2013-06-18

Personality and Performance: An Examination of Relationships Between Personality,Character Traits, and Performance Among Wilderness Field Guides

John David Bishoff
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the Recreation Business Commons

Personality and Performance: An Examination of Relationships Between Personality,

Character Traits, and Performance Among Wilderness Field Guides

John D. Bishoff

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Mark A. Widmer, Chair
Stacy Taniguchi
John B. Bingham

Department of Recreation Management

Brigham Young University

June 2013

ABSTRACT

Personality and Performance: An Examination of Relationships Between Personality,
Character Traits, and Performance Among Wilderness Field Guides

John D. Bishoff
Department of Recreation Management
Master of Science

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between job performance of wilderness and adventure therapy (WAT) field guides and personality traits. Specifically, this study utilized the NEO-PI-R to assess personality and the Field Guide Performance Evaluation (FGPE) to assess job performance. Job performance was measured by managers, peers, and WAT participants. The sample consisted of 89 personality assessments, gathered from both the U.S. and Canada. Ordinary least squares regression analysis indicated there was a non-significant relationship between field guide job performance and personality. Findings provide implications for WAT practitioners seeking the most qualified field guides possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Table of Contents

Personality and Performance: An Examination of Relationships Between Personality,

Character Traits, and Performance Among Wilderness Field Guides

Wilderness experience programs (WEP) are "organizations that conduct outdoor

programs in wilderness or comparable lands for the purposes of personal growth, therapy,

rehabilitation, education, or leadership/organizational development" (Friese, Hendee, &

Kinziger, 1998, p. 40). The literature is replete with studies touting the efficacy of wilderness

experience programs (WEPs) to positively influence individuals with a variety of behavioral and

emotional problems across their respective life spans (Hood, 2003; Judge, 2005; Russell, 2006;

Scholl, McAvoy, Rynders, & Smith, 2003; Useem, 2001). In one specific form of WEP,

wilderness adventure therapy (WAT), licensed therapists and field guides work with clients who

engage in activities such as backpacking, rock climbing, canoeing, and skiing (Jones, Lowe, &

Risler, 2004). Existing research on WAT organizations has "primarily focused on definitions,

industry characteristics, outcome assessments, standardization, and professionalization of the

workforce" (Marchand, Russell, & Cross, 2009, p. 360).

An often overlooked but important component of wilderness therapy, however, is the

relationship between field guides and clients. Very little is known about the personality and

character traits field guides must have in order to facilitate effective change in clients (Taniguchi,

Widmer, Duerden, & Draper, 2009). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to evaluate

selection procedures used to make hiring choices within WATs and to determine if specific

relationships exist between personality traits and job performance of field guides.

Personality, character traits, and fit are an important aspect of employment in most

organizations, and WAT organizations are no different. Many organizations utilize assessment

tools to help them determine a potential employee's fit, personality, and character traits for a

specific job description. Most WAT organizations, however, do not utilize these valuable

assessments to select the best candidates for their field guides. Given the difficult, yet vital role

of the field guide in WAT, an understanding of personality traits associated with successfully

meeting the demands of this job seems crucial for the long-term vitality of the organization, the

field guide, and the client. If, indeed, certain traits are associated with successful job

performance, WAT organizations might use personality measures as screening instruments to

identify and recruit the best field guides.

An effective way to measure job performance is to obtain 360-degree (360) feedback.

This performance measure involves obtaining feedback from subordinates, peers, and bosses. In

this case, the subordinates are the program participants. Three-sixty degree feedback provides a

more complete picture of performance by utilizing evaluations from important stakeholders

within the organization and offers relevant job information that would otherwise be unavailable

(Mount, 1998). Currently, no research examines the relationship between personality and

effectiveness of field guides in WAT utilizing 360 evaluations. The important role field guides

play in facilitating the therapeutic process of clients necessitates this research which may have

important implications for the organization, client, and employee.

Two likely benefits are associated with identifying and recruiting the best field guides.

First, they are likely to be more effective at building and maintaining therapeutic relationships

with the clients, thus making the program more effective (Moses, 2000). Second, they are likely

to be happier on the job and stay on the job longer, thus reducing the high cost of recruitment and

training (Hogan & Holland, 2003; McEvoy & Cascio, 1985; Mobley, 1977). Due to the paucity

of research on character traits and employee performance of wilderness field guides, this study

may provide initial insights into character traits associated with being an effective field guide.

Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Job Performance

Past literature has consistently shown Conscientiousness is a trait which is positively correlated with job performance and is generalizable across various job types and settings (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Similarly, Agreeableness is positively correlated with job performance when team work and collaboration are needed (Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). Both Conscientiousness and Agreeableness should be highly sought after traits for field guides. Due to the nature of their jobs, field guides generally utilize a fairly complex set of soft and hard skills necessary to successfully complete their work responsibilities. Field guides must be willing to perform their duties at all times regardless of weather, time of day, or personal preferences.

Performance determined by managers. Because no universal field guide performance evaluation within WAT exists, we gathered the performance evaluations of each organization and looked for common themes between the evaluations. After review of each performance evaluation, analysis revealed the ideal candidate for a field guide position possesses the ability to manage risk, dependability, and the necessary skills to successfully navigate the outdoors. Management is concerned about the well-being of their clients and wants to be assured their field guides prioritize client safety and well-being. Because Conscientiousness and Agreeableness have consistently shown to be positively correlated with job performance, the following is our first hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 1*: A significant ($p < .05$) positive correlation will be found between scores on SDS and scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness from NEO-PI-R on ratings from employers.

Performance determined by co-workers. Generally, field guides work in pairs of two. They share the responsibilities of teaching clients to navigate the outdoors, lead trips, and complete paperwork associated with their jobs. Analysis of performance reviews (see appendix under SDS) revealed field guides prefer to have co-workers who are easy to get along with, share responsibilities equally, take initiative, are team players, and follow through with their duties and assignments. Co-workers, then, prefer someone who is Conscientious and Agreeable. Therefore, the following is our second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: A significant ($p < .05$) positive correlation will be found between scores on SDS and scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness from NEO-PI-R on peer ratings of co-workers.

Performance determined by clients. Field guides are responsible for the well-being and safety of the client during their work shifts on-trail. Because field guides are informally responsible for most of the therapeutic work of WAT clients, a positive relationship between field guides and clients is mandatory for the client's physical and emotional welfare. Taniguchi et al. (2009) found participants in a wilderness adventure program clearly valued specific personality traits among field staff. Clients entering WAT programs may not have had strong modeling of positive communication and coping skills. Field guides can become an important and positive role model for clients to learn strong social and coping skills. Research is limited on the traits clients feel are important for field guides to possess. Our third hypothesis is the following:

Hypothesis 3: A significant ($p < .05$) positive correlation will be found between scores on SDS and scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness from NEO-PI-R on ratings from WAT clients.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to explore potential relationships between personality traits and employee performance in field guides working in WATs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the relationships between performance scores and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs.

Significance of the Study

Companies offering wilderness therapy are confronted with a deluge of challenges from high employee turnover and burnout due to the emotional and physical challenges inherent to their job descriptions to working with unruly and troubled adolescents (Marchand, 2008). High turnover rates and burnout of field guides result in a substantial drain on financial and human resources associated with recruitment, hiring, and training. Valuable organizational knowledge and history are lost when employees leave (Ashworth, 2006; Massingham, 2008; Parise, Cross, & Davenport, 2006). Research has not examined the cost of turnover to wilderness therapy programs; however, estimates in the hospitality industry indicate turnover costs for a front-desk associate range anywhere from $5,688 to $12,881 (Hinkin & Tracey, 2000). It is likely the cost of turnover in wilderness therapy is much higher. The process of hiring new employees not only stresses the wilderness therapy institution, but the clients as well. Clients are constantly dealing with rules and expectations of different field guides, which could have a negative effect the efficiency of the program to facilitate therapy. The challenges confronting the individual employees are not to be overlooked. The work of wilderness field guides can be stressful. Work issues can also cause field guides to struggle in their relationships with family and friends due to schedule constraints, anxiety, and physical and emotional challenges (Marchand, 2008).

The current body of literature has failed to address the importance of personality of wilderness field guides and its relationship to employee performance. This lack of knowledge necessitates this study. The need for establishing the importance of certain traits for field guides is essential for the health and vitality of field guides, the efficiency of the wilderness therapy program, and the mental and physical well-being of the client.

Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships between performance scores and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs. This review of literature will examine research relating to employee performance and personality traits in a management setting as well as the limited research on personality in the wilderness therapy setting. The following topics will be discussed in this chapter: (a) current research on personality, (b) employee performance (c) wilderness therapy programs, and (d) the impact of working as a field guide for a wilderness therapy program. Finally, an examination of the lack of research on the effects of personality on employee performance in the wilderness therapy industry will set the stage for further analysis, per Taniguchi et al., (2009).

Personality

An individual's underlying personality inevitably influences how they will perform on the job. Investigations of personality began in the 1930s and have been adopted by the fields of psychiatry, psychopathology, sociology, and American psychology (John, Robins, & Pervin, 2008). More recently, personality research has been used to determine organizational citizenship, contextual performance, and change-oriented extra-role behaviors on work effectiveness (Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011). Current research in personality tends

to focus on an individualistic approach where personality traits are individually scrutinized to assess choice and satisfaction (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Lee, Johnston, & Dougherty, 2000).

Within the last 20 years, personality psychologists have converged regarding structure and concepts of personality, classifying the taxonomy into five robust factors: (a) agreeableness, (b) conscientiousness, (c) openness to experience, (d) neuroticism, and (e) extraversion (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

Big five personality traits. Extensive research has examined the effectiveness of the five aforementioned traits (Chiaburu et al., 2011; Oh & Berry, 2009; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011). This Five-Factor Model (FFM) has become a mainstay in regards to personality research, noting nearly all personality traits can be understood in terms of these five dimensions (Costa, McCrae, & Kay, 1995). Costa and McCrae (1992) developed the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI) as a "reasonable representation of human personality" (McCrae & Costa, 1987, p. 81) and is predictive of job performance, leadership, and other work-related criteria (Ones, Dilchert, Viswesvaran, & Judge, 2007). The comprehensiveness of the FFM, in predicting job performance, has allowed it to be used across different theoretical frameworks, in different cultures and languages, and with a variety of samples.

Neuroticism. Neuroticism is defined as an individual's susceptibility to psychological distress, the tendency to experience anxiety, feelings of guilt, shyness, or depression and has also been referred to as Emotional Stability, Stability, and Emotionality (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals who rate high in Neuroticism tend to prefer and adapt better to positive environments that are less ambiguous and unthreatening (Oh & Berry, 2009; Szalma & Taylor, 2011). Neuroticism can predict "impairment of working memory, attentional resources, and sustained attention, biases in selective attention for negative information, a

tendency to appraise environmental demands as threats, and greater sensitivity to threat

information" (Szalma & Taylor, 2011, p. 72). Individuals who score low in this trait tend to

show confidence, self-assurance, and optimism (Oh & Berry, 2009).

Agreeableness. Agreeableness can be defined as the ability to work with others. It is

associated with sympathy, altruism, helpfulness, tender mindedness, and a propensity to trust

others (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals who rate high in agreeableness tend to adapt well to

interpersonal settings and have lower levels of distress, which can be based on an individual's

desire to be prosocial (Chiaburu et al., 2011; Szalma & Taylor, 2011). Agreeableness is a

component of trust and inspires trust in situations of high uncertainty or risk (Szalma & Taylor,

2011). Agreeableness may not always be a desired trait for managers and may not be a valid

predictor of leader effectiveness (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Oh & Berry, 2009).

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness reflects dependability, thoroughness,

responsibility, and organization (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and is the single-best, generalizable

Big Five predictor of job performance (Ones et al., 2007). Lee et al. (2000) showed

Conscientiousness is composed of two factors: achievement orientation and dependability.

Barrick and Mount (1991) showed Conscientiousness was a valid predictor of task

accomplishment for all occupational groupings (e.g., professionals, police, managers, sales,

skilled/semi-skilled workers). Barrick, Stewart, and Piotrowski (2002) found Conscientiousness

is correlated with accomplishment striving and status. Those scoring low on the Conscientious

scale may need help with time management, organizational skills, and motivation (Lee et al.,

2000). Conscientiousness is a difficult trait for interviewers to assess in job applicants due to the

applicant's ability to manage their self-presentation during interviews (Barrick, Patton, &

Haugland, 2000).

Openness to Experience. Openness to Experience is the most difficult dimension to identify and has not been as extensively studied as the other traits (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Pace & Brannick, 2010). Openness to Experience includes imagination, tolerance, appreciation of arts, and breadth of interests. Openness to Experience may be important when targeting diversity attitudes or to cultural training that uses skills such as cultural empathy, behavioral flexibility, and tolerance (Lee et al., 2000). Pace and Brannick (2010) showed Openness to Experience may be helpful with jobs requiring employees to adapt to changing demands and to generate novel ideas.

Extraversion. Extraversion has been defined as "the enjoyment of others' company" (McCrae & Costa, 1987, p. 87) and can be associated with persuasiveness, leadership, sociability, energy, assertiveness, activity level, and a preference for excitement (Oh & Berry, 2009; Szalma & Taylor, 2011). Barrick and Mount (1991) found Extraversion was a valid predictor of training proficiency across all occupations requiring interpersonal skills and led to more effective performance in jobs that required traits such as sociability, gregariousness, assertiveness, action, and the ability to be talkative. Extraversion is the easiest trait to assess because the inherent traits mentioned above enhance the visibility of the trait (Barrick et al., 2000). Extraversion is correlated with high performance *only* when performance has been explicitly rewarded and seems to show a weak relationship between citizenship and extraversion (Barrick et al., 2002; Chiaburu et al., 2011).

Personality and Performance

Meta-analyses repeatedly found relationships between personality and performance across all job types and contexts (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Chiaburu et al., 2011; Oh et al., 2011). Current theory and research have converged on the belief employee performance should be

defined by the following dimensions: (a) task performance, (b) organizational citizenship

behavior (OCB), and (c) counterproductive work behavior (CWB) (Dalal, 2005; Le et al., 2011).

According to Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994), task performance includes two classes of

behavior. The first consists of activities that transform raw materials into goods and services the

organizations produce (e.g., selling merchandise in a retail store or teaching a client to backpack

in a wilderness therapy program). The second consists of maintaining and servicing the

technical requirements that enable an organization to run smoothly such as planning,

coordinating, supervising, and staffing. OCB can be defined as "contributions to the

maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task

performance" (Organ, 1997, p. 91). CWB, on the other hand, is defined as "intentional

employee behavior that is harmful to the legitimate interests of an organization" (Dalal, 2005, p.

1241–1242).

Wilderness Therapy Programs

Wilderness therapy programs are a form of therapeutic experiential education. Learning

opportunities are created using direct experience. The experiences are intended to facilitate

personal growth and development. These programs utilize experiential education by immersing

clients in a setting where their skills and self-concepts are challenged and developed. Hattie,

Marsh, Neill, & Richards, (1997) describe the following features inherent in most adventure

programs:

> (a) wilderness or backcountry settings; (b) a small group (usually less than 16); (c)
>
> assignment of a variety of mentally and/or physically challenging objectives, such as
>
> mastering a river rapid or hiking to a specific point; (d) frequent and intense interactions

that usually involve group problem solving and decision making; (e) nonintrusive, trained

leader; and (f) a duration of two to four weeks. (p. 44)

The challenges inherent to WAT programs allow for optimal experiences, where clients feel a

balance between their personal skill level and the challenge of the activity (Csikszentmihalyi &

Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Generally, adventure programs produce positive growth because they

provide a sense of accomplishment and efficacy (i.e., natural occurring consequences). These

challenges lead to improved satisfaction and promote the development of proper social and

adaptive behaviors (Becker, 2010).

Field guides. Field guides have the challenge and responsibility of caring for clients in

remote, outdoor settings. They teach clients the vital skills necessary to navigate the challenges

of the wilderness. These skills range from fire building, outdoor cooking, and packing a

backpack, to more advanced skills such as mountain biking and rock climbing. Field guides

typically eat similar food as the clients and use the same minimal outdoor gear as the clients.

They live in potentially hostile environmental conditions such as the hot, summer sun to frigid,

winter winds and snow. Field guides endure the physical rigor from miles of difficult hiking,

backpacking, mountain biking, and other strenuous outdoor activities. Work shifts can be long—

often eight days on and six days off. Field guides also endure substantial emotional stress

associated with the challenges of working with troubled adolescents who are away from home

and living in the rugged wilderness environment, often for the first time. Clearly, the role of a

field guide presents unique physical and emotional challenges, challenges unlike any other job.

Marchand et al. (2009) surveyed field guides and found a 9:1 ratio of negative aspects of being a

field guide over the benefits. Due to the difficult work environment, most field guides work 6–

18 months before leaving. Yet, they will often report the job is immensely rewarding.

What personality strengths are most advantageous for field guides to possess? How does personality influence employee performance in the wilderness therapy setting? How do the FFM traits of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness affect a field guide's performance? Does performance affect the term of employment for a field guide? These questions have yet to be answered. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between performance scores and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs.

Methods

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between performance scores and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs within the U.S. and Canada. This chapter outlines the structure and methods of the study. The following areas will be covered: (a) study sample, (b) instrumentation, (c) data collection procedures, (d) data analysis.

Study Sample

A convenience sample of 89 field guides within the United States and Canada contributed personality data for this study. Additionally, 54 managers, 71 peers/co-workers, and 95 WAT participants within the United States and Canada were recruited to provide performance data. All field guides in this study work directly with troubled adolescents during work shifts lasting at least six consecutive days in remote regions of the United States. Managers oversee the work of field guides and run day-to-day operations of their respective organizations. Clients have been matriculated into WAT programs, ranging in age from 13 to 22, with a majority (70%) falling between the ages of 14–18.

Recruiting Procedures

To gather recruits for this study, researchers sent an email to all members of the Outdoor Behavioral Healthcare Industry Council (OBHIC). OBHIC is a community of OBH programs, "working to advance the field through best practices, effective treatment, and evidence-based research" (OBHIC Website). Directors of OBHIC member organizations that showed interest in the study were then contacted via phone and email. Once permission was granted by the organization for study participation, the researchers then visited each organization, presenting the study to field guides, managers, and WAT participants. Employees and WAT participants interested in study participation were then recruited to participate in this study.

Instrumentation

The International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) NEO-PI-R (Goldberg et al., 2006) was used to measure personality of field guides. The IPIP NEO-PI-R is a 50-item measure of personality traits and consists of five 10-item facets to measure the broad domains of the Big Five personality dimensions of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness. Administration of the instrument takes between 20 and 30 minutes. Field guides were instructed to answer a given item in terms of how well the description describes their personality. Sample questions include, "I rarely get irritated" to measure Neuroticism, and, "I am always prepared" to measure Conscientiousness. Scores varied from 10 to 50 for each of the 5 personality traits. Moreover, a higher score indicates disposition towards the specific trait. Responses are based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5= *strongly agree*. Cronbach's alpha reliability measure of the IPIP NEO-PI-R model varies from (.85) to (.91) with a mean of (.89) (Goldberg et al., 2006).

To measure performance of field guides, Semantic Differentials Scales (SDS) derived from current employee performance appraisals were used. Because no standard field guide performance evaluation within WAT existed, we gathered the current performance evaluations of each participating organization and looked for common themes among the performance reviews. Once a list of commonalities began to appear, we consolidated each statement into one word that described the phrase as accurately as possible. We then looked for the word's antonym and put in onto the SDS. Semantic differentials were administered to management, clients, and co-workers of field guides participating in the study.

Developed by Osgood and Luria (1954), semantic differentials are a composition of associations and rating procedures, using a set of bipolar adjectives, to give an objective measure to the meaning of concepts. SDS allows the researcher to evaluate perceived employee traits, strengths, and effectiveness as found in performance evaluations. Paired adjectives were selected to represent the content covered in employee evaluations currently used by participating WAT programs. One evaluation, for example, elicits questions about customer care. To measure customer care using semantic differentials, we paired *care* with its polar opposite *careless*, which allowed the test taker to rate a field guide's performance by circling either *care* or *careless*. Once a list of semantic differentials was compiled from the performance evaluations, an expert panel representing the participating organizations was asked to review the SDSs for content validity. Individual scores from SDS were used in conjunction with the IPIP NEO-PI-R and VIA and correlational analyses were using SPSS to identify which personality and character traits are linked to performance.

Data Collection

Data was collected from employees and clients of 10 wilderness and adventure therapy companies and occurred in one wave during 10 group sessions. Data collection occurred from August 2012 through November 2012. Personality data was collected from field guides through self-assessment, online, through the use of Qualtrics. Field guide performance data was collected utilizing the 360 performance assessment, obtained from manager, peers, and WAT participants. All adults participating in this study were given a brief letter describing the study and a consent form. Minors participating in the study were given an assent form. Additionally, no adolescents participated in the study that did not first receive parental consent. Consent forms were sent, online, to parents of all WAT participants and only those adolescents who were given parental consent were allowed to participate in the study.

All personality data was gathered, online, through the use of Qualtrics. A brief explanation of the study was given to participants, in person, by the researcher. Field guides taking the personality assessment were then instructed to answer each item in the survey in terms of whether a statement described their character strengths and personality traits.

Data in regards to employee performance were collected using 360 performance measures collected from management teams, WAT participants, and co-workers. The ideal scenario was to have two managers, two peers, and two WAT participants assess one field guide's individual performance utilizing the FGPE, to give an idea as to the ideal characteristics of a field guide working within WAT. Individual performance of each field guide was measured using semantic differential scales. WAT participants were given a brief explanation of the study and instructions regarding the FGPE and asked to rate the performance of the field guides. They were assigned to answer specific questions, using a paper and pencil, regarding the individual

field guides they had worked with. Management teams and co-workers were informed about the study and given instructions in regards to FGPE and a consent form. They were assigned to answer specific questions, through Qualtrics, regarding performance of individual field guides they have worked with. Due to the nature of this experiment, no control group was needed.

Data Analysis

Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used to test the hypotheses. To reduce the dimensionality of the data set and to retain as much of the variance as possible, principal component analysis (PCA) was used (Jolliffe, 2005). Post-PCA, reliability analysis was used to check for reliability of both the SDS and the personality assessment. Correlational analysis was then used to evaluate the strength of the relationship between all the variables in the study. OLS was conducted separately for each hypothesis using SDS performance evaluations from managers, peers, and adolescents. The outcomes of job performance were used as the dependent variable, while the personality assessment, with the Big-5 variables of Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism, were used as the independent variables.

Results

Demographics

Socio-demographic data were collected from field guides in personality assessments, as well as from managers, peers, and adolescents that took the Field Guide Performance Evaluation (FGPE). In order to have a more robust measure, we had a goal for 100 personality assessments. Ultimately, we came close to our goal with 89 field guide participants. Our sample consisted of 45 (50.6%) males and 44 females (49.4%), with most field guides (78.6%) ranging in age from 18–30 and coming from WAT programs within the U.S. and Canada.

Before research began, our goal was to attain 200 field guide performance evaluations

from each group of evaluators (i.e., managers, peers, and WAT participants). In the end, socio-

demographic data from the FGPE consisted of 54 managers, 71 peers, and 95 WAT participants.

Managers consisted of 45 (83.3%) males and 9 (16.7%) females, with most (68.5%) of the

managers ranging in age from 25–30, with 44 (81.5%) managers having a bachelor's degree or

higher. Peers consisted of 37 (52.1%) males and 34 (47.9%) females, with most peers (56.3%)

ranging in age from 25–30, with most of the peers (67.6%) possessing bachelor's degree or

higher. WAT participants consisted of 65 (68.4%) males and 30 (31.6%) females, with 34

(35.8%) of the WAT participants falling between the ages of 17–18.

Reliability

The highest possible score on the FGPE is 340. Student scores on the FGPE ranged from

173 to 332. The mean score was 294 ($SD = 35.66$). Peer scores on the FGPE ranged from 269 to

325, with an average score of 297 ($SD = 16.11$). Additionally, manager scores on the FGPE

ranged from 218 to 317. The mean manager score was 276 ($SD = 26.06$). In order to evaluate

the reliability of inferences made from the FGPE from managers, peers, and WAT participants),

internal consistency estimates were calculated using a Cronbach's alpha. An alpha estimate of α

$= .96$ ($n = 198$) resulted, indicating the measure has very low levels of error variation.

Additionally, Alphas were calculated independently for the FGPE for the program participants,

peers, and managers/supervisors. Theses internal consistency estimates were .93, .97, and .98

respectively. Overall, the analysis suggests strong internal consistency among all items in the

instrument.

Internal consistency estimates reported in previous research for the NEO-PI-R range from

$.77 - .86$ (Mean (α) = .82) (Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg et al., 2006). Our own reliability analysis

for the 50 items of the NEO-PI-R, resulted in an average internal consistency of $\alpha = .75$, with

alphas ranging from .59 (Agreeableness) to .87 (Extraversion).

Correlations and Regression

A bivariate correlation was calculated to determine if relationships existed between the

scores on the FGPE and scores on the NEO-PI-R. Correlations were found between peers'

scores on the FGPE and the sub-facets of Openness to Experience ($r = -.37$, $p > .05$, $n = 41$) and

Agreeableness ($r = -.35$, $p > .05$, $n = 41$) in the NEO-PI-R.

To examine potential relationships between the NEO-PI-R and the FGPE of managers,

peers, and students, an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis was performed. For the

first hypothesis, we entered the managers' responses to the FGPE as the dependent variable with

Conscientiousness and Agreeableness as the independent variables. The model explained under

1% of the variance and showed a nonsignificant relationship between Conscientiousness and

Agreeableness in WAT field guides and job performance rated by managers ($R^2 = .008$, $F(2,30)$

$= .115$, $p > .05$).

For the second hypothesis, we entered peers' responses to the FGPE as the dependent

variable with Conscientiousness and Agreeableness as the independent variables. This model

explained just over 13% of the variance and showed a nonsignificant relationship between peers'

scores and Conscientiousness and Agreeableness ($R^2 = .13$, $F(2,38) = 2.95$, $p > .05$). However, it

was found that Agreeableness negatively predicted job performance for peers ($\beta = -.331$, $p <$

.05). Lastly, the OLS regression results for the third hypothesis show a nonsignificant

relationship between job performance rated by WAT participants and job performance of WAT

field guides ($R^2 = .011$, $F(2,49) = .269$, $p > .05$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The need of WAT organizations to find and keep the best field guides is of utmost importance for the health of the organization and the therapeutic process of the WAT participants. WAT organizations have "primarily focused on definitions, industry characteristics, outcome assessments, standardization, and professionalization of the workforce" (Marchand et al., 2009, p. 360); however, very little is known about the personality traits of field guides that might facilitate this process (Taniguchi et al., 2009). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the possible relationships between personality of WAT field guides and their performance per managers, peers, and WAT participants.

Research demonstrates the relationship between personality, and job performance, across demographics and job descriptions (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Mount et al., 1998; Oh et al., 2011; Witt, Burke, Barrick, & Mount, 2002). Results from this study indicated a non-significant relationship between the personality and job performance of WAT field guides. The only significant relationship noted, was a negative correlation between peers' scores on the FGPE and Agreeableness. Sub-facets of Agreeableness include Trust, Straightforwardness, Altruism, Compliance, Modesty, and Tender-mindedness (Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg et al., 2006).

Field Guide Performance Evaluation

Researchers and practitioners have often used single-source assessments in employee selection and to match individuals to careers; such ratings are used extensively by organizations and researchers to assess performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick et al., 2002; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Thompson, 2005). However, single-source ratings of employees neglect the fact employees work with various individuals at different levels of the organization (Oh & Berry, 2009). WAT field guides, for example, work with three types of individuals during their work

week: (a) clients of the program, (b) co-workers and peers, and (c) upper management. Each set

of individuals has their own expectations regarding behaviors and performance of field guides.

Clients want an individual who is fun-loving and unselfish with their time (Taniguchi et al.,

2009). Co-workers and peers might prefer a person who is relaxed and considerate, while upper

management looks for traits such as timeliness and a willingness to follow organizational

procedures. Therefore, it would seem insufficient to measure performance from only one source.

Multi-source or 360-degree ratings assess performance from two or more sources such as

supervisors, peers, subordinates, and self.

Currently, there are no reliable assessments for job performance of WAT field guides.

The need for establishing an assessment to move research forward in this area is essential for the

vitality of the field guide and the industry. The FGPE was developed specifically for this study

to ascertain specific performance traits that might facilitate the therapeutic process, keep

managers, peers, and WAT participants happy, and to ultimately help the WAT to be successful.

The FGPE allows us to understand job performance in the WAT setting, providing a 360-degree

view of the traits managers, peers, and WAT participants seek in a field guide. Sub-scales of the

FGPE entail the following traits: (a) Dependability, (b) Individual Behavior, (c) Job Knowledge,

(d) Leader Relations, (e) Peer Relations, (f) Student Relations, (g) Risk Management, and (h)

Student Supervision. Reliability scores for the FGPE were quite high, which means the

evaluation is a good predictor of job performance among WAT field guides. Organizations

looking to assess performance of their field guides could use the FGPE to effectively measure

the progress of their employees. Although reliability estimates for the FGPE demonstrate

robustness in the measure, it is possible field guides perform other functions not captured in this

measure that could increase validity and contribute to significance between job performance of

WAT field guides and their personality. Additionally, role ambiguity among managers and/or peers could play a part in contributing to the non-significance of the relationship between personality and job performance (Abramis, 1994; Tubre & Collins, 2000).

Before FGPE administration, the administrator gave a concise and brief description of the study and the possible outcomes of the study, while addressing any concerns study participants had about the study. The directions on the FGPE were thorough and led to very few questions from study participants. Most of the participants answered each question without clarification of word meaning or significance.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

This study offers initial reliability information about the FGPE. Although the FGPE provides positive results, more reliability studies are necessary to solidify the validity of the inferences generated from the instrument. Furthermore, larger and more diverse samples will provide even more normative data to help practitioners interpret scores on the FGPE. Future data collection utilizing the FGPE is essential to see if it is a valid measure to assess 360-degree job performance of WAT field guides.

Methodology. It is possible the methodology of the study contributed to the non-significant results. For example, in the current study, only performance reviews that had a corresponding personality assessment were used. There were a number of performance evaluations completed that did not have a corresponding personality assessment and were not used in this analysis. Furthermore, we did not have two performance evaluations from each evaluator (i.e., managers, peers, and WAT participants) for each personality assessment. The lack of performance evaluations could have contributed to the non-significant results.

Additionally, we did our best to work in conjunction with each of the 10 organizations to assure evaluators had a close, working relationship with those they were to evaluate. Although we tried to utilize employees who had been on the job for at least three months, it could be possible some of the field guides did not have the tenure necessary for a reliable performance assessment. Moreover, as the performance evaluations were completed, it is possible the evaluators did not have a sufficient enough working relationship with the field guide they were evaluating to provide a reliable evaluation of the field guide's job performance.

Future Research. Future researchers should take care to assure the tenure of field guides is at least three months and that the relationship between evaluator and field guide is sufficient enough to provide a reliable performance assessment. Additionally, it might be interesting and valuable for the researcher to have non-independent (self-assessed) evaluations of field guide job performance. Non-independent evaluations would help paint a picture of a field guide's perceptions of their own job performance in relation to the independent evaluations performed by managers, peers, and WAT participants.

References

Abramis, D. J. (1994). Work role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and job performance: Meta-

analyses and review. *Psychological Reports, 75*(3f), 1411–1433. doi:

10.2466/pr0.1994.75.3f.1411

Ashworth, M. J. (2006). Preserving knowledge legacies: Workforce aging, turnover and human

resource issues in the US electric power industry. *The International Journal of Human

Resource Management, 17*(9), 1659–1688. doi: 10.1080/09585190600878600

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job

performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1–26. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-

6570.1991.tb00688.x

Barrick, M. R., Patton, G. K., & Haugland, S. N. (2000). Accuracy of interviewer judgments of

job applicant personality traits. *Personnel Psychology, 53*(4), 925–951. doi:

10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb02424.x

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test

of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 87*(1), 43–51. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.43

Becker, S. (2010). Wilderness therapy: Ethical considerations for mental health professionals.

Child and Youth Care Forum, 39(1), 47–61. doi: 10.1007/s10566-009-9085-7

Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model

of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of

Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1140–1166. doi: 10.1037/a0024004

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO PI-R professional manual. *Odessa, FL:

Psychological Assessment Resources*, 396, 653–65.

Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Kay, G. G. (1995). Persons, places, and personality: Career

assessment using the revised NEO personality-inventory. *Journal of Career Assessment,*

3(2), 123–139. doi: 10.1177/106907279500300202

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, I. (1990). Adventure and the flow experience.

Adventure Education, 149–155.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship

behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6),

1241–1255. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241

Friese, G., Hendee, J. C., & Kinziger, M. (1998). The wilderness experience program industry in

the United States: Characteristics and dynamics. *The Journal of Experiential Education,*

21(1), 40–45.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the

lower-level facets of several five-factor models. *Personality psychology in Europe, 7*, 7–

28.

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., &

Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-

domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(1), 84–96. doi:

10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., &

Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-

domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(1), 84–96. doi:

10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007

Hattie, J., Marsh, H. W., Neill, J. T., & Richards, G. E. (1997). Adventure education and

> Outward bound: Out-of-class experiences that make a lasting difference. *Review of*
> *Educational Research, 67*(1), 43–87.

Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (2000). The cost of turnover. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant*

> *Administration Quarterly, 41*(3), 14–21. doi: 10.1177/001088040004100313

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance

> relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 100–112.
> doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.100

Hood, C. D. (2003). Women in recovery from alcoholism: The place of leisure. *Leisure Sciences,*

> *25*(1), 51–79.

Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited.

> *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(6), 869–879. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.85.6.869

Itin, C. M. (2001). Adventure therapy—critical questions. *Journal of Experiential Education,*

> *24*(2), 80.

John, O. P., Robins, R. W., & Pervin, L. A. (2008). *Handbook of personality: Theory and*

> *research*: New York. The Guilford Press.

Jolliffe, I. (2005). Principal component analysis. *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science,*

> John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. doi: 10.1002/0470013192.bsa501

Jones, C. D., Lowe, L. A., & Risler, E. A. (2004). The effectiveness of wilderness adventure

> therapy programs for young people involved in the juvenile justice system. *Residential*
> *Treatment for Children & Youth, 22*(2), 53–67. doi: 10.1300/J007v22n02_04

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765–780. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Judge, W. (2005). Adventures in creating an outdoor leadership challenge course for an EMBA program. *Journal of Management Education, 29*(2), 284–300. doi: 10.1177/1052562904265251

Le, H., Oh, I.-S., Robbins, S. B., Ilies, R., Holland, E., & Westrick, P. (2011). Too much of a good thing: Curvilinear relationships between personality traits and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1), 113–133. doi: 10.1037/a0021016

Lee, F. K., Johnston, J. A., & Dougherty, T. W. (2000). Using the Five-Factor Model of personality to enhance career development and organizational functioning in the workplace. *Journal of Career Assessment, 8*(4), 419–427. doi: 10.1177/106907270000800411

Marchand, G. (2008). Challenges affecting field instructors in wilderness therapy. *Journal of Experiential Education, 30*(3), 286–289.

Marchand, G., Russell, K. C., & Cross, R. (2009). An empirical examination of outdoor behavioral healthcare field instructor job-related stress and retention. *Journal of Experiential Education, 31*(3), 359–375.

Massingham, P. (2008). Measuring the impact of knowledge loss: More than ripples on a pond? *Management Learning. 39*, 541–560. doi: 10.1177/1350507608096040

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 81–90. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81

McEvoy, G. M., & Cascio, W. F. (1985). Strategies for reducing employee turnover: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*(2), 342–353. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.70.2.342

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*(2), 237–240. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237

Moses, T. (2000). Attachment theory and residential treatment: A study of staff-client relationships. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70*(4), 474–490. doi: 10.1037/h0087681

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(4), 475–480. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475

Mount, M. K. (1998). Trait, rater and level effects in 360-degree performance ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 51*(3), 557–576.

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-Factor Model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance, 11*(2/3), 145–165.

Oh, I.-S., & Berry, C. M. (2009). The Five-Factor Model of personality and managerial performance: Validity gains through the use of 360 degree performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1498–1513. doi: 10.1037/a0017221

Oh, I.-S., Wang, G., & Mount, M. K. (2011). Validity of observer ratings of the five-factor model of personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 762–773. doi: 10.1037/a0021832

Ones, D. S., Dilchert, S., Viswesvaran, C., & Judge, T. A. (2007). In support of personality

assessment in organizational settings. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(4), 995–1027. doi:

10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00099.x

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human

Performance, 10*(2), 85–97.

Osgood, C. E., & Luria, Z. (1954). A blind analysis of a case of multiple personality using the

semantic differential. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49*(41), 579–591.

doi: 10.1037/h0054362

Pace, V. L., & Brannick, M. T. (2010). Improving prediction of work performance through

frame-of-reference consistency: Empirical evidence using openness to experience.

International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 18(2), 230–235. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-

2389.2010.00506.x

Parise, S., Cross, R., & Davenport, T. H. (2006). Strategies for preventing a knowledge-loss

crisis. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 47*(4), 31–38.

Russell, K. C. (2006). Brat camp, boot camp, or ……..? Exploring wilderness therapy program

theory. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning, 6*(1), 51–67. doi:

10.1080/14729670685200741

Scholl, K. G., McAvoy, L., Rynders, J., & Smith, J. (2003). The influence of an inclusive

outdoor recreation experience on families that have a child with a disability. *Therapeutic

Recreation Journal, 37*(1), 38–57.

Szalma, J. L., & Taylor, G. S. (2011). Individual differences in response to automation: The five

factor model of personality. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 17*(2), 71–96.

doi: 10.1037/a002417010.1037/a0024170.supp

Taniguchi, S., Widmer, M., Duerden, M., & Draper, C. (2009). The attributes of effective field

    staff in wilderness programs: Changing youths' perspectives of being 'cool.'. *Therapeutic*

    Recreation Journal, 43(1), 11–26.

Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective.

    Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(5), 1011–1017. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1011

Tubre, T. C., & Collins, J. M. (2000). Jackson and Schuler (1985) revisited: A meta-analysis of

    the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict, and job performance. *Journal of*

    Management, 26(1), 155–169. doi: 10.1177/014920630002600104

Useem, M. (2001). The leadership lessons of Mount Everest. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(9),

    51–58.

Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. A., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of

    conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*

    87(1), 164–169. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.164

Appendix A

Field Guide Personality Assessment

Please take a minute to fill out the demographic information. At the end of the demographics, you will find the survey instructions.

Q1.1 What is your name?

Q1.2 Gender

❍ Male
❍ Female

Q1.3 Age

❍ 18–25
❍ 26–30
❍ 31–35
❍ 36–40
❍ 41–45
❍ 46 +

Q1.4 What company do you work for?

Q1.5 How long have you worked for your current employer?

❍ Less than one year
❍ 1–3 years
❍ 4–6 years
❍ 7–9 years
❍ 10 + years

Q1.6 Is this your first experience working as a field guide for a wilderness/adventure therapy program?

❍ Yes
❍ No

Answer if This is your first experience working as a field guide…No is selected

Q1.7 How long have you worked in wilderness/adventure therapy?

○ Less than one year
○ 1–3 years
○ 4–6 years
○ 7–9 years
○ 10 + years

Answer if This is your first experience working as a field guide….No is selected

Q1.8 With how many other organizations have you worked?

○ 1
○ 2
○ 3
○ 4
○ 5
○ 6 +

Q1.9 Do you have other experience working with therapeutic programs?

○ Yes
○ No

Answer if Do you have other experiences working with therapeutic programs….Yes is selected

Q1.10 Please list the types of therapeutic organizations you have worked for.

Answer if D you have other experiences working with therapeutic programs…Yes is selected

Q1.11 How long have you worked in a therapeutic setting?

○ Less than one year
○ 1–3 years
○ 4–6 years
○ 7–9 years
○ 10 + years

Q2.1 This survey should take between 15–20 minutes to complete. On the following pages, there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can

describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then fill in the bubble that corresponds to the number on the scale. Response Options1: Strongly Disagree 2: Disagree3: Neither Agree nor Disagree4: Agree5: Strongly Agree

Q3.1 I often feel blue.

○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither agree nor disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

Q3.2 I dislike myself.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.3 I am often down in the dumps.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.4 I have frequent mood swings.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.5 I panic easily.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.6 I rarely get irritated.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.7 I seldom feel blue.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.8 I feel comfortable with myself.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.9 I am not easily bothered by things.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.10 I am very pleased with myself.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

- ○ Q3.11 I feel comfortable around people.
- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.12 I make friends easily.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.13 I am skilled in handling social situations.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.14 I am the life of the party.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.15 I know how to captivate people.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.16 I have little to say.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.17 I keep in the background.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.18 I would describe my experiences as somewhat dull.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.19 I don't like to draw attention to myself.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.20 I don't talk a lot.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.21 I believe in the importance of art.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.22 I have a vivid imagination.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.23 I tend to vote for liberal political candidates.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.24 I carry the conversation to a higher level.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.25 I enjoy hearing new ideas.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.26 I am not interested in abstract ideas.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.27 I do not like art.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.28 I avoid philosophical discussions.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.29 I do not enjoy going to art museums.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.30 I tend to vote for conservative political candidates.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.31 I have a good word for everyone.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.32 I believe that others have good intentions.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.33 I respect others.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.34 I accept people as they are.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.35 I make people feel at ease.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.36 I have a sharp tongue.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.37 I cut others to pieces.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.38 I suspect hidden motives in others.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.39 I get back at others.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.40 I insult people.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.41 I am always prepared.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.42 I pay attention to details.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.43 I get chores done right away.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.44 I carry out my plans.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.45 I make plans and stick to them.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.46 I waste my time.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.47 I find it difficult to get down to work.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.48 I do just enough work to get by.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.49 I don't see things through.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Q3.50 I shirk my duties.

❍ Strongly Disagree
❍ Disagree
❍ Neither Agree nor Disagree
❍ Agree
❍ Strongly Agree

Q4.1 Below are 12 statements about grit. Read each one and then click on the dropdown list next to the statement and select how much the statement is like you. Please be honest and accurate!

Q4.2 I have overcome setbacks to conquer an important challenge.

❍ Very much like me
❍ Mostly like me
❍ Somewhat like me
❍ Not much like me
❍ Not like me at all

Q4.3 New ideas and projects sometimes distract me from previous ones.

❍ Very much like me
❍ Mostly like me
❍ Somewhat like me
❍ Not much like me
❍ Not like me at all

Q4.4 My interests change from year to year.

❍ Very much like me
❍ Mostly like me
❍ Somewhat like me
❍ Not much like me
❍ Not like me at all

Q4.5 Setbacks don't discourage me.

❍ Very much like me
❍ Mostly like me
❍ Somewhat like me
❍ Not much like me
❍ Not like me at all

Q4.6 I have been obsessed with a certain idea or for a short time but later lost interest.

- ❍ Very much like me
- ❍ Mostly like me
- ❍ Somewhat like me
- ❍ Not much like me
- ❍ Not like me at all

Q4.7 I am a hard worker.

- ❍ Very much like me
- ❍ Mostly like me
- ❍ Somewhat like me
- ❍ Not much like me
- ❍ Not like me at all

Q4.8 I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one.

- ❍ Very much like me
- ❍ Mostly like me
- ❍ Somewhat like me
- ❍ Not much like me
- ❍ Not like me at all

Q4.9 I have difficulty maintaining my focus on projects that take more than a few months to complete.

- ❍ Very much like me
- ❍ Mostly like me
- ❍ Somewhat like me
- ❍ Not much like me
- ❍ Not like me at all

Q4.10 I finish whatever I begin.

- ❍ Very much like me
- ❍ Mostly like me
- ❍ Somewhat like me
- ❍ Not much like me
- ❍ Not like me at all

Q4.11 I have achieved a goal that took years of work.

❍ Very much like me
❍ Mostly like me
❍ Somewhat like me
❍ Not much like me
❍ Not like me at all

Q4.12 I become interested in new pursuits every few months.

❍ Very much like me
❍ Mostly like me
❍ Somewhat like me
❍ Not much like me
❍ Not like me at all

Q4.13 I am diligent

❍ Very much like me
❍ Mostly like me
❍ Somewhat like me
❍ Not much like me
❍ Not like me at all

Q5.1 In general, I am satisfied with my job.

❍ Strongly Disagree
❍ Disagree
❍ Somewhat Disagree
❍ Neither Agree nor Disagree
❍ Somewhat Agree
❍ Agree
❍ Strongly Agree

Q5.2 All in all, the job I have is great.

❍ Strongly Disagree
❍ Disagree
❍ Somewhat Disagree
❍ Neither Agree nor Disagree
❍ Somewhat Agree
❍ Agree
❍ Strongly Agree

Q5.3 My job is very enjoyable.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Somewhat Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Somewhat Agree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q6.1 I generally help others who have been absent.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q6.2 I take a personal interest in the well-being of other employees.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q6.3 I generally help others who have heavy workloads.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q7.1 I sometimes take undeserved of extended work breaks.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q7.2 I adhere to informal organizational rules devised to maintain order.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q7.3 I always give advance notice when I am unable to come to work

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q8.1 I fulfill all the responsibilities specified in my job description.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q8.2 I consistently meet the formal performance requirements of my job.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q8.3 I conscientiously perform tasks that are expected of me.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q9.1 This is the end of the official survey. Thank you for taking the time to answer a few questions about yourself. If you would like to learn more about your character traits, select "yes," and it will lead you to another set of 50 questions.   If you would not like to find out more about your character traits, select "no."

○ Yes
○ No

If No is selected, then skip to end of survey

Q10.1 Please choose one option in response to each statement. All of the questions reflect statements that many people would find desirable, but we want you to answer only in terms of whether the statement describes what you are like. Please be honest and accurate! We cannot rank your strengths until you answer all of the 50 questions.

Q11.1 I am willing to take risks to establish a relationship.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.2 I know that there are people in my life who care as much for me as for themselves.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.3 I know that some others accept my shortcomings.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.4 I am the most important person in someone else's life.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.5 I can express love to someone else.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.6 I know someone whom I really care about as a person.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.7 I do not easily share my feelings with others.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.8 I feel isolated from other people.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.9 I have difficulty accepting love from anyone.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.10 I don't miss group meetings or team practice.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.11 I enjoy being part of a group.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.12 I support my teammates or fellow group members.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.13 I feel I must respect the decisions made by my group.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.14 I am not good at working with a group.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.15 I prefer to do everything alone.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.16 I work best when I am alone.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.17 I keep to myself.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.18 I don't think it's important to socialize with others.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.19 I let bygones be bygones.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.20 I never seek vengeance.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.21 I allow others to make a fresh start.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.22 I believe that it is best to forgive and forget.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.23 I don't try to get even.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.24 I hate to see anyone suffer, even my worst enemy.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.25 I try to respond with understanding when someone treats me badly.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.26 I hold grudges.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.27 I do not give anyone a second chance to hurt me.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

○ Q11.28 I am never too busy to help a friend.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.29 I go out of my way to cheer up people who appear down.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.30 I love to make other people happy.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.31 I helped a neighbor in the last month.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.32 I get as excited about the good fortunes of others as I am about my own.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.33 I call my friends when they are sick.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.34 I love to let others share the spotlight.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.35 I get impatient when others talk to me about their problems.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.36 I try not to do favors for others.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.37 I am only kind to others if they have been kind to me.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.38 I go out of my way to attend educational events.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.39 I am thrilled when I learn something new.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.40 I look forward to the opportunity to learn and grow.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.41 I am a true life-long learner.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.42 I read all the time.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.43 I consult the library or the Internet immediately if I want to know something.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.44 I read a large variety of books.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.45 I do not like to learn new things.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.46 I do not like to visit museums.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.47 I do not read nonfiction books for fun.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.48 I prefer to participate fully rather than view life from the sidelines.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.49 I don't approach things halfheartedly.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.50 I love what I do.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.51 I look forward to each new day.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.52 I can't wait to get started on a project.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.53 I can hardly wait to see what life has in store for me in the years ahead.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q11.54 I awaken with a sense of excitement about the day's possibilities.

O Strongly Disagree
O Disagree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Agree
O Strongly Agree

Q11.55 I dread getting up in the morning.

O Strongly Disagree
O Disagree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Agree
O Strongly Agree

Q11.56 I don't have much energy.

O Strongly Disagree
O Disagree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Agree
O Strongly Agree

Q11.57 Thank you again for your participation in this study. Please insert your name and email address so we can provide you with an assessment of your personality.   Your information will not be shared and will be kept strictly confidential.

Appendix B

<u>Field Guide Performance Evaluation-Managers/Peers (FGPE-M/P)</u>

Purpose: The Field Guide Performance Evaluation is designed to describe performance of field guides in a wide range of situations. You may discover some of the items appear to be duplicates. Please DO NOT leave these items blank. When you begin to complete the FGPE-M/P you will see that you can easily make a field guide look as good or as bad as you wish. Please do not do that! If you are as accurate as possible, it is more likely we can determine the best field staff in wilderness therapy.

Directions: Read each statement carefully. Fill in the circle that most accurately describes the field guide's performance and behavior. Please rate the staff member according to your perception of their performance. Answer the questions honestly and completely. Your answers will not impact or influence the current position or employment of the person you are evaluating. Check only one answer for each word pair and erase unwanted marks clearly.

Q1.1 What is your name?

Q1.2 What is your gender?

❍ Male
❍ Female

Q1.3 How old are you?

❍ 12–18 years
❍ 19–24 years
❍ 25–30 years
❍ 31–35 years
❍ 36–40 years
❍ 41–45 years
❍ 46+ years

Q1.4 Are you a

❍ Supervisor or manager
❍ Co-worker or peer

Q1.5 What company do you work for?

Q1.6 How long have you worked for this company?

❍ 0–3 months
❍ 4–6 months
❍ 7–12 months
❍ 1–3 years
❍ 3–5 years
❍ 6 + years

Q1.7 How long have you worked in wilderness or wilderness adventure therapy?

❍ Less than a year
❍ 1–3 years
❍ 4 + years

Q1.8 Do you have any clinical experience?

❍ Yes
❍ No

Answer if Do you have any clinical experience? Yes is selected

Q95 Time of clinical experience:

❍ Less than 1 year
❍ 1–3 years
❍ 4–6 years
❍ 7+ years

Answer if Do you have any clinical experience? Yes is selected

Q93 Do you have a formal clinical degree?

❍ Yes
❍ No

Answer if Do you have a formal clinical degree? Yes is selected

Q94 What degrees do you have?

Q1.9 What is your highest level of education?

○ Some high school
○ High school diploma or GED
○ Some college
○ Bachelor's degree
○ Master's degree
○ PhD

Q1.11 What is the name of the person you are evaluating?

Q1.12 How long have you known this person?

○ Less than one month
○ 1–3 months
○ 4–6 months
○ 6–12 months
○ 1–3 years
○ 3 + years

Q92   The following questions are regarding field staff performance. Please rate the staff member according to your perception of their   performance. Answer the questions honestly and completely. Your answers will not impact or influence the current position or employment of the person you are evaluating.

Q2.1

	1	2	3	4	5
Trustworthy:Untrustworthy	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.2

	1	2	3	4	5
Honest:Dishonest	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.3

	1	2	3	4	5
Accountable:Unaccountable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.4

	1	2	3	4	5
Boring:Fun	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.5

	1	2	3	4	5
Closed-minded:Open-minded	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.6

	1	2	3	4	5
Responsible:Irresponsible	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.7

	1	2	3	4	5
Skilled in outdoors:Unskilled in outdoors	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.8

	1	2	3	4	5
Wasteful:Resourceful	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.9

	1	2	3	4	5
Humble:Proud	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.10

	1	2	3	4	5
Listens:Ignores	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.11

	1	2	3	4	5
Sad:Happy	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.12

	1	2	3	4	5
Late:Timely	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.13

	1	2	3	4	5
Cautious:Careless	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.14

	1	2	3	4	5
Hard-headed:Teachable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.15

	1	2	3	4	5
Confident:Insecure	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.16

	1	2	3	4	5
Inspires trust:Invites mistrust	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.17

	1	2	3	4	5
Genuine:Fake	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.18

	1	2	3	4	5
Follows through:Quits early	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.19

Open:Closed	1	2	3	4	5
	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.20

Mean:Nice	1	2	3	4	5
	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.21

Uninspiring:Inspiring	1	2	3	4	5
	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.22

Wilderness survivor:Wilderness wimp	1	2	3	4	5
	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.23

Nurturing:Neglectful	1	2	3	4	5
	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.24

Takes responsibility:Blames others	1	2	3	4	5
	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.25

Lost in life:Goal-oriented	1	2	3	4	5
	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.26

	1	2	3	4	5
Disorderly:Structured	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.27

	1	2	3	4	5
Hateful:Loving	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.28

	1	2	3	4	5
Supportive:Unsupportive	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.29

	1	2	3	4	5
Ineffective:Effective	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.30

	1	2	3	4	5
Unreasonable:Reasonable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.31

	1	2	3	4	5
Reliable:Unreliable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.32

	1	2	3	4	5
Clean:Dirty	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.33

	1	2	3	4	5
Constructive:Destructive	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.34

	1	2	3	4	5
Loyal:Disloyal	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.35

	1	2	3	4	5
Rigid:Flexible	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.36

	1	2	3	4	5
Team player:Self-oriented	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.37

	1	2	3	4	5
Productive:Unproductive	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.38

	1	2	3	4	5
Aware:Clueless	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.39

	1	2	3	4	5
Organized:Disorganized	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.40

	1	2	3	4	5
Unprofessional:Professional	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.41

	1	2	3	4	5
Heart at peace:Heart at war	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.42

	1	2	3	4	5
Material:Spiritual	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.43

	1	2	3	4	5
Friendly:Unfriendly	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.44

	1	2	3	4	5
Positive:Negative	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.45

	1	2	3	4	5
Careful:Careless	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.46

	1	2	3	4	5
Educated:Uneducated	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.47

	1	2	3	4	5
Considerate:Inconsiderate	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.48

	1	2	3	4	5
Dangerous:Safe	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.49

	1	2	3	4	5
Hopeless:Hopeful	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.50

	1	2	3	4	5
Enthusiastic:Unenthusiastic	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.51

	1	2	3	4	5
Sincere:Hypocritical	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.52

	1	2	3	4	5
Negligent:Watchful	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.53

	1	2	3	4	5
Stands up for beliefs:Easily gives into temptation	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.54

	1	2	3	4	5
Follower:Leader	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.55

	1	2	3	4	5
Grateful:Ungrateful	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.56

	1	2	3	4	5
Realistic:Unrealistic	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.57

	1	2	3	4	5
Dependable:Undependable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.58

	1	2	3	4	5
Unprepared:Prepared	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.59

	1	2	3	4	5
Interested:Disinterested	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.60

	1	2	3	4	5
Decisive:Indecisive	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.61

	1	2	3	4	5
Courageous:Cowardly	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.62

	1	2	3	4	5
Unforgiving:Forgiving	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.63

	1	2	3	4	5
Needs prodding:Takes Initiative	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.64

	1	2	3	4	5
Rude:Polite	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.65

	1	2	3	4	5
Disobedient:Obedient	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.66

	1	2	3	4	5
Self-serving:Helps others	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.67

Hard to work with:Works well with others	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.68

	1	2	3	4	5
Committed:Uncommitted	○	○	○	○	○

Q3.1 This employee fulfills all the responsibilities specified in his/her job description.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.2 This employee consistently meets the formal performance requirements of his/her job.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q3.3 This employee conscientiously performs tasks that are expected of him/her.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q4.1 This employee sometimes takes undeserved of extended work breaks.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q4.2 This employee adheres to informal organizational rules devised to maintain order.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q4.3 This employee always gives advance notice when he/she is unable to come to work

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q5.1 This employee generally helps others who have been absent.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q5.2 This employee takes a personal interest in the well-being of other employees.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q5.3 This employee generally helps others who have heavy workloads.

- ○ Strongly Disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly Agree

Appendix C

Field Guide Performance Evaluation- Student (FGPE-S)

Purpose: The Field Guide Performance Evaluation is designed to describe performance of field guides in a wide range of situations. You may discover some of the items appear to be duplicates. Please **DO NOT** leave these items blank. When you begin to complete the FGPE-S you will see that you can easily make a field guide look as good or as bad as you wish. **Please do not do that!** If you are as accurate as possible, it is more likely we can determine the best field staff in wilderness therapy.

Directions: Read each statement carefully. Fill in the circle that most accurately describes the field guide's performance and behavior. Please rate the staff member according to **your perception** of **their performance**. Answer the questions honestly and completely. Your answers will not impact or influence the current position or employment of the person you are evaluating. Check only one answer for each word pair and erase unwanted marks clearly.

Q1.1 What is your name?

Q1.2 What is your gender?

❍ Male
❍ Female

Q1.3 How old are you?

❍ 10–13 years old
❍ 14–16 years old
❍ 17–18 years old
❍ 19–21 years old
❍ 22 + years

Q1.5 How long have you been in this program?

❍ Less than one month
❍ 1 month
❍ 2 months
❍ 3 months
❍ 4 months
❍ 5 + months

Q94 What program are you participating in?

Q1.6 Have you participated in other wilderness programs?

❍ Yes
❍ No

If No is selected, then skip to, What is the name of the person you are evaluating

Q93 How long have you participated in other wilderness therapy programs?

❍ Less than one month
❍ 1 month
❍ 2 months
❍ 3 months
❍ 4 months
❍ 5 + months

Q1.11 What is the name of the person you are evaluating?

Q1.12 How long have you known this person?

❍ Less than one month
❍ 1–3 months
❍ 4–6 months
❍ 6–12 months

The following questions are regarding field staff performance. Please rate the staff member according to your perception of their performance. Answer the questions honestly and completely. Your answers will not impact or influence the current position or employment of the person you are evaluating.

Q2.1

	1	2	3	4	5
Trustworthy:Untrustworthy	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q2.2

	1	2	3	4	5
Honest:Dishonest	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q2.3

	1	2	3	4	5
Accountable:Unaccountable	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q2.4

	1	2	3	4	5
Boring:Fun	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.5

	1	2	3	4	5
Closed-minded:Open-minded	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.6

	1	2	3	4	5
Responsible:Irresponsible	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.7

	1	2	3	4	5
Skilled in outdoors:Unskilled in outdoors	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.8

	1	2	3	4	5
Wasteful:Resourceful	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.9

	1	2	3	4	5
Humble:Proud	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.10

	1	2	3	4	5
Listens:Ignores	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.11

Sad:Happy	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.12

Late:Timely	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.13

Cautious:Careless	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.14

Hard-headed:Teachable	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.15

Confident:Insecure	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.16

Inspires trust:Invites mistrust	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.17

Genuine:Fake	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.18

Follows through:Quits early	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.19

	1	2	3	4	5
Open:Closed	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.20

	1	2	3	4	5
Mean:Nice	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.21

	1	2	3	4	5
Uninspiring:Inspiring	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.22

	1	2	3	4	5
Wilderness survivor:Wilderness wimp	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.23

	1	2	3	4	5
Nurturing:Neglectful	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.24

	1	2	3	4	5
Takes responsibility:Blames others	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.25

	1	2	3	4	5
Lost in life:Goal-oriented	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.26

	1	2	3	4	5
Disorderly:Structured	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.27

	1	2	3	4	5
Hateful:Loving	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.28

	1	2	3	4	5
Supportive:Unsupportive	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.29

	1	2	3	4	5
Ineffective:Effective	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.30

	1	2	3	4	5
Unreasonable:Reasonable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.31

	1	2	3	4	5
Reliable:Unreliable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.32

	1	2	3	4	5
Clean:Dirty	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.33

	1	2	3	4	5
Constructive:Destructive	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.34

	1	2	3	4	5
Loyal:Disloyal	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.35

	1	2	3	4	5
Rigid:Flexible	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.36

	1	2	3	4	5
Team player:Self-oriented	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.37

	1	2	3	4	5
Productive:Unproductive	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.38

	1	2	3	4	5
Aware:Clueless	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.39

	1	2	3	4	5
Organized:Disorganized	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.40

	1	2	3	4	5
Unprofessional:Professional	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.41

	1	2	3	4	5
Heart at peace:Heart at war	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.42

	1	2	3	4	5
Material:Spiritual	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.43

Friendly:Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.44

Positive:Negative	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.45

Careful:Careless	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.46

Educated:Uneducated	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.47

Considerate:Inconsiderate	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.48

Dangerous:Safe	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.49

Hopeless:Hopeful	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.50

Enthusiastic:Unenthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.51

	1	2	3	4	5
Sincere:Hypocritical	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.52

	1	2	3	4	5
Negligent:Watchful	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.53

	1	2	3	4	5
Stands up for beliefs:Easily gives into temptation	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.54

	1	2	3	4	5
Follower:Leader	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.55

	1	2	3	4	5
Grateful:Ungrateful	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.56

	1	2	3	4	5
Realistic:Unrealistic	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.57

	1	2	3	4	5
Dependable:Undependable	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.58

	1	2	3	4	5
Unprepared:Prepared	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.59

	1	2	3	4	5
Interested:Disinterested	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.60

	1	2	3	4	5
Decisive:Indecisive	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.61

	1	2	3	4	5
Courageous:Cowardly	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.62

	1	2	3	4	5
Unforgiving:Forgiving	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.63

	1	2	3	4	5
Needs prodding:Takes Initiative	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.64

	1	2	3	4	5
Rude:Polite	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.65

	1	2	3	4	5
Disobedient:Obedient	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.66

	1	2	3	4	5
Self-serving:Helps others	O	O	O	O	O

Q2.67

Hard to work with:Works well with others	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	○

Q2.68

	1	2	3	4	5
Committed:Uncommitted	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix D

Prospectus

Personality and Performance: An Examination of Relationships Between Personality,

Character Traits, and Performance Among Wilderness Field Guides

Chapter 1

Introduction

Wilderness experience programs (WEP) are "organizations that conduct outdoor

programs in wilderness or comparable lands for the purposes of personal growth, therapy,

rehabilitation, education or leadership/organizational development" (Friese, Hendee, & Kinziger,

1998, p. 40). The literature is replete with studies touting the efficacy of wilderness experience

programs (WEPs) in positively influencing individuals with a variety of behavioral and

emotional problems across their respective life spans (Hood, 2003; Judge, 2005; Russell, 2006;

Scholl, McAvoy, Rynders, & Smith, 2003; Useem, 2001). In one specific form of WEP,

wilderness adventure therapy, (WAT), licensed therapists and field guides work with clients who

engage in activities such as backpacking, rock climbing, canoeing, and skiing (Jones, Lowe, &

Risler, 2004). Existing research on WAT organizations has "primarily focused on definitions,

industry characteristics, outcome assessments, standardization, and professionalization of the

workforce" (Marchand, Russell, & Cross, 2009, p. 360).

An often overlooked but important component of wilderness therapy, however, is the

relationship between field guides and clients. Very little is known about the personality and

character traits that field guides must have in order to facilitate effective change in clients

(Taniguchi, Widmer, Duerden, & Draper, 2009). Thus, the purpose of this study is to evaluate

selection procedures used to make hiring choices within WATs and to examine the extent to

which field guides' performance influences the overall client experience.

Personalities, character traits, and fit are an important aspect of employment in most organizations. Due to the high costs associated with staffing WAT programs and the key role field guides play in working with clients, effectively attracting, selecting, and training field guides is critical to the client's therapeutic process and ultimately the WAT's success.

Given the difficult, yet vital role of the field guide in WAT, an understanding of personality traits associated with successfully meeting the demands of this job seems crucial for the long-term vitality of the organization, the field guide, and the client. If, indeed, certain traits are associated with successful job performance, WAT organizations might use personality measures as screening instruments to identify and recruit the best field guides.

An effective way to measure performance in field guides is to use 360-degree ratings. The use of 360-degree ratings provides a more complete picture of performance by utilizing evaluations from important stakeholders in the organization and offer relevant job information that would otherwise be unavailable (Mount, 1998). Currently, no research examines the relationship between personality and effectiveness of field guides in WAT utilizing 360-degree evaluations. The important role field guides play in facilitating the therapeutic process of clients necessitates this research which may have important implications for the organization, client, and employee.

Two likely benefits are associated with identifying and recruiting the best field guides. First, they are likely to be more effective at building and maintaining therapeutic relationships with the clients, thus making the program more effective (Moses, 2000). Second, they are likely to be happier in the job and stay in the job longer, thus reducing the high cost of recruitment and training (Hogan & Holland, 2003; McEvoy & Cascio, 1985; Mobley, 1977). Due to the paucity

of research on character traits and employee performance of wilderness field guides, this study

may provide initial insights into character traits associated with being an effective field guide.

Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Job Performance

Past literature has consistently shown that Conscientiousness is a trait that is positively

correlated to job performance and is generalizable throughout various job types and settings

(Barrick & Mount, 1991). Similarly, Agreeableness is positively correlated with job

performance when teamwork and collaboration are needed (Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998).

Due to the nature of their jobs, field guides generally utilize a fairly complex set of soft and hard

skills necessary to successfully completing their job description. Field guides must be willing to

perform their duties whenever the occasion permits, independent of weather, time of day, or their

personal preferences.

Performance determined by field guides. An analysis of performance evaluations from

WATs participating in the current study revealed the ideal candidate for a field guide position

possesses the ability to manage risk, is dependable, and has necessary skills to successfully

navigate the outdoors. Management is concerned about the well-being of their clients and wants

to be assured their field guides prioritize client safety and well-being. Because

Conscientiousness and Agreeableness have consistently shown to be positively correlated with

job performance, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1: A significant ($p < .05$) positive correlation will be found between scores

on SDS and scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness from NEO-PI-R on ratings

from employers.

Performance determined by co-workers. Generally, field guides work in pairs of two.

They share the responsibilities of leading trips, completing job-related paperwork, and teaching

their clients to navigate the outdoors. Analysis of performance reviews (see appendix under

SDS) revealed field guides prefer to have co-workers who are easy to get along with, share

responsibilities equally, takes initiative, are team players, and follow through with their duties

and assignments. Co-workers, then, prefer someone who is Conscientious and Agreeable.

Therefore, I propose the following:

> *Hypothesis 2*: A significant ($p < .05$) positive correlation will be found between
>
> scores on SDS and scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness from NEO-PI-R
>
> on peer ratings of co-workers.

Performance determined by clients. Field guides are responsible for the well-being

and safety of the client during their work shifts on-trail. Because field guides are informally

responsible for most of the therapeutic work of WAT clients, a positive relationship between

field guides and clients is mandatory for the client's physical and emotional welfare. Taniguchi

et al. (2009) found clients participating in a therapeutic recreation program deemed certain traits

were more important than others. Clients often enter WAT programs coming from dysfunctional

homes where positive communication is absent and good role models are hard to come by. Field

guides can become an important and positive role model for clients to look up to. Research is

limited on the traits clients feel are important for field guides to possess. Our third hypothesis is

the following:

> *Hypothesis 3*: A significant ($p < .05$) positive correlation will be found between
>
> scores on SDS and scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness from NEO-PI-R
>
> on ratings from WAT clients.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to explore potential relationships between personality traits and employee performance in field guides working in WATs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to determine the relationships between performance scores and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs.

Significance of the Study

Companies offering wilderness therapy to their clients are confronted with a deluge of challenges from high employee turnover and burnout due to the emotional and physical challenges inherent to their job descriptions to working with unruly and troubled adolescents (Marchand, 2008). High turnover rates and burnout of field guides result in a substantial drain on financial and human resources associated with recruitment, hiring, and training. Valuable organizational knowledge and history are lost when employees leave (Ashworth, 2006; Massingham, 2008; Parise, Cross, & Davenport, 2006). Research has not examined the cost of turnover to wilderness therapy programs; however, estimates in the hospitality industry indicate turnover costs for a front-desk associate range anywhere from $5,688 to $12,881 (Hinkin & Tracey, 2000). It is likely the cost of turnover in wilderness therapy is much higher. The process of hiring new employees not only stresses the wilderness therapy institution, but the clients as well. Clients are constantly dealing with rules and expectations of different field guides, which could have a negative effect the efficiency of the program to facilitate therapy. The challenges confronting the individual employees are not to be overlooked. The work of wilderness field guides can be very stressful. Work issues can also cause instructors to struggle

in their relationships with family and friends due to schedule constraints, anxiety, and physical

and emotional challenges (Marchand, 2008).

The current body of literature has failed to address the importance of personality of

wilderness field guides and its relationship to employee performance. This lack of knowledge

necessitates this study. The need for establishing the importance of certain traits for field guides

is essential for the health and vitality of field guides, the efficiency of the wilderness therapy

program, and the mental and physical well-being of the client.

Delimitations

The scope of the study will be delimited to the following:

1. The sample will consist of only current employees of 10 wilderness therapy programs

    in the United States and Canada.

2. Data collection will occur only during the months of August–October, 2012.

Limitations

The study will be limited to the following:

1. Employee performance will only be measured by clients participating in the

    programs, co-workers, and field leaders.

2. Personality will be measured only through self-assessment.

Definitions

1. *Wilderness therapy*. "An integrative treatment model that incorporates well-established

    therapeutic modalities within the context of wilderness group living and backcountry

    travel" (Russell, 2006, p. 53).

2. *Adventure therapy*. "Adventure therapy is both the use of specific activities, high

    adventure, and wilderness in conjunction with a philosophy that embraces an active

exploration of the unknown, in which the challenges encountered are seen as

opportunities, and the group is seen as an essential element of individual success and

opportunities or genuine community are promoted" (Itin, 2001, p. 80).

3. *Field guide*. Field guide will be used to identify the employees responsible for working

    and living with the clients of wilderness therapy programs.

4. *Contained and continuous flow expedition programs*. Marchand et al. (2009) defines

    contained and continuous flow expedition programs as "[programs] conducted entirely in

    remote wilderness environments [and] require instructors to spend a minimum of

    consecutive eight days to as much as four consecutive weeks in the field with students"

    (p. 361).

5. *Co-workers*. Co-workers and peers will be used interchangeably to identify the

    employees that work alongside field guides and who hold and share the same

    responsibilities in WATs.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationships between performance scores

and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs. This review of

literature will examine research relating to employee performance and personality traits in a

management setting as well as the limited research on personality in the wilderness therapy

setting. The following topics will be discussed in this chapter: (a) current research on

personality, (b) employee performance (c) wilderness therapy programs, and (d) the impact of

working as a field guide for a wilderness therapy program. Finally, an examination of the lack of

research on the effects of personality on employee performance in the wilderness therapy

industry will set the stage for further analysis, per Taniguchi et al., (2009).

Personality

An individual's underlying personality inevitably influences how they will perform on

the job. Investigations of personality began in the 1930s and have been adopted by the fields of

psychiatry, psychopathology, sociology, and American psychology (John, Robins, & Pervin,

2008). More recently, personality research has been used to determine organizational

citizenship, contextual performance, and change-oriented extra-role behaviors on work

effectiveness (Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011). Current research in personality tends

to focus on an individualistic approach where personality traits are individually scrutinized to

assess choice and satisfaction (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Lee, Johnsont, & Dougherty, 2000).

Within the last 20 years, personality psychologists have converged regarding structure

and concepts of personality, classifying the taxonomy into five robust factors: (a) agreeableness,

(b) conscientiousness, (c) openness to experience, (d) neuroticism, and (e) extraversion (Barrick

& Mount, 1991).

Big five personality traits. Extensive research has examined the effectiveness of the five

aforementioned traits (Chiaburu et al., 2011; Oh & Berry, 2009; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011).

This Five-Factor Model (FFM) has become a mainstay in regards to personality research, noting

nearly all personality traits can be understood in terms of these five dimensions (Costa, McCrae,

& Kay, 1995). Costa and McCrae (1992) developed the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI) as

a "reasonable representation of human personality" (McCrae & Costa, 1987, p. 81) and is

predictive of job performance, leadership, and other work-related criteria (Ones,Dilchert,

Viswesvaran, & Judge, 2007). The comprehensiveness of the FFM, in predicting job

performance, has allowed it to be used across different theoretical frameworks, in different

cultures and languages, and with a variety of samples.

   Neuroticism. Neuroticism is defined as an individual's susceptibility to psychological

distress, the tendency to experience anxiety, feelings of guilt, shyness, or depression and has also

been referred to as Emotional Stability, Stability, and Emotionality (Barrick & Mount, 1991;

Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals who rate high in Neuroticism tend to prefer and adapt

better to positive environments that are less ambiguous and unthreatening (Oh & Berry, 2009;

Szalma & Taylor, 2011). Neuroticism can predict "impairment of working memory, attentional

resources, and sustained attention, biases in selective attention for negative information, a

tendency to appraise environmental demands as threats, and greater sensitivity to threat

information" (Szalma & Taylor, 2011, p. 72). Individuals who score low in this trait tend to

show confidence, self-assurance, and optimism (Oh & Berry, 2009).

   Agreeableness. Agreeableness can be defined as the ability to work with others. It is

associated with sympathy, altruism, helpfulness, tender mindedness, and a propensity to trust

others (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals who rate high in agreeableness tend to adapt well to

interpersonal settings and have lower levels of distress, which can be based on and individual's

desire to be prosocial (Chiaburu et al., 2011; Szalma & Taylor, 2011). Agreeableness is a

component of trust and inspires trust in situations of high uncertainty or risk (Szalma & Taylor,

2011). Agreeableness may not always be a desired trait for managers and may not be a valid

predictor of leader effectiveness (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Oh & Berry, 2009).

   Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness reflects dependability, thoroughness,

responsibility, and organization (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and is the single-best, generalizable

Big Five predictor of job performance (Ones et al., 2007). Lee et al. (2000) showed

Conscientiousness contains two factors: achievement orientation and dependability. Barrick and Mount (1991) showed Conscientiousness was a valid predictor of task accomplishment for all occupational groupings (e.g., professionals, police, managers, sales, skilled/semi-skilled workers). Barrick, Stewart, and Piotrowski (2002) found Conscientiousness is correlated with accomplishment striving and status. Those scoring low on the Conscientious scale may need help with time management, organizational skills, and motivation (Lee et al., 2000). Conscientiousness is a difficult trait for interviewers to assess in job applicants due to the applicant's ability to manage their self-presentation during interviews (Barrick, Patton, & Haugland, 2000).

Openness to Experience. Openness to Experience is the most difficult dimension to identify and has not been as extensively studied as the other traits (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Pace & Brannick, 2010). Openness to Experience includes imagination, tolerance, appreciation of arts, and breadth of interests. Openness to Experience may be important when targeting diversity attitudes or to cultural training that uses skills such as cultural empathy, behavioral flexibility and tolerance (Lee et al., 2000). Pace and Brannick (2010) showed Openness to Experience may be helpful with jobs requiring employees to adapt to changing demands and to generate novel ideas.

Extraversion. Extraversion has been defined as "the enjoyment of others' company" (McCrae & Costa, 1987, p. 87) and can be associated with persuasiveness, leadership, sociability, energy, assertiveness, activity level, and a preference for excitement (Oh & Berry, 2009; Szalma & Taylor, 2011). Barrick and Mount (1991) found Extraversion was a valid predictor of training proficiency across all occupations requiring interpersonal skills and led to more effective performance in jobs that required traits such as sociability, gregariousness,

assertiveness, action, and the ability to be talkative. Extraversion is the easiest trait to assess because the inherent traits mentioned above enhance the visibility of the trait (Barrick et al., 2000). Extraversion is correlated with high performance *only* when performance has been explicitly rewarded and seems to show a weak relationship between citizenship and extraversion (Barrick et al., 2002; Chiaburu et al., 2011).

Personality and Performance

Meta-analysis of personality has repeatedly shown relationships between personality and performance across all job types and situations (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Chiaburu et al., 2011; Oh et al., 2011). Current theory and research have converged on the belief that employee performance should be defined by the following dimensions: (a) task performance, (b) organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and (c) counterproductive work behavior (CWB) (Dalal, 2005; Le et al., 2011). According to Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994), task performance includes two classes of behavior. The first consists of activities that transform raw materials into goods and services the organizations produce (e.g., selling merchandise in a retail store or teaching a client to backpack in a wilderness therapy program). The second consists of maintaining and servicing the technical requirements that enable an organization to run smoothly such as planning, coordinating, supervising, and staffing. OCB can be defined as "contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance" (Organ, 1997, p. 91). CWB, on the other hand, is defined as "intentional employee behavior that is harmful to the legitimate interests of an organization" (Dalal, 2005, pp. 1241–1242).

Wilderness Therapy Programs

Wilderness therapy programs employ ideas based off experiential education, which provides learning opportunities through direct experience, intended to facilitate personal growth. Wilderness and adventure programs utilize experiential education by immersing clients in a setting where their skills and self-concepts are challenged and developed. Hattie, Marsh, Neill, & Richards (1997) describe the following features inherent in most adventure programs:

(a) wilderness or backcountry settings; (b) a small group (usually less than 16); (c) assignment of a variety of mentally and/or physically challenging objectives, such as mastering a river rapid or hiking to a specific point; (d) frequent and intense interactions that usually involve group problem solving and decision making; (e) nonintrusive, trained leader; and (f) a duration of two to four weeks. (p. 44)

The challenges inherent to WAT programs allow for optimal experiences, where clients feel a balance between their personal skill level and the challenge of the activity (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Generally, adventure programs produce positive growth because they provide immediate feedback (i.e., natural occurring consequences). These challenges lead to improved satisfaction and promote the development of proper social and adaptive behaviors (Becker, 2010).

Field guides. Field guides have the challenge and responsibility of caring for clients in remote, outdoor settings. They teach clients the vital skills necessary to navigate the challenges of the wilderness. These skills range from outdoor cooking and packing a backpack to more advanced skills such as mountain biking and rock climbing. Field guides often eat similar food as the clients and often times use the same minimal outdoor gear as the clients. They live in various environmental conditions such as the hot, summer sun to frigid, winter winds. Field

guides endure the physical rigor from miles of difficult hiking, backpacking, mountain biking, and other strenuous outdoor activities. Work shifts can be long—often eight days on and six days off. Field guides also endure substantial emotional stress associated with the challenges of working with troubled adolescents who are away from home and living in the rugged wilderness environment, often for the first time. Clearly, the role of a field guide presents unique physical and emotional challenges, challenges unlike any other job. Marchand et al. (2009) surveyed field guides and found a 9:1 ratio of negative aspects of being a field guide over the benefits. Due to the difficult work environment, most field guides work 6–18 months before leaving. Yet, they will often report the job is immensely rewarding.

What personality strengths are most advantageous for field guides to possess? How does personality influence employee performance in the wilderness therapy setting? How do the FFM traits of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness affect a field guide's performance? Does performance affect the term of employment for a field guide? These questions have yet to be determined. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine the relationships between performance scores and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs.

Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this study is to study is to determine the relationships between performance scores and scores of personality and character strengths among field guides in WATs within the U.S. and Canada. This chapter outlines the structure and methods of the study. The following areas will be covered: (a) study sample, (b) instrumentation, (c) data collection procedures, (d) data analysis.

Study Sample

A convenience sample of 500 field guides, managers, and clients of WAT programs within the United States and Canada will be recruited. All field guides in this study work directly with troubled adolescents during work shifts lasting at least six consecutive days in remote regions of the United States. Managers oversee the work of field guides and run day-to-day operations of their respective organizations. Clients have been matriculated into WAT programs, ranging in age from 13 to 22.

Instrumentation

The International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) NEO-PI-R (Goldberg et al., 2006) will be used to measure personality of field guides. The IPIP NEO-PI-R is a 50-item measure of personality traits and consists of five 10-item facets to measure the broad domains of the Big Five personality dimensions of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness. Administration of the instrument should take between 20 and 30 minutes. Field guides will be instructed to answer a given item in terms of how well the description describes their personality. Sample questions include, "I rarely get irritated" to measure Neuroticism, and, "I am always prepared" to measure Conscientiousness. Scores should vary from 10 to 50 for each of the 5 personality traits. Moreover, a higher score indicates disposition towards the specific trait. Responses are based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5= *strongly agree*. Cronbach's alpha reliability measure of the IPIP NEO-PI-R model varies from (.85) to (.91) with a mean of (.89) (Goldberg et al., 2006).

To measure performance of field guides, Semantic Differentials Scales (SDS) derived from current employee performance appraisals will be used. Semantic differentials will be administered to management, clients, and co-workers of field guides participating in the study.

Developed by Osgood and Luria (1954), semantic differentials are a composition of associations and rating procedures, using a set of bipolar adjectives, to give an objective measure to the meaning of concepts. SDS allows the researcher to evaluate perceived employee traits, strengths, and effectiveness as found in performance evaluations. Paired adjectives were selected to represent the content covered in employee evaluations currently used by participating WAT programs. One evaluation, for example, elicits questions about customer care. To measure customer care using semantic differentials, we paired *care* with its polar opposite *careless*, which allowed the test taker to rate a field guide's performance by circling either *care* or *careless*. Once a list of semantic differentials was compiled from the performance evaluations, we sent the scales back to the organizations for clarification, checking for validity of the differentials in the assessment. Individual scores from SDS were used in conjunction with the IPIP NEO-PI-R and VIA and correlational analyses were using SPSS to identify which personality and character traits are linked to performance.

Data Collection

Data will be collected from employees and clients of 10 wilderness and adventure companies. Personality and character traits data was gathered, online, through the use of Qualtrics. Performance measures were gathered, by the researcher, at the specific locations of each WAT. Incentives were used to motivate employees to honestly and completely respond to questions on questionnaires. Data collection will occur in one wave during 10 group sessions from September 2012 through October 2012. All field guides will be given a letter containing a brief explanation of the purpose of the study and a statement insuring confidentiality of their results. Field guides will be instructed to answer each item in the survey in terms of whether a statement describes their character strengths and personality traits.

Additionally, data in regards to employee performance will be collected using 360 performance measures collected from management teams, youth participating in the programs, and co-workers. Individual performance of each field guide will be measured using semantic differential scales. Wilderness and adventure therapy programs have parental rights over the adolescents participating in the program and have consented to youth participation of this study. Adolescents will be given a brief explanation of the study and instructions regarding the SDS and asked to rate the performance of the field guides. Management teams and co-workers will be informed about the study and given instructions in regards to SDS and a consent form. They will be assigned to answer specific questions regarding performance of individual field guides they have worked with. Due to the nature of this experiment, no control group will be needed.

Data Analysis

In order to find a positive relationship between the Big-5 and performance of wilderness field guides, a block regression will be used to determine the amount of variance explained by each variable, in this case, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, while controlling for the other variables. No studies have determined the relationships between the character traits found in Peterson and Seligman's (2004) VIA and employee performance. Therefore, a stepwise regression model will be used to systematically find the strongest correlation between character and performance in wilderness field guides.

References

Abramis, D. J. (1994). Work role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and job performance: Meta-

analyses and review. *Psychological Reports, 75*(3f), 1411–1433. doi:

10.2466/pr0.1994.75.3f.1411

Ashworth, M. J. (2006). Preserving knowledge legacies: Workforce aging, turnover and human

resource issues in the US electric power industry. *The International Journal of Human

Resource Management, 17*(9), 1659–1688. doi: 10.1080/09585190600878600

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job

performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1–26. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-

6570.1991.tb00688.x

Barrick, M. R., Patton, G. K., & Haugland, S. N. (2000). Accuracy of interviewer judgments of

job applicant personality traits. *Personnel Psychology, 53*(4), 925–951. doi:

10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb02424.x

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test

of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 87*(1), 43–51. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.43

Becker, S. (2010). Wilderness therapy: Ethical considerations for mental health professionals.

Child and Youth Care Forum, 39(1), 47–61. doi: 10.1007/s10566-009-9085-7

Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model

of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of

Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1140–1166. doi: 10.1037/a0024004

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO PI-R professional manual. *Odessa, FL:

Psychological Assessment Resources*, 396, 653–65.

Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Kay, G. G. (1995). Persons, places, and personality - Career assessment using the revised NEO personality-inventory. *Journal of Career Assessment, 3*(2), 123–139. doi: 10.1177/106907279500300202

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, I. (1990). Adventure and the flow experience. *Adventure Education*, 149–155.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1241–1255. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241

Friese, G., Hendee, J. C., & Kinziger, M. (1998). The wilderness experience program industry in the United States: Characteristics and dynamics. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 21*(1), 40–45.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. *Personality psychology in Europe, 7*, 7–28.

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(1), 84–96. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(1), 84–96. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007

Hattie, J., Marsh, H. W., Neill, J. T., & Richards, G. E. (1997). Adventure education and

Outward bound: Out-of-class experiences that make a lasting difference. *Review of Educational Research, 67*(1), 43–87.

Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (2000). The cost of turnover. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 41*(3), 14–21. doi: 10.1177/001088040004100313

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance

relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 100–112. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.100

Hood, C. D. (2003). Women in recovery from alcoholism: The place of leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 25*(1), 51–79.

Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(6), 869–879. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.85.6.869

Itin, C. M. (2001). Adventure therapy—critical questions. *Journal of Experiential Education, 24*(2), 80.

John, O. P., Robins, R. W., & Pervin, L. A. (2008). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Jolliffe, I. (2005). Principal component analysis. *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science,* John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. doi: 10.1002/0470013192.bsa501

Jones, C. D., Lowe, L. A., & Risler, E. A. (2004). The effectiveness of wilderness adventure

therapy programs for young people involved in the juvenile justice system. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth, 22*(2), 53–67. doi: 10.1300/J007v22n02_04

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A

    qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765–780. doi:

    10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Judge, W. (2005). Adventures in creating an outdoor leadership challenge course for an emba

    program. *Journal of Management Education, 29*(2), 284–300. doi:

    10.1177/1052562904265251

Le, H., Oh, I.-S., Robbins, S. B., Ilies, R., Holland, E., & Westrick, P. (2011). Too much of a

    good thing: Curvilinear relationships between personality traits and job performance.

    Journal of Applied Psychology, 96(1), 113–133. doi: 10.1037/a0021016

Lee, F. K., Johnston, J. A., & Dougherty, T. W. (2000). Using the Five-Factor Model of

    personality to enhance career development and organizational functioning in the

    workplace. *Journal of Career Assessment, 8*(4), 419–427. doi:

    10.1177/106907270000800411

Marchand, G. (2008). Challenges affecting field instructors in wilderness therapy. *Journal of

    Experiential Education, 30*(3), 286–289.

Marchand, G., Russell, K. C., & Cross, R. (2009). An empirical examination of outdoor

    behavioral healthcare field instructor job-related stress and retention. *Journal of

    Experiential Education, 31*(3), 359–375.

Massingham, P. (2008). Measuring the impact of knowledge loss: More than ripples on a pond?

    Management Learning. 39, 541–560. doi: 10.1177/1350507608096040

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across

    instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 81–90.

    doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81

McEvoy, G. M., & Cascio, W. F. (1985). Strategies for reducing employee turnover: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*(2), 342–353. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.70.2.342

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*(2), 237–240. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237

Moses, T. (2000). Attachment theory and residential treatment: A study of staff-client relationships. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70*(4), 474–490. doi: 10.1037/h0087681

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(4), 475–480. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475

Mount, M. K. (1998). Trait, rater and level effects in 360-degree performance ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 51*(3), 557–576.

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-Factor Model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance, 11*(2/3), 145–165.

Oh, I.-S., & Berry, C. M. (2009). The Five-Factor model of personality and managerial performance: Validity gains through the use of 360 degree performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1498–1513. doi: 10.1037/a0017221

Oh, I.-S., Wang, G., & Mount, M. K. (2011). Validity of observer ratings of the five-factor model of personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 762–773. doi: 10.1037/a0021832

Ones, D. S., Dilchert, S., Viswesvaran, C., & Judge, T. A. (2007). In support of personality

assessment in organizational settings. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(4), 995–1027. doi:

10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00099.x

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human

Performance, 10*(2), 85–97.

Osgood, C. E., & Luria, Z. (1954). A blind analysis of a case of multiple personality using the

semantic differential. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49*(41), 579–591.

doi: 10.1037/h0054362

Pace, V. L., & Brannick, M. T. (2010). Improving prediction of work performance through

frame-of-reference consistency: Empirical evidence using openness to experience.

International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 18(2), 230–235. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-

2389.2010.00506.x

Parise, S., Cross, R., & Davenport, T. H. (2006). Strategies for preventing a knowledge-loss

crisis. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 47*(4), 31–38.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Character strengths and virtues: a handbook and

classification: Oxford University Press, USA.

Russell, K. C. (2006). Brat camp, boot camp, or ……..? Exploring wilderness therapy program

theory. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning, 6*(1), 51–67. doi:

10.1080/14729670685200741

Scholl, K. G., McAvoy, L., Rynders, J., & Smith, J. (2003). The influence of an inclusive

outdoor recreation experience on families that have a child with a disability. *Therapeutic

Recreation Journal, 37*(1), 38–57.

Szalma, J. L., & Taylor, G. S. (2011). Individual differences in response to automation: The five factor model of personality. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 17*(2), 71–96. doi: 10.1037/a002417010.1037/a0024170.supp

Taniguchi, S., Widmer, M., Duerden, M., & Draper, C. (2009). The attributes of effective field staff in wilderness programs: Changing youths' perspectives of being 'cool.'. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 43*(1), 11–26.

Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 1011–1017. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1011

Tubre, T. C., & Collins, J. M. (2000). Jackson and Schuler (1985) Revisited: A Meta-Analysis of the Relationships Between Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, and Job Performance. *Journal of Management, 26*(1), 155–169. doi: 10.1177/014920630002600104

Useem, M. (2001). The leadership lessons of Mount Everest. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(9), 51–58.

Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. A., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 164–169. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.164

Letter for Organizational Consent

Office of Research and Creative Activities   May 9, 2012
Brigham Young University
A-285 ASB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
Attn: IRB

I am writing to indicate our willingness to participate in a study being conducted by Researcher's from Brigham Young University (Mark Widmer PhD., Stacy Taniguchi PhD., John Bingham PhD and John Bishoff). I understand this study will examine relationships between personality traits and performance among wilderness therapy and adventure therapy field guides. We are willing to allow these researchers access to our staff and program participants subject to IRB approval and within the prescribed guidelines of the IRB and our agency.

Organization's Name:_____

Signature: _____Date:_____

Printed Name: _____

Position: _____

Consent to be a Research Subject for Personality Assessment

Introduction

This research study is being conducted by Mark Widmer Ph.D., Stacy Taniguchi, Ph.D., John Bingham, Ph.D., and graduate student John Bishoff at Brigham Young University to examine the relationship between personality traits and performance among wilderness therapy and adventure therapy field guides. You have been chosen to participate in this study because you are currently working or have worked in the past as a field guide for a wilderness therapy or adventure therapy organization.

Procedures

If you agree to participate in this research study, the following will occur:

- You will participate in a survey for approximately twenty to thirty (20–30) minutes about your personality and character traits.
- Your performance will be measured through the use of three-sixty degree (360˚) evaluations performed by two of your peers, two management team members, and two clients in the organization. Each evaluation will take approximately fifteen (15) minutes.
- Your personality assessment will take place online at a time convenient to you.

Risks/Discomforts

There are minimal risks for participation in this study. You may, however, feel some discomfort when answering questions about your personality or character traits. Participants in this study will not be compensated for their participation. However, participants in this study will receive a candy bar for completing the performance evaluation as a token of appreciation.

Benefits

There will be no direct benefits to you. It is hoped, however, that through your participation researchers may learn more about personality and performance in wilderness therapy and adventure therapy field guides.

Confidentiality

The research data will be kept on password protected computers and only the researchers will have access to the data. Participants in this study will not be compensated for their participation. However, participants in this study will receive a candy bar for completing the performance evaluation as a token of appreciation. At the conclusion of the study, all identifying information will be removed, and the data will be kept in the researcher's locked office/computer.

Compensation

Participants in this study will not be compensated for their participation. However, participants in this study will receive a candy bar for completing the performance evaluation as a token of appreciation.

Participation

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to refuse or withdraw without consequence to you or your employment.

Questions about the Research

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Professor Mark Widmer at widmer@byu.edu, (801) 422-3381 or John Bishoff at jdbishoff@marriottschool.byu.edu, (801) 592-6803 for further information.

Questions about Your Rights as Research Participants

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant contact IRB Administrator at (801) 422-1461; A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu.

Statement of Consent

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

Name: _____

Signature: _____Date:_____

Organization's Name: _____

Consent to be a Research Subject Manager/Peer Review

Introduction

This research study is being conducted by Professors Mark Widmer, Stacy Taniguchi, John Bingham, and graduate student John Bishoff at Brigham Young University to examine the relationship between personality traits and performance among wilderness therapy and adventure therapy field guides. You have been selected to participate in this study because you work as a manager for a wilderness therapy or adventure therapy program.

Procedures

If you agree to participate in this research study, the following will occur:

- You will participate in a survey for approximately fifteen (15) minutes that will rate job performance of your co-workers/subordinates.
- You will measure your co-worker/subordinates' performance through the use of a semantic differential. A semantic differential is designed to measure the connotative meaning of concepts. You will be asked to choose where your position lies, on a scale between two bipolar adjectives (for example: "Adequate-Inadequate," "Good-Evil," or "Valuable-Worthless").
- Your performance evaluation will be done online through the use of Qualtrics online survey tools.

Risks/Discomforts

There are minimal risks for participation in this study. You may, however, feel some discomfort when answering questions about your co-worker's performance. Field guides being evaluated will not have access to your responses and will not see how you have rated their performance.

Benefits

There will be no direct benefits to you. It is hoped, however, that through your participation researchers may learn more about personality and performance in wilderness therapy and adventure therapy field guides.

Confidentiality

The research data will be kept on password-protected computers, and only the researchers will have access to the data. Field guides being evaluated will not have access to your responses and will not see how you have rated their performance. At the conclusion of the study, all identifying information will be removed and the data will be kept in the researcher's locked office/computer.

Compensation

Participants in this study will not be compensated for their participation. However, participants in this study will receive a candy bar for completing the performance evaluation as a token of appreciation.

Participation

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to refuse or withdraw without consequence to you or to your employment.

Questions about the Research

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Professor Mark Widmer at widmer@byu.edu, (801) 422-3381 or John Bishoff at jdbishoff@marriottschool.byu.edu, (801) 592-6803 for further information.

Questions about Your Rights as Research Participants

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant contact IRB Administrator at (801) 422-1461; A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu.

Statement of Consent

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

Name: _____

Signature: _____Date:_____

Organization's Name: _____

Your Position: _____

Consent to be a Research Subject Young Adult Review

What is this study about?
My name is John Bishoff, and I am from Brigham Young University. I would like to invite you to take part in a research study. You have been selected to participate in this study because you are currently participating in a wilderness therapy program. Your parent(s) know we are talking with you about the study. This form will tell you about the study to help you decide whether or not you want to be in it.
In this study, we want to learn about what personality traits make a good field guide.

What am I being asked to do?
If you decide to be in the study, we will ask you to answer some questions about your field guide. This will take about 15 minutes.

What are the benefits to me for taking part in the study?
Taking part in this research study may not help you in any way, but it might help us learn how to find the best field guides for wilderness therapy programs.

Can anything bad happen if I am in this study?
We think there are a few risks to you by being in the study, but some participants might become bored because of some of the questions we ask. You don't have to answer any of the questions you don't want to answer.

Who will know that I am in the study?
We won't tell anyone that you are in this study, and everything you tell us and do will be private. Your field guide will not be shown your answers. Your parent may know that you took part in the study, but we won't tell them anything you said or did, either.   When we tell other people or write articles about what we learned in the study, we won't include your name or that of anyone else who took part in the study.

Do I have to be in the study?
No, you don't. The choice is up to you. No one will get angry or upset if you don't want to do this. You can change your mind any time if you decide you don't want to be in the study anymore.

What if I have questions?
If you have questions at any time, you can ask us and you can talk to your parents or supervisors about the study. We will give you a copy of this form to keep. If you want to ask us questions about the study, contact John Bishoff at 801-592-6803 or at jdbishoff@marriottschool.byu.edu. If you want to be in this study, please sign and print your name.

Name:_____Date:_____Signature:_____

Youth Assent to be a Research Subject

What is this study about?

My name is John Bishoff. I am from Brigham Young University. I would like to invite you to take part in a research study. Your parent(s) know we are talking with you about the study. This form will tell you about the study to help you decide whether or not you want to be in it.

In this study, we want to learn about what personality traits make a good field guide.

What am I being asked to do?

If you decide to be in the study, we will ask you to answer some questions about your field guide. This will take about 15 minutes.

What are the benefits to me for taking part in the study?

Taking part in this research study may not help you in any way, but it might help us learn how to find the best field guides for wilderness therapy programs.

Can anything bad happen if I am in this study?

We think there are few risks to you by being in the study, but some kids might become bored because of some of the questions we ask. You don't have to answer any of the questions you don't want to answer.

Who will know that I am in the study?

We won't tell anyone that you are in this study, and everything you tell us and do will be private. Your field guide will not be shown your answers. Your parent may know that you took part in the study, but we won't tell them anything you said or did, either. When we tell other people or write articles about what we learned in the study, we won't include your name or that of anyone else who took part in the study.

Do I have to be in the study?

No, you don't. The choice is up to you. No one will get angry or upset if you don't want to do this. You can change your mind any time if you decide you don't want to be in the study anymore.

What if I have questions?

If you have questions at any time, you can ask us and you can talk to your parents or supervisors about the study. We will give you a copy of this form to keep. If you want to ask us questions about the study, contact John Bishoff at 801-592-6803 or at jdbishoff@marriottschool.byu.edu. You will receive a candy bar for being in this research study. Before you say yes to be in this study, what questions do you have about the study?

If you want to be in this study, please sign and print your name.

Name (Printed):_____Date:_____Signature:_____

Parental Consent for a Minor to be a Research Subject

Introduction

My name is John Bishoff. I am a graduate student from Brigham Young University. I am conducting a research study about understanding the relationship between personality and job performance among wilderness field guides. I am inviting your child to take part in the research because (he/she) is participating in a wilderness therapy or wilderness adventure therapy program.

Procedures

If you agree to let your child participate in this research study, the following will occur:

• You child will be asked to rate the performance of the field guides that oversee him/her.

• It will take no more than 15 minutes for your child to complete the performance measure.

• The performance measure will be taken during down times, out in the field, where your child is participating in therapy.

Risks/Discomforts

There are minimal risks for participation in this study. Your child may answer only those questions your child wants to, or your child may stop the entire process at any time without affecting his/her standing in the wilderness therapy program in which they are participating.

Confidentiality

Personal information will not be disclosed to anyone. Moreover, guides will not have access to the raw data gathered from your child. Your child's field guide will not have access to the responses your child makes about their field guide's performance. The researcher will keep all data in a locked office in a secure location. Only the researchers will have access to the data. At the end of the study, data with any names or identifiers will be destroyed.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits for your child's participation in this project. It is hoped, however, that through participation, researchers may learn more about personality and performance in wilderness therapy and adventure therapy field guides that may assist in future employee selection and improve the overall effectiveness of programs for clients.

Compensation

Participants will not be compensated for their participation in this study. However, participants will receive a candy bar as a token of appreciation for their participation in this study.

Questions about the Research

Please direct any further questions about the study to John Bishoff at 801-592-6803 and jdbishoff@marriottscholl.byu.edu. You may also contact Professor Mark Widmer at 801-422-3381 and widmer@byu.edu

Questions about your child's rights as a study participant or to submit comment or complaints about the study should be directed to the IRB Administrator, Brigham Young University, A-285 ASB, Provo, UT 84602. Call (801) 422-1461 or send emails to irb@byu.edu.

You have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

Participation

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You are free to decline to have your child

participate in this research study. You may withdraw you child's participation at any point without affecting your child's therapeutic treatment.

If you agree to have your child participate in this study, please select I agree.

Child's Name: _____Date:_____

Parent's Name: _____

Parent's Signature: _____