006*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.027**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Life Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminiscence/Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.028**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Learn</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *significant at p < .01; ** significant at p < .05

As expected, each measure (3D-WS, SAWS, and WDS) described progressively more variance in the therapeutic working alliance (11.4%, 17.9%, and 25.7% respectively). The significant relationship between each measure as a whole and the therapeutic working alliance was consistent with the definition of wisdom as a set of cognitive, affective, and reflective personal characteristics that are interactive, as well as both interpersonal and intrapersonal in nature (Sternberg, 1998).
The wisdom of the counselor as measured by each instrument described a significant amount of variance in the therapeutic working alliance, and several of the individual subscales were significant. There was significance with the cognitive and reflective dimensions from the 3D-WS, the emotional regulation subscale from the SAWS, and the life knowledge, life skills, and inspirational engagement subscales from the WDS. While each individual trait was important, the traits have increasing significance in combination with each other. These results indicated that the wisdom of the counselor included a combination of traits, which together impacted the therapeutic working alliance more than the individual components alone.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The therapeutic working alliance has been described as the most important factor in explaining the outcomes in counseling (Lambert, 1992; Wampold, 2001). The therapeutic working alliance is the relational context in which the counselor works with the client to restore hope, identify goals, and approaches to treatment which best meet the client’s needs. The counselor’s personal traits are central to building an effective counseling relationship. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the traits of wisdom of the counselor explained the effectiveness of the therapeutic working alliance. The findings of the current study indicated that the wisdom of the counselor accounted for a significant portion of the counselor’s perception of the therapeutic working alliance.

In this chapter, details of the findings are summarized and interpreted. The context for the findings is described in terms of convergence and divergence with past and present research, as well as contributions to the literature. The implications of the findings are discussed, with a focus on the application of wisdom concepts to theory and practice in counselor education and supervision. The limitations of the current study are addressed. Finally, future directions in the area of researching wisdom are suggested.

Summary of Findings

The results indicated a significant amount of the variance in the therapeutic working alliance was accounted for by the wisdom traits of the counselor.
The wisdom of the counselor, as measured by each instrument, the 3D-WS, SAWS, and WDS, accounted for an increasing amount of variance of the therapeutic working alliance. Specifically, more variability in the therapeutic working alliance was explained by the wisdom of the counselor as measured by the eight factor instrument (WDS; 25.7%), than the five factor instrument (SAWS; 17.9%) and the three factor instrument (3D-WS; 11.4%). The measures exhibited strong internal validity for each instrument as well as the subscales (see Table 2).

This study included 106 participants, with the average participant represented by a 44 year old Caucasian female, Licensed Professional Counselor, with 8 years of clinical experience. The counselor’s age \( (r = .167) \) and years of experience \( (r = .131) \) were not found to be significant in the therapeutic working alliance. Naturally, a person’s age was significantly correlated with years of experience \( (r = .599) \). The lack of significant correlation between age and the wisdom of the counselor was consistent with previous findings (Ardelt, 2003; Webster, 2007) and with the second pilot study (see Appendix B). In terms of the effect of years of experience on the counselor’s wisdom, the second pilot findings also indicated no significance for years of experience \( [F (2, 50) = 1.1, p = .41; \text{see Appendix B}] \). The lack of effect on the therapeutic working alliance from the counselor’s age and years of experience suggested that chronological age and numbers of years of experience were not important to the wisdom of the counselor.

Factor analysis was used to verify the factor structures for the measures of wisdom (3D-WS, SAWS and WDS). In previous studies, Ardelt (2003) found three (3D-WS), Webster (2007) found five (SAWS), and Brown and Greene (2006) found eight factors; however in the current study between four and six factors were identified by the
measures for wisdom. The factor structures for each instrument were partially confirmed with the current data from the professional counseling participants. The 3D-WS represented each of the 3 factors (reflective, cognitive, and affective dimensions), plus a factor with a combination of the dimensions. SAWS had the five factors (emotional regulation, reflection/reminiscence, experience, openness and humor), and WDS had six of eight factors which included altruism, life knowledge, life skills, emotional management, inspirational engagement, and willingness to learn; however, judgment and self-knowledge were not identified as distinct factors.

The subscales from each instrument which were identified by the factor analyses were compared to identify overlapping definitions. The wording and intention of each item within the subscale was compared to subscales from the other measures. Emotional regulation was found to be a significant component in the wisdom of the counselor. Emotional regulation (SAWS) was somewhat related to emotional management (WDS), with the emotional management items which were primarily intrapersonal; “I manage my emotions effectively” and “I keep cool in stressful situations.” Upon analyses of the factor loadings, the emotional management items were imbedded in the inspirational engagement or leadership subscale (WDS), which was identified as significant in this study.

The affective dimension (3D-WS) was not as pronounced and was not found to be significant in this study. The items representing the affective dimension were a combination of interpersonal attributes and compassion towards others, as well as emotional regulation which was intrapersonal and focused on the individual’s regulation of internal emotional experiences (Ardelt, 2003; Webster, 2007). The items represented
on the SAWS emotional regulation subscale contained both interpersonal and intrapersonal related items, but the focus was clearly and consistently related to emotional intelligence, as defined by Goleman (1995). The emotional regulation subscale (SAWS) was a significant factor in this study, indicating the importance of emotional intelligence as a component of wisdom.

As described in the results section, the items from reflective dimension from the 3D-WS were closely related to the reflection/ reminiscence dimension of SAWS. The 3D-WS was comprised of items representing perspective-taking and personal problem solving. Perspective taking was also represented on the openness (SAWS); however this was not found to be a significant factor in this study. Personal problem solving was an attribute included in critical life experience (SAWS) and life skills (WDS). The reflective dimension (3D-WS), life knowledge and life skills (WDS) were found in the current study to be significant components of the counselor’s wisdom.

As described in the results, life knowledge (WDS) was comprised of items which were comparable to the reflection/ reminiscence subscale (SAWS) and reflective dimension (3D-WS). For the WDS, it would appear that self-knowledge subscale would represent self-awareness or self-reflectivity; however, these questions were eliminated since they did not load onto any components. Upon closer examination of the items, each of the four statements began with; “I am well aware of all of my…” and ended with a term; weaknesses, values, interests, and beliefs. These items seem to contradict Sternberg’s (1985a) wisdom description in which one recognizes the limitations of knowledge; therefore it would be difficult to know “all.”
Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted in order to determine the variability in the therapeutic working alliance accounted for by the specific wisdom traits represented in each of the three measures; the 3D-WS, SAWS and WDS. In relation to the pilot studies, the amount of variance in the therapeutic working alliance accounted for by the wisdom traits of the counselor was comparable to the current study.

In the pilot studies, the therapeutic working alliance was the dependent variable measured by the WAI-S-T, with wisdom traits as the independent variable measured by the SAWS (Pilot One; Appendix A) and then both SAWS and the 3D-WS (Pilot Two; Appendix B). The amount of variability in the therapeutic working alliance explained uniquely by wisdom as measured by the SAWS was 17.9% (n = 106) in this study; as compared to 25% (n = 38) in the first pilot study, and 13% (n = 50) in the second pilot study. The 3D-WS was added in the second pilot study, and accounted for only 1% (n = 50) of the therapeutic working alliance; as compared to 11.4% (n = 106) in the current study.

Each measurement of wisdom as a whole was related significantly to the therapeutic working alliance with 3D-WS (p = .006), SAWS (p = .001), and WDS (p = .000). Three of the subscales of wisdom significantly explained a portion of the therapeutic working alliance; the cognitive dimension (3D-WS; p = .027), emotional regulation (SAWS; p = .005), and life knowledge (WDS; p = .028). Additionally, the reflective dimension (3D-WS; p = .112), inspirational engagement (WDS; p = .130) and life skills (WDS; p = .159) were close to significant, therefore also indicated as important in the therapeutic working alliance.
Interpretation of Findings

In this study, wisdom was conceptualized within six categories; cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, reflective attitude, concern for others (Bluck & Glück, 2005) and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995). Based on the findings in the current study, a combination of traits represented the wisdom of the counselor which explained a significant amount of the counselor’s perception of the working alliance. The specific wisdom traits of the counselor, in order of importance to the therapeutic working alliance, were emotional regulation (SAWS), the cognitive dimension (3D-WS), life knowledge/life skills (WDS), the reflective dimension (3D-WS), and inspirational engagement or leadership (WDS).

Emotional regulation (SAWS) was found to be a significant factor in the therapeutic working alliance in this study. Webster (2003) defined emotional regulation as “an exposure to and appropriate regulation of the full spectrum of human emotions; an ability to distinguish among subtle and mixed emotions; an acceptance of and openness to both positive and negative affective states” (p. 16). These results supported previous assertions that the counselor’s ability to regulate and experience a range of emotions was an essential aspect in the wisdom of the counselor (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Webster, 2007). For example, when countertransference is experienced in the counseling relationship, the counselor must reflect on and manage personal emotional reactions in order to maintain a sense of objectivity and priority of the client’s best interest.

According to the findings, the cognitive dimension (3D-WS) of the counselor significantly impacted the therapeutic working alliance. The cognitive dimension (3D-WS) was represented by items which describe the counselor’s knowledge and the ability
to make decisions based on critical life experiences, cognitive flexibility, and tolerance of ambiguity (Ardelt, 2003). When compared to the other measures, the cognitive dimension (3D-WS) was similar to life skills and judgment as identified by Greene & Brown (2009). Life skills (WDS) were also found to be a significant wisdom trait in the wisdom of the counselor, characterized by the ability to prioritize and manage life tasks, as well as maintain a sense of personal responsibility for one’s own life. The item from the judgment (WDS) subscale was also included in the life skills factor, which was related to cognitive flexibility. Life skills are a significant factor in the wisdom of the counselor, and most closely related to the real-world skills identified by Bluck and Glück (2005).

Bluck and Glück (2005) stated that cognitive abilities are realized through real-world skills, which requires cognitive flexibility, the tolerance of ambiguity, as well as the ability to think about thinking, known as metacognition (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Sternberg, 1985a). The cognitive dimension was found to be an important wisdom characteristic of the counselor in this study. The significance of the cognitive dimension (3D-WS) and life skills (WDS) found in this study support the concept that cognitive abilities and real-world skills are both necessary components of wisdom, as presented by Bluck and Glück (2005). In a successful counseling relationship, these wisdom traits allow a counselor to remain open and flexible while helping people with different cultural backgrounds, beliefs and values (Hanna, Bemak & Chung, 1999).

In this study, the reflective dimension (3D-WS) was found to be an important wisdom trait of the counselor. The reflective dimension (3D-WS) had items based on the ability to understand multiple perspectives, and not allowing emotions such as resentment
and anger to interfere with the ability to make sound decisions. Both cognitive and reflective traits (3D-WS) had items which were similar to reflection/reminiscence (SAWS). Reflection/reminiscence (SAWS) represented the desire to reflect on and learn from critical life experiences, and openness characterized by the will to learn from different experiences (Webster, 2007). These findings support the indication that wisdom is the result of a person’s reflection and learning from critical life experiences (Brown & Greene, 2006). Based on these findings, the counselor’s self-awareness gained from personal reflection on critical life experience contributed to their perception of an effective therapeutic working alliance. While it was expected that self-knowledge would represent the counselor’s self-awareness, the self-knowledge (WDS) was not found to be a factor of the wisdom of the counselor, as measured by the WDS.

In the current study, life knowledge (WDS) was significantly related to the therapeutic working alliance. Life knowledge was conceptualized by Brown and Greene (2006) as the ability to understand the interconnectedness between people and the world, and to look at the deeper meaning and questions of life. “Life knowledge is characterized by a capacity to grasp the central issue, find one’s way in a time of darkness, and understand the realities and uncertainties of life, over the life span” (Greene & Brown, 2009, p. 293). These findings validate that the counselor’s ability to recognize the life cycles and underlying subtexts in different life situations as critical when working effectively with clients.

The life knowledge (WDS) subscale was conceptualized as associated with concern for others (Bluck & Glück, 2005). One such example on the life knowledge subscale was, “I am concerned with issues that affect all people.” The person’s ability to
care about a broader context for life represents humility which also opens the possibility for belief in power greater than oneself (Hall, 2010). Since this idea seems closely tied to altruism, it was surprising that altruism (WDS) was not found to be significant in this study. Compassion and sensitivity towards others seem logically related to a counselor’s ability to connect deeply with another person in counseling. These results indicate that while the emotional intelligence of the counselor is crucial, the counselor’s compassion towards a client may not be as critical as expected.

Inspirational engagement or leadership (WDS) was identified as a subscale of interpersonal understanding (Brown & Greene, 2006) and was found as an important wisdom trait of the counselor in this study. Inspirational engagement (WDS) was identified by leadership abilities, such as inspiring others, giving good advice on issues of life, and demonstrating courage when necessary (Brown & Greene, 2006). Items such as, “I communicate effectively with others” and “I am prepared for many situations” were represented on the inspirational engagement subscale. Leadership abilities as a wisdom characteristic were noted by Brown and Greene (2006), but were not identified as a specific part of the other measures of wisdom. Previous literature addressing the wisdom of the counselor does not mentioned leadership traits (Hanna, Bemak & Chung 1999; Hanna & Ottens 1995). However, these findings support the point that an effective therapeutic working alliance requires the counselor to engage the client, to identify treatment approaches, and to collaborate on goals with the client (Bordin, 1979; Horvath & Bedi, 2002).

In summary, a combination of traits represented the wisdom of the counselor based on the six conceptual; cognitive ability, real-world skills, insight, a reflective
attitude, concern for others (Bluck & Glück, 2005) and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995). The specific wisdom traits of the counselor related to the six conceptual categories were emotional regulation (SAWS; emotional intelligence), the cognitive dimension (3D-WS; cognitive ability), life knowledge (WDS; insight), life skills (WDS; real-world skills), the reflective dimension (3D-WS; reflective attitude), and inspirational engagement or leadership (WDS; concern for others). The findings suggested that these wisdom traits of the counselor explained a significant amount of the counselor’s perception of the working alliance. The significant relationship between the wisdom measures and the therapeutic working alliance seem to support Sternberg’s (1985a, 1998) definition of wisdom as a set of cognitive, affective, and reflective personal characteristics that are interactive, as well as both interpersonal and intrapersonal in nature.

Implications

The importance of the wisdom of the counselor in the counseling relationship has been supported. The wisdom traits represented by the findings in this study included emotional intelligence, cognitive ability, insight, real-world skills, a reflective attitude, and inspiration engagement which is identified with concern for others. The counselor’s wisdom abilities extend beyond cognitive ability, and are essentially relational (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Sternberg, 1998). The experience of wisdom within the counseling relationship can extend to other relationships, with co-workers, friends, family and intimate partners. The significance of the counselor’s wisdom abilities has important implications for counselor education and supervision.
Wisdom in Counselor Education

The findings have suggested a significant impact of the wisdom traits of the counselor on the therapeutic working alliance, therefore incorporating these wisdom related abilities into counselor education seems important in training future counselors. Counselor educators can consider the potential counselor’s wisdom abilities at the outset, as well as the willingness or capacity for the development of wisdom. In counselor education, the importance of wisdom can be emphasized from the acceptance of a student into the counselor education program to graduation and beyond in their development as a master counselor. Wisdom traits can be identified, evaluated, and experienced in the learning environment at each stage of counselor development (Stoltenberg, 1981).

According to Stoltenberg’s (1981) stages of counselor development, level one is the initial stage of counselor development, when the counselor has little to no experience in counseling. The wisdom traits of a potential counselor can be identified during the application process. The findings in this study suggest that a potential counselor could be assessed for wisdom abilities, such as their cognitive ability, insight, and real-world skills. Typically, students must submit an application to be accepted into a counselor education program. The cognitive ability to succeed at the graduate level is typically evidenced by the applicant’s undergraduate grade point average (GPA) and perhaps their graduate record examination (GRE) scores. Another part of the application can include a self-reflective autobiographical essay to identify critical life experiences and personal qualities that may either enhance or limit the ability to counsel. The face-to-face interview can involve individual and group discussion about a case involving a complex problem or culturally diverse situation. The activity is designed to assess the applicant’s
wisdom traits, such as concern for others, cognitive flexibility, and understanding multiple perspectives.

The wisdom traits identified as significant in the therapeutic working alliance, such as emotional regulation, life knowledge, and leadership abilities can be integrated into the student performance evaluation. The student performance evaluation can be used to help identify the strengths and weaknesses of the student throughout the program. Both formative and summative evaluations are helpful for student development throughout a counselor education program (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). The student performance evaluation provides a concrete measure of the wisdom traits in the student’s developmental progress in areas such as counselor communication skills, professional identity, ethical decision making, and use of supervision. Wisdom traits found in this study to be important such as self-awareness or awareness of limitations, and the ability to understand the context of a client’s problem can be incorporated in the student performance evaluation.

The student performance evaluation can be utilized at each stage of counselor development, with the goal of validating the strong wisdom traits and identifying areas for growth. Instructors and supervisors can work with students to create action plans for targeting areas of growth. When a student falls below expected levels of performance, plans for remediation can be put in place to incorporate specific aspects of wisdom development.

**Wisdom in Counselor Education Coursework**

A counselor education program can be designed for optimal facilitation of the development of the counselor in training, including the wisdom of the counselor.
Scholars have suggested that wisdom traits can be taught and learned (Hall, 2010; Hanna, 2002). According to Hall (2010) wisdom traits, such as compassion, can be developed through cognitive exercises such as mindfulness and mediation. In the first stage of counselor development, the foundation of knowledge, in wisdom related terms cognitive ability, is established by completing core academic coursework. The foundational courses typically include topics in human growth and development, abnormal psychology, professional identity and ethics, cultural issues and social justice, and theories of counseling. The wisdom characteristics important for the counselor and the counseling relationship, such as reflectivity, insight, and judgment can be incorporated throughout the counselor education curriculum.

In each class, journaling assignments in each class can help the student increase self-awareness by asking them to reflect personally on class material and related life experiences. In human growth and development, students can be challenged to think about different views of human sexuality and moral development. Students can reflect on and learn from their life experiences and process of development. In professional ethics, students are given ethical case dilemmas in which they engage the ethical decision making process. This can give the student an opportunity to reflect on their moral judgment and ability to tolerate ambiguity. In cultural issues and social justice, students can practice understanding multiple perspectives and develop sensitivity to social power and oppression. These are wisdom characteristics which were identified in this study as important to the counselor and the counseling relationship.

In theories of counseling, students learn the historical context of counseling theory. In order to promote development of the counselor’s cognitive and reflective
dimensions of wisdom, including dialectical thinking, the instructor can ask students to reflect on personal experience while comparing different models of counseling (Hanna, Giordano, & Bemak, 1996). Theories of counseling can be conceptualized in terms of schools of thought centered on differing views of problem development, techniques, and goals. Counseling approaches have different emphasis on thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Teyber, 2006). For example, depth and psychoanalytical theories are focused on insight or thoughtful understanding of a client’s past, whereas humanistic and person-centered approaches focus on feelings and here-and-now experiences, and behavioral and solution-focused therapies emphasize utilizing client strengths and making behavioral changes for the future. Interestingly, the balance of thinking, feeling and behaving has been related to wisdom (Ardelt, 2003; Sternberg, 1998).

Understanding counseling theories in relation to each other can help students to integrate seemingly different concepts, which is an exercise in dialectical thinking. Dialectical reasoning was identified with cognitive abilities, which is a significant counselor wisdom trait in the counselor relationship (Hanna & Ottens, 1995). The ability to engage in dialectical reasoning enhances the cognitive ability aspect of wisdom of the counselor. When students are asked to articulate how they understand human behavior and the process of change and growth, they must apply their knowledge with a new awareness of self and others. These foundational academic experiences help the counselor in training begins to develop a personal approach to counseling.

Theoretical approaches to counseling help students to learn effective conceptualization and treatment of client issues (Teyber, 2006), although research has indicated the counseling relationship is the most essential aspect of successful client
outcome (Horvath & Bedi, 2002; Wampold, 2001). In counselor education, students need to learn the specific wisdom traits which have been found to be important in the counseling relationship. Counseling students can make a plan for personal development of their wisdom traits such as emotional regulation, cognitive ability, real-world skills, and insight.

**Wisdom in Supervision**

The counselor’s wisdom traits found to be important in the counseling relationship can also be developed through the clinical supervisory relationship. In the second stage of counselor development the student begins to practice counseling skills with clients (Stoltenberg, 1981). When the student practices counseling micro-skills, such as reflective listening, they have the opportunity to practice expressing empathy. Empathy is an important aspect of wisdom, especially in the demonstration of concern for others. While the definition of empathy remains elusive, Hanna (2002) suggested empathy is crucial to the therapeutic relationship. Hall (2010) imagined empathy as a part of a set of human characteristics and behaviors comprising the wisdom trait of compassion. Compassion is the “transcendent ability to step outside the moat of one’s own self-interest to understand the point of view of another…(compassion) requires us to understand the way another person’s feelings inform his or her intentions and actions” (p. 116). Hanna (2002) suggested exercises, such as role playing various clients in supervision, designed to increase the therapist capacity for empathy.

In the second stage of development, the counselor in training is experiencing the internal conflict of dependency on the supervisor and the need for autonomy (Stoltenberg, 1981). Wisdom is experienced by the counselor in the form life knowledge
or the understanding the context for the struggle and the recognition of personal limitations. Self-awareness increases as the student struggles with insight into his or her own motivations and behaviors (Stoltenberg, 1981). The development of professional identity emerges as the autonomy-dependency conflict is resolved.

In the third stage of counselor development, the counselor is able to practice more autonomously and experience an increased self-confidence as a counselor. Further, the trainee develops into a counselor characterized by an increased empathy toward others and a more highly differentiated interpersonal approach (Stoltenberg, 1981). At this stage, the counselor reduces the focus on personal performance, and concentrates more on relating to the client. Stoltenberg (1981) described the ability to tolerate individual differences, making it possible to value different client perspective, as well as theoretical perspectives of other clinicians. The wisdom related values were found to be significant in this study and are necessary to build rapport in the counseling relationship (Hanna, Bemak & Chung, 1999; Hanna & Ottens, 1995).

At the fourth stage of counselor development, the professional identity of the counselor is fully developed. The counselor can practice autonomously, with insight and self-awareness of limitations (Stoltenberg, 1981). This awareness is related to the wisdom of the counselor, which results in the counselor’s ability to intentionally seek consultation from others in the profession, on-going supervision, and continuing education in the field of counseling. At this point the counselor can embrace different approaches to counseling, as well as understand the strengths and limitations of his or her own approach.
The counselor’s development is impacted by the effectiveness of the supervisory relationship (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982). The wisdom characteristics found to be important in the counselor and the counseling relationship is critical in the supervisory relationship as well. Most important is the supervisor’s ability to regulate emotions, reflect and learn from life experiences, to recognize limitations, tolerate ambiguity and understand multiple perspectives. A supervisor must be able to build a relationship with a supervisee who has a different perspective and approach to counseling. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) adhere to the discrimination model of supervision, in which the supervisor employs three roles in supervision; teacher, counselor and consultant.

Depending on the stage of development of the counselor, the supervisor uses these roles with the appropriate emphasis in supervision. For example, at the beginning of counselor development, the supervisor uses more teaching skills to inform the counselor in training about techniques and approaches, and the counseling skills are used to build the supervisory relationship. In the later stages of counselor development, the supervisor uses more of the consultant skills to encourage the autonomy of the counselor in training. The decision about which role to take -- teacher, counselor or consultant -- at any given point during the supervision process requires discernment. The supervisor must have self-awareness, as well as awareness of the supervisee, which is a part of the wisdom ability of the supervisor. As the supervisee develops through the stages as a counselor, the supervisor must adjust roles to meet the needs of the supervisee.

In order to make wise decisions in supervision, the supervisor needs to understand the context of the counselor in training in terms of their stage of counselor development, as well as the personal context which impacts their development as a counselor. One
activity which can facilitate the consideration of the student’s context is using the student’s family of origin genogram in the context of supervision. The student is asked to identify issues or patterns within the context of their genogram which influence their development as a counselor. The supervisor’s empathy for the student is increased by this understanding. The genogram can also be used in supervision to help the student to identify how they are impacted personally by a client. In this activity, the counselor in training has the opportunity to develop self-awareness and empathy, which in turn helps the counseling relationship.

Throughout the process of counselor development, the wise supervisor remains confident, but aware of their own limitations. The supervisor models self-awareness and taking responsibility for lifelong learning. Toward the final stages of counselor development, the supervisory relationship can be the vehicle for both the supervisor and supervisee to share and gain insight, enhancing wisdom in each other.

**Wisdom in Significant Relationships**

The finding that wisdom traits of the counselor significantly impact the counseling relationship could have important implications for people’s wisdom abilities in significant relationships, such as with loved ones, co-workers and friends. Wisdom abilities such as understanding multiple perspectives, concern for others and recognizing subtexts in interpersonal relationships would be beneficial in interpersonal relationships in general. For example, Goleman (2006) defined social intelligence as including social awareness and social ability. Social awareness involves empathy, concern for others, attunement to others, and social cognition, which is to know how the social world works (Goleman, 2006).
According to Goleman (2006) social ability builds on social awareness to allow smooth, effective interaction with others. Not only can counselors be aware of and practice these traits when interacting with clients, but these skills can be practiced with clients, and in turn applied to other significant relationships. Couple relationships could be transformed by such other-centered approaches to interacting. Wisdom could be experienced as beneficial to building intimacy and resolving conflicts when couples communicate with each other.

Wisdom in Communication

When people communicate, it defines the relationship. In communication, wise counselors would have the cognitive ability to be aware of various levels of meaning in communication. According to Watzlawick, Bavelas, and Jackson (1967) communication consists of the literal content of the communication as well as the relationship aspects, such as responsiveness, affect and control or balance of power in the relationship. The relationship communication level is primarily non-verbal, therefore counselors must be able to recognize and respond appropriately to subtexts and metacommunication. The wisdom traits of life knowledge, including insight and perspicacity (recognizing context and seeing beyond literal meaning) make the transparency of the relationship level communication transparent, and intimate understanding or conflict resolution is made possible.

Wisdom in Education

Just as wisdom traits can be identified and evaluated in counselor education and supervision, wisdom traits can be useful in selecting and training teachers. In education, teachers need wisdom traits, such as cognitive flexibility, emotional regulation,
understanding multiple perspectives and concern for others, in the classroom with students of all ages. Wisdom traits have been linked to multicultural competence (Phan, Rivera, Volker, & Maddux, 2009); therefore teachers who exhibit these traits will be more likely to be successful teaching diverse student populations. Critical reflection is a technique used in education to promote personal growth and cognitive complexity of teachers (Brookfield, 1988). The students benefit from the wisdom traits their teachers exemplify, and they can learn wisdom traits in the classroom, such as empathy, understanding multiple perspectives, and emotional regulation. These wisdom traits will help students of all ages with sound decision making and enhancing their relationships with others.

The rationale for teaching wisdom in education at all age levels can also be applied to counselor education and supervision. Sternberg, Jarvin, and Grigorenko (2009) suggested a model for teaching for wisdom, intelligence, and creativity from elementary to high school age. They gave four reasons why wisdom should be taught in school:

1. Knowledge is insufficient for wisdom and certainly does not guarantee satisfaction or happiness. Wisdom seems a better vehicle to attainment of these goals.
2. Wisdom provides a mindful and considered way to enter thoughtful and deliberative values into important judgments. One cannot be wise and at the same time be impulsive…
3. Wisdom represents an avenue to creating a better, more harmonious world…
4. Students—who later become parents and leaders—are always part of a greater community and hence will benefit from learning to judge rightly, soundly, or justly on behalf of their community (p. 105).

The wisdom-based thinking skills identified by Sternberg, Jarvin, and Grigorenko (2009) are: thinking reflectively, thinking dialogically, and thinking dialectically.

Reflective thinking causes counselors to think about their own thinking, and increases
their awareness of their own values and beliefs. A counseling student utilizes reflective thinking to increase self-awareness, so they can establish a relationship with a client who has different values and beliefs.

Dialogical thinking involves taking into account different perspectives, such as understanding a client who decided to have an abortion, when the counselor feels strongly against such action. The counselor value of advocacy would be enhanced by the development of dialogical thinking. Dialectical thinking requires the integration of different ways of thinking, similar to when theories of counseling are compared and contrasted resulting in the counselor forming their own personal theory of counseling.

**Wisdom in Leadership**

Inspirational engagement or leadership abilities (WDS) were found to be a significant component of the wisdom of the counselor’s effectiveness in the counseling relationship. Leadership in counselor education has been promoted through professional associations, such as Chi Sigma Iota counselor honor society. Chi Sigma Iota has developed leadership principles in order to help counselors become involved in the development and advancement of the counseling profession. Counselor Education programs which encourage involvement in professional associations and provide leadership training opportunities are helping future counselors develop wisdom related skills crucial in the counseling relationship.

Leaders in education and business can be selected for positions based on the wisdom traits they exemplify. For example, in higher education, an academic dean or department chair would be someone who would not only have cognitive and real-world abilities, but they must understand multiple perspectives, display concern for others and
comfortable with the limits of knowledge. In business, leaders need to have wisdom qualities such as learning from experience and understanding of subtexts within the business. The leadership skills represented by qualities such as confidence in one’s knowledge and abilities, known as inspiration engagement (WDS), might be more significant in the business world as in counseling relationships.

**Limitations**

There were several limitations to the internal validity of this study. Although common in social science research, the use of a survey research design potentially hindered the inferences drawn from the data about the professional counseling population (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). In order to describe the population as accurately as possible, the sample was selected randomly from the professional counseling population through membership in the American Counseling Association (ACA). The professional counselor not a member of the American Counseling Association was excluded from the study, therefore inferences from the results of this study cannot be made to that population. The results can be generalized only to the population described in the sample, which were primarily licensed professional counselors. The results do not necessarily apply to other mental health professions, such as marriage and family therapists, clinical social workers, and professional psychologists. In the future, studies on the wisdom of the counselor and the therapeutic relationship that include those populations would be valuable.

While the response rate was adequate (22.55%) and steps were taken to maximize the response rate; a potential selection bias was created given the fact that not all of the participants completed the survey. Some of the participants who did not complete the
surveys indicated they were not seeing clients, and therefore were ineligible to participate. The qualities and traits are unknown of those participants who received surveys and were eligible (currently seeing clients) but did not complete them.

The wisdom of the counselor, as well as the therapeutic working alliance as perceived by the client, was not evaluated in this study. The surveys were based on the counselor’s self-report, so the wisdom traits were accurate descriptions as far as the counselor might view him/herself at the time the survey. Social desirability was a potential threat to internal validity, in that a participant may have had a tendency to reply in a manner that created a positive image as a professional counselor. This tendency was evidenced by the slight skewness of subscales which counselors may have recognized as favorable traits in a professional counselor; critical life experience (SAWS), self-knowledge, emotional management, and altruism (WDS). Counselors may have a tendency towards answering more positively on the items representing these desirable personal qualities. A social desirability measurement, such as the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhaus, 1991) could be added in future studies to account for the potential bias. In addition, the client’s evaluation of the counselor’s wisdom and the therapeutic working alliance could add to the validity of the study.

The multiple linear regression analysis indicated the presence of multicollinearity. In other words, even though few of the wisdom variables had a statistically significant impact on the therapeutic working alliance, together they made a significant contribution (Motulsky, 2002). When variables are highly correlated, they are explaining essentially the same traits. Given the interactive nature of wisdom traits, correlations among variables were expected (Webster, 2007).
Utilizing the results from the factor analysis, steps were taken to minimize multicollinearity. However, multicollinearity could be problematic such that the individual $p$ values could be misleading; a $p$ value can be high even though the variable is important. In the future, multicollinearity could be preventively handled by increasing the sample size, as well as combining or removing some of the variables (Motulsky, 2002). Future studies could include a combination of the significant wisdom traits, such as emotional regulation (SAWS), life knowledge (WDS) and cognitive ability (3D-WS) as well as other traits which were close to significance; the reflective dimension (3D-WS), life skills (WDS) and inspirational engagement (WDS).

**Future Directions**

The study of wisdom is important to research, teaching, and supervision in counselor education. The counseling relationship has the most potential for impacting the outcome of counseling, and the wisdom of the counselor is significantly related to the counseling relationship (Hanna & Ottens, 1995; Wampold, 2001). As counselor education programs move toward relying on research evidence to inform the educational experience, the focus on the counseling relationship and the person of the counselor becomes increasingly important. The development of a useful measurement for wisdom could help counselor educators to identify, evaluate and teach wisdom traits in future counselors. The wisdom traits could be incorporated into the curriculum and student performance evaluations, which would be utilized to determine student progress and efficacy of the program.

The current study demonstrated the significance of wisdom in the counseling relationship. A qualitative study on the wisdom of the counselor and the counseling
relationship would be useful in capturing the counselor’s lived experience of the wisdom
traits in the counseling relationship. Using the findings in the current study and
qualitative research results, a survey measure for wisdom could be developed which
specifically targets the wisdom qualities necessary in the counseling relationship.

Through scale development, the qualities which were identified could be further studied. Self-knowledge (WDS), was expected to represent a counselor’s self-awareness or insightful personal and interpersonal understanding, perspicacity, but was not captured by the measure. Since these qualities seem important in the context of counseling (Hanna & Ottens, 1995), a subscale with items more closely identifying these features could be explored. Additionally, some wisdom scales which were comprised of a combination of qualities, for example, life knowledge (WDS) could have subcategories emerge if studied further, since it was represented understanding subtexts and deeper questions in life, as well as concern for others. Traits such as compassion, within the broader subscale of life knowledge could emerge in the context of further study. In future studies, compassion would be an interesting subscale to target concern for others specifically; comprised of empathy, sympathy, generosity, cooperation, and other-centeredness (Hall, 2010).

The cognitive dimension (3D-WS) included knowing the limits of knowledge, which could also include humility. Humility opens the possibility for spiritual development which could be beneficial to both counselor and client. Hall (2010) suggested that humility is closer to Sternberg’s idea of sagacity, which is known as exceptional discernment, considering advice, learning from other people, admitting mistakes, being a good listener, and acknowledging multiple perspectives (Sternberg, 1985a). A scale measurement specifically targeting these qualities of sagacity could be
researched in terms of importance in the counselor and the counseling relationship. In addition, future studies could incorporate the study of wisdom and spirituality.

In future research, traits not included in this study, such as patience or delayed gratification (Hall 2010) could be added. For example, pain and suffering are integral to the experience of the wounded healer (Nouwen, 1972) and patience is often the result of such experience. In intimate relationships, patience allows the possibility for forgiveness to occur (Hall, 2010). Additionally, delayed gratification is required for people to avoid impulsive or addictive behaviors. These traits, in addition to other wisdom traits such as concern for others, emotional regulation, and understanding different perspectives would be valuable to research and teach in the context of intimate relationships. In the context of relationships, wisdom could be further studied in relation to social intelligence (Goleman, 2006) and communication theory (Watzlawick, Bavelas, & Jackson, 1967).

Wisdom concepts could be integrated not only into counselor education and supervision, but into teacher education programs and corporate leadership development. In addition to utilizing a wisdom measurement survey with counselors, the measure could be used with clients (individual and couples), students, teachers and leaders. As a self-assessment, the measure of wisdom could indicate strength and growth areas which could be targeted for learning. Counselors, teachers and business leaders could incorporate wisdom concepts into their work with clients, students, and colleagues. Teaching wisdom in the classroom for people of all ages could enhance relationships and improve decision making, and ultimately prevent future problems for individuals, families, and the community at large.
Wisdom is an important personal quality to nurture, as human beings are faced with navigating the complexities of life in this age of growth in technology, and diminishing personal contact. Knowledge is readily attained through information gained in a variety of formats, including online. However, there is little time and motivation necessary to meditate, to reflect and to learn from experiences in order to develop wisdom. Hall (2010) described wisdom as knowledge that is “profoundly social, deeply personal, adaptive and intuitive” (p. 43). Our wisdom abilities have the potential to influence critical decisions, knowing what’s important, and making a positive impact in the lives of others, as well as broader society. The future of our relationships with others, as well as the natural world might depend on our ability to develop wisdom.
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APPENDIX A

PILOT STUDY ONE
Pilot Study One

In the field of human growth and development, the construct of wisdom has been studied from various theoretical approaches, such as philosophical, implicit and explicit (Sternberg, 1998). Generally, explicit theories are derived from the expert observation of human performance in problem solving, whereas implicit theories are based on people’s everyday experience of the phenomenon. Through implicit approaches to studying wisdom, Sternberg (1985), identified wisdom traits such as reasoning ability, judgment, perspicacity, learning from ideas and the environment, and sagacity. More recently, researchers have found similar constructs and have begun to develop measures for wisdom. For example, such as the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale (SAWS; Webster, 2003) identified five characteristics of wisdom; critical life knowledge, reflection or reminiscence, openness, humor, and emotional regulation. Based on the review of literature, there is a gap in counselor education and supervision research in terms of the identification and measurement of wisdom.

The traits identified by Sternberg have been linked to effective psychotherapy (Hanna & Ottens, 1995), as well as multicultural competency in counseling (Hanna, Bemak & Chung, 1999). Research has demonstrated that the counselor’s personal traits have a significant impact on the positive outcome of therapy (Norcross, 2002). Additionally, the therapeutic alliance is specific human relationship which has been identified as more important in the therapeutic outcome, than any other factor (Wampold, 2001). Therefore counselor’s personal characteristics, which can be conceptualized by the wisdom traits, and the impact on the counseling working alliance is worthy of further research.
The purpose of this pilot study was to assess the validity of using the Self-Assessment of Wisdom (SAWS; Webster, 2003) measure with the professional counseling population. Additionally, the wisdom of the counselor, measured by SAWS will be compared with the counselor’s perception of the working alliance, measured by the Working Alliance Inventory, Counselor Short Form (WAI-S-T; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). The following are the research questions and hypothesis for the purpose of this study:

Q1 Is the SAWS a valid and reliable measure for the professional counseling population?

H1 The SAWS is a valid measure for use with the professional counseling population.

Q2 How much variability in the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the SAWS?

H2 More than zero percent of the variability of the therapeutic working alliance is explained by the counselor’s wisdom, as measured by the SAWS.

Methods

Participants

This pilot study included 38 adult counselors from the Mountain Central region of the United States. Participants were 76% female and 24% male, conveniently drawn from doctoral and master’s degree programs as well as faculty from one private university and one public university in the region. Additionally, participants were counselors from a community mental health agency from a large regional city. The majority (74%) of the participants were between the ages of 21 and 50 years old, master’s degree level (71%), with levels of experience ranging from one to over 20 years. Descriptive information representative of the sample population are detailed in Table 7.
Table 7

**Characteristics of Practicing Counselors as a Percentage of the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>License</strong> a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience (years)</strong> b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a In Colorado, unlicensed psychotherapists are registered with the state department of regulatory agencies (DORA) and can be doctoral or master’s level counselors or students.*

*b The years of experience practicing counseling with individuals, couples, and/or families.*

**Note.** N=38

**Instruments**

The independent variable, the latent variable of wisdom was measured using the SAWS instrument, and the dependent variable was measured by the Working Alliance Inventory, Therapist Short Form (WAI-S-T; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). Additionally,
the participants were asked to identify demographic information including, their age, gender, degree, license, years of experience, number of session with the client, and theoretical preference.

**The Self-Assessment of Wisdom Scale (SAWS).** The forty item self-assessment survey was developed by Webster (2003) measuring the wisdom traits based on five interrelated factors, with 8 items on each subscale: Experience, emotional regulation, reminiscence/ reflection, humor, and openness. The SAWS survey was answered on a Likert-type scale with response options from 1 to 6, 1 being the response “strongly disagree”; six being the response “strongly agree.” According to Webster (2007) two reliability measures indicate a high to excellent reliability status for the SAWS. “First, two-week test-retest reliability assessment showed a .838 level of reliability. Second, Cronbach’s alpha for the total SAWS was .904” (p. 170) demonstrating that the SAWS consistently measures the concept in question. In this pilot study the internal consistency estimate Cronbach’s alpha was reported equal to .90.

**The Working Alliance Inventory – Therapist Short Form (WAI-S-T).** The dependent variable was represented by the total alliance score from the Working Alliance Inventory --Short Form which was originally proposed by Tracey and Kokotovic (1989). The WAI-S is based on the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989) which was developed to measure the working alliance as defined by Bordin (1994). The WAI–S is consistent with Bordin’s (1994) model of the alliance, which describes three aspects of the therapeutic relationship in terms of agreement on task and goals, and the quality of the bond between counselor and client. This measure produces a total alliance score, as well as scores for three subscales (Goal, Task, Bond).
The WAI–S is a 12-item self-report measure of the alliance with parallel forms for clients and counselors; in this study participants were counselors completing the counselor form. Each item is rated on a seven-point scale; one being the response “never”; seven being the response “always.” Validity for the WAI-S has been established through significant correlations between WAI ratings and counseling outcome (Horvath & Symonds, 1991). Busseri and Tyler (2003) have supported the interchangeability of the short and original forms for both the counselor (WAI-S-T) and the client (WAI-S-C) versions for the total and subscale scores. In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha for the WAI-S-T was equal to .86.

**Procedure**

The institutional review board at each university, as well as the community mental health agency approved the study. Participants were made aware of their right to volunteer, procedures to insure confidentiality, and the general activities for which they were being asked to volunteer through the process of a documented informed consent. Participants consented to participate in the study by signing and dating the informed consent form. After completing the informed consent, participants received a packet including the surveys to be completed for the study. In order to protect participant confidentiality, the informed consent forms were collected by the researchers separately from the surveys. Informed consent forms were stored in a locked filing cabinet, in a locked office of the lead investigator. During data collection, participants were not required to provide their name on any documentation. The researchers were not able to link the responses with the identity of the participants.
Although the participants were asked to reflect on their relationship with one of their randomly selected client’s, the client’s identity was not revealed, and the client was not a participant in the study. Completed surveys were stored in a locked filing cabinet until scored and entered into Statistical Package for Social Sciences© 17.0 (SPSS) for data analysis. After data was entered into SPSS, it was copied onto a HSB mass storage device, which was kept in the locking filing cabinet, in the locked office of the lead investigator.

Results

To explore the first research question, whether the SAWS a reliable instrument for use with the counseling population, the internal reliability coefficient, Cronbach’s Alpha, was reported at .90 for the SAWS total score, indicating SAWS is likely a reliable instrument for measuring wisdom traits in the counseling population. On each of the five subscales for SAWS, Cronbach’s Alpha was equal to .83 for experience, .65 for emotional regulation, .87 for reflection, .85 for humor, and .63 for openness. The internal consistency for the openness and emotional regulation subscales were the least consistent for this sample.

To establish validity, the evidence from the internal structure of the measurement was used to analyze the relationship of these items to each other which provided evidence about validity of the measure (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). The significance levels were set at .05 and reported accordingly, although it is important to note that some of the results met this level of significance and reported significant correlation at the stricter .01 level. In terms of subscale correlations, the Pearson Correlation coefficient were reported as follows; experience r=.548, positive correlation significant at the .01 level (p < .01),
emotional regulation $r=.549$, positive correlation significant at the .01 level ($p < .01$), reflectivity $r=.437$, correlation significant at the .01 level ($p < .01$), humor $r=.395$, positive correlation significant at the .05 level ($p < .05$), and openness $r = .370$, positive correlation significant at the .05 level ($p < .05$).

Additionally, experience was significantly correlated with humor ($r = .395$, $p < .05$) and openness ($r = .370$, $p < .05$), emotional regulation correlated with humor ($r = .390$, $p < .05$) and openness ($r = .339$, $p < .05$), reflection correlated with humor ($r = .328$, $p < .05$) and openness ($r = .341$, $p < .05$), and humor and openness were significantly correlated ($r = .437$, $p < .01$). These results indicate the scales are significantly correlated between subscales, in other words, the correlational analysis indicates that an individual who answered items a certain way consistently answered items the same way compared to an individual who answered it differently (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007), which provides evidence of validity of the SAWS measure with the professional counseling population.

In order to effectively conduct a multiple linear regression analysis, the minimum sample size should be 55, based on Cohen’s (1988) suggested values for medium effect size $f^2$ equal to .15, alpha equal to .05, and power of .80. When these values plus the total of 13 predictors (five independent variables, measured by SAWS, one dependent variable, measured by WAI-S-T, and seven covariates represented by the demographic information) was entered into G-Power 3.1.2 software (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) the minimum sample size was calculated to be 55. Although the sample was technically too small ($n = 38$) for conducting a multiple linear regression analysis, a preliminary multiple linear regression analysis was conducted the by entering the five independent variables measured by the SAWS and analyzing their relationship to the
dependent variable, the counseling working alliance. The correlation between each of the SAWS factors and the total WAI-S-T scores indicated $R^2 = .25$, $F(5, 30) = 2.0$, $p = .105$. In other words 25% of variability in the working alliance was explained by the traits of wisdom, as measured by the five subscales of the SAWS. The sample size was small and also representative of a sample of convenience, rather than a true random sampling. It is suggested that the study be replicated with a larger, random sampling by future research to further validate these findings and their clinical and statistical significance.

**Discussion**

Several important aspects of the methodology were taken into consideration for changes to future studies. First, a couple of the demographic questions were either unclear or too difficult to interpret for the purpose of this study. Specifically, the question identifying the theoretical orientation of the counselor and the location of practice will be omitted in future studies. Additionally, it was learned that the WAI-S-T measure had gender biased language on two of the twelve items. For example, question one stated “(client) and I agree about the steps to be taken to improve his situation” and question 12 stated “(client) believes the way we are working with her problem is correct.” These statements were changed from “he” or “she” to “she/he” within the statements for future research. Additionally, the SAWS measure did not have the scales listed with each question, requiring participants to write in numeric values beside each question, which was awkward and added to the potential for scoring error. For future studies, the measure was reformatted to provide the Likert-scale on each question, so participants can circle the number corresponding to each answer.
In summary, the results provide some evidence that the SAWS measure is both reliable and valid for use with the professional counseling population. Additionally, based on the preliminary results of the multiple linear regression analysis, the SAWS may be a promising measure for wisdom as it relates to the counseling working alliance.
APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY TWO
Pilot Study Two

Researchers have explored theories of wisdom in human growth and development (Sternberg, 1990) and a theoretical link between wisdom and psychotherapy has been established (Hanna & Ottens, 1995). Further, research has identified the significance of the therapeutic alliance as more important than counseling techniques in terms of therapeutic outcome. The person of the counselor is a significant aspect of the counseling relationship, and wisdom is a construct for describing the qualities of an effective counselor. Therefore, the wisdom of the counselor and the counseling relationship is an area of research which needs to be explored. A useful model of wisdom has important implications for counselor education and supervision, since it could be deliberately incorporated into counselor training programs from admission, to training and evaluation.

The second pilot study was conducted to implement the changes from the first pilot, as well as perform further validation research for the measures of wisdom to be used with the professional counseling population. Convergence evidence for validity of the Self Assessed Wisdom Scale (Webster, 2003) was further investigated by examining the relationship to other variables, such as the Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS; Ardelt, 2003). Ardelt’s model of wisdom is based on the three interactive components identified by Clayton and Birren (1980), which is composed of the latent variable of wisdom measured by the three-dimensional wisdom scale (3D-WS). In this study, these three overlapping constructs are compared to Webster’s five subscales, experience, humor, openness, emotion, and reflectivity. The following are the research questions and hypothesis for the purpose of this study:
Q1 Are the scores from the 3D-WS instrument reliable for measuring wisdom traits for the professional counseling population?

H1 The 3D-WS is a reliable measure for use with the professional counseling population.

Q2 Do the scores from the three subscales of the 3D-WS instrument provide construct validity for the five SAWS subscales?

H2 The 3D-WS subscales will provide construct validity for the SAWS subscales.

Q3 To what extent does the wisdom of the counselor (measured by SAWS and the 3D-WS) explain the counseling working alliance (measured by WAI-S-T)?

H3 The wisdom of the counselor will explain a percentage (*range based on literature) the counseling working alliance.

Method

Participants

In the second pilot study, the sample included 50 adult counselors from the State of Colorado, specifically 13 from a doctoral and master’s degree students and faculty from a public university in the Rocky Mountain Region of the United States; 26 from faculty and master’s degree students from a private university in the same region; and 11 counselors who attended a National professional counselor organization conference. The sample included 50 practicing counselors of all ages and levels of experience, and educational backgrounds, specifically 22% male and 78% female, primarily ages 21 to 40 years old (60%), and 58% with 2 years or less experience. Descriptive information representative of the sample population are detailed in Table 8.
Table 8

*Characteristics of Practicing Counselors as a Percentage of the Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years) b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a In Colorado, unlicensed psychotherapists are registered with the state department of regulatory agencies (DORA) and can be doctoral or master’s level counselors or students.

b The years of experience practicing counseling with individuals, couples, and/or families.

*Note:* N=50

**Instruments**

Few instruments have been established for the measurement of wisdom characteristics in general. The 39-item Three-Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS; Ardelt, 2003) is based on a three factor model of wisdom (affective dimension, cognitive dimension, and reflective dimension) used with a sample of older adults (age 52 plus).
The Self-Assessment of Wisdom Scale (SAWS) is a 40-item self-assessment survey, which is based on five factors (experience, emotional regulation, reminiscence/reflection, humor, and openness) was tested with young adults, mean age 42.8 (Webster, 2007). The 3D-WS and the SAWS are the measures used in this study to measure the traits of wisdom which compare the independent variable, the latent characteristic of wisdom.

Theoretically, Ardelt’s (2003) cognitive dimension can be compared to Webster’s (2007) critical life experience subscale. Webster defines the critical life experience as rich and varied experience which requires difficult choices, coping with important life transitions and dealing with challenging life circumstances. Ardelt’s cognitive dimension included the assessment of people’s ability and willingness to understand a situation (or phenomenon) thoroughly, including people’s knowledge of the ambiguity of human nature and life in general.

The reflective dimension of wisdom, a prerequisite for the development of the cognitive dimension, is the understanding of life’s complexity which is possible because a person engages in reflective thinking, looking at phenomenon from different perspectives, and developing self-awareness and deeper insight (Ardelt, 2003). The combination of reflective and cognitive dimension can be compared to Webster’s (2007) reflection/reminiscence subscale. Webster defined reflection as pertaining to one’s past and using life events to connect with the past and gain perspective for coping, which is representative of the combination of Ardelt’s (2003) cognitive and reflective dimensions.

The affective dimension, according to Ardelt (2003), is defined by the presence of positive emotion and behavior towards others, such as feelings of empathy and compassion. Webster (2007) defined emotional regulation more in terms of the
individual’s ability to regulate and distinguish the full spectrum of human emotion with openness to both positive and negative affective states. Webster’s subscale of humor incorporates the concern for others and the ability to make others feel comfortable, which is a combination of the affective and cognitive components. Webster’s openness subscale is defined by receptivity to different ideas, values, and experiences and the appreciation of multiple perspectives, and tolerance for others. The wisdom characteristic of openness described by Webster compares to the combination of cognitive and reflective abilities described by Ardelt.

**Self-Assessment of Wisdom Scale (SAWS).** The SAWS was developed by Webster (2003, 2007) measuring the wisdom traits based on five interrelated factors, with eight items on each subscale: Experience, emotional regulation, reminiscence/reflection, humor, and openness. The SAWS survey was answered on a Likert-type scale with response options from 1 to 6, 1 being the response “strongly disagree”; six being the response “strongly agree.” Sample items include the following for experience, “I have experienced many moral dilemmas”; for emotions, “I am good at identifying subtle emotions within myself”; for reminiscence, “I often think about my personal past”; for openness, “I like being around persons whose views are strongly different than mine”; and for humor, “I often use humor to put others at ease.”

The SAWS was piloted in three studies as a 30-item self-assessment survey (Webster, 2003). Study one was intended to establish reliability and factor structure of scores from SAWS, based on a sample of 78 men and 179 women with the mean age of 28.5 ($SD = 13.37$). The results indicated the total scale scores had acceptable reliability of alpha equal to .78, with factor loadings consistent with each subscale but overlapping
on the five dimensions. The reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales. Study two compared the traits of wisdom to its opposite, foolishness. The participants were 45 men and 44 women with the mean age of 39 ($SD = 17.67$) asked to complete the SAWS as they thought a wise person would, then again as a foolish person would. The results indicated a significant difference between the scores on the two tests, $t$-test $(87) = 9.40, p< .001$, establishing wisdom traits as a separate and discrete latent variable, despite overlap in the five hypothesized dimensions of wisdom. The replication of reliability findings in study one was done in study three, yielding very good scale reliability at alpha equal to .87. Again, the reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales.

In a follow-up study, 73 men and 98 women ranging in age from 17-92, completed the SAWS, the Loyola Generativity Scale, and the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (Webster, 2007). Reliability estimates indicated a high to excellent reliability status for scores from the SAWS with a two-week test-retest reliability, $r = .84$ and Cronbach’s alpha = .90 for the total SAWS, demonstrating that the SAWS consistently measured the concept in question. Again, the reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales. More recently, Webster (2009) conducted another series of three overlapping studies using SAWS with young adults. Study one (42 women and 19 men, ranging in age from 19-36) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .89 for the total SAWS; study two (33 women and 27 men, ages 17-34) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .90; and the third study (27 men and 35 women, ages 17 to 52) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .88. Again, the reliability coefficients were not reported for the five subscales.
In the current study, the internal consistency estimate (Cronbach’s alpha) for SAWS was reported equal to .88, and the subscale reliability scores had a Cronbach’s alpha of .85 for experience, a Cronbach’s alpha of .78 for emotional regulation, a Cronbach’s alpha of .86 for reminiscence/reflection, a Cronbach’s alpha of .75 for humor, and a Cronbach’s alpha of .67 for openness.

**The Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-WS).** The affective dimension, cognitive dimension, and reflective dimension are the three wisdom components which are measured by the Three-Dimensional Wisdom Scale (3D-SW) developed by Ardelt (2003) based on 39 items on a 5 point Likert-type scale with response options from 1 to 5, with 1 = “strongly agree,” and 5 = “strongly disagree.” There are 14 items on the cognitive subscale, 12 items (5 reverse scored) on the reflective subscale, and 13 items (3 reverse scored) on the affective subscale. Some examples of subscale items include, “There is only one right way to do anything” (cognitive), “I don’t like to get involved listening to other people’s troubles” (affective), and “I would feel much better if my present circumstances changed” (reflective).

The survey was developed with a sample of older adults (age 52 plus) and the results indicated that the scores from 3D-SW were reliable for each of the three subscales representing the latent variable of wisdom (Ardelt, 2003). Ardelt hypothesized that wisdom traits studied by other researchers could be described by one or more of the affective, cognitive, and reflective dimensions of this measure. In the empirical study of the 3D-WS, the reliability was determined by the internal consistency and its individual dimensions based on the sample of 180 adults, 52 years and older, with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .71 to .85. The correlations between the indicators ranging from .30 to .50
were based on confirmatory factor analysis, with statistically significant standardized factor loading values ranging from .50 to .84.

The test-retest reliability of the scale yielded insignificant differences between time measurements, with a 10-month test-retest correlation of .85. The subscale reliability estimates for the initial test yielded Cronbach’s alpha equal to .78 for the cognitive dimension, .75 for the reflective dimension, and .74 for the affective dimension. In the re-test, the subscale reliability estimates yielded Cronbach’s alpha of .85, .71, and .72 for the cognitive, reflective, and affective respective dimensions. The current study yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .86 for the 3D-WS, and alpha’s of .77 for the cognitive dimension, .73 for the reflective dimension, and .65 for the affective dimension.

**The Working Alliance Inventory – Counselor Short Form (WAI-S-T).** The dependent variable was measured by the 12-item working alliance inventory (WAI-S) which was developed by Tracey and Kokotovic (1989), with parallel forms for clients and counselors. In this study participants were counselors completing the counselor form (WAI-S-T). They completed the WAI-S-T by mentally filling in the blank with the client’s name and answering the corresponding items based on their response on a seven-point Likert-type scale with 1 = “never” and 7 = “always.”

The short form is based on the original 36-item Working Alliance Inventory (WAI) developed by Horvath and Greenberg (1989) to measure the working alliance as defined by Bordin (1979). Consistent with Bordin’s definition of the working alliance, the WAI-S assesses perceptions of three aspects of the therapeutic relationship in terms of agreement on task and goals, and the quality of the bond between counselor and client. The WAI-S produces a total alliance score, as well as scores for the three subscales
(Goal, Task, Bond), where the total 12-items are comprised of 4 items from each of the subscales. Tracey and Kokotovic (1989) studied the factor structure of both the client and counselor versions of the WAI-S and concluded that both measures primarily support the general alliance factor, and secondarily the three subscales of goals, task, and bond. They reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .95 for the total score of the counselor’s version.

Busseri and Tyler (2003) have supported the interchangeability of the short and original forms for both the counselor and the client versions for the total and subscale scores, testing the similarities in both the short and original forms with counselors at two different points during counseling. They found high internal consistency reliabilities for both versions, and for the WAI-S-T, they reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .91 after the fourth session, and .96 at the final session.

In a recent study, Carmel and Friedlander (2009) studied 50 men and 56 women counselors who counsel male clients who have committed a sexual offense and measured their perception of the working alliance and the relation to secondary traumatization. They used the WAI-S-T, and reported internal consistency reliability estimates based on Cronbach’s alpha equal to .93. Other recent researchers studied the counselor characteristics influencing the quality of the alliance, using both the counselor and client short versions of the WAI and although they did not report internal consistency estimates, they noted on average the counselor’s ratings of the working alliance were lower than the patient’s ratings (Hersoug, Høglend, Havik, von der Lippe, & Monsen, 2009).

Additionally, the Hersoug, et al. study supported the use of the total sum score of the WAI-S-T, given that the general alliance factor is primary, and the subscales are secondary. Based on this information, the WAI-S-T (without the WAI-S-C) will be a
conservative estimate of the working alliance. In the current study the total sum for the WAI-S-T was used with a Cronbach’s alpha of .88.

The covariates or extraneous variables were determined by demographic questionnaire which are accounted for using multiple linear regression in data analysis. Participants identified their gender, age, degree earned, license type, years of experience, number of counseling sessions with the client, and counseling setting.

**Procedure**

At the institutional collection sites, it was determined when university faculty and student counselors met for practicum and internship courses and faculty meetings and permission was solicited to attend and invite voluntary participation in the study. Students enrolled in the practicum and internship courses were currently practicing counseling, and faculty not currently seeing clients were not selected to participate. At the National professional counselor organization annual conference, permission was obtained from presenters to solicit voluntary participation in the current research study. Upon the conclusion of the presenter’s session, participation in the study was invited by giving the survey to those who identified they were currently practicing counseling. A drop box was left at the conference registration desk, so participants could leave their completed surveys anonymously. An accurate response rate was not calculated due to the nature of the convenience sampling procedure.

The Institutional Review Board of both participating universities and the president of the National professional counselor organization approved all research procedures. Participants were aware of their right to decline to volunteer, procedures to insure confidentiality, and the general activities for which they were being asked to volunteer
through the process of a no-signature informed consent which they kept for their own reference. Participants consented to participate in the study by continuing with completion of the survey. Participants were not required to provide their name on any documentation; therefore participation was anonymous. Although the participants were asked to reflect on their relationship with one client, the client’s identity was not revealed, and the client did not participate in the study. Completed surveys were stored in a locked filing cabinet until scored and entered into PASW Statistics GradPack 18 (SPSS) for data analysis. After data were entered into SPSS, they were copied onto a HSB mass storage device, which was kept in the locked office of the lead investigator’s locked filing cabinet.

Based the research questions and corresponding data analysis using multiple linear regression Cohen (1988) has suggested values for most social research studies. The sample size target of 56 was based on a medium effect size of $f^2$ equal to .15, with a power of .80 and alpha equal to .05 (Cohen, 1988). The sample size was calculated by entering these values, and the 16 predictors, 8 independent variables representing different components of wisdom (five measured by SAWS, 3 measured by the 3D-WS), 7 extraneous variables (gender, age, degree earned, license type, years of experience, number of counseling sessions with the client, and counseling setting), and 1 dependent variable, which was the counselor’s perception of the working alliance (measured by the WAI-S-T).

Data Analysis

PASW Statistics GradPack 18 (SPSS) was used for all data analysis. Reverse scored items for each of the measures were transformed to reflect the accurate value of
those items. The results from two of the participants were discarded because of missing data, so a total of 48 were entered into the analysis. The frequencies of the descriptive data were calculated (see Table 1), on each of the measures to examine the spread of the data. The data analysis was conducted to answer each research questions.

For the first research questions, “Are the scores from the 3D-WS instruments reliable for measuring wisdom traits in the counseling population?” the internal reliability coefficient, Cronbach’s Alpha, was calculated and reported earlier on each of the three subscales of the 3D-WS. The values determined the reliability of the instrument based on the value (*citation needed). In order to answer the second research question, “Do the scores from the three subscales of the 3D-WS instrument provide construct validity for the five SAWS subscales?” A Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the correlation of the scores from the subscales from both measures in relation to each other. The effect size which is used in the correlation itself is the effect size, according to the criteria established by Cohen (1988) and cited by Granello (2007) as a guide for reporting results in counselor education and supervision quantitative research, with small, .10, medium, .30 and large, .50 as the standard.

In order to answer the research question, “To what extent does the wisdom of the counselor (measured by SAWS and the 3D-WS) explain the counseling working alliance (measured by WAI-S-T)?” a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted with the three subscales (affective dimension, reflective dimension, and cognitive dimension) of the 3D-WS, and five subscales (experience, emotional regulation, reflectivity, humor, openness) of the SAWS as independent variables and the working alliance (WAI-S-T) as the dependent variable. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to verify whether any
variance in the working alliance could be explained by demographics such as gender, age, degree earned, license type, and years of experience. A t-test was run to determine the relationship between the number of counseling sessions and the WAI total score.

**Results**

The results indicated that neither the demographics nor the number of counseling sessions resulted in significant variables contributing to the strength of the working alliance. The one-way ANOVA results were reported for gender ($F = 1.0$, p-value = .46), age ($F = .70$, p-value = .77), degree earned ($F = 1.1$, p-value = .39), license type ($F = .59$, p-value = .86), and years of experience ($F = 1.1$, p-value = .41). The approach to therapy and counseling setting were not included, since data was missing and/or more than one item was marked indicating it was difficult to answer for some participants. This is understandable since many counselors work in multiple settings, and apply various approaches to counseling. Therefore it was determined that these items would not be included in the final study. A t-test was run to determine the significance of the number of counseling sessions and the WAI-S-T total score, yielding a Pearson’s correlation coefficient $r = .218$, indicating the number of sessions may have a small effect on the working alliance (Granello, 2007). Since a larger sample size may yield more effects from the gender, age, gender, degree earned, license type, years of experience and especially the number of counseling sessions, these demographics will be included in the final study as covariates to be controlled so the effects of the wisdom variables can be examined in relation to the working alliance.

In terms of the convergence evidence provided by the correlational analysis between the SAWS and the 3D-WS, the following results are reported. The SAWS
critical life experience scale was not correlated with the 3D-WS cognitive dimension \((r = .06)\), affective dimension \((r = .08)\), and the reflective dimension \((r = .04)\). The SAWS reflectivity/reminiscence scale indicated a small effect size correlations with the 3D-WS affective and reflective scales, with Pearson Correlation values of \(r = .16\) for the affective dimension, and \(r = .15\) for the reflective dimension.

The Cognitive dimension was not significantly correlated at \(r = .02\) with the SAWS reflectivity/reminiscence scale. The SAWS openness scale had small effect sizes for the correlations between the affective dimension \((r = .12)\), the reflective dimension \((r = .27)\) and the cognitive dimension \((r = .22)\). The SAWS humor scale was most highly correlated with a large correlational effect size for the reflective dimension \((r = .58)\), and medium effect sizes for the affective \((r = .31)\) and cognitive dimensions \((r = .43)\). Finally, the SAWS emotional regulation scale was correlated with a medium effect correlations for the affective dimension \((r = .38)\) and the reflective dimension \((r = .38)\) and a small effect for the cognitive dimension \((r = .25)\). Table 9 summarizes the results of correlations between the subscales for the SAWS and the 3D-WS.
Table 9

*Pearson Correlations for the Subscales for the SAWS and the 3D-WS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWS Characteristic</th>
<th>3D-WS</th>
<th>r-value</th>
<th>Effect Size (Granello, 2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical life experience</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflective</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection/reminiscence</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflective</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflective</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflective</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional regulation</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflective</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=50

The covariates are entered into the final multiple linear regression analysis as a means for controlling the effect on the working alliance. The multiple linear regression analysis of data for the final research question comparing the counselor’s wisdom traits (measured by SAWS and the 3D-WS) to the working alliance, the results indicated $R^2$ equal to .35, an $F (8, 32) = 2.2, p = .058$. In other words 35% of variability in the working alliance was explained by the traits of wisdom, measured by the eight total subscales of wisdom. Thirteen percent of the variability was uniquely explained by the SAWS measure, and 1% was explained by the 3D-WS. As expected, none of the subscales alone significantly contributed to the variance, although combined, the results...
were more impressive. Additionally, the removal of any of the subscales did not increase $R^2$.

**Discussion**

The results of the study are encouraging, in that there is potential for significance to be found between the wisdom of the counselor and the counselor’s perception of the counseling relationship when the study is conducted with a larger sample. The SAWS subscales, experience, emotional regulation, reflection, humor and openness appear to explain more of the wisdom traits than the 3D-WS’s affective, reflective and cognitive dimensions. The 3D-WS provided some convergent evidence for the SAWS scales of wisdom, especially for humor and emotional regulation. There is, however a substantial amount of variance which is not explained by either the SAWS or the 3D-WS. The unexplained variance is also not accounted for by the demographics (gender, age, highest degree earned or years of counseling experience), nor the number of counseling sessions. Future studies will include the use of an additional measure of wisdom, namely the Wisdom Development Scale (WDS; Greene & Brown, 2009), which may provide further convergent evidence for the SAWS, and may capture what Sternberg identified as wisdom traits (1991), such as life knowledge, life skills, self-knowledge, willingness to learn, and interpersonal understanding.
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT
The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the counselor’s characteristics and the counselor’s perception of the counseling relationship. The goal of the research is to describe traits of the counselor’s which improve the effectiveness of the counseling relationship.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete the demographic information questionnaire and four surveys; three designed to measure characteristics of yourself as a counselor and one to measure your perception of the counseling relationship – the WAI-S-T (Working Alliance Inventory for Counselor, Short Form). For the WAI-S-T, you will be asked to answer the survey by selecting one of your current counseling clients as the basis for your response. To qualify for the study, you will need to be
currently seeing a client for at least three sessions. You will not identify your client in any way. Answering the surveys will take approximately 30 minutes.

We foresee no risks associated with participation in this research study beyond those typically associated with self-awareness or insight. Specifically, you may experience discomfort as a result of completing the self-survey due to increased self-awareness about your personal counseling characteristics and a potential heightened awareness of your level of satisfaction in the counseling relationship. You may benefit from participation in the study because you will be provided an opportunity to reflect on your traits and your satisfaction in the counseling relationship. Additionally, you will have a chance to enter a drawing to win 1 of 5 ten dollar gift cards to Starbucks© as an incentive for your participation in the study.

Participation in this study will not impact your position as a counselor, and your responses will not be shared with others. In fact, no one, including the researcher will be able connect your identity to your responses.

Your participation is voluntary. You may also begin participating and decided to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Having read the above, please click “CONTINUE” to indicate your consent to participation in the study. You may print this form for future reference.

If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Sponsored Programs and Academic Research Center, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-1907.
Demographics Questionnaire

Instructions: Please indicate the correct answer for each question with an “X” or written response in the corresponding blank.

Gender:
__ Female
__ Male

What is your age: __________

What is your race/ethnicity:
__ African American
__ American Indian
__ Asian American/Pacific Islander
__ Caucasian
__ Hispanic/Latino/a
__ Multiethnic/Multiracial
__ Other

Highest Degree Earned:
__ Bachelor’s
__ Master’s
__ Doctoral

How many years of clinical experience do you have (post master’s degree): _____

License Type: __________

Other Credentials:
__ AAMFT Approved Supervisor
__ ACS Approved Supervisor
__ Certified Drug and Alcohol Counselor
__ Registered Play Counselor (Supervisor)
__ Other, Please Specify _________________________
__ None
APPENDIX E

THREE DIMENSIONAL WISDOM SCALE
Three-Dimensional Wisdom Scale (Ardelt, 2003)

This section asks you about your opinion and feelings. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what’s going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am annoyed by unhappy people who just feel sorry for themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is basically the same most of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People make too much of the feelings and sensitivity of animals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can classify almost all people as either honest or crooked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel much better if my present circumstances changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is only one right way to do anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are some people I know I would never like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is better not to know too much about things that cannot be changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things often go wrong for me by no fault of my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance is bliss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (1)</td>
<td>Agree (2)</td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>Disagree (4)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be comfortable with all kinds of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person either knows the answer to a question or he/she doesn’t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not really my problem if others are in trouble and need help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are either good or bad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much are the following statements true of yourself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definitely true of myself (1)</th>
<th>Mostly true of myself (2)</th>
<th>About half-way true (3)</th>
<th>Rarely true of myself (4)</th>
<th>Not true of myself (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I see people in need, I try to help them one way or another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I’m upset at someone, I usually try to “put</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Definitely true of myself</td>
<td>Mostly true of myself</td>
<td>About half-way true</td>
<td>Rarely true of myself</td>
<td>Not true of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself in his or her shoes” for a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are certain people whom I dislike so much that I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inwardly pleased when they are caught and punished for something they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always try to look at all sides of a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel a real compassion for everyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is a likely chance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to think in depth about something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I look back on what has happened to me, I can’t help feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resentful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely true of myself (1)</td>
<td>Mostly true of myself (2)</td>
<td>About half-way true (3)</td>
<td>Rarely true of myself (4)</td>
<td>Not true of myself (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often have not comforted another when he or she needed it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A problem has little attraction for me if I don’t think it has a solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I either get very angry or depressed if things go wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I don’t feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often do not understand people’s behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I get so charged up emotionally that I am unable to consider many ways of dealing with my problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes when people are talking to me, I find myself wishing that they would leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer just to let things happen rather than try to understand why they turned out that way.</td>
<td>Definitely true of myself (1)</td>
<td>Mostly true of myself (2)</td>
<td>About half-way true (3)</td>
<td>Rarely true of myself (4)</td>
<td>Not true of myself (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am confused by a problem, one of the first things I do is survey the situation and consider all the relevant pieces of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like to get involved in listening to another person’s troubles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am hesitant about making important decisions after thinking about them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m easily irritated by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who argue with me.</td>
<td>Definitely true of myself (1)</td>
<td>Mostly true of myself (2)</td>
<td>About half-way true (3)</td>
<td>Rarely true of myself (4)</td>
<td>Not true of myself (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I look back on what’s happened to me, I feel cheated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply knowing the answer rather than understanding the reasons for the answer to a problem is fine with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes find it difficult to see things from another person’s point of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

SELF-ASSESSED WISDOM SCALE
The SAWS Inventory (Webster, 2003)

This brief questionnaire is designed to investigate how people of different ages perceive themselves with respect to life experiences and whether or not these perceptions change as we grow older. You are asked to rate all of the following statements using the scale below. Remember, there are not “right” or “wrong” answers and your responses will remain anonymous. Do not rush, but work steadily as we are interested in your first impressions. Please record your responses by circling only one number on the rating scale below each statement.

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Moderately Disagree
3= Slightly Disagree
4= Slightly Agree
5= Moderately Agree
6= Strongly Agree

I have overcome many painful events in my life.

1 2 3 4 5 6

It is easy for me to adjust my emotions to the situation at hand.

1 2 3 4 5 6

I often think about connections between my past and present.

1 2 3 4 5 6

I can chuckle at personal embarrassments.

1 2 3 4 5 6

I like to read books which challenge me to think differently about issues.

1 2 3 4 5 6

I have had to make many important life decisions.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Emotions do not overwhelm me when I make personal decisions.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I often think about my personal past.
1 2 3 4 5 6

There can be amusing elements even in very difficult life situations.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I enjoy listening to a variety of musical styles besides my favorite kind.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I have dealt with a great many different kinds of people during my lifetime.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I am “tuned” in to my own emotions.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I reminisce quite frequently.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I try and find a humorous side when coping with a major life transition.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I enjoy sampling a wide variety of different ethnic foods.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I have experienced many moral dilemmas.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I am very good at reading my emotional states.
1 2 3 4 5 6
Reviewing my past helps me gain perspective on current concerns.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I am easily aroused to laughter.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I often look for new things to try.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I have seen much of the negative side of life (e.g., dishonesty, hypocrisy).
1 2 3 4 5 6

I can freely express my emotions without feeling like I might lose control.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I often recall earlier times in my life to see how I’ve changed since then.
1 2 3 4 5 6

At this point in my life, I find it easy to laugh at my mistakes.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Controversial works of art play an important and valuable role in society.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I have lived through many difficult life transitions.
1 2 3 4 5 6

I am good at identifying subtle emotions within myself.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Recalling my earlier days helps me gain insight into important life matters.
1 2 3 4 5 6
I often use humor to put others at ease.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I like being around persons whose views are strongly different from mine.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I’ve personally discovered that “you can’t always tell a book from its cover”.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I can regulate my emotions when the situation calls for it.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I often find memories of my past can be important coping resources.

1  2  3  4  5  6

Now I find that I can really appreciate life’s little ironies.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I’m very curious about other religious and/or philosophical belief systems.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I’ve learned valuable life lessons from others.

1  2  3  4  5  6

It seems I have a talent for reading other people’s emotions.

1  2  3  4  5  6

Reliving past accomplishments in memory increases my confidence for today.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I can make fun of myself to comfort others.

1  2  3  4  5  6
I’ve often wondered about life and what lies beyond.
APPENDIX G

WISDOM DEVELOPMENT SCALE
Wisdom Development Scale (Brown & Greene, 2006)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Neutral Strongly
Agree           Disagree

**Self-Knowledge**
- I am well aware of all of my weaknesses
- I am well aware of all of my values
- I am well aware of all of my interests
- I am well aware of all of my beliefs

**Emotional Management**
- I manage uncertainty well
- I manage stress effectively
- I manage my emotions effectively
- I keep cool in stressful situations
- I do not get upset easily

**Altruism**
- I use my influence for the good of others
- I treat others with respect
- I show appreciation towards others
- I see good in others
- I respect other’s boundaries
- I make amends with those I have hurt
- I learn from others
- I help others
- I have compassion towards others
- I compromise with others when appropriate
- I am sensitive to the needs of others
- I accept others
**Inspirational Engagement**

I inspire others
I give good advice on issues of life
I overcome limitations imposed by others
Other people see me as a role model
I demonstrate courage when necessary
I have general confidence in what I know
I have confidence in my abilities
I present well-supported arguments
I communicate effectively with others
I am prepared for many situations

**Judgment**

I am aware of different ways of life, philosophies, and cultures
I am inquisitive
I take the context of the situation into consideration when making decisions
I integrate and apply what I have learned from one part of my life to another
I understand how my background has shaped my perspective on things
I have integrated different aspects of my identity into who I am
I know how to behave in a variety of situations
I am able to relate to people different from me

**Life Knowledge**

I see the interconnectedness between people and the natural world
I see the interconnectedness between knowledge and ideas
I reflect on my life regularly
I recognize that there are cycles in life
I look for the deeper meaning of events in life
I explore the deeper questions of life
I consider myself and my experiences in a larger context
I assess underlying subtexts in situations
I am concerned with issues that affect all people
I accept what I cannot change
I accept there are uncertainties in life

**Life Skills**
I manage time effectively
I prioritize projects effectively
I have a strong work ethic
I achieve my goals
I handle multiple obligations effectively
I have a sense of purpose in my life
I make sound decisions
I take advantage of life’s opportunities
I multitask well
I fulfill my obligations to others
I attend to the important matters in my life

**Willingness to Learn**
I recognize the limits of my knowledge
I learn from my experiences
I enjoy learning for the sake of learning
I am open to change
I accept constructive criticism
APPENDIX H

WORKING ALLIANCE INVENTORY-
SHORT FORM THERAPIST
Working Alliance Inventory-Short Form, Therapist (Tracey & Kokotovic, 1989)

Instructions:

On the following page there are sentences that describe some of the different ways you might think or feel about your client. As you read the sentences mentally insert the name of your client in place of ______________ in the text.

Below each statement there is a seven point scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always

1. ______________ and I agree about the steps to be taken to improve his/her situation.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always

2. My client and I both feel confident about the usefulness of our current activity in counseling.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always

3. I believe ______________ likes me.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always
4. I have doubts about what we are trying to accomplish in counseling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I am confident in my ability to help _________________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. We are working towards mutually agreed upon goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I appreciate ________________ as a person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. We agree on what is important for ________________ to work on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. ______________ and I have built a mutual trust.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always

10. ______________ and I have different ideas on what his/her real problems are.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always

11. We have established a good understanding between us of the kind of changes that would be good for ______________.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always

12. ______________ believes the way we are working with his/her problem is correct.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Never Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Often Very Often Always
APPENDIX I

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH STUDY
August 2010

Dear Participant,

You have been selected to participate in a valuable study. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the counselor’s characteristics and the counselor’s perception of the working alliance in the counseling relationship. The goal of the research is to describe the traits of the counselor and their effectiveness in the counseling relationship. *You will receive an e-mail in the next week, inviting you to complete the study.* While your participation is completely voluntary, you are strongly encouraged to complete the survey as soon as possible, so your contribution can be included in the study. If you would like to take the survey immediately, you can access the survey through the following link: [http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TKZGVD](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TKZGVD)

If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Office of Sponsored Programs, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-2161.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this valuable research.

Sincerely,

Linda Osterlund, MA, LMFT
Lead Investigator
loserla@regis.edu
(719) 640-8286
APCE, Counselor Education and Supervision

Heather Helm, PhD, LPC
Researcher Advisor
(970) 351-1650
APCE, Counselor Education and Supervision