The Influence of Personality Type on the Supervisory Relationship in Field Education

Alan J. Dettlaff

The supervisory relationship between field instructor and student is an essential element of a student's professional development in field education. Although there is a growing body of literature on the supervisory skills and learning activities that contribute to a successful supervisory relationship, little attention has been given to personality variables in field education and how these variables affect that relationship. The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of personality type on student and field instructor perceptions of the quality of the supervisory relationship. Results indicate that students who shared certain personality types with their field instructor rated the overall quality of their relationship significantly higher than those who did not share those personality types with their field instructor. Results were similar for field instructors placed with students of differing personality types. Results suggest that the supervisory relationship can be enhanced by recognizing and responding to personality differences. Recommendations are provided for working effectively with students of differing personality types.

Key words: *supervisory relationship, personality differences, field instruction, MBT*

The supervisory relationship between field instructor and student is a fundamental element of a student's professional development in field education. The quality of this relationship has been shown to have a significant effect on student learning, satisfaction with the field agency, and overall success of the field placement (Alperin, 1998; Fortune & Abramson, 1993; Raskin, 1989; Ronnestadt & Skovholt, 1993). Additional literature suggests that a positive and productive supervisory relationship must be established in order for learning and professional growth to occur (Behling, Curtis, & Foster, 1982; Holloway, 1995;

Alan J. Dettlaff, Ph.D., LMSW, is Assistant Professor and Director of Field Education in the Department of Social Work at Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Texas.

Worthen & McNeill, 1996). Given the importance of this relationship to student learning and professional development, understanding the variables that affect it is critical.

Personality style is one of the factors known to have a significant effect on interpersonal relationships (Lawrence, 1997). The supervisory relationship is a product of the individual personality styles of both supervisor and supervisee. While individual differences between supervisor and supervisee may contribute to relationship development, they may also form the basis for problems in supervision. Moskowitz and Rupert (1983) studied conflicts in the supervisory relationship and found that 50 percent of students reporting conflicts described this conflict as the result of personality differences. Similarly, Holtzman and Raskin (1989) found that personality conflicts were a primary reason for failure in field placements. In order to establish a positive and productive supervisory relationship, field instructors must be aware of their own personality style and how this style can affect others and relationship development.

A growing body of literature in field education has provided information regarding the supervisory skills and learning activities that contribute to a successful supervisory relationship (Fortune & Abramson, 1993; Fortune, McCarthy, & Abramson, 2001; Kissman & Van Tran, 1990; Knight, 1996, 2001). However, very little attention has been given to personality variables in field education and how these variables can influence the quality of the supervisory relationship. Research on personality type indicates that relationship variables are often a function of personality similarities or differences (Lawrence, 1993; Myers & Kirby, 1993). Understanding the influence of these variables on the supervisory relationship can help field instructors recognize and respond to differences in order to prevent potential problems from developing. The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of personality type on student and field instructor perceptions of the quality of the supervisory relationship. Recommendations are provided for working effectively with students of differing personality types.

Literature Review

The field instructor is one of the most significant and influential elements of field education. Research indicates that students' perception of the quality of field instruction is the most significant factor contributing to satisfaction with the field placement (Fortune & Abramson, 1993). As a result, several studies have identified the elements of supervision that contribute to satisfaction. These elements have been identified as primarily task-oriented, including providing detailed explanations, feedback on learning assignments, reviewing and analyzing students' cases, helping the student understand the agency, integrating theory and practice, conducting co-interviews with students, and using process recordings as a learning assignment (Fortune & Abramson, 1993; Fortune et al., 2001; Knight, 2001).

While these studies have focused primarily on the supervisory skills of field instructors, additional studies indicate that relationship variables also can have a significant effect on outcome measures in field education. Lazar and Mosek (1993) found that the quality of the relationship between field instructor and student had a stronger influence on field instructors' evaluations of student performance than did measures of their ability in the placement. Turban, Jones, and Rozelle (1990) found that supervisees who were liked by their supervisors received higher quality supervision and greater psychological support, and were evaluated more favorably than disliked supervisees. Additional studies support that supervisor feelings toward a supervisee significantly influences treatment of the supervisee and evaluations of performance (Alexander & Wilkins, 1982; Kingstrom & Mainstone, 1985). Similarly, perceived similarity between supervisor and supervisee has been shown to have a significant effect on supervisors' evaluations of supervisees on outcome measures including intelligence, competence, motivation, and quality of work (Royal & Golden, 1981; Turban & Jones, 1988).

Although the literature clearly shows the importance of the supervisory relationship in field education, the influence of personality type on the supervisory relationship has not been examined in the social work literature. However, this influence has been examined in the field of psychology between counseling students and their supervisors. In a study examining the effects of personality type on the supervisory relationship, Steen (1998) found that supervisors and students with similar personality types had significantly higher levels of perceived satisfaction with the supervisory relationship than those with dissimilar personality types. Handley (1982) examined the relationship between personality type and several variables, including the supervisory relationship, students' satisfaction with supervision, and supervisors' evaluation of students. Results indicate that similarity of personality type between supervisor and student was significantly related to positive perceptions of the supervisory relationship and to students' satisfaction with supervision. Praul (1970) examined the relationship between personality type and supervisors' evaluations of students, finding a positive correlation between similarity of personality type and supervisors' ratings of trainee effectiveness. In a related study, Swanson and O'Saben (1993) found that students' needs and expectations of their supervisors differed as a result of their personality type. Each of these studies suggests that recognizing and responding to differences early in the supervision process can lead to a more effective supervisory relationship and improved learning opportunities.

Theory of Personality Type and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Theory of personality type stems from the work of Carl Gustav Jung (1923). Jung believed that the seemingly random variations seen in individual behavior are actually consistent and orderly behaviors. Jung's theory of personality

Extraversion (E)	↔	Introversion (I)
Sensing (S)	↔	Intuition (N)
Thinking (T)	↔	Feeling (F)
Judging (J)	↔	Perceiving (P)

Figure 1   Personality type dichotomies of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

involved the recognition of patterns of behavior that are characteristic of people in interpersonal relationships. The use of the word "type" by Jung has been described as short for "typical" (Pearman & Albritton, 1997). Jung's theory developed out of numerous anthropological observations and studies, from which he proposed that the world is composed of polarities. From this belief, Jung proposed three dichotomous categories that differentiate individuals according to the processes by which they perceive information and make decisions or judgments based on information, and whether they process perception and judgment internally, through thought and reflection, or externally, through interaction with others (Kroeger & Thuesen, 1988; Pearman & Albritton, 1997). Jung's theory was developed to describe normal personalities, rather than pathological personalities, in an attempt to explain the individual differences that contribute to the intelligence and uniqueness of human beings (McCaulley, 1990).

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was developed by Katherine Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers in order to measure the individual differences described by Jung and make this information applicable to individuals and interpersonal relationships (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). Briggs and Myers incorporated Jung's three dichotomies into the instrument and added a fourth dichotomy that measured the processes by which individuals function in the external environment (Myers et al., 1998). The MBTI consists of self-reported, forced-choice items that classify individuals according to their preferences in each of the four dichotomous dimensions (figure 1), each representing an opposing preference. Each person taking the instrument will prefer one of the two categories in each dimension.

The Extraversion-Introversion (E-I) scale measures the direction from which individuals seek their sources of energy (Myers et al., 1998). Extraverts seek energy from their external environment and are energized through interaction with others, while Introverts seek energy from within and are more comfortable alone or in small groups (Lawrence, 1993; Thomson, 1998). The Sensing-Intuition (S-N) scale measures perception, or an individual's preferred manner of processing information (Myers et al.). Sensors focus on practical facts and specific information, using their five senses to gather and process information, while Intuitives focus on possibilities and abstract conceptualization, using their insight to gather and process information (Lawrence, 1993; Thomson, 1998). The Thinking-Feeling (T-F) scale indicates an individual's preferred manner of making decisions (Myers et al.). Thinkers make decisions based on

logical and objective analysis, while Feelers focus on interpersonal relationships and the impact of decisions on others (Lawrence, 1993; Thomson, 1998). The final scale, Judging-Perceiving (J-P), measures the manner in which people prefer to structure their lives (Myers et al.). Judgers prefer planned, orderly, and structured activities, while Perceivers are flexible and spontaneous, preferring casual and less organized activities (Lawrence, 1993; Thomson, 1998).

Method

This study used an ex post facto design to examine the influence of personality type on the supervisory relationship. An ex post facto design is used to measure the effects of pre-existing individual characteristics on a given criteria, when subjects already possess a certain level of the independent variable (Wilkinson & McNeil, 1996). In this study, an ex post facto design is most appropriate as the purpose of the study is to measure the effect of personality type on student and field instructor perceptions of the supervisory relationship. Two research questions were developed to guide this study: (1) What is the relationship between similarity or difference in personality type and *student* perceptions of the quality of the supervisory relationship? and (2) What is the relationship between similarity or difference in personality type and *field instructor* perceptions of the quality of the supervisory relationship?

Participants

All social work students enrolled in field education at one large southern university and their field instructors were invited to participate in this study. In order to participate, it was necessary that both the student and the student's field instructor agree to participate in the study, as the research questions necessitated data on the personality type of both individuals in the student-field instructor pair. The final sample, comprising those who agreed to participate and who completed all instruments, was composed of eighty-four student-field instructor pairs. All students were enrolled in field education during Spring 2003; all field instructors were licensed social workers, approved by the university and designated as field instructors.

Instruments

Student and field instructor personality types were measured using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI is the most widely used instrument in the United States to measure normal personality differences (Myers et al., 1998), and has been used consistently in previous research to identify personality type (Handley, 1982; Praul, 1970; Steen, 1998; Swanson & O'Saben, 1993). Studies indicate that the MBTI has internal consistency as high as most major psychological scales, with coefficient alphas ranging from 0.86 to 0.95.

Test–retest reliability is consistent over time, with alphas ranging from 0.83 to 0.97 (Carlson, 1989; Harvey, 1996; McRae & Costa, 1989; Murray, 1990; Myers et al., 1998). Construct validity has been established through factor analysis and correlations with personality variables measured by other instruments (Carlson, 1985, 1989; Myers et al., 1998, Thompson & Borrello, 1986).

Student and field instructor perceptions of the supervisory relationship were measured using the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI). The BLRI has been used often in previous research to assess supervisor and trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship (Carey & Williams, 1986; Handley, 1982; Threadgill, 1991). The BLRI measures perceptions of the supervisory relationship according to four subscales: (1) level of regard, (2) empathic understanding, (3) unconditionality, and (4) congruence. Barrett-Lennard (1962) reports a mean split-half reliability coefficient of .90 for the subscales, and stability coefficients of .93 to .95. Predictive and known-groups validity have also been established (Barrett-Lennard). The BLRI is a 40-item instrument, with scores ranging from 0 to 60 on each of the four subscales and a total relationship score ranging from 0 to 240.

Procedures

The Institutional Review Board of the university approved the study prior to data collection. Following approval, all students enrolled in field education in Spring 2003 and their field instructors were informed of the purpose of the study. Those agreeing to participate were administered the MBTI during the first month of the field placement. At the completion of the semester, students and field instructors completed the BLRI. Participants were assured their responses would remain confidential and that their decision to participate in the study would have no effect on their status as a student or field instructor in the university.

Data Analysis

Data resulting from the MBTI are considered categorical data. Although the instrument results in preference scores, these scores are designed to reflect the direction of a preference, rather than intensity. Therefore, quantitative interpretation of these scores is not recommended (Myers et al., 1998). As a result, students and field instructors were grouped as having either the same personality types or different personality types for each of the four dimensions of the MBTI. Independent samples t tests were conducted to determine if there were significant differences in perceptions of the supervisory relationship between students placed with a field instructor who shared their personality type and those placed with a field instructor of a different personality type. Similarly, independent samples t tests were conducted to determine if there were significant differences in perceptions of the supervisory relationship between field instruc-

tors supervising a student who shared their personality type and field instructors supervising a student of a different personality type.

Results

Results show significant differences ($p < .01$) in students who were placed with a supervisor of the same personality type on the Extraversion-Introversion scale and the Sensing-Intuition scale, as compared to students placed with a supervisor of a different personality type. Students who shared the Extraversion-Introversion personality type with their field instructor rated the overall quality of their relationship significantly higher as compared to students who did not share this personality type with their field instructor. Similarly, students who shared the Sensing-Intuition personality type with their field instructor rated the overall quality of their relationship significantly higher as compared to students who did not share this personality type. No significant differences were found in BLRI scores in the Thinking-Feeling or Judging-Perceiving categories. A summary of mean BLRI scores and significance levels for all personality types is presented in table 1.

Results were similar for field instructors, as results show significant differences ($p < .01$) in the relationship scores of field instructors who were placed with a student of the same personality type on the Extraversion-Introversion scale and the Sensing-Intuition scale, as compared with field instructors placed with students of a different personality type. Field instructors who shared the Extraversion-Introversion type with their student rated the overall quality of their relationship significantly higher than those field instructors who did not share this personality type with their student. Similarly, field instructors who shared the Sensing-Intuition type with their student rated the overall quality of their relationship significantly higher than those field instructors who did not share this type. Similar to student results, no significant differences were found in BLRI scores in the Thinking-Feeling or Judging-Perceiving categories. BLRI totals and significance levels for all personality types are presented in table 2.

Table 1   Student scores on BLRI for all personality types

Personality Type	Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
E-I	Matched	194.13	29.84		
	Unmatched	170.46	31.35	3.542	.001
S-N	Matched	199.27	23.84		
	Unmatched	172.71	33.44	3.956	.000
T-F	Matched	185.65	33.61		
	Unmatched	179.27	32.03	0.874	.385
J-P	Matched	190.00	31.78		
	Unmatched	178.00	32.60	1.688	.095

Table 2   Field instructor scores on BLRI for all personality types

Personality Type	Group	M	SD	t	p
E-I	Matched	205.64	11.92		
	Unmatched	176.24	12.01	10.987	.000
S-N	Matched	197.89	13.12		
	Unmatched	167.57	9.55	10.865	.000
T-F	Matched	189.00	20.63		
	Unmatched	185.91	15.42	0.737	.463
J-P	Matched	190.80	20.47		
	Unmatched	184.31	16.04	1.600	.113

Discussion

This study reveals significant differences in student and field instructor perceptions of the quality of the supervisory relationship when students and field instructors shared certain personality types, as compared with students and field instructors with opposing personality types. These results are consistent with findings in other academic disciplines concerning the influence of personality type on the supervisory relationship, and provide significant implications for social work education. These results suggest that the interpersonal relationship between field instructor and student may be enhanced when similarity exists in interaction style (E-I) and information processing (S-N). It is important to note that these results do not suggest matching students according to personality type. Rather, results suggest the need for field instructors to be aware of their own personality type and to learn how to respond to students of differing types. Field instructors must be able to respond to their students according to the students' personality type, in order to most effectively relate to their students and to meet their students' learning needs. This ability may lead to more productive and positive supervisory interactions, thus improving the supervisory relationship. Following are explanations of the Extraversion-Introversion and Sensing-Intuition dichotomies and strategies for working with students of differing personality types within these dichotomies.

The Extraversion-Introversion Dichotomy

Extraverts learn best through talking and interaction with others (Lawrence, 1997; Myers et al., 1998). They prefer collaborative approaches to learning and are often dependent on feedback and suggestions when undertaking new tasks (Elliott & Sapp, 1988). Extraverts prefer action to reflection and learn best through active engagement and experimentation (Penn, 1992; Myers et al.). In terms of interaction style, extraverts enjoy involvement with others and are energetic and enthusiastic about meeting new people and engaging in new

experiences. Extraverts communicate freely and enjoy sharing ideas and opinions with others (Lawrence, 1993).

Introverts prefer to process information internally through thought and reflection (Lawrence, 1997; Myers et al., 1998). They work contentedly alone and prefer quiet for concentration. Introverts learn through reflective observation and prefer to process information before acting. They think most effectively with anticipation and preparation, rather than immediate responses (Myers et al., 1998). Introverts are generally comfortable with one-on-one communication, but may struggle with communication in group settings. They are generally reserved in their communication patterns, and may appear detached or uninvolved (Lawrence, 1993).

Extraverted Students and Introverted Field Instructors   To the extraverted student, introverted field instructors may appear distant, aloof, and uninterested. Introverted field instructors must be aware of this perception and attempt to be more expressive and open with extraverted students. Extraverted students prefer substantial feedback and involvement from their field instructors. However, introverted field instructors tend to have a more relaxed approach to supervision because of their value for autonomy, and may see feedback as less important as they are generally self-reinforcing and self-motivating. When working with extraverted students, introverted field instructors should be aware of extraverts' preferences for supervision and be actively engaged in the supervision process by providing significant feedback, input, and reinforcement.

Extraverted students process information through discussion. As a result, they often develop their ideas as they discuss them and may change the direction of their focus throughout the discussion. To the introverted field instructor, this may be perceived as a lack of focus or an intrusion on the introvert's internal thinking pattern, but must be recognized as a necessary part of the learning process. Introverted field instructors should attempt to provide significant opportunities for students to discuss new information and actively participate in this discussion to facilitate learning. Extraverted students also are likely to benefit from group supervision sessions, to discuss their ideas with others. Introverted field instructors are generally more comfortable with individual supervision, but should recognize the educational benefits of group supervision to extraverted students and schedule a balance of group and individual supervision as appropriate.

Introverted Students and Extraverted Field Instructors   To the introverted student, extraverted field instructors may appear loud, interrupting, and aggressive. Extraverted field instructors must be aware of this perception and attempt to slow down and allow time for silence and reflection. Introverted students consider information carefully before discussing it and prefer time to process information before making decisions. Extraverted field instructors who do not recognize this quality may be concerned about students' ability to connect with the

material quickly enough to be effective. They may expect immediate responses and mistake introverts' internal processing for a lack of understanding or attention. Extraverted field instructors should recognize this as a part of the introverted learning process and allow introverts time to process new information, while maintaining consistent standards and making expectations for performance clear. Introverted students are less likely to see feedback as important and may view continuous feedback as an unnecessary interruption. Extraverted field instructors should provide feedback when necessary for improved performance, but should not view feedback as a source of motivation or encouragement, as introverted students tend to be self-motivating.

Extraverted field instructors are likely to approach supervision in a very active and engaged manner, which may conflict with introverts' preference for processing and reflection. Introverted students are likely to feel hesitant toward client contact and advanced field assignments until they feel well prepared through observation and planning. Extraverted field instructors may push introverted students too quickly as their style is to act, entering situations in order to understand them. This can be threatening to introverted students who prefer to understand before acting. Field instructors should carefully assess students' readiness for new experiences, providing these experiences as appropriate to the practice level of the student. Field instructors should openly discuss any concerns of introverted students, and help them overcome these concerns through careful preparation and planning.

The Sensing-Intuition Dichotomy

This personality characteristic reflects individuals' most basic learning difference: perception, or the way individuals become aware of the world around them. This characteristic is the source of the most miscommunication among people, particularly in teaching and learning (Lawrence, 1997), and should be given considerable attention by field instructors to avoid potential problems in relationship development.

Sensors use their five senses to gain awareness of the external world, focusing on facts and information that is concretely obtainable (Lawrence, 1997). They are observant and accurate, focusing on facts and specific details, rather than the overall picture. Sensors prefer to learn new information through concrete experiences first, and then follow these experiences with reading for additional understanding (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). They learn best when new information is perceived to be clearly useful and opportunities are available for immediate application of the information (Myers et al., 1998). When approaching new projects, sensors prefer to rely on familiar tactics and past experiences that have been proven successful. They prefer the conventional and work in a thoughtful and planned manner, following each step in sequence (Drummond & Stoddard, 1992). While capable of producing original ideas, sensors prefer to first consult what they already know about a topic before considering alternatives.

Intuitives use their intuition to gain awareness of the external world, focusing on ideas and possibilities that extend beyond facts (Lawrence, 1997). They use imagination and creativity to look at the overall picture, rather than focusing on specific details. Intuitives prefer to learn new information through abstract conceptualization, reading for understanding first, followed by observation or concrete experience (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). They learn best when new information inspires their imagination and creativity, and then are allowed to actively explore the possibilities of this new information (Jacobsen, 1993). When approaching new projects, intuitives prefer to try new ideas and interventions rather than follow conventional patterns (Lawrence, 1997). They are conceptual thinkers, and enjoy providing the ideas for new projects.

Sensing Students and Intuitive Field Instructors   Sensing students prefer concrete and specific objectives from their field instructors that provide clear expectations for performance. Intuitive field instructors tend to provide much broader experiences in supervision with a focus on creativity and independent learning, which may be difficult and frustrating for sensing students. Sensing students expect that their field instructor knows the knowledge and skills that are necessary for effective practice, and expect that their field instructor will teach them this knowledge and skill directly. Sensing students are likely to view learning through discovery as ineffective, and may become frustrated with a field instructor who provides these opportunities rather than more traditional approaches to learning.

Sensing students prefer hands-on experiences prior to learning the theory behind these experiences. For sensing students, reading about clients or interventions prior to interaction is less effective as a preparatory tool. They prefer direct observation, home visits, and other opportunities to see how something is done. After directly experiencing interaction, they will be able to process the situation and apply theory. When providing new concepts or teaching new skills to sensing students, field instructors should review the material carefully and thoroughly, working sequentially from beginning to end. Students should then be given opportunities for immediate application of new concepts and skills, as learning will come from the understanding that these concepts are immediately relevant to their current position.

In preparing for client interactions, sensing students prefer to develop a plan that they know will be effective before acting. Intuitive field instructors may view this process as frustrating and unnecessary, as their style is to jump into new experiences and use their intuition and experience to guide them. As a result, intuitive field instructors may push sensing students into new experiences for which the students feel uncomfortable and unprepared. Similarly, sensing students prefer to focus on conventional techniques and interventions that have been proven successful. To the intuitive field instructor, this may be viewed as a lack of creativity or a lack of motivation. Intuitive field instructors must recognize this as a learning style preference of sensing students, rather than a limitation. However, intuitive field instructors may need to help sensing students

think outside the box when working with clients who may not respond to traditional interventions.

Intuitive Students and Sensing Field Instructors   Intuitive students prefer to use their imagination to explore possibilities in their developing practice. Sensing field instructors tend to provide supervision that focuses on experiences that have been successful in the past with a narrow range of experiences for students, which may be frustrating for the intuitive student. Intuitive students prefer to choose and direct their own work, figuring out how something is done on their own. As a result, intuitive students may perceive sensing field instructors as too conservative, as they tend to hold students back until they demonstrate the ability to perform appropriately. Sensing field instructors should provide intuitive students with sufficient opportunities to develop their practice by providing a variety of learning opportunities that keep intuitive students challenged.

Intuitive students prefer to understand the big picture and the theory behind their actions before delving into the details of new information. Intuitive students prefer to read for understanding prior to dealing with clients, and will enjoy discussing ideas and theories to further their understanding. When providing new concepts or teaching new skills, field instructors should begin with concepts that are new and original to inspire the imagination of the intuitive student. Once engaged, instruction can turn to the aspects that are more familiar to the student.

In client interactions, intuitive students are likely to explore possibilities and try original and creative ways of addressing a problem. This may generate concern for the sensing field instructor, whose tendency is to rely on tried and true methods that are known to be successful. When working with intuitive students, it is important that sensing field instructors remain open to a variety of approaches and encourage students to use their natural creativity, as this is the source of inspiration and motivation for intuitive students. When working with clients, intuitive students' assessments may be based more on gut reaction than on details and facts because of their tendency to focus on intuition and the big picture. To the sensing field instructor, this may seem like a lack of common sense and inattention to detail. Sensing field instructors must recognize this as a learning preference of intuitive students, rather than a limitation. However, sensing field instructors may need to help intuitive students learn to focus on details and facts in order to avoid errors in judgment.

Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that the supervisory relationship in field education may be enhanced through the understanding of personality differences that exist between field instructors and their students. In order to respond to these differences, field instructors must first be aware of their own personality preferences, and then develop an understanding of how to respond effec-

tively to students of different preferences. This understanding of differences and the ability to respond to these differences may lead to a more effective supervisory relationship, and as a result, an enhanced learning experience.

Results of this study are limited by the possibility of alternative variables that may have affected the supervisory relationship among participants. Because the independent variable being examined is a pre-existing variable that cannot be manipulated, an experimental design that would help to control for alternative hypotheses was not possible. Additional research in the field of social work is needed that explores the influence of personality type on the supervisory relationship in field education, in order to further determine the effect of this variable and improve the generalizability of these findings. Given the importance of field education to the development of effective and ethical social work practitioners, additional research in this field is needed to improve the quality of field education and provide the best learning experience to social work students.

References

Alexander, E. R., & Wilkins, R. D. (1982). Performance rating validity: The relationship of objective and subjective measures of performance. *Group and Organization Studies, 7,* 485–496.

Alperin, D. E. (1998). Factors related to student satisfaction with child welfare field placements. *Journal of Social Work Education, 34*(1), 43–54.

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (1962). Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 76*(43), 1–33.

Behling, J. C., Curtis, C., & Foster, S. A. (1982). Impact of sex-role combinations on student performance in field instruction. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 18,* 93–97.

Carey, J. C., & Williams, K. S. (1986). Cognitive style in counselor education: A comparison of practicum supervisors and counselors in training. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 26,* 128–136.

Carlson, J. G. (1985). Recent assessments of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 356–365.

Carlson, J. G. (1989). Testing the test. Affirmative: In support of researching the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 67,* 484–486.

Drummond, R. J., & Stoddard, A. H. (1992). Learning style and personality type. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 75,* 99–104.

Elliot, G. R., & Sapp, G. L. (1988). The relationship between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Grasha-Riechmann Student Learning Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Psychological Type, 14,* 46–50.

Fortune, A. E., & Abramson, J. S. (1993). Predictors of satisfaction with field practicum among social work students. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*(1), 95–110.

Fortune, A. E., McCarthy, M., & Abramson, J. S. (2001). Student learning processes in field education: Relationship of learning activities to quality of field instruction, satisfaction, and performance among MSW students. *Journal of Social Work Education, 37,* 111–119.

Handley, P. (1982). Relationship between supervisors' and trainees' cognitive styles and the supervision process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29*(5), 508–515.

Harvey, R. J. (1996). Reliability and validity. In A. L. Hammer (Ed.), *MBTI applications: A decade of research on the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator* (pp. 5–29). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Holloway, E. L. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holtzman, R., & Raskin, M. S. (1989). Why field placements fail: Study results. In M. S. Raskin (Ed.), *Empirical studies in field instruction* (pp. 123–136). New York: The Hawthorne Press.

Jacobsen, C. M. (1993). Cognitive styles of creativity: Relations of scores on the Kirton Adaptation Inventory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator among managers in USA. *Psychological Reports, 72,* 1131–1138.

Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types.* New York: Harcourt Brace.

Kingstrom, P. O., & Mainstone, L. E. (1985). An investigation of rater-ratee acquaintance and rater bias. *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 641–653.

Kissman, K., & Van Tran, T. (1990). Perceived quality of field placement education among graduate social work students. *Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 5,* 27–30.

Knight, C. (1996). A study of MSW and BSW students' perceptions of their field instructors. *Journal of Social Work Education, 32*(3), 399–414.

Knight, C. (2001). The process of field instruction: BSW and MSW students' views of effective field supervision. *Journal of Social Work Education, 37*(2), 357–380.

Kroeger, O., & Thuesen, J. (1988). *Type talk: The 16 personality types that determine how we live, love, and work.* New York: Dell.

Lawrence, G. (1993). *People types & tiger stripes* (3rd ed.). Gainesville, FL: Center for Applications of Psychological Type.

Lawrence, G. D. (1997). *Looking at type and learning styles.* Gainesville, FL: Center for the Application of Psychological Type.

Lazar, A., & Mosek, A. (1993). The influence of the field instructor-student relationship on evaluations of students' practice. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*(1), 111–120.

McCaulley, M. (1990). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: A measure for individuals and groups. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 220,* 181–195.

McRae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indi-

cator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality, 57*(1), 17–40.

Moskowitz, S. A., & Rupert, P. A. (1983). Conflict resolution within the supervisory relationship. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14*(5), 623–641.

Murray, J. B. (1990). Review of research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 70,* 1187–1202.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, K. D., & Kirby, L. K. (1993). Type development—the Jungian model for lifelong growth. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 16,* 4–5.

Pearman, R. R., & Albritton, S. C. (1997). *I'm not crazy, I'm just not you: The real meaning of the sixteen personality types.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.

Penn, B. K. (1992). Correlations among learning styles, clinical specialties, and personality types of U.S. Army nurses (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*(02), 393A. (UMI No. 9212610)

Praul, J. A. (1970). The relationship of personality variables to selected outcomes of the counselor training process (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1969). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 31,* 161A. (UMI No. 7011705)

Raskin, M. S. (1989). Factors associated with student satisfaction in undergraduate social work field placements. In M. S. Raskin (Ed.), *Empirical studies in field instruction* (pp. 321–335). New York: The Haworth Press.

Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71,* 396–405.

Royal, E. G., & Golden, S. B. (1981). Attitude similarity and attraction to an employee group. *Psychological Reports, 48,* 251–254.

Steen, A. L. (1998). The effects of matched personality types on the outcome measure of perceived supervisory satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(08), 2855A. (UMI No. 9903524)

Swanson, J. L., & O'Saben, C. L. (1993). Differences in supervisory needs and expectations by trainee experience, cognitive style, and program membership. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71,* 457–464.

Thomson, L. (1998). *Personality type: An owner's manual.* Boston: Shambhala.

Thompson, B., & Borrello, G.M. (1986). Construct validity of the Myers-Briggs

Type Indicator. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46(*3), 745–752.

Threadgill, A. H. (1991). An intervention upon counseling supervisors' effectiveness and perceived empathy levels in supervisor-supervisee relationships (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52,* 506B. (UMI No. 9115718)

Turban, D. B., & Jones, A. P. (1988). Supervisor-subordinate similarity: Types, effects, and mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73,* 228–234.

Turban, D. B., Jones, A. P., & Rozelle, R. M. (1990). Influences of supervisor liking of a subordinate and the reward context on the treatment and evaluation of that subordinate. *Motivation and Emotion, 14(*3), 215–233.

Wilkinson, W. K., & McNeil, K. (1996). *Research for the helping professions.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Worthen, V., & McNeill, B. W. (1996). A phenomenological investigation of "good" supervision events. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43(*1), 25–34.