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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

One of the indispensable tools of counselors in all fields of endeavor is the counseling interview; it is the point of interaction between client and counselor. Such an interview may have many possible functions. A few of the things a counselor may try to accomplish in the interview are: to establish rapport, to gain information, to clarify the client's thinking, to give information, encouragement, reassurance or guidance, to persuade, to give the client emotional release, or to better the adjustment of the client.

Counselors have long been handicapped by lack of knowledge about techniques which will effect their purposes in the interview. In the last fifteen years, increasing numbers of books have been written which purport to describe effective techniques for conducting interviews. However, there has been little agreement among the various writers. One reason would seem to be that these books are based on trial and error experience or are derived from theoretical points of view. None of them have been adequately based on research.
This lack of agreement among authors is highlighted by the present controversy between the so-called directive and non-directive counselors. Williamson, an advocate of the directive school, places the chief responsibility on the counselor in directing the course of the interview and planning the course of action for the counselee. He says, for example, that it is obvious by the large proportion of students who select courses of study, vocations, and extra-curricular activities which are incongruent with their potentialities, that they cannot diagnose and understand their own needs. The opposing view is taken by Rogers, who places the responsibility for making plans and gaining insight directly on the shoulders of the client. He feels that there are potentialities for growth in each individual which need only the proper atmosphere to insure their operation.

Although this is the most notorious area of disagreement in the counseling field, there are many others which the careful reader cannot fail to discover. For example, Bingham and Moore stress the importance of adequate tests and records as a basis for diagnosis and guiding the interview in order to cover all the important details. Reed, on the other hand, thinks it well to avoid the use of tests.

3 Bingham, W. V., & Moore, B. V., How To Interview, Harpers, New York, 1934.
life histories, and the like, since they may make the client feel that he doesn't have a chance for a fresh start in a new situation.

Young suggests the sharing of mutual experience or the use of personal reference as a means of establishing rapport. Williamson, however, feels that the counselor should not go too far in meeting the client on his own level since this might lead the client to lose respect for the counselor and to make up his own mind as to the proper course of action.

These few examples are sufficient to indicate the wide areas of disagreement between the writers of textbooks on counseling procedures. It seems obvious that there is need for objective evidence on (1) effective means of accomplishing the purpose of the interview, and (2) objective criteria for evaluating outcomes of interviews.

One variable which has been suggested as both a means of accomplishing interview purposes and a criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of the interview is the amount of client talk. Authors, however, disagree as to the function of client talk.

A frequently mentioned function of talk is catharsis or release. Bingham says, "The interviewer often performs his greatest personal service, incidentally gleaning the

6 Williamson, op. cit.
7 Bingham and Moore, op. cit., page 224.
most important details, when he maintains the passive role of listener. Not only in the mental clinic but in industry and in education, the wholesome therapeutic effect of release from emotional strain results when the interviewee has a real opportunity to unburden his mind, talking out instead of acting out his troublesome impulses."

Rogers points out that "one of the major purposes of the counselor is to help the client express freely emotionalized attitudes which are basic to his adjustment problems and conflicts. . . . in this process the client finds emotional release from feelings heretofore repressed, increasing awareness of the basic elements in his own situation and increased ability to recognize his own feelings openly and without fear."

Paterson implies the information-getting role of client talk when as one of a list of interviewing techniques he gives the following rule: "Listen to the student's story, helping him to supplement omitted pertinent facts and to keep the conversation directed on the subject. In short, be a good listener."

Strang thinks of talk as a criterion of insight. She says: "Spontaneous participation is one criterion of a good interview, for the student who remains passive

8 Rogers, op. cit., page 173.
during an interview is likely to go away with about the same ideas that he had at the beginning of the conference."

On the other hand, counselee talk as a means of achieving counselee insight is proposed by Rogers. He says, "The primary technique which leads to insight on the part of the client is one which demands the utmost in self-restraint on the counselor's part rather than the utmost in action. The primary technique is to encourage the expression of attitudes and feelings until insightful understanding appears spontaneously."

Client talk, then, has been proposed as a means of achieving counselor purposes in the interview, and as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the interview. Both propositions are based on a priori grounds, since there have been no direct researches which substantiate either claim. 12

Although Hobbs has suggested that in group therapy insight gains in a client are related to the amount of client talk, it is a possibility that counselor purposes can be achieved as well with little client talk as with much client talk. If client talk is an incorrect or only a secondary criterion of effectiveness, there is danger that emphasis on getting the client to talk may

11 Rogers, op. cit., page 195
12 Hobbs, N. H., Psychological Research and Services in an Army Air Forces Convalescent Hospital, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1946 (unpublished thesis).
lead merely to more talk and not to greater effectiveness. Research is needed to discover the real importance of amount of talk and its role in the counseling interview.

It is the intent of this research to answer some of the questions concerning the role and importance of client talk, and its relationship to other variables. Specifically there will be an attempt to answer the following questions: Is the amount of client talk directly related to client insight growth? Is a large amount of client talk important for the working relationship in the interview? What is the effect of various counselor techniques upon the amount of client talk? What is the effect of the topic of discussion upon amount of client talk? Is a large amount of client talk a good criterion for responsibility which the client assumes for the progress of the interview?

Summary,

This chapter has attempted to point out that there are many areas of disagreement among the textbook writers in the field of counseling. These disagreements make obvious the need for scientific evidence on effective counseling techniques and on criteria for evaluating interviews. A frequently mentioned technique and criterion is a large amount of client talk. However this may be an incorrect or secondary criterion, since no research has proved its worth. This study intends to evaluate its importance.

The next chapter will review the research in interviewing which is basic to this study and makes it possible.
CHAPTER II
HISTORY OF RESEARCH ON THE COUNSELING INTERVIEW

In the introductory chapter some writers' opinions on the importance of client talk in the interview were reviewed and the need for research on the subject was recognized. This chapter will outline some of the research on the interview which has been carried on at Ohio State University. Although other studies have been made of the interview, the ones reviewed here are most directly applicable to this study.

Not until 1940 was there a serious attempt to scientifically examine the interview. At that time, \(^1\) Porter undertook to find a methodology for the objective study of the interview. From an analysis of 19 typescripts of interviews he formulated a check list for the classification of counselor's remarks. This check list, which contains 24 sub-headings, is grouped into these main categories: (1) defining the interview situation, (2) bringing out and developing the problem situation, (3) developing the client's insight and understanding, and (4) sponsoring certain activities to be carried out by the client, and/or

---

\(^1\) Porter, E. H., The Development And Evaluation of a Measure of Counseling Interview Procedures, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1941 (unpublished thesis).
fostering decision-making by the client. A comparison of the ratings by independent judges was made both of recorded interviews and typescripts of interviews. The correlations of the ratings of judges for typescripts was .95 and for recordings was .96. Porter's research proved that it was possible to study the interview objectively from a typescript.

In looking for individual characteristics for interviewers Porter thought that one such measure was the ratio of the number of words spoken by the counselor to the number of words spoken by the client in an interview. He found marked extremes in this characteristic, with client talk ranging from 20% to 87% of the total. He thought that with minor exceptions each interviewer tended to be relatively consistent from one interview to the next in the proportionate amount of talking. Counselors who talked more than did the clients received higher ratings of directiveness than did counselors who talked less than the client.

In 1943 Snyder used six non-directive contacts comprising 48 interviews and analyzed them according to a check list in an attempt to discover reasons for their success or failure. He classified counselor statements into 16 groups including lead-taking, non-directive response-to-feelings, semi-directive response-to-feelings,

---

directive counseling, and other minor categories. Counselee responses were classified according to problem, simple response, and understanding or action-taking categories. He also classified according to client feeling. In a recheck of his reliabilities, Snyder himself obtained 76% to 87% agreement while an independent rating varied from 52% to 78% agreement.

Sherman's study in 1945 was a departure from the previous theses in that she used as her interview unit topics of conversation instead of single responses. She found it possible to identify these units with a high degree of reliability. She was able to classify these units into topics and to identify the primary counselor technique for each topic. Judges made these classifications with good reliability. Sherman also devised rating scales which attempted to measure growth in counselee insight, counselee responsibility, and working relationship. One of her findings was that it was easier to rate insight gains when more counselee talk existed. On the basis of these tools she was able to discover some of the important dynamic relationships operating in the interview.

In 1946 Hobbs made a study of two different types of group therapy used in the United States Army for


4 Hobbs, N. H., Psychological Research and Services in an Army Air Forces Convalescent Hospital, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1946 (unpublished thesis).
patients with anxiety state diagnoses. One technique was the typical mental hygiene lecture and discussion as recommended by the Army whereas the other, called the Y technique, was relatively non-directive. The function of the group leader in this technique was to stimulate discussion. A series of sessions using the Y technique was recorded and analyzed. One measure obtained from the analysis was the percentage of lines of group talk and of leader's talk. It was discovered that the patients talked more than the group leader in the Y technique. Hobbs feels that "best judgement would indicate the desirability of adopting the technique that provides most opportunity for relevant participation of the members of the group."

Recently, Tindall, in an attempt to isolate and study one of the specific factors in the interview, has made an investigation of the use and results of counselor silence as a technique. He found that pauses or silences occur rather frequently and can be classified as techniques which have varied effects upon the counseling situation. They can be used as a means of forcing the counselee to contribute to the interview. Their greatest effect is to lead to clarification of remarks. Tindall felt that silence as a technique was often effective and resulted in a higher amount of client responsibility.

5 Tindall, R. H., An Analysis of the Use of the Technique of Silence as it Appears in the Counseling Situation, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1946 (unpublished thesis).
Daulton this year made a study of resistance in the interview, and found it generally undesirable from the point of view of rapport. She felt that some resistance results from inhibitions within the client himself and is not caused directly by the counselor or the counseling situation. However, immediate signs of resistance were not necessarily proof of later non-acceptance of counselor ideas.

This series of researches launched at Ohio State University has as its purpose the discovery of correct interviewing techniques, their place in the counseling interview, and the dynamic relationships involved. Enough groundwork has been laid that it is possible to give intensive study to specific factors in the interview. One of these factors which has been frequently mentioned by armchair philosophers as being important, but which has not been subjected to scientific study, is the amount of counselee talk in the interview. This study will attempt to discover the importance of this factor.

The next chapter will concern itself with discussion of methods and definitions used in analyzing the interview.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The Problem

The purpose of this study is to attempt to quantify the importance of the amount of client talk in the counseling interview. An analysis will be made of the relationships between the amount of counselee talk and the following counselee outcomes: insight, working relationship, and responsibility. In addition, variations in these relationships will be determined for the different topics and counselor techniques.

The contents of this chapter include a description of the data, its source and nature, the number of interviews used, and some information about the counselors. Following that are definitions of variables in the interview and a discussion of their classification and method of rating. Definitions include the units used, the amount of talk, the topic of the unit, the counselor technique, growth in counselee insight, counselee responsibility for the progress of the unit, and the working relationship between counselor and counselee. Finally, an outline of the methods of handling the data in the next chapter is presented.
Description of Data

The interviews included in this study were obtained in conjunction with two related courses offered by the Psychology Department of Ohio State University. The first of these courses has as its chief purpose the teaching of effective study techniques to undergraduate students. This is a laboratory course and one of the methods used is a weekly interview with a counselor during which problems arising in the course, or related problems, can be discussed. The second course is designed primarily to give supervised counseling experiences to counselors-in-training. The students of the second course act as counselors to those of the first.

The counselors for the most part consist of advanced students in Psychology, the majority of them graduate students. About half the data used comes from this group. The other half comes from interviews conducted by experienced counselors, some of whom were supervisors of the counseling course, others of whom were experts not ordinarily participating in the course.

The interviews were recorded and verbatim typescripts made from the recordings. This study made use of the typescripts for 78 interviews. Of this number 42 interviews were conducted by 7 experts and the other 36 by 16 counselors-in-training. Much of this material was

---

used by Sherman in her original study. However, additional data has been added and the reliability of the data has been increased by the accumulation of further ratings.

**Definition of Variables**

The next eight pages are devoted to definitions of the variables used, their classification, and the methods by which they were rated.

**Definition of a Unit.** A counseling interview is not an aimless, rambling discussion. It is organized around particular problems which the counselee seeks aid in solving. Sherman found it possible to recognize with a high degree of consistency the transition point at which the conversation changes from one topic to another, and the conversation between these transition points is called the unit. It is defined as all the counselor and counselee statements and questions which are related to one main idea or problem discussed in the interview.

In checking the reliability of dividing interviews into units, Sherman divided four interviews into 19 units, and had two other judges each divide two of the interviews into units. On 13 of the 19 units, the division was identical. On 5 more, the difference consisted merely of a few non-committal remarks which marked a shift in the

topic of conversation, and in which there were no
important responses. In the one remaining case, one
judge divided a unit into two parts at a point where there
was a slight interruption in the main flow of conversation
which quickly turned back to the point of interruption.
On the basis of this sample it is assumed that the pro-
cedure of dividing interviews into units is quite reliable.

A typical interview may consist of one or many units.
Of the 78 interviews used in this study, the range was
from 1 to 15 units per interview. The average number was
approximately 6. The total number of units used in the
study was 353 after the omission of certain units (to be
discussed later).

Amount of Talk. It was necessary to devise a measure
of the amount of counselee talk. In order to facilitate
counting, the original decision was to count lines instead
of words in the typescript of the interview. However, so
many of the responses consisted of only a few words that
a line seemed a somewhat unreliable measure, so the half-line
was finally decided upon. In order to check upon the
accuracy of this measure a random sample of ten pages of
typescript was chosen from the interviews which were used;
the pages were counted in terms of words and half-lines, and
the results correlated. A correlation of .965 was obtained,
which indicates sufficient accuracy to justify use of the
half-line as the measure of amount of talk.
Since the units vary in length from a half-page to as much as eight or ten pages, a simple quantitative total of the measure could not be used. Instead the ratio between counselee talk and the total amount of talk in the unit was decided upon. For ease of reference this will be referred to as the talk ratio, and will be presented in decimal fractions. As an example, if the talk ratio is .25, it is apparent that the counselee has done only 25% of the talking.

**Topic of Conversation.** The topic is certainly one of the important variables which needs to be studied in its relationship to the amount of talk. The most desirable classification by topics is one which groups the most similar problems together and does not obscure important differences. The classification used by Sherman and followed by this study is one which is particularly adapted to the conditions under which these interviews were conducted.

It is a sevenfold classification:

1. **Study skill:** The counselor helps the counselee with some technique which is used in studying such as outlining, reading, writing, etc.

2. **Other scholastic problems:** Any problem related directly to school work which is not a study skill. This category would include such problems as schedule-making, discussion of point-hour-ratios, study conditions, etc.

3. **Personal problem dealt with on an information basis:** Any problem which does not arouse much emotional concern, and which can be dealt with merely by giving the counselee certain information which he does not have, such as suggestions regarding housing, recreational facilities, possible part-time employment, etc.
4. **Vocational problems:** The counselee's vocational problems and plans are discussed.

5. **Therapy:** The unit is structured in such a way as to use the interview situation as a therapeutic device to treat an individual with a difficult personal problem about which he has rather highly emotionalized attitudes, or to treat a personality maladjustment. Neither the technique used by the counselor nor the success of the unit has anything to do with this classification.

6. **Visiting:** The counselor and the counselee just talk about anything that interests them without any consideration of the counselee's problem.

7. **Unclassifiable:** Any unit which does not fit into the above classification.

As a check on the consistency of trained judges in classifying units according to topic, Sherman compared herself to two other judges on a 10% sample of her study, or on 26 units. There was perfect agreement in 20 cases, and a difference on 6 cases.

In assembling the data for this study, units concerned with three topics were eliminated. They consisted of 17 concerned with visiting, 12 which were unclassifiable, and 7 concerned with personal problems dealt with on an information basis. In addition 32 units were eliminated which were considered too short to use. The final sample included 147 units concerned with study skills, 100 with other scholastic problems, 66 with therapy, and 40 with vocational problems.
The Primary Counselor Technique. Another method of classifying units is concerned with the technique used by the counselor. Sherman discovered that, although in any given unit several techniques may be commonly used, there is one technique which is used predominately or which is most important to the conduct of the interview. This has been labeled the primary technique.

To determine the primary technique of the unit, each counselor response is tabulated on a check list of the various possible kinds of techniques. The primary technique used by the counselor is then determined on the basis of the value of the technique for the total unit.

In Sherman's sample check of reliability using 26 units, she obtained 17 cases of perfect agreement as to primary technique, 6 cases where there was one degree of difference in amount of lead, and three cases where there were two degrees of difference.

Sherman found that four primary techniques were used almost to the exclusion of the others. Only units for these four are used in the study and will be defined.

1. Clarification: The counselor states the feeling or problem of the counselee in such a way that it can be more clearly understood and used in the interview, but he does not interpret the counselee's feelings or problem, nor does he add any information or suggestion of his own.

2. Tentative Analysis: The counselor presents a conception of the problem being discussed but does so in a purely tentative manner. The client feels freedom to accept, modify, or reject the idea. The counselor is not attempting to push the counselee toward a given idea but is setting
up ideas for the counselee to examine. It is also considered tentative analysis if following a statement of the counselee, the counselor asks a question of the type, "Tell me more about that."

3. **Interpretation:** The counselor verbalizes his conception of the problem and states it positively enough that the counselee feels that it is presented for his acceptance. Data may or may not be given to support the interpretation. As presented the observation seems objective and obvious and the counselor's values do not seem to be involved.

4. **Urging:** The counselor not only presents his conception of the problem but gives advice on its treatment. The client definitely feels that he is being pushed toward acceptance. It often contains phrases like "I want you to" or "you should." Data may be used to bolster the argument. The counselor's values seem to be involved here.

It will be observed that these techniques vary by the amount which the counselor leads the counselee. Classification of a given counselor remark is determined from the context, the amount of lead, and the supplementary devices used.

The units which were eliminated on the basis of primary counselor technique include 5 in which the technique was giving information, 1 in which the technique was approval, and 1 in which the technique was non-committal response.

**Outcomes.** The next factors to be defined and discussed may be described as evidences of client reactions to the interview. The factors to be considered are (1) growth of counselee insight, (2) working relationship of the two participants of the interview, and (3) responsibility for the progress of the interview. These three factors are difficult to objectify. The most feasible means of
measuring them seems to be by the use of rating scales. The rating scales were devised by Sherman. These are reproduced here and their reliabilities are discussed.

1. Growth in Counsellee Insight. There seems to be general agreement among counselors that a primary objective in a counseling interview is to increase the client's insight into his problems. The rating scale which follows is an attempt to provide an instrument for measuring any increase in counselee insight.

**Change In Insight or Skill During Unit:** (Check One)

1. Does not see his problem in new relationships, does not have better understanding of self nor make any attempt to accept a deeper understanding of his basic problem; or he makes no progress on the study skill.

2. Makes very slight progress in understanding his problem or himself; or makes very slight progress on study skill.

3. Brings some facts together into new relationships but omits significant items from his analysis, makes some gain in understanding at least one aspect of his own behavior or attitude; or makes moderate gain on study skill (enough to continue work on it by himself).

4. Brings most of the significant facts relating to his problem into a new relationship but is not quite able to accept his new insight into his problem or understanding of himself and after showing his insight he may regress from it or may simply be unable to go ahead and make use of the insight; or he shows definite progress and independence in working on study skill.

5. Gives a new meaning to the facts bearing on his problem by seeing them clearly in new relationships and has a much keener understanding of his basic problems and can use this insight in working out his problem; or gains competency in study skill.
Of all the factors studied by Sherman, growth in insight was the most difficult to measure consistently. It was her experience, and the writer's, that it is particularly difficult to judge growth in insight when the client has done little talking. On a reliability test of 26 units, Sherman found perfect agreement among the judges on 11, one degree of difference on 8, two degrees of difference on 6, and three degrees of difference on 1.

2. Working Relationship. Another factor which seems important in the interview situation, and which probably has a bearing on other outcomes is the working relationship between the counselor and the counselee. A perusal of the rating scale reproduced below will indicate that the basis for the rating is the client's participation, ranging from resistive to cooperative.

Working Relationship: (Check One)

_____1. Definitely resistive--rejects counselor point of view or manner of structuring interview in a somewhat belligerent manner, refuses to talk about a real problem, or attempts to close interview.

_____2. Somewhat resistive--rejects counselor point of view or suggestion but in a polite manner, does not talk freely, or may show a tendency to contradict counselor.

_____3. Apathetic, takes no initiative but accepts counselor suggestions, usually in a non-committal fashion.

_____4. Counselor and counselee work together fairly well, talk together rather freely, although there may be some friendly parrying to advance points.

_____5. Counselor and counselee work together on a real problem, talk very freely, feeling of mutual respect is marked.
This rating scale was tested for reliability by Sherman in her sample of 26 units. There was perfect agreement on 18 of the units, one degree of difference on 3, two degrees of difference on 4, and three degrees of difference on 1.

3. Responsibility for Progress Of The Unit. A third client reaction which has received some attention is the amount of responsibility the counselee assumes for the progress of the unit. Non-directive counselors in particular feel that the counselee should assume the major responsibility. The rating scale for this variable follows:

Responsibility for Progress Of The Unit: (Check One)

1. Counselor assumes nearly all the responsibility for the interview by introducing leads, making suggestions, etc.

2. Counselor introduces several of his own ideas and makes suggestions and the counselee follows these leads and adds his ideas during the interview.

3. Counselor and counselee share almost equally in the responsibility for the interview through exchange of ideas and suggestions with each party freely introducing his own point of view.

4. Counselor follows leads introduced by the counselee so that the counselee is carrying more than half of the responsibility for the interview. Counselor makes suggestions but does not introduce new leads for the most part.

5. Counselee assumes nearly all the responsibility for the interview because the counselor does not introduce leads or make suggestions ahead of the counselee responses.

Sherman found in her test of 26 sample units that there was perfect agreement on 17 of the units and one degree of difference on the other 9.
The Rating Scales and Training of Judges

The actual rating sheets used in classifying the data are presented in the appendix. They summarize the definitions which have been presented and give an over-view of the rating scheme.

The judges were trained with the emphasis on consistency of rating. Definitions and examples were discussed until thoroughly understood and then trial units were rated and compared for agreement. Discussion of areas of disagreement led to a high degree of consistency in rating, at least equal to that of Sherman's judges.

As has been mentioned earlier each interview was completely rated. Much of the material was rated by Sherman, but Mr. Stanley Davis and the writer, who were trained as judges, not only rechecked many of Sherman's ratings but also added additional data. Where marked disagreement occurred, the units were omitted. Thus more reliable values were obtained for each of the variables.

Analysis Procedure

Thus it is seen that in an attempt to ascertain the importance of the amount of client talk in a counseling interview, 78 interviews were studied. These interviews were conducted in conjunction with a course in study skills and related problems. The interviews were broken down into units, consisting of all the talk related to one main idea. These units were classified according to
topic and primary counselor technique. In addition each unit was rated by trained judges for growth in counselee insight, working relationship and responsibility. A sample of the rating form used in classifying these interviews is included in the appendix.

The study is limited to four topics: study skills, other scholastic problems, vocational problems and therapy. It is further limited to those units having as the primary counselor technique, clarification, tentative analysis, interpretation and urging. Table I shows the distribution of the units used in the study, tabulated according to topic and counselor technique.

In the next chapter the quantitative results of the analysis will be presented. In analyzing the data, distribution of talk ratio for all units was first computed. Following this, the talk ratio was correlated with growth in insight, working relationship and responsibility. Next, the same correlations were computed for each type of interview topic. Finally, attention was given to the relationship between the amount of talk and the primary counselor technique.
# TABLE I

**DISTRIBUTION OF UNITS USED IN THE STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clarification</th>
<th>Tentative Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Urging</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Skills</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Scholastic Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapy</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Problems</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Distribution of Talk Ratio for All Units

An analysis of the 353 units of the study shows that there is a wide range of differences in the amount of counselee talk from one unit to another. One counselee talked as little as 4% of the total, another talked 89% of the total. The individual counselors differ considerably from one another in the mean talk ratio of their units, but each is somewhat consistent from one unit to another. Means and standard deviations of the units contributed by each of nine counselors have been computed and are presented in Table II. These nine counselors are the ones who contributed the largest number of units to the study. The means vary from .26 to .67, and the standard deviations vary from .10 to .22. The standard error of each mean is so small that it can be seen that a counselor is rather consistent in the proportion of talk in different interviews with a given client.

For all the units, the mean talk ratio is .42, with a standard deviation of .21 (see Table III).

Although it is apparent from Table II that individual differences in the talk ratio are great, it is possible that on the average there is a consistent tendency for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III

A TABULATION OF THE TALK RATIOS OF ALL UNITS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE EXPERIENCE OF THE COUNSELORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talk Ratios</th>
<th>0-.19</th>
<th>.20-.39</th>
<th>.40-.59</th>
<th>.60-.79</th>
<th>.80-.99</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experienced counselors to obtain a larger talk ratio than inexperienced counselors. It seemed desirable to test this possibility since the counselors in this study include a group of experts on the one hand and a group of counselors-in-training on the other hand. Analysis (see Table III) shows virtually identical mean talk ratios and standard deviations for the two groups. Inspection of the table reveals fewer units of experienced counselors with very low talk ratios and more with very high ratios. However, there are more units of the experienced group in the low-to-medium group. In short, experience of the counselor does not seem to be an important determiner of the amount of talk.

Relationship of Amount of Talk to Insight, Working Relationship, and Responsibility

Among the important variables in an interview are (1) the counselee growth in insight, (2) the working relationship between the counselor and the counselee, and (3) the amount of responsibility assumed by the counselee for the conduct of the interview. The relationships between each of these variables and the talk ratio were investigated. Findings must, of course, be interpreted in the light of reliabilities in the measurement of these variables.
l. The Talk Ratio as Related to Growth in Counselee Insight. Table IV shows the relationship between growth in counselee insight and the amount of counselee talk. The correlation between these two variables for all units is .25, indicating a relationship which, although not great, is positive. The question arises as to what factors may be operating in this relationship.

Sherman has shown that insight is the most difficult variable upon which to obtain a reliable measure. Judges have particular difficulty rating short counselee responses; for example, it is hard to tell what a counselee means by "mmhm". It is quite possible that there is a tendency to rate down brief counselee remarks, in which case a low talk ratio would appear to be related to a low insight rating.

An inspection of the table shows that as the insight rating increases from 1 to 3, there is a noticeable increase in the talk ratio, but this trend does not continue with an additional increase in the insight rating from 3 to 4. There is, in short, a somewhat higher tendency than the correlation indicates for low degrees of insight to be associated with a low talk ratio.

A question which arises again is whether the experience of the counselor may not have some bearing on the relationship between talk ratio and growth of insight. Correlations were computed separately for the experts and
### Table IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insight</th>
<th>0.0-0.19</th>
<th>0.20-0.39</th>
<th>0.40-0.59</th>
<th>0.60-0.79</th>
<th>0.80-0.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r = 0.25$
for the beginners; the figure for the experts is .26, for the beginners .21. The difference is not statistically significant.

Later in the chapter there is further discussion of this relationship between amount of talk and insight as affected by the topic of the unit.

2. Talk Ratio As Related to Working Relationship.
The amount of counsellee talk might well seem a function of working relationship. In the lowest rating of working relationship where the counsellee is definitely resistive, he is apt to speak in monosyllables or perhaps merely nod his head in silence. On the other hand in the highest rating there is mutual give and take, with both counselor and counsellee talking freely.

In this study the correlation between talk ratios and the working relationship was .31. The break-down is shown in Table V. A glance at the table leads to the inference that although it is quite possible for the working relationship to be good with a low talk ratio, it is less likely that the converse will occur, that is, that the working relationship will be poor when the talk ratio is high. Of 71 units with a talk ratio over .60, only 8 show a working relationship rating of less than 4. In other words, a large talk ratio seems to be insurance against a poor working relationship.
TABLE V
A TABULATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TALK RATIO AND WORKING RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Relationship</th>
<th>0-.19</th>
<th>.20-.39</th>
<th>.40-.59</th>
<th>.60-.79</th>
<th>.80-.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r = .31
Although it is true that a high talk ratio seldom yields a poor working relationship, it will be noted that even when the working relationship is best, the average talk ratio is still in the middle range. However, this may be true merely because there are so few units with a very large talk ratio.

3. Talk Ratio as Related to Counselee Responsibility for the Progress of the Interview. The most clear-cut relationship which was found in this study is that between the talk ratio and counselee responsibility for the progress of the unit. The correlation is .66. Undoubtedly there is much in common between the two variables, since counselee responsibility is evidenced primarily through the medium of talk. However it does occasionally happen (see Table VI) that a counselee talks a great deal and still the judges feel that he has not taken much responsibility for the progress of the unit. It is, of course, not uncommon for a person to use loquacity and glibness as a means of avoiding an issue, and in such an individual one might expect an inverse relationship between talk ratio and responsibility. Evidently responsibility for the progress of the unit means considerably more than mere verbiage.

Summary. The amount of counselee talk shows some relationship to growth in insight and to the working relationship. It also shows, as is to be expected, considerable relationship to responsibility for the
TABLE VI
COUNSELEE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PROGRESS OF THE UNIT AS RELATED TO THE TALK RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Talk Ratio</th>
<th>0.0-0.19</th>
<th>0.20-0.39</th>
<th>0.40-0.59</th>
<th>0.60-0.79</th>
<th>0.80-0.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r = .66$
progress of the unit. However, it can hardly be said to have proved to be a highly important factor so far. The question arises, Is it more important under special conditions? Consideration will be given next to its importance as related to various topics, and finally as related to counselor techniques.

**Relationship Between the Topic of the Unit and the Talk Ratio**

1. Talk Ratio by Topics. It might be that the amount of talk would be a more important variable with some problems than with others. One might expect, for example, that insight concerning study skills would grow more from having an expert explain effective study techniques than from counselee verbalization of his difficulties, since effective study depends upon information as to correct techniques. In therapy, on the other hand, the need might be for growth in self-understanding through verbalizing of vague fears rather than for the acquisition of information.

Table VII gives the talk ratios for all topics. In line with expectations the lowest mean talk ratio (.36) is found in units concerned with study skills. In the other three topics the ratio is approximately equal, that is, those topics in which the counselee discusses his problems get about the same amount of talk. Therapy, with
TABLE VII
DISTRIBUTION OF UNITS BY TOPICS, SHOWING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOPIC AND THE TALK RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talk Ratio</th>
<th>0-.9</th>
<th>.20-.39</th>
<th>.40-.59</th>
<th>.60-.79</th>
<th>.80-.99</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scholastic Problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
its more emotional loading, did not produce more talk than other problems. Perhaps, the variability within a topic is more important than the differences between topics.

2. Analysis of Units by Topics. An analysis was made to determine whether the relationship between growth in counselee insight and talk ratio, and between working relationship and talk ratio, were affected by the topics of the units. The results are tabulated in Table VIII.

It is apparent that the topic of a unit has a marked effect on these relationships. The correlation between growth in insight and talk ratio varies from .09 in study skills to .60 in vocational problems. The correlation between working relationship and talk ratio varies from .11 in therapy to .61 in vocational problems. An explanation for the low correlation in study skills has previously been suggested, i.e. growth in insight in study skills may not necessarily come from client conversation so much as from counselor description of correct study techniques.

It is difficult to account for the low correlation in therapy. It is possible, though, that in therapy where emotionalized problems are present, the differences between directive and non-directive counselors stand out most clearly. In order to test this possibility the counselors who conducted the therapy units were divided into two groups: those primarily directive, and those primarily
### TABLE VIII

**ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP OF TALK RATIO TO GROWTH IN INSIGHT AND WORKING RELATIONSHIP BY TOPICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Study Skills</th>
<th>Other Scholastic Problems</th>
<th>Therapy</th>
<th>Vocational Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk Ratio $r$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Relationship</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-directive. This grouping was made without knowledge of the talk ratios by an experienced judge who was familiar with all the counselors. On the basis of this division those therapy units conducted by non-directive counselors (23 in number) yielded an average talk ratio of .66, while the remaining 43 units yielded a ratio of only .29.

Correlations between insight and talk ratio were computed for each of these groups. For the non-directive group the correlation was .39, for the directive group the correlation was .36, while for both groups combined, the correlation was only .25. This anomalous outcome can be explained on the basis of the increased standard deviation of talk ratio when directive and non-directive units are combined. A glance at the frequency distributions of the two groups makes the reason clear (see Table IX). In non-directive therapy (Table IX A) there is a bunching of the units at the high end of the talk ratio scale, whereas in directive therapy (Table IX B) the bunching is at the low end. It is apparent that combining these two groups (Table IX C) yields a much greater variability in talk ratio, and tends to lower the correlation.

To summarize, the relationship between growth in insight and talk ratio in therapy is higher than the correlation coefficient of .25 indicates. In therapy the differences between the directive and non-directive counselors seem to become much more clear-cut, the first
TABLE IX
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GROWTH IN INSIGHT AND TALK RATIO

A. In Non-Directive Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talk Ratio</th>
<th>Insight</th>
<th>0-.19</th>
<th>.20-.39</th>
<th>.40-.59</th>
<th>.60-.79</th>
<th>.80-.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=.66  r=.39

B. In Directive Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talk Ratio</th>
<th>Insight</th>
<th>0-.19</th>
<th>.20-.39</th>
<th>.40-.59</th>
<th>.60-.79</th>
<th>.80-.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=.29  r=.36

C. In All Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talk Ratio</th>
<th>Insight</th>
<th>0-.19</th>
<th>.20-.39</th>
<th>.40-.59</th>
<th>.60-.79</th>
<th>.80-.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=.43  r=.25
making for low talk ratios and the second for high talk ratios. In either type of therapy the relationship between insight and talk ratio is higher than when the two are combined, and this relationship is about equal in the two types of therapy.

This analysis has been particularly interesting in that it has uncovered a distribution averaging above the middle ranges in talk ratio and it has not shown such high talk ratios to be especially advantageous in producing greater insight. It should be borne in mind, however, that the sample is small in this case, and the results should be regarded only as indicative.

**Relationship Between Counselor Technique and Talk Ratio**

The final factor to be investigated which appears to be related to talk ratio is the primary counselor technique. The relationship between the two is summarized in Table X. The counselor techniques are arranged in order of increasing amount of lead over the counselee's previous remark. Clarification, the most non-directive of the techniques, has a mean talk ratio of .51 and a standard deviation of .19. Tentative analysis with somewhat more lead has the almost identical mean talk ratio of .52 with a standard deviation of .18. Interpretation which is the next technique beyond tentative analysis in terms of amount of lead has a talk ratio of .39 and a standard deviation of .19. Finally, urging, the most directive of the techniques used, has a talk ratio of only .26 and a standard deviation of .15.
### TABLE X

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PRIMARY COUNSELOR TECHNIQUE AND THE TALK RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>0-.19</th>
<th>.20-.39</th>
<th>.40-.59</th>
<th>.60-.79</th>
<th>.80-.99</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urging</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is apparent that beginning with tentative analysis there is an inverse relationship between the amount of lead and the talk ratio. There is little difference between clarification and tentative analysis as far as amount of counselee talk is concerned, although on the basis of the relationship which maintains from tentative analysis to urging, one would expect the highest talk ratio in clarification. It is interesting that this relationship does not continue past the point where the counselor is actively participating in the interview to the extent of advancing his own ideas.

Implications

These results seem to indicate that, within limits, counselee insight tends to increase with increasing amounts of counselee talk. This generalization is broad, however, and must be applied with caution. It does not seem to hold when the topic of conversation is study skills, and probably not in any case dealt with on an information basis. It is more important in therapy, other scholastic problems, and vocational problems. Particularly in vocational problems, the relationship acquires considerable significance. The amount of experience of the counselor has little bearing on this relationship.
The working relationship in the interview has a slight tendency to become better as the amount of client talk increases. With very high talk ratios, the working relationship is seldom poor; however it may be good with low talk ratios. The topic of the unit has a marked influence on this relationship. The correlation between talk ratio and working relationship is lowest in therapy, probably because of the differences in the talk ratios of the directive and the non-directive therapists. It increases in study skills, other scholastic problems, and becomes quite important in vocational problems.

The amount of responsibility which the client takes for the progress of the unit is rather highly related to the amount that he talks.

The highest degree of insight growth, working relationships, and client responsibility appear to occur when the talk ratio is at least in middle ranges. These data do not indicate that the highest talk ratios are more desirable than those in the middle ranges.

Beginning with tentative analysis, increases in the amount of counselor lead make for decreases in the amount of counselee talk; clarification and tentative analysis are associated with more counselee talk than are interpretation and urging, and this seems to be an advantage. Although clarification is less directive than tentative analysis, it does not yield more client talk.
In therapy, non-directive counselors obtain much more client talk than do directive counselors. This is one case in which talk ratios average above the middle ranges; however, it does not result in greater insight gains. The two types of counselors are about equally successful in producing growth in insight.

While the amount of client talk is a criterion of the effectiveness of the interview, it would be unwise at this stage in our knowledge to use it as a single criterion. In the first place, it does not correlate very highly with either insight or working relationship. In the second place, it is influenced not only by topic and primary counselor technique but undoubtedly also by other factors which have not yet been isolated; therefore its importance cannot be fully evaluated. Finally, it seems possible to the writer that amount of client talk is quite secondary in the counseling interview. It may reflect, rather than lead to, insight, working relationship, and other variables, and it may have importance only in so far as it indicates the presence of these variables. It has not been shown in this study that setting the client to talk more makes for a more effective interview; it might merely make for client verbosity.

Additional research is needed to establish the role and importance of amount of client talk. A few of the problems which remain unsolved will be indicated.
There has been no attempt made to evaluate the role of talk in catharsis. The value of catharsis and the manner in which it operates have yet to be analyzed.

It is neither proved nor disproved that higher talk ratios than were available for this study would be even more effective than talk ratios in the middle ranges.

For the data available for this study, talk ratios in the middle ranges are most effective. One possible reason which suggests itself, since counselor and counselee are talking about an equal amount, is that the interviews are effective when both parties are contributing and working together cooperatively. This and other possibilities need to be explored to discover why the middle ranges are most effective.

The hypothesis has been advanced that talk ratio is merely a reflection of other variables, such as insight and working relationship. This possibility needs additional study.

Finally, more study is needed to determine other factors which influence the amount of client talk.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is frequently asserted that the client in a counseling interview should be encouraged to talk, the implication being that a large amount of counselee talk is a desirable thing. In fact, amount of talk has been used as one criterion of the effectiveness of certain counselor techniques. This study centers around the importance of client talk. It consists of an analysis of the relationships between the amount of counselee talk and the following interview variables: topic, counselor technique, growth in counselee insight, working relationship, and counselee responsibility for the progress of the interview.

This study made use of 78 interviews which were recorded in conjunction with a psychology course offered by Ohio State University. The course has as its purpose the teaching of effective study skills; however the interviews encompassed any problem of adjustment with which the student was concerned.

These 78 interviews were broken down into 353 units, each consisting of all counselor and counselee discussion relating to one main idea or problem. The units analyzed
here were limited to four topics: study skills, other scholastic problems, vocational problems, and therapy. These topical units were classified according to primary technique used by the counselor; the four techniques covered in the study were clarification, tentative analysis, interpretation, and urging the acceptance of advice. Rating scales were used for the purpose of estimating growth in counselee insight, working relationship, and counselee responsibility for the progress of the unit. The measure used for the amount of client talk was the ratio between the number of half-lines of counselee talk and the total number of half-lines in the typescript of the unit.

In analyzing these data, relationships between the interview variables were studied and the following conclusions were reached:

1. The correlation between growth in client insight and amount of client talk was .25, indicating a relationship which, although positive, was not great. This correlation was affected very little by the experience of the counselor.

2. The correlation between the amount of client talk and working relationship in the interview was .31. With quite large amounts of client talk, the working relationship was almost always good.
3. The correlation between the amount of client talk and client responsibility for the progress of the unit was .66.

4. The lowest average amount of client talk occurred when the topic was study skills. In the other three topics, all of which are concerned with types of personal problems, the amount of talk was greater, with little difference between them.

5. With study skills as the topic, the correlation between growth in insight and the amount of client talk was very low (.09). In other topics this relationship was more marked, amounting to .60 in vocational problems. In therapy, non-directive counselors obtained much more counselee talk than did directive counselors but were no more successful in producing growth in insight.

In the correlations between working relationship and amount of client talk the results range from .35 in study skills to .61 in vocational problems. In therapy the correlation of .11 is spuriously low because of the large differences between directive and non-directive counselors in amount of client talk obtained.

6. Clarification, which is the least directive of the counselor techniques, does not yield more client talk than tentative analysis. Clarification and tentative analysis are associated with more counselee talk than are interpretation and urging the acceptance of advice.
Beginning with tentative analysis increases in the amount of counselor lead make for decreases in the amount of counselee talk.

While amount of client talk is a criterion of the effectiveness of the interview, it cannot justifiably be used as a sole criterion. It is influenced by many factors; it does not correlate very highly with interview outcomes; and so far as is known it may merely reflect, rather than lead to, insight, working relationship, and client responsibility. In short, more client talk may not mean a more effective interview.
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APPENDIX
UNIT ANALYSIS

Judge __________________ Date ___________________ Unit Identification ________

Topic of Unit: (Check once in each column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co Purpose</th>
<th>Co Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Skill</td>
<td>Other Scholastic Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Problem</td>
<td>Personal problem dealt with by information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>Visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification of Counselor Techniques: Read each counselor remark and tabulate it no more than once under either Groups "A" or "B". If a resistance reducing device is used, also tabulate under "C". When the unit is thus read and tabulated, judge which counseling technique was of greatest importance under Group "A" and label it "1"; also judge which technique was second in importance and label it "2". Finally rate the outcomes of the unit on the rating scales on the next pages.

A. Amount of lead over Co remark: C. Resistance reducing devices:

- Non-committal response
- Restatement
- Clarification
- Summary Clarification
- Gives Information
- Further elaboration requested
- Tentative analysis
- Interpretation
- Urging
- Depth Interpretation
- Unclassifiable

- Sympathy
- Assurance
- Approval
- Humor
- Objective materials used
- Co. makes personal reference
- Illustration or anecdote (non-personal)
- Question form
- C's words used as springboard
- Threat
- Experimental findings cited
- Expression of surprise
- Irony
- Rejection

B. Leading not directly related to Co remarks:

- Silence at end of stage or unit
- General lead or open-ended question
- Asks for information
- Structuring speech

Comments: 
Working relationship: (Check one)

1. Definitely resistive--rejects counselor point of view or manner of structuring interview in a somewhat belligerent manner, refuses to talk about a real problem, or attempts to close interview.

2. Somewhat resistive--rejects counselor point of view or suggestion but in a polite manner, does not talk freely, or may show a tendency to contradict counselor.

3. Apathetic, takes no initiative but accepts counselor suggestions, usually in a non-committal fashion.

4. Counselor and counselee work together fairly well, talk together rather freely, although there may be some friendly parrying to advance points.

5. Counselor and counselee work together on a real problem, talk very freely, feeling of mutual respect is marked.

Change in Insight or Skill during Unit: (Check one)

1. Does not see his problem in new relationships, does not have better understanding of self--nor make any attempt to accept a deeper understanding of his basic problem; or he makes no progress on the study skill.

2. Makes very slight progress in understanding his problem or himself; or makes very slight progress on study skill.

3. Brings some facts together into new relationships but omits significant items from his analysis, makes some gain in understanding at least one aspect of his own behavior or attitude; or makes moderate gain on study skill (enough to continue work on it by himself.)

4. Brings most of the significant facts relating to his problem into a new relationship but is not quite able to accept his new insight into his problem or understanding of himself and after showing this insight he may regress from it or may simply be unable to go ahead and make use of the insight; or he shows definite progress and independence in working on study skill.

5. Gives a new meaning to the facts bearing on his problem by seeing them clearly in new relationships and has a much keener understanding of his basic problem and can use this insight in working out his problem; or gains competency in study skill.
Responsibility for Progress of the Unit:

1. Counselor assumes nearly all the responsibility for the interview by introducing leads, making suggestions, etc.

2. Counselor introduces several of his own ideas and makes suggestions and the counselee follows these leads and adds his ideas during the interview.

3. Counselor and counselee share almost equally in the responsibility for the interview through exchange of ideas and suggestions with each party freely introducing his own point of view.

4. Counselor follows leads introduced by the counselee so that the counselee is carrying more than half of the responsibility for the interview. Counselor makes suggestions but does not introduce new leads for the most part.

5. Counselee assumes nearly all the responsibility for the interview because the counselor does not introduce leads or make suggestions ahead of the counselee responses.

Comments on Dynamics of Interview:

Directions: Write notes on the dynamics of the unit including notation of counselee responses which show insight, places at which working relationship became better or worse, changes in counselee responsibility for the interview. Make any other comments which seem pertinent to you.