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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Reference to Biblical literature reveals the religious individuals of that time counseling troubled individuals. From the Golden Rule through Kant's categorical imperatives and beyond, suggestions have been offered in the hope of guiding people to live happier, fuller lives. Even present day conversation frequently contains injunctions of dos and don'ts.

Well meaning as this advice may be, the question must be asked, is it effective: The most well-meaning injunction is wasted to say nothing of being harmful if the respondent is not in a state of readiness. Any type of advice if it is to be profitably heeded must be given to one whose thinking has developed enough for him to accept and act upon it willingly.

The scientific discipline of counseling is far removed from the above illustrations. Counseling, as a professional and scientific discipline, is the process of helping another bring to light through his own developmental efforts, thoughts previously unknown or denied and alternative forms of behavior regarding a problematic situation. The realization of this process presupposes that the counselor be a
highly trained individual, sensitive to the client's feeling and expressions of thought, with a working knowledge (both theoretical and statistical) of the probabilities of varied client response. Thus, a good counselor is constantly hypothesizing in regard to the client's behavior both past and future, and he must be keenly aware of the methods and effects of communication between himself and the client.

Since counseling applies to a wide range of behavior found in normal individuals, it must deal with a wide range of client performance. In this regard Robinson states:

". . . Counseling includes all types of two person situations in which one person, the client, is helped to adjust more effectively to himself and his environment. It includes the use of the interview to obtain and give information to coach or teach, to bring about increased maturity, and to aid with decision-making and therapy. (58, p. 3)"

To illustrate the rapid growth counseling has assumed and the integral part it plays in our society, consider the different settings in which it is applied. Presently counseling is carried on in guidance programs in the elementary and secondary schools, in student personnel departments and university counseling centers, in vocational counseling agencies sponsored by the Veterans Administration, by communities or on a private basis, and in counseling units in VA hospitals, and in industry.
At the elementary and particularly at the secondary school level, school psychologists and counselors help students with both personal and vocational adjustment problems. While much counseling has been problem oriented, the recent need for obtaining an optimal use of manpower potential resulted in the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; Title V of this Act provides financial aid to teachers in order that they may further their studies and become competent counselors.

The growth of student personnel services at the college level has been rapid and in terms of physical structure highly diversified. Initially, student affairs and problems were handled by interested professors and academic deans. However, with the recognition of an increasing need, reflected by the wide range of problems presented, counseling emerged as a specialized service in order to fulfill more adequately the function of giving individual attention in the process of mass education. Regardless of the physical structure of different student personnel services, the great majority of colleges today have counseling and testing centers where psychologists and graduate students in training deal with student problems. Wrenn indicates some of the general factors contributing to the evolution of our present student personnel services and centers.
Over a period of decades, service after service to students has been refined or introduced on the campus. Both refinement of existing services and the introduction of new services have been the products of such factors as: (1) the increasing size and greater heterogeneity of student bodies, (2) emphasis upon certain phases of student life because of both changed educational purpose and changed concepts of personality, (3) the development of new tools and specialized procedures, and (4) increasing complexity of social adjustments in terms of both campus life and the off-campus world from which the student came and to which he will return. (80, p. 24)

Many communities presently support counseling services for the citizens of our larger cities. A good example of this is the counseling center of the Rochester Institute of Technology; it was originally established in 1940 as a service division of the Institute, but later its services were offered to people of the community who needed help in occupational choice. As early as 1938 in Detroit, a counseling center was established for citizens of that community who had severe handicaps of a physical or emotional nature.

State and federal rehabilitation programs have been developed for aiding the physically and emotionally handicapped. In this respect, counselors operate as the focal agent in the entire rehabilitation program of a given client. The counselor's function has been expressed in terms of the "Wheel Concept" (33). The other services, medical, industrial, educational, report to the counselor and the latter coordinates these various services for the
client's optimal benefit. Presently, the need for counselors in this area is great, and universities now provide specialized training for rehabilitation counseling both at the M. A. and the Ph. D. level. The Ph. D. usually operates in a supervisory and research capacity.

The Veterans Administration has also made counseling a focal point in the rehabilitative process of veterans. Vocational orientation and guidance from Ph. D. psychologists are provided by counseling centers under this program. Here counselors provide the overall planning and therapeutic service mentioned above. VA hospitals, beginning in July 1952, have been offering vocational counseling service to their patients. The functional services of counseling in this setting have grown rapidly. A good example is the Exit Service Program in neuropsychiatric hospitals, where patients who are improving to the extent that they are being considered for dismissal from the hospital live on a separate ward and receive much personal freedom and responsibility. In this setting a thorough analysis can be made of each patient's strengths and weaknesses as they might operate outside of the hospital. Evaluative research is a major part of the overall counseling program in an attempt to improve these services.

... the program is first of all intended to help patients return to a productive role in the community which may be on a job, in training, or as a non-working member of a family group. In many
Instances, no matter how helpful the other professional workers have been in their treatment of the patient, the fact still remains that unless the counseling psychologist helps him to think through the vocational process of selecting the right kind of job and then helps him to interpret his abilities to an employer, his post-hospital adjustment may be only temporary. (10, p. 58)

In industry, programs have developed to give individualized attention to employees. The idea of the hard-headed approach to the problems of the industrial worker was discarded following the period after World War I and in this regard, industrial counselors have played a large part in helping to bring about better employee adjustment. Functionally, counselors receive and give information for morale and attitude surveys which can serve as both guides in management and personnel policy making and as aids to employees. As Bellows states:

Several companies pioneered in counseling for mental hygiene in the 1920's; for example, R. H. Macy and Company. Their research staffs included psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers. Studies which were made by their staffs revealed that there was a close relationship between an employee's efficiency at work and his personal and social problems away from his place of work. (5, p. 308)

More evidence of the rapid growth of counseling is reflected in the development and expansion of professional organizations. Conferences and activities sponsored by the American Personnel and Guidance Association with its many divisions have focused upon the problems of professional objectives of counseling. Division 17 of the American
Psychological Association in sponsoring conferences on the training of counselors has been instrumental in drawing up standards for training.

With such professional growth there has been the recognition that it is necessary constantly to evaluate the methods and effects of counseling; research has played perhaps the most important part in contributing to the increased efficacy of the counseling function. The major share of counseling research has been relatively recent, i.e., within the last ten to fifteen years. Prior to this time very little was done. In the behavioral sciences, as opposed to the physical sciences, the methodological problems of experimental control and variation are a constant source of difficulty. In research on the counseling process this difficulty is even more pronounced. One of the major difficulties is that actual experimental manipulation is not feasible in counseling research. In order to control all other relevant factors, while varying the experimental factors, it is necessary first to obtain subjects or clients who are equally motivated to seek counseling services. While varying and controlling other factors, counseling would be given to some and not given to others in order to determine the variables operating in bringing about the differential effects of counseling. This is not done since it violates the principle of giving aid to clients when they need it.
Prior to the time of ten to fifteen years ago counselors evaluated and analyzed counseling on the basis of their own experience. This could hardly be considered research, since most of the reports consisted of subjective evaluation of the client made by the counselor, unverifiable, not replicable, and with an absence of adequate criteria. Since then three major areas of research have contributed to an understanding of counseling: testing, personality theory and the study of interview dynamics.

During World War II, large scale research was carried on for the military in order to evaluate the ability of needed manpower. Psychologists developed testing instruments covering a wide range of human behavior. This development in the testing area indirectly affected the growth of counseling research through providing methods for the diagnosis and prediction of individual differences. By being able to measure the clients' relative strengths and weaknesses through testing it was easier to predict the results of counseling. With such information derived from test results the counselor had a frame of reference from which to operate in working with the client.

Theories of personality have also affected counseling, and provide a theoretical basis for developing hypotheses in carrying on research. In speaking of the importance of theoretical systems Pepinsky and Pepinsky state:
The job of the scientist is to use theory to create a possible world, which he then checks against the observable world. By a series of approximations and corrections, he is able to make an increasingly better fit of "possible and actual" worlds. Thus, the scientist not only observes and infers, but he uses these observations and inferences to create an explanatory structure, from which he is able, with varying success, to deduce what will happen in other situations and at other times. (50, p. 18)

While various personality theories, e.g., the psychoanalytic, the neo-behavioral, and the client-centered approach, have influenced the methods used by counselors, the research of the "client-centered" group has had the most influence on the topic of interest in this study because of their use of transcribed interview protocols. Rogers and his co-workers have been interested in changes in the client's self-concept as expressed through self reference remarks in the interview. This interest led to recording and transcribing actual interviews for use in interview analysis. This group of researchers were further interested in the effects of different kinds of counselor remarks on client behavior. Around 1945 a beginning was made in categorizing counseling techniques and in judging the outcomes of counseling through rating characteristics of client interview behavior (Rogers (60), Snygg and Combs (72), Seeman (66), Haigh (31), Hoffman (36), Sheerer (67), Stock (73), Raskin (55)).
From this development another area of counseling research began, which has recently received considerable attention. This is the analysis of the counselor-client interaction process. There are not any prior theoretical constructs governing the research in this particular area. Rather the attempt is made to categorize and analyze the behavior of counselor and client in order that a functional relationship can be drawn between the dynamics of such interactions and the relationship of this to interview outcome.

One early attempt at interaction analysis was made by Bales (2) in a study of group behavior. He formulated twelve mutually exclusive categories of individual behavior as they appeared in group activity and studied their frequency of occurrence. Others who have worked in this area of interaction process analysis with groups are Basham (4), Gorlow, Hoch, and Telschow (29), Peres (51), Tallant (75), and Ward (77).

Strupp (74) applied Bales's method in a study of the interview situation. Using a modified method he categorized counselor responses to client statements. He obtained a reliability coefficient of .78 using 533 units.

The earliest analysis of different counselor remarks, however, was done by Porter (54). He used the single remark as the principal unit of analysis. Essentially, he
showed that counselor's procedures could be reliably categorized along a directive-nondirective continuum. Snyder (70), studied the effect of counselor statements upon succeeding client remarks. He used as his interview segment each person's remarks. He found that the effect of counselor statements on client statements could be identified and analyzed.

In addition to simple descriptive categorization of the interaction process between counselor and client, a next step was to determine what represented the optimum degree of interaction. This required an analysis of outcomes of the interview. Robinson (59) has been the chief spokesman in this area and more recently others have pursued a similar approach, for example, Polmantier (11), Dipboye (24). The term "communications approach" was applied to this area of work by Pepinsky (50).

At Ohio State University counselor behavior has been studied in terms of such dimensions as "degree of lead," "response to core of the client's remark," "division of responsibility," and "acceptance." These counselor behaviors are then related to measures of interview outcome. Although it is readily recognized that the ultimate goals of counseling are such factors as mature behavior and effective adjustment skills, these measures are not readily available since long range follow-up studies are not
practical. In addition, such delayed behavior cannot always be related to specific counseling functions, since other intervening factors are influential. Therefore, in the communications approach immediate criteria from within the interview are considered symptomatic of the ultimate criteria. The literature on this type of criteria is discussed in Chapter II.

The two pioneering efforts of Porter (53) and Snyder (71) mentioned earlier dealt with relatively short segments of the interview process. As it became apparent that longer segments of behavior were necessary to measure the delayed effects of counselor-client interaction, new units of analysis were chosen for study. Curran (19) studied in detail the reactions of a single client over a series of interviews. In order to study developmental changes, he divided the total pages into fractions. While he developed a method for studying the client's learning process as it occurred in the interview series, later research showed that using such fractionation obscured the dynamics of the interview. Sherman (68) used the discussion topic, which was all consecutive counselor-client statements pertaining to the same general topic, e.g., study skills, adjustment problem, and vocational problem. She then characterized the counselor's general manner of counseling by referring to his most frequently used type of remark in that topic.
as the counselor's "primary technique." Elton (25) found a significant difference among counselors in the degree of lead used by the counselor and the degree of responsibility the counselor assigned the client. He also found that a given counselor significantly varied the degree of lead and the client assignment of responsibility in shifting from adjustment to skill topics. Carnes (15) studying variability of lead found a marked difference between experienced and inexperienced counselors during a discussion topic, i.e., the former were more flexible. However, he did not find any significant relationship between degree of lead and interview outcome. In addition, there was no apparent difference in variability of mean lead from one unit to the next between those counselors who received the highest outcome scores and those who received the lowest. Muthard (46) investigated the effects of using different topic units in analyzing the interview. Treating the interview fraction, discussion topic, and problem areas as units for analysis, he concluded that these areas are related to distinct sets of counselor-client behavior. He suggested that these shifts in behavior, as they occurred with respect to different segments of the interview, might be a function of the changing subordinate roles which the counselor and client assumed. Commenting upon this level of analysis as compared to the earlier studies, Robinson states:
These (earlier) studies missed the important first step in counseling interaction—what counselor behavior determines or should determine client response. Furthermore, these early studies in using an atomistic, single speech approach and dividing series into fractions tended to cover up an important factor in the dynamics of communication, i.e., counselor roles [subordinate roles]. (59, p. 164)

Following through on this trend of research, Danskin (20) investigated the reliability with which seeming consistency and seeming shifts in counseling purpose (sub-roles) could be identified and labeled. In both cases he was successful. He found that counselors show a consistency in their behavior as they try to play subordinate roles. In speaking of counselor sub-roles he states:

For clarification it is necessary to distinguish between the usual meaning assigned the term "role" and the meaning given in this study. Roles generally have been described in broader terms. That is a person's role may be that of a father, teacher... In this study, the term "role" (sub-role) refers to these patterns or types of consistent verbal behavior which counselors use within the counseling interview. (20, p. 22)

He suggested that since these sub-roles are readily identified and categorized, they may well be used as referent points to determine what different forms of counselor behavior lead to optimum interview outcomes.

Hoffman (37) did a much more extensive analysis in order to provide normative data regarding the total range and pattern of sub-roles used by college counselors. He defined the sub-role more explicitly:
One can speak in general terms about the overall role of the counselor. In our particular culture for example, a counselor is thought of as a person who helps individuals solve their problems, increase behavioral maturity, gain insights, make plans or decisions, (2) a counselor's behavior can also be described in terms of longer segments of the interview, as assuming sub-roles which change throughout the interview for the purpose of producing certain results in a particular situation at a given period of time. (37, p. 19)

From his analysis he concluded the following:

(1) The use of counselor sub-roles are usually determined early in the conference regardless of the total length of the interview series, and (2) although variations occur with different clients, counselors have a tendency to stay within this repertoire of sub-roles once it has been established in the early interviews regardless of the particular client or the nature of new problems presented. (37, p. 104)

Following the suggestion made by Danskin and Hoffman that certain sub-role behavior may be analyzed in terms of its relationship to interview outcome, Mueller (43) analyzed sub-role flexibility and repertoire in relationship to measures of interview outcome. He found a positive relationship in all cases, but only one of these was significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

It is the purpose of this study to explore further the relationship between counselor use of sub-roles and interview outcome. A much more detailed analysis will be made than the one cited above. In the present study there will be an investigation of the way in which the counselor utilizes the sub-roles he plays. The degree to which the
counselor appropriately utilizes these sub-roles will be related to interview outcome.

Statement of the Problems to be Investigated

1. To what extent do counselors use the appropriate sub-roles?

2. To what extent do judges agree on whether or not counselor sub-roles are appropriately or inappropriately played?

3. If a sub-role played seemingly becomes inappropriate to the interview situation after being used for a certain period of time, can judges agree on the transition point where another sub-role should have been played?

4. In the case where the sub-role was considered inappropriate can the judges agree, from among the remaining fourteen sub-roles, on the sub-role that should have been played?

5. In the case where an alternative sub-role was chosen as being more appropriate, can the judges agree upon the degree of deviation between the appropriate sub-role and the inappropriate sub-role, according to a dimension of counselor-client assumption of responsibility?

6. How important is it for the counselor to use the right sub-role? To the extent that a counselor plays the appropriate sub-roles, will there be a proportionate gain in interview outcome?
CHAPTER II
HISTORY

In this chapter the literature on the two variables which are central to the present study, i.e., counselor sub-roles and interview outcome, will be reviewed. First, however, an introductory review of role theory and research will be presented.

It is difficult to offer a chronologically and conceptually ordered account of role theory and analysis. Two disciplines, i.e., sociology and social psychology, currently dominate the scene in this area. Within both of these disciplines there is considerable disagreement as to the definition of the term. It appears that since the role construct is a relatively broad one, difficulty arises in defining the specific behavioral limits of a role. In a review of the literature Neiman and Hughes have this to say:

The concept of role is at present still rather vague, nebulous, and non-definitive. Frequently in the literature, the concept is used without any attempt on the part of the writer to define or delimit the concept, the assumption being that both writer and reader will achieve an immediate compatible consensus. Concomitantly, the concept is found frequently in popular usage which adds further confusion. (47, p. 149)
They go on to point out that in addition to this lack of agreement regarding definitional limits, there are considerable differences in the manner in which role research is carried on. Nevertheless, it is safe to say that, regardless of the many definitional and methodological differences among investigators, role analysis attempts to conceptualize human conduct at a relatively complex level. In this regard it is an interdisciplinary theory, since the variables of research are taken from studies of culture, society, and personality. In psychological thought, until recently, the role concept was merely an abstraction dealt with via the armchair. It has been through the efforts and influence of an interdisciplinary attack on the part of sociologists and cultural anthropologists that the role concept has gained heuristic value.

Role theory in counseling conceptualizes behavior in terms of reciprocal interaction between counselor and client. These actions are organized into roles. In social psychology the additional construct of the "self" is introduced into this interactive process.

It is to the investigation of these structures and their interaction that role theory addresses itself. In broad perspective, contemporary role theory regards human conduct as the product of the interaction of self and role. Not dissimilar is Parson's and Shill's idea of need dispositions and role expectations. (61, p. 223)
The historical development of this present view is not clear cut, when compared to the genesis of other theoretical approaches in psychology, e.g., psychoanalytic, field theory, and S-R. These latter schools of thought developed as a result of a relatively concerted coordinated attack. Role theory developed through the work of sociologists, anthropologists, and psychologists working independently of one another, and such concepts as the self, which was developed by Dewey and James, was later discarded. More recently, however, sociologists and anthropologists along with Allport (1) have revitalized the notion of the self. Among the psychologists currently employing the concepts of self, role and their interaction are Newcomb (48), Cameron (12), Sargent (65), McCelland (40), and Sarbin (61). The sociologist, Cottrell, offers a concise and well formulated definition of role:

A role is an internally consistent series of conditioned responses by one member of a social situation which represents the stimulus pattern for a similarly internally consistent series of conditioned responses of the other (S) in that situation. (17, p. 617)

Here Cottrell is emphasizing the fact that role is a pattern of learned action in response to an occupied social position. The position one occupies, e.g., type of occupation, is comprised of particular behavioral units in response to the expectation of others with whom he interacts while occupying that position. The particular type of
roles enacted are directly influenced by the status of that position. The notion of role behavior as a function of position and status has been further studied by Young (81), Znaniecki (82), and Murphy (45). Young (81) conceptualizes role behavior in terms of status in referring to the action of a person in a particular group as usually directed to some end, acceptable to other members of the group, e.g., wage earner, parent, pastor or citizen.

Role conflict has been studied from the standpoint of a situation in which one occupies two or more positions simultaneously. When the role expectation positions of the two are not consistent or similar, role conflict results (Ort (49), Warner (78), Brunswick (9), Brown (8)).

Conflict in expectations may lead to inappropriate perception of roles expected by the self and of the roles played by others. This has been studied recently by psychologists with the purpose in mind of uncovering a functional relationship among role perceptions, role expectations and deviant behavior. As Sarbin states:

... it becomes obvious that the veridicality of one's role perceptions and functional adaptations to the social world are highly related. If a person's locating of the position of the other is invalid, then his location of the position of self is likely to be invalid. His role enactment then will be inappropriate and nonadaptive. (61, pp. 229, 230)

Sarbin states that role perception research has been sadly neglected in the past, but considers this approach
to role behavior very important. Recently he and his associates have been carrying on considerable research in this area (Sarbin and Rosenberg (63), Sarbin and Hardych (62), Sarbin and Williams (64)). Evidence from these research efforts indicate that adjusted role enactment is intimately associated with "as if" and imaginative qualities of individuals, in adopting the perspective of the "other" with whom they are interacting.

As a tool in therapy these results offer a good deal of promise. The number of roles has been used as a dimension in the study of psychopathology "... deficiency in role playing means the incapacity to look upon one's self as an object (Mead (42)), or to identify with another's point of view ... " (Gough (30)). Cameron (13) has postulated that the inability to assume a variety of roles is highly influential in the development of paranoid disorders.

Dealing with group behavior Benne and Sheats (6) have found that roles, lacking the traditional institutional structure usually attributed to role behavior, e.g., mother, doctor, can be readily identified. Examples are "opinion-giver," "orienter," "aggressor." Magelis (39) studied the relationship between number of leader roles in a group and group productivity, finding a rank order correlation of .78 between role diffusion among members and production ratings.
The preceding review of role theory has conceptualized role as an overarching purpose, which determines a counselor's behavior throughout an interview series. As noted earlier, it has been found that a counselor plays various subordinate roles in carrying out his overall counseling function. These are considered subordinate in the sense that they are different modes of appropriately fulfilling the larger, institutional type role of "counselor." Very little has been done at this level of analysis. Waller (76) has described various subsidiary roles as they operate within the general institutional role of teacher. This study, other than the ones to be reviewed in the next section, is the only one that deals with an analysis of subordinate role behavior.

Sub-Role Research in Counseling

Only recently has the construct of the subordinate role become a part of counseling research. As noted in Chapter I, it was found that single remarks and other relatively short units obscured an analysis of the dynamic process of interaction and that a larger unit of behavior was needed, characteristic enough to differentiate among counselors and distinct enough to be readily identified. Research in sub-role behavior was anticipated by Robinson in speaking of the behavioral shifts brought about by the different topics being discussed.
The counselor's role (sub-role) varies from topic to topic but within a given topic his attitudes and manners are apt to be fairly constant. Similarly in making small talk, making arrangements, questioning for information, etc., the client and counselor will play rather consistent roles while the topic is being discussed, but these roles shift as the topic shifts. (57, p. 713)

A study by Davis (22) was carried out for the general purpose of finding whether or not client behavior could be reliably categorized by way of transcript analysis. With a sample of forty first interviews from five university counseling centers he had two judges rate client behavior along four dimensions. One of these dimensions was the sub-role the client expected the counselor to play. Each judge rated this sub-role expectancy part of the way through the interview, and then later in time made a second rating after reading the whole interview. Results of studying this dimension were as follows:

The role the client expects the counselor to play can be rated with some reliability at the end of the first counseling interview (median Spearman-Brown .59). The reliability with which Expected Counselor Role can be rated at the Transition Point (median Spearman-Brown .49) is not significantly different from the reliability at the end of the first counseling interview. (22, p. 172)

Perry and Estes (52) studying the behavior that the client expects of the counselor, have coined a term called the "heuristic set." Before starting counseling, a client has a mental set in regard to how the counselor is going to behave and the client sets his behavior in terms of this
expectation. When the counselor plays a different role than originally expected by the client, the client will also shift his behavior. This new role as assumed by the client is the "heuristic set."

In studying the value of using larger units in the analysis of transcripts, Muthard (46) studied the effects that the discussion topic, the interview fraction, and problem area units have on understanding counselor-client behavior. He found that judges particularly noted shifts in behavior as a change was made in the discussion topic. His suggested explanation for these behavioral shifts was that the counselor and client were assuming different sub-roles with the change in topic.

The studies just mentioned dealt with the sub-role concept in terms of client expectation of the counselor and the interaction of counselor-client sub-role behavior. Danskin (20), studying sub-role behavior of the counselor, selected thirty early and late interviews from the conferences of fifteen counselors. He obtained high reliability from independent judges on the transition points between subordinate roles and also on the classification of these roles. He concluded that (1) counselors behave in a consistent manner as they play a particular subordinate role; (2) in general, these subordinate roles changed as the topics changed; (3) within certain discussion topics
subordinate roles change; and (4) the average degree of lead, although widely varying over counselor single speeches, is considerably influenced by the subordinate role being played at the time.

Hoffman (37) followed up on the methodology initiated by Danskln. He made a more extensive study of the characteristic uses of counselor sub-roles, choosing a larger normative sample consisting of 20 counselors and 46 clients with a total number of 165 interviews from five university counseling centers. (For a complete list and description of the different counselor sub-roles see Appendix A.) From this he was able to provide considerable information regarding counselor sub-role behavior. With respect to sub-role frequency he states:

Some sub-roles occur significantly more than others. . . . however, all the sub-roles except for Rejecting, were used quite frequently by the counselor from the five counseling centers . . . the use of counselor sub-role is usually determined early in the conference series regardless of the total length of the interview series. Counselors, in general, have a tendency to stay within their repertoire of sub-roles once it has been established regardless of the particular client or of the nature of the problem. (37, pp. 182-184)

In regard to pattern similarity of sub-roles:

Counselors utilize a similar pattern of sub-role units with different clients even though clients in themselves differ and the nature of the problems being presented are different. . . . there is some similarity existing between counselors in their use of sub-role patterns . . . however, individual counselors have a tendency to differ more in the use of their sub-role patterns than do
individual counselors in moving from client to client. . . . counselors within a particular counseling center tend to use similar patterns of sub-roles . . . the frequency of the sub-roles played by counselors is related to the type of problem being discussed. . . . there are significant differences in the sub-role patterns used by counselors in discussing different kinds of problems. (37, pp. 185, 186)

In regard to the range of sub-roles:

Counselors tend to play a wide range of sub-roles, seventeen of the twenty counselors sampled in this study played more than 60 per cent of the fifteen sub-roles described in the checklist. . . . Counselors are quite consistent in their use of the number of kinds of sub-roles in going from client to client. . . . Counselors who use a low range of sub-roles differ significantly in the sub-role pattern they manifest from those counselors who use a middle or high range of sub-roles . . . (with the exception of the Chicago sample) the range of sub-roles utilized by counselors are not essentially differentiated by particular centers. (37, p. 186)

Hoffman's study represents the first all out effort to determine the characteristic use of counselor sub-roles. In the past, counselor training and supervision have been done in terms of specific remarks and particular techniques. It appears that the sub-role might be a useful unit of counselor behavior to concentrate on in making supervisory suggestions, since it (1) is readily identifiable, (2) extends over longer periods of time, and (3) is related to client behavior. In addition, because of its categorical nature, counselors in training can utilize the subordinate role as a behavioral frame of reference.
At the present time, however, there is very little evidence regarding the relationship between the particular utilization of these sub-roles and the effects they have on the conference. It is to this problem that the present study addresses itself, by studying the way in which counselors utilize these sub-roles as related to interview outcome. The following section will present a historical overview of outcome measures in counseling research with a more extensive coverage being devoted to the type of criterion used in the present study.

**Interview Outcome Studies**

The matter of developing sound criterion measures for gauging the relative effects of counseling has been one of the stumbling blocks to research. Typical measures of outcome have involved (1) client self-report, i.e., requesting the client's subjective impression of himself after counseling (38); (2) personality measures before and after counseling, principally using such tests as the Rorschach, the TAT, the Bernreuter, and the Bell Adjustment Inventory (Combs (16), Cowen and Combs (18), Muench (44), Hamlin and Albee (34), Haimowitz and Haimowitz (32) and Hamlin, Berger and Cummings (35)); (3) rating of client behavior after a counseling series (Eysenck (26), Bartlett (3), Snyder (71), and Rogers (60)); (4) nature of change
in the interview (Snyder (71), Seeman (66), Raskin (55), Hoffman (36), Haigh (31), and Sheerer (67)).

The relative merits of these criterion measures cannot be thoroughly discussed in this presentation. Generally it appears that the first four types of criteria, while measuring client behavior in a delayed and relatively objective manner, do not reveal the functional relationships between elements of the interview process and the interview results. Without a precise measure of the relationship between the counselor and client it is questionable as to what degree the differences in client behavior can be attributed to the interview relationship. In this regard Robinson states:

... delayed criteria are needed to determine if counseling a client over a series of interviews is effective, and such delayed criteria are not of much use in determining the general effectiveness of particular types of counselor remarks. An interview series contains so many different types of remarks that it is difficult to determine which types of remarks or patterns of remarks produced the delayed outcomes. Nor having made a remark, can a counselor wait until the next day or year to find out if it was effective; more immediate criteria must be used. (58, p. 25)

Since the purpose of this study is to determine the effect of counselor behavior patterns, i.e., the degree to which appropriate use of sub-role behavior is related to interview outcome, it is necessary to utilize immediate criteria. It is with this specific type of outcome measure that the following sections will be concerned.
Client Talk relative to the amount of total talk within the interview has been considered symptomatic of the client's eagerness to carry on with and take an active part in the interview. In studying the relationship between client talk and working relationship, Carnes and Robinson (14) found client talk to be dependent upon the topic being discussed as well as the counseling technique used. They found that the client talked significantly more when the degree of lead was held to a minimum, yet the client did not gain more in insight. Using a derived score in which case the counselor technique was held constant, they found that in study skill units, client talk correlated .04 with growth in insight and .12 with working relationship. In decision-making units client talk correlated .39 with growth in insight and .12 with working relationship.

The study mentioned above throws some doubt upon the usefulness of client talk in measuring interview outcome. It is not related to growth in insight, except in decision-making units. This latter relationship is even low. In decision-making units it is even less related to working relationship. Therefore, client talk does not appear to be reasonably related to the other dimensions of client progress. It would appear that client talk is measuring something different from the other criteria and until it
can be determined precisely what this measure is, it is best not to include it.

Client Growth in Insight can be considered by name alone to be the focal point around which the endeavors of counseling revolve. When expressions of insight are made the assumption follows that a growth process is unfolding within the client whereby he perceives his problems more realistically. Thus, it is considered as a necessary first step in client emotional and intellectual development. However, little is known regarding specific interview dynamics as they related to such statements of insight.

Sherman (68) constructed a five point scale to rate the presence of this dimension. Using three judges he found perfect agreement on 42 per cent of 26 discussion units. Judges disagreed by only one degree on eight units, two degrees on six, and three degrees on only one. Good and Robinson (28) reported a Spearman-Brown reliability of .90 with three judges. Carnes (15) revised this rating scale to cover a fifty point range. With this scale McCormick (41) obtained a reliability of .90 with two judges. Dial (23) used a dimension quite similar to client growth, i.e., client progress. In rating client progress he obtained a phi coefficient of .45.

Rating client growth does have certain disadvantages as Carnes states:
Several difficulties are found which reduce reliability. One occurs in measuring brief statements: "Mm Hmm" may mean that the client is understanding and agreeing with the counselor, or it may mean that he is making social noises to keep the counselor happy. A second difficulty is that unverbalized insights cannot be measured. The client may achieve real insight from a counselor interpretation, yet, it cannot be rated as insight unless the client himself verbalizes it. Finally, it is difficult to know whether verbalized material is new to the client, or whether it has been known and accepted and is just being mentioned to the counselor for the first time. (15, p. 34)

The difficulty that might occur in rating the onset of client growth must be carefully taken into account. Directions for rating this dimension state explicitly that the judge should rate only gains within the particular interview, not gains carried over from a previous interview. Although the onset of client growth is not completely identifiable, as Carnes indicates, it is felt that when this dimension is utilized in conjunction with other criteria such a rating difficulty is compensated for, since other criterion measures will contribute to the total outcome score.

Feeling Reactions stated by the client have been used as an indication of the degree of rapport and emotional progress in responding to particular problems. Often in our interpersonal relationships we ask ourselves the question: "What was the meaning behind his remark?" Sometimes little feeling is expressed and sometimes, a verbal lack of feeling may be an indication that emotional response is
being inhibited. However, when an individual feels strongly about a particular problem and expresses his feelings, he can be considered to be in a developmental stage of adjustment.

In order to measure the significance of negative and positive feelings expressed by the client, Raimy (54) analyzed the feelings involved in self-references made by fourteen clients with non-directive counselors. Judging these self-references as they varied throughout a counseling series, in terms of being positive, negative, or ambivalent, he found that in the successful cases there was a shift in self-evaluative statements from disapproval (negative) to self-approval (positive). These shifts were not apparent in the unsuccessful cases.

Good and Robinson (28) studied feeling reaction in conjunction with study skill problems and adjustment problems. When progress occurred in study skill areas in which the problem was non-emotional in nature, changes in feeling reactions were not present to indicate the degree of that progress. In the present study the criteria chosen to measure interview outcome should be applicable to all problem areas. Thus, the utilization of this dimension as a criterion is not appropriate. In addition to this drawback Snyder (71) found that judges had difficulty in agreeing upon the nature of client expression of feelings.
Reid and Snyder (56) found that fifteen judges had distinct category preferences when required to classify feeling remarks into twenty-five categories.

Client Interest in Assuming Responsibility has been used with rewarding results in measuring interview outcome. It has been assumed that the degree to which the client initiates the introduction of new ideas and actively pursues working them through is a measure of growth and development. This active, inquiring behavior evidenced in the interview should reflect post-interview adjustment and utilization of skills.

Historically, this dimension of client behavior was first used irrespective of counselor technique. However, it was found that the client may not be assuming responsibility on his own, but rather as a result of the counselor's behavior. In order to avoid this contaminating factor this dimension is presently rated in light of the counselor's techniques.

Using a five-point scale with client responsibility at one end and counselor responsibility at the other, Sherman (68) obtained quite reliable ratings, i.e., perfect agreement sixty-five per cent of the time and a difference in rating of only one point for the remaining thirty-five per cent.
Following Elton's (25) suggestion, Carnes (15) developed a fifty-point scale for client interest in assuming responsibility. Here the counselor technique is discounted and a more accurate measure of client motivated behavior is obtained. Both McCormick (41) and Muthard (46) have used this measure. McCormick received an inter-rater reliability of .88, Muthard obtained Spearman-Brown coefficients ranging from .71 and .73 (depending upon the unit of analysis, whether problem area, interview fraction, or discussion topic).

In addition to the two advantages cited above of (1) obtaining a client motivated measure by discounting counselor technique and (2) good reliability, a third value lies in using this dimension. The ratings obtained for this measure have covered a good share of the fifty-point scale, indicating that this dimension is sensitive to changes within the interview. For these reasons it is felt that this is an appropriate criterion to use in measuring interview outcome.

Working Relationship, in terms of face validity, appears to be a necessity in any effective counseling relationship. This dimension goes further than the notion of getting along or establishing rapport. Although it is necessary for these two factors to operate for a good working relationship, it is also necessary that a goal be
constructively pursued in the process, whereby the client is open in his dealing with the counselor, accepting of suggestions, and willing to seek solutions to his problem. The absence of a good working relationship would be reflected by client apathy, passive or active resistance, and general lack of interest.

Sherman (68) developed a five-point rating scale for measuring this dimension. On twenty-eight units, two judges agreed sixty-nine per cent of the time. She found this dimension quite sensitive to changes within the interview with cases on discussion topics, varying from "somewhat resistive--rejects counselor point of view or suggestion, but in a polite manner, or does not talk freely. . . ." to one in which the "counselor and counselee work together on a real problem, talk freely. . . ."

Others, using this dimension found similar results (Carnes and Robinson (14), Good and Robinson (28), Elton (25), Muthard (46), and Davis (22)).

Daulton (21) studied a resistance factor in conjunction with working relationship. Obtaining ratings for both dimensions, she found they correlated -.64. This is quite high, considering the general unreliability of ratings. Since this relationship suggested that the two dimensions were probably measuring essentially the same thing, resistance has been included as one of the
behavioral characteristics operating to determine the degree of working relationship.

The reliability of rating working relationship along a fifty-point scale has been very favorable. Carnes (15), using three judges, obtained a Spearman-Brown coefficient of .81; McCormick (41), with two judges, a coefficient of .91; Davis (22), a two rater Spearman-Brown coefficient of .63; and Muthard (46), coefficients ranging from .69 to .77 depending upon the type of unit being rated.

The fact that this dimension (1) is quite sensitive to change in the interview as reflected by the variability of rating along the entire scale, (2) has been studied from the viewpoint of its relationship to other behavioral characteristics, i.e., client resistance, and (3) has been widely used with considerable reliability, indicates that it is a sound measure to use as an immediate criterion of interview outcome.

Selection of the Appropriate Criteria for the present study will be done in terms of three factors to be considered: (1) Those criteria which have been the most widely used, and therefore considered the most valid by past investigators and subjected to the greatest degree of refinement, (2) those criteria which have been used with the greatest degree of reliability, and (3) those criteria that measure change in the interview most
adequately, i.e., when the nature of the interview changes the rating of the criteria respond accordingly.

On the basis of these three considerations, three criteria have been chosen for the purpose of this study. They are: (1) Client Growth in Insight, (2) Client Assumption of Responsibility, and (3) Counselor-Client Working Relationship.

No one specific criterion measures all the aspects of the interview process. Therefore all three criteria will be summated over each interview in order to arrive at an overall measure of interview outcome. This will then constitute a fourth measure which will be a composite criterion. In this way, a more reliable measure of interview outcome will be obtained.

The present chapter has presented (1) the history of role theory and analysis, (2) the concept of subordinate role and its utilization in counseling research, and (3) a review of outcome studies in counseling research with a more detailed review of internal measures of outcome. The following chapter will present the method of research employed in this study.
CHAPTER III
METHOD OF RESEARCH

Statement of Problems Investigated

The present investigation was concerned with the general problem of the relationship between the utilization of counselor sub-roles and interview outcome. Specific questions that were asked in order to answer this general one were as follows:

1. To what extent do counselors appropriately utilize the sub-roles they play?

2. Can judges agree on the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles?

3. In those instances where sub-roles were played beyond an appropriate duration, can judges agree on the alternative points in the interview at which time the counselors should have switched sub-roles?

4. Can Judges agree on the choice of a more appropriate sub-role in the instances where (1) the sub-role played was either considered completely inappropriate or (2) an alternative transition point was selected?

5. Where an alternative sub-role is chosen by the judges, to what degree can they agree on the degree of deviation (on the degree of counselor or client assumption
of responsibility) of the inappropriately played sub-role from the alternative sub-role chosen?

6. How important is it for the counselor to play the right sub-role? That is, is there a relationship between the ratings of the ways in which counselors utilize their sub-roles and the outcomes of their interviews? It was hypothesized that (1) those counselors rated as using a larger number of appropriate sub-roles, and (2) those counselors whose deviation scores were lower (i.e., the deviation between the sub-role actually played and the sub-role chosen by the judges) would both have higher ratings of interview outcome.

Source of Data

Over three hundred transcribed interviews were available from five university counseling centers at Minnesota, Chicago, Missouri, Michigan, and Ohio State. Counselors were either advanced graduate students in counseling or members of the faculty of the departments of psychology. Clients represented a random selection of the various types of clients and problems found in interview contacts at university counseling centers. Therefore, these many interviews offered a representative source of many different counselor-client interactions at the college level from which a sample could be drawn for study.
The sample. Selection of the interview sample was made so that each counselor would be represented by interactions with different clients. Those interviews were chosen which would represent the counselors having two or more different clients and in some instances two or more interviews with each client. In this way, each counselor had the opportunity to display his variations in counseling technique as they might differ from client to client. In all, there were nineteen different counselors, thirty-eight different clients, and forty-seven interviews from the five university counseling centers. Table I identifies the counselors, the universities they represent, their clients, the different interviews for each counselor-client combination, and the number of sub-role units in each interview.

The counselor sub-roles, considered as the unit of analysis in this study, totaled 271 units in number. A descriptive account of the nature and behavior of counselor sub-roles as used in this study is presented in the following section.
TABLE I. The counselors, the universities they represent, the different clients, the different interviews for each counselor-client combination, and the number of different sub-role units in each interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Client Code</th>
<th>Interview Number</th>
<th>Number of Sub-Role Units Per Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Bi</td>
<td>Bi-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Di-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Di-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Di-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pr-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Ru-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ru-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Sh-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Ya</td>
<td>Ya-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ya-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D-38728</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D-33728</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-38740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A-38740</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A-38761</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C-38705</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-38705</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-38850</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-38715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B-38715</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B-38967</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>Fl</td>
<td>Fl-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fl-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fl-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Client Code</td>
<td>Interview Number</td>
<td>Number of Sub-Role Units Per Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F2-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>F3-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F3-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>F4-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>F5-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F5-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F5-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F5-6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-17967</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A-15688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-17905</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B-18045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X-Lee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X-Will</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y-Foh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y-Pir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y-Pir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 19  N = 38  N = 47  N = 271
Measures of Counselor Subordinate Roles

In order to determine the relationship between the use of sub-roles and interview outcome, it was first necessary to measure and describe the actual sub-role behavior of the counselors. In general this involved three stages of work: (1) developing a satisfactorily complete and readily identifiable checklist of different counselor sub-role categories, (2) identifying the transition points in the interview at which time the counselor switched his behavior to such a degree that a new form of sub-role behavior appeared to be used, and (3) describing the nature of that behavior, i.e., what sub-role was being played between the transition points designated.

The checklist of sub-roles first devised by Danskin (20) was studied and used as a basis for a small pilot study by Hoffman (37). Hoffman further developed the sub-role checklist in a second pilot study of thirty interviews. The resulting checklist along with interviews representing a variety of problems was then given to twelve experienced counselors who were asked to describe the methods or forms of verbal behavior they would use to implement these sub-roles and to suggest other sub-roles appearing in the interviews. These results were then compared to Danskin's checklist to reduce any overlap and to refine the sub-role categories.
This second checklist was then used by having three advanced graduate students in counseling psychology read ten interviews (two from each of the five centers), classify the sub-roles played by the counselor, and make any additional suggestions.

From this a final checklist was made which was used in the present study. A manual for judges included a description of each sub-role, instructions for locating transition points between counselor sub-roles, and instructions for classifying sub-roles. Below is the final checklist of counselor sub-roles along with a brief definition of each.

1. **Friendly Discussion.** This is typified by counselor statements that are, in general, non-problem solving in nature and primarily designed to maintain a positive rapport with the client.

2. **Information Gathering.** The counselor statements are directed toward obtaining specific information about the client and designed to inform the counselor without particularly furthering the client's insights.

3. **Information Giving.** The counselor supplies factual data to the client and offers authoritative information with no immediate pressure for action.

4. **Diagnosing.** Here the counselor directs his statements towards drawing out information or ideas from the
client so the counselor can infer what some of the client's problems are and what the sources might be.

5. **Supporting**. The counselor helps the client feel more secure by reassuring the client that their joint efforts will produce positive gains.

6. **Administrative Arrangements**. The counselor makes plans for following interviews, makes arrangements for tests, etc.

7. **Structuring Relationship**. The counselor indicates the nature of the relationship which he will have with the client during the counseling hour.

8. **Focusing of Topic**. The counselor aims at changing the direction of the discussion by re-opening a previously stated topic or opening a new one, such as "Let's go back" or "Have you thought of?"

9. **Listening**. The client does most of the talking while the counselor says little or interjects nearly neutral statements such as "Yes, I see," etc., not implying approval or disapproval.

10. **Asking for Elaboration**. Counselor statements such as "What happened then?," "How do you mean?" are aimed at helping the client understand the origin of his difficulties.

11. **Reflecting**. The counselor's statements are characterized by an effort to clarify or reproduce the
attitudes and feelings which are expressed in the responses of the client.

12. Participating. The counselor uses a range of techniques which may include clarification, acceptance remarks, interpretation, and lead questions so that both he and the client seem involved in arriving at some solution to the problem at hand.

13. Advising. Here the counselor's statements attempt to persuade the client to accept a particular point of view; an implication that the client should change his attitudes or behavioral activities.

14. Rejecting. The counselor's statements imply rejection, or reluctance to accept insights or plans stated by the client. This does not include negative replies to direct questions asked by the client.

15. Tutoring. The counselor directs practice in some specific skill, manifesting behavior similar to that of a teacher or tutor.

16. Unclassifiable. The counselor's behavior is such that it cannot be properly categorized under any of the above labels.

Rating Actual Sub-Role Behavior. Once the final checklist had been completely developed two judges rated all the sub-roles played by the counselors in terms of

(1) transition points between sub-roles (see Rating Form
(#1) and, (2) the classification of sub-roles (see Rating Form #2). Both judges were advanced graduate students in counseling psychology with extensive graduate training in the practice and theory of counseling.

Training of the judges involved reading and discussing the Manual of Instructions for Judges (Appendix A), making practice ratings on interviews not included in the final study, and discussing practice ratings in an effort to clear up any misunderstandings.

In rating transition points at least two independent judgments were made; in most instances two different judges rated the same transition points while in other cases one judge made both ratings with the second rating being made at least three weeks later. The ratings were counted as agreeing if the counselor statements designated as transition points by the judges were no more than three counselor statements apart, e.g., two judges marking speeches forty and forty-two was called agreement. In case the two judges disagreed on the location of a transition point, an additional judge was used. This third judge was asked to read the particular portion of the interview in which the discrepancy occurred and to designate the transition points or to indicate that no transition point was apparent. A transition point was then designated if at least two of the three judges agreed on the same counselor statements not more than three speeches apart.
RATING FORM #1 FOR COUNSELOR SUB-ROLES

**IDENTIFYING DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELOR</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIENT</td>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSITION POINT**
RATING FORM #2 FOR COUNSELOR SUB-ROLES

IDENTIFYING DATA

SCHOOL____ TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS____ RATER____
COUNSELOR____ INTERVIEW NUMBER____ DATE____

TRANSITION POINT

NUMBER OF FIRST COUNSELOR SPEECH IN SUB-ROLE UNIT_____
NUMBER OF LAST COUNSELOR SPEECH IN SUB-ROLE UNIT_____

COUNSELOR SUB-ROLES

_____ FRIENDLY DISCUSSION
_____ INFORMATION GATHERING
_____ DIAGNOSING
_____ INFORMATION GIVING
_____ SUPPORTING
_____ STRUCTURING
_____ A. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS
_____ B. RELATIONSHIP
_____ C. FOCUSING OF TOPIC

_____ LISTENING
_____ ASKING FOR ELABORATION
_____ REFLECTING
_____ PARTICIPATING
_____ ADVISING
_____ REJECTING
_____ TUTORING
_____ UNCLASSIFIABLE
_____ OTHER (ELABORATE BELOW)

COMMENTS:

________________________________________
After the transition points had been determined for all the interviews, the same judge re-read the interviews six weeks after the transition points were rated and classified the sub-role played by the counselor in each unit.

The judge first read the Manual for Rating of Counselor Sub-Roles (Appendix A). Practice labeling on interviews not included in the final study were made and a discussion of the practice ratings followed in order to clear up any confusion. Then the sub-role unit or units in each and in portions of each interview of the interview sample were rated, using a separate rating sheet for each unit (Rating Form #2, page 49). The interviews were rated in the same sequence as that used in locating the transition points.

**Rating the Appropriate Sub-Role Behavior.** The appropriate use of the counselor's sub-role behavior was determined by having two judges (different ones than those who made the ratings of actual sub-role behavior) independently make the following ratings on that counselor's interviews. Both judges were advanced graduate students in counseling psychology, who had extensive training in the theory and practice of counseling.

1. For each sub-role played within the interview a "yes" or "no" check was made, according to whether or not the sub-role played seemed appropriate (designated by a "yes" check) or inappropriate (designated by a "no" check).
2. In the case where the sub-role played was rated as being inappropriate, it was necessary to judge whether the sub-role had been inappropriate during its entire time or only during a portion of it. If the latter was the case, judges checked the alternative transition points where the counselor should have switched sub-roles.

3. In the case where the entire sub-role was inappropriate or the sub-role was inappropriate part of the time, the judges designated the alternative sub-role that should have been played. In cases where it was difficult to decide upon only one sub-role alternative as being appropriate, a second and sometimes a third choice was made.

4. Where an alternative sub-role was selected, it and the sub-role actually played were each located along a scale of the "degree of counselor or client assumption of responsibility." This dimension was rated according to a fifty-point scale with extreme responsibility on the part of the counselor at the low end and extreme responsibility on the part of the client at the high end.

The manual used for rating counselor sub-role behavior is given in Appendix B, page 115. Below is an example of the sub-role rating sheet used for each sub-role unit rated in the interview sample. Identifying features of the rating sheet include school, judge, counselor-client interview number in that series, transition points, i.e., the
counselor speech numbers within which the sub-role was played, and the sub-role previously labeled as actually played. The following questions were asked: (1) Was the sub-role appropriate, "Yes" or "No?" (2) What other transition points if any were preferred? (3) What sub-role or sub-roles were preferred? (4) What was the degree of deviation between the sub-role played and the preferred sub-role? This latter rating was made on the fifty-point scale of the "degree of counselor or client assumption of responsibility."

The procedures have been reviewed for (1) rating the actual counselor sub-roles played and (2) rating the appropriate use of the sub-roles played by the counselors. In order to minimize any effects of bias in rating the appropriate use of sub-roles played it was considered necessary to obtain ratings of the actual sub-role behavior completely independent of the ratings of how appropriately they were used. In this way, the judges who rated the appropriate use of sub-roles would not be influenced in their ratings by having previously rated the actual sub-roles played. Thus an entirely different set of judges was used for rating the actual sub-role behavior and an entirely different set of judges was used for rating the appropriate use of sub-roles. The judges who had rated the appropriate use of sub-roles knew only what sub-role was being played, not why it had been so classified.
RATING FORM #3

THE APPROPRIATENESS WITH WHICH THE SUB-ROLE WAS PLAYED

School__________  Judge__________

Counselor-Client-Interview Code No.__________

Transition Points__________  Additional Transition Points Needed (if any)

Sub-Role Played__________  a.__________

Appropriate Sub-Role?  Yes__  No__  b.__________

Preferred Sub-Role
1st choice__________  Preferred sub-roles at these points
2nd choice__________  a.__________

3rd choice__________  b.__________

Since these sub-roles generally lie along a dimension of counselor assumption of responsibility, mark with an "A" the degree of counselor assumption of responsibility as reflected by the actual sub-role played and mark by a "P" any additional sub-role or sub-roles you have suggested along the following scale.

Q1  Md  Q3

Counselor  Counselor Resp. evenly  Counselor lets  Counselor lets assumes complete  assumes primary divided  client assume  client assume resp.  resp.  primary resp.  complete resp.
It would have been permissible to have the same judges rate both the sub-role played and the appropriate use, by utilizing a considerable time interval between the two different ratings. However, a greater degree of independence was obtained through the use of entirely different judges. The actual sub-roles played were rated previously in an earlier study done by Hoffman (37), according to the same procedure outlined above in the section of "Rating Actual Sub-Role Behavior."

Scores for the Appropriate Use of Counselor Sub-Roles. First each sub-role unit received (1) a "Yes" or "No" rating that was used as an appropriateness score for that sub-role unit, and was retained as such for a measure of inter-judge reliability of rating; and (2) a sub-role deviation score for each sub-role unit, which was used in that form for a measure of inter-judge reliability in rating the degree to which a counselor deviated from using the appropriate sub-role. The sub-role deviation score for each unit was the number of dots between the inappropriately rated sub-role and the alternative sub-role along the dimension of the degree of counselor or client assumption of responsibility.

In addition, each counselor received two sub-role scores for each client based upon the appropriate use of sub-roles with the client; a "proportion correct score"
and an "average sub-role deviation score." The proportion correct score was computed for each client's series of interviews and based upon the total number of "yes" ratings, i.e., the sub-role was appropriate, divided by the total number of sub-role units in the interview series. A particular sub-role was scored as "No" or inappropriate in the event an alternative transition point was chosen anywhere within the sub-role unit. The average sub-role deviation score was the number of dots in the counselor-client assumption of responsibility scale between the sub-role played and the sub-role chosen as appropriate. When the sub-role played was considered appropriate the deviation score was considered zero for that sub-role unit. The total of these deviation scores over the two or more client interviews was then divided by the number of sub-role units to give an "average client sub-role deviation score."

Both of these scores obtained above for each client interview series were also computed for each counselor for all of his clients' interviews. That is, a proportion correct score and an average sub-role deviation score were obtained for each counselor by adding together the same types of scores for each of his clients.
Measures of Interview Outcome

As noted earlier in Chapter II, three criteria were chosen in this study to measure interview outcome. They were (1) Counselor-Client Working Relationship, (2) Client Growth in Insight, and (3) Client Assumption of Responsibility.

An independent judge rated all of the interviews on outcome. These ratings were made on a global basis on each criterion in each interview. The manual for rating outcome is given in Appendix C, page 122. A fifty-point scale was used for rating each criterion measure. After reading the entire interview, the judge checked the scale of each criterion in terms of the degree to which each dimension was present in the interview. The rating sheet that was used for each interview rated is given below (Rating Form #4).

In addition to the three scores on each interview for the three criteria, a fourth measure of interview outcome was obtained by summing all three criteria scores to give a composite outcome score for each interview rated.

The four outcome scores on each interview were added and averaged according to the number of interviews rated for each client to give four "client outcome scores" and also added for the clients of a counselor to give four "counselor outcome scores."
RATING FORM #4 FOR THE MEASURES OF INTERVIEW OUTCOME

Interview Outcome Criteria. Rating Sheet  Judge_______
School  No. Sub-Roles Appropriately Played_______
Client-Counselor Interview No.____  No. Sub-Roles Played  ________

The following ratings are to be based on overall impressions of the entire unit. The scales are marked with Md, Q1 and Q3. Thus a unit which is believed to be slightly below average would be checked between Md and Q1; a unit believed to be better than three quarters or more such units on a given characteristic would be checked to the right of Q3.

A. Counselor-Client working relationship

Good working relationship is the presence of mutual respect and warmth, of respectful consideration for each others ideas, and of client willingness to explore his problems. It is also the absence of symptoms of resistance. At the other end poor working relationship is the presence of symptoms of resistance and the absence of the positive signs of warmth, respect and willingness to explore problems. In judging poor working relationship, consider both frequency and severity of resistance, and make a global rating of the unit.

Poor  Q1  Md  Q3  Excellent

B. Growth during the interview

Growth consists of evidences of new insights, gains in skill, self acceptance and plans. It is important to rate only gains within the unit, not gains carried over from a previous unit. Again as above, consider both number and importance of gains.

Poor  Q1  Md  Q3  Excellent
RATING FORM #4 FOR THE MEASURES OF INTERVIEW OUTCOME
(contd.)

C. Client interest in assuming responsibility

How much responsibility does the client want to take, discounting counselor techniques and their influence upon the amount of responsibility that the client actually assumes? That is, this is a measure of client interest in initiating behavior.

Q1  Q2  Q3
Client desires  Client desires
no responsibility  to assume a great
or even rejects it.  deal of responsibility.
Hypotheses Tested

1. It was hypothesized that judges could agree to a statistically significant degree in rating counselor sub-role behavior in terms of -
   a. The appropriateness with which counselors utilize their sub-roles, using a "yes" or "no" choice system.
      This was tested by correlating the ratings of both judges of each sub-role unit, using the phi correlation method for dichotomous classification. The N in this case was 271; the number of sub-role units.
   b. The alternative points in the interview at which counselors should or should not have switched sub-roles.
      This was tested by comparing the number of times that both judges chose the same new transition points. A chi square test of significance was made to see if the two judges agreed beyond chance level on the same alternative points where the counselor should have switched sub-roles. The N consisted of the number of cases in which both judges checked the sub-role as inappropriate.
c. Agreement on alternative choice of sub-roles in cases where the sub-roles played were considered inappropriately used.

This was tested by the number of agreements between judges in choosing the same sub-role out of fourteen alternatives. A chi square test of significance was used to determine the level at which the judges agreed beyond chance expectation. The N consisted of the number of times that both judges rated the same sub-role unit as inappropriate.

d. Agreement on the degree of deviation between the inappropriately used sub-role and the sub-role chosen as being appropriate in terms of counselor-client assumption of responsibility.

Where an alternative sub-role choice was made there was a sub-role deviation score in terms of the difference in assumption of responsibility between the sub-role played and the sub-role suggested. Where an alternative choice was not made, the deviation score was considered zero. The N included all sub-role units, i.e., 271. In the cases where both
judges agreed that the sub-role was appropriate, the degree of deviation was zero. These scores were included in measuring the degree of agreement between judges on the sub-role deviation. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed to determine the degree of agreement between the judges. (27, p. 339)

2. It was hypothesized that a significantly positive relationship would exist between the appropriateness with which counselors utilize their sub-roles and interview outcome.

The "yes" or "no" ratings, designating appropriateness of sub-role usage, were used to test this. The ratings of the two judges were treated separately in relating the sub-role ratings to interview outcome. The following procedure applied individually to the ratings made by the two judges who rated the interviews on sub-role behavior. The number of "yes" ratings for a client interview series was divided by the total number of sub-role units in that series to give a "client proportion correct score." These scores
were then related to each of the three outcome criteria scores and to the composite criterion score of each client series, using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation method. (27, p. 339) Each criterion score was summated for the interviews of each client and divided by the number of interviews rated to give the four different average outcome scores for each client. Here the N for each correlation was 38, i.e., 38 client scores.

The relationship between the "counselor's proportion correct score" for all clients and the counselor's "interview outcome score" for all clients was measured by the same statistical procedure. Here the N was 19. The "counselor proportion correct score" was obtained by dividing the "yes" ratings by the total number of sub-role units over a counselor's four interviews, irrespective of the client and each total outcome score was divided by the number of interviews rated for a "counselor average outcome score."

3. It was hypothesized that an inverse relationship would exist between the "counselor's sub-role
deviation scores" (that is, the difference between the sub-role played and the sub-role rated as more appropriate on the dimension of counselor or client assumption of responsibility) and interview outcome.

This was measured first by relating the average number of deviation units over each client interview series to the four average criteria scores of interview outcome for that interview series, using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation method. (27, p. 339) Since there were 38 clients, the N in this case was 38. The second approach was to relate the "counselor average deviation score" for all of his clients, i.e., the average of all deviations in the interviews with all clients to each of the four average outcome scores with all clients, using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation method. (27, p. 339) In this instance the unit was that of counselors so the N was 19.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present chapter will deal with the results of the study in the same order that the questions were presented in the previous chapter: (1) To what extent do counselors use the appropriate sub-roles, as rated by judges on a "yes" or "no" basis? (2) To what extent do judges agree as to whether the counselor used the appropriate sub-roles? (3) To what extent do judges agree on choosing alternative transition points within the sub-role unit played where they believe a different sub-role should have been used? (4) To what extent do judges agree on the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles? (5) To what extent do judges agree on the actual choice of a sub-role in those sub-role units where both judges consider the sub-role played to be inappropriate? (6) What is the degree of relationship between the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles (on a "yes" or "no" choice basis) and measures of interview outcome? (7) What is the degree of relationship between the extent to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles and measures of interview outcome?
1. To what extent do counselors generally use the appropriate sub-roles?

The two judges were instructed to read each sub-role unit played within the interview and to check "yes" or "no" as to whether it was appropriate or inappropriate to the interview situation. The total number of sub-role units rated in this manner was 271.

The per cent of times that a counselor generally utilizes the appropriate sub-roles was measured by dividing the total number of sub-role units in his interviews into the total number of appropriate sub-role ratings. This was done for both judges and is reported in Table II.

The per cents given in Table II indicate that there was considerable variability among the judges in their ratings of the appropriateness with which the sub-roles were utilized. The first judge tended to rate the greater share of the sub-roles played as inappropriate. The second judge tended to rate the greater share of the sub-roles as appropriate. Mean per cent of each judge equals 38.3 per cent and 75.9 per cent respectively. The median per cents were 28.6 per cent and 80.25 per cent respectively. In the case of the first judge the ratings covered a wide range. However, the distribution was quite positively skewed, i.e., the greater share of the counselors received low ratings of appropriate sub-role usage; few received high ratings.
TABLE II. The proportion of times (per cent) that the first judge and the proportion of times (per cent) that the second judge rated the sub-roles played as appropriate according to "yes" or "no" ratings of the sub-roles played by each counselor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>No. of Sub-Roles Played in a Counselor's Two to Four Interviews</th>
<th>Judge #1</th>
<th>Judge #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 19\) \(N = 271\) Average per cent 38.3% 75.9%
Median per cent 28.6% 80.25%
Contrary to this the second judge rated the sub-role usage relatively high; the highest per cent correct was 91.7. The mean was 75.9 per cent; the median 80.25 per cent. The distribution in this case was quite negatively skewed.

It appears that regardless of which judge does the rating there is variability among the counselors in the degree to which sub-roles are used appropriately.

2. To what extent do the two judges agree upon the instances where there was an appropriate use of sub-roles?

The procedure followed for rating this dimension was the same one as that presented under the preceding question. The degree to which the judges agreed in rating each sub-role unit as appropriately or inappropriately played was measured by the phi correlation method for computing the relationship between dichotomous variables (in this case "yes" or "no" ratings). The N, i.e., the number of sub-role units rated by both judges, was 271. The judges agreed that the sub-role was appropriate 87 times, agreed it was inappropriate 58 times, and disagreed as to its appropriateness 126 times.

The overall degree of agreement according to the phi coefficient was .27, which was significant at the .01 risk level. (This means that this degree of agreement would occur due to chance alone less than one time out of a hundred.) However, the degree of agreement was not so high as
might be desired. It does suggest considerable discrepancy between the judges with respect to the criteria they had in mind in determining what constituted an appropriate sub-role.

An explanation is offered as to why the judges did not agree more highly on sub-role appropriateness. In certain instances an inappropriate sub-role immediately preceding the one being rated gave rise to such a lack of rapport that it was difficult to determine if the present sub-role was aiding in the process of eventually re-gaining rapport. If there was even the slightest improvement gained with the use of the sub-role it could justifiably be rated as appropriate. It was difficult to detect with certainty such slight levels of improvement. Where one judge might have felt such improvement justified a rating of appropriate, the other judge might have felt that another sub-role would be even more appropriate.

3. To what extent did judges agree on the alternative choice of transition points at which time counselors should have switched sub-roles?

It was felt that in certain instances a counselor might play an appropriate sub-role for a while but continue it beyond the point where it was appropriate. Judges were instructed to check such points. It was planned to measure whether judges reliably agreed in selecting these transition
points, using a chi square test of significance. Of the number of conceivable times (theoretically the total number of transition points in the entire interview sample) the judges agreed on the same transition points only twice. This would indicate that where there was a question of selecting new transition points the degree of agreement was so slight that a test of significance was not appropriate.

4. To what extent did judges agree on the same alternative choices of sub-roles?

When a judge considered a sub-role to be inappropriate he then selected an alternative, more appropriate sub-role. In instances where it was felt necessary to do so a second and a third choice of possible sub-role alternatives was made.

First let us discuss those instances where both judges agreed that the sub-role played was inappropriate (N equalled 58). In these instances they agreed on the alternative sub-roles twenty times. These were on first choice alternatives. A chi square value was obtained to test the statistical significance with which judges agreed. Since in choosing a sub-role the judge could select from among at least fourteen possible alternative sub-roles, the probability that both judges would choose exactly the same sub-role was 1/14. A chi square value measuring the expected
versus the observed frequency was significant beyond the .01 level.

It is interesting to mention parenthetically at this point that in the 126 instances where the judges disagreed as to the appropriateness with which the sub-roles were used (and therefore one judge did not make alternative sub-role choices) the average degree of disagreement was not large. This was measured by the amount of deviation between the sub-role rated as appropriate by one judge and the alternative sub-role chosen as being more appropriate by the other judge. The average degree of disagreement over these 126 sub-role units was 20.262 points out of a possible 50 points. This indicates that even though there was disagreement as to the appropriateness with which the sub-roles were used, the overall degree of disagreement was not extreme.

In brief, it appears that in the fifty-eight instances where both judges chose alternative sub-roles, they were fairly successful in choosing the same sub-roles, considering the number of alternative choices available, i.e., fourteen.

5. To what extent did judges agree on the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles?

This was determined by obtaining a measure of reliability of the judges' ratings as to the degree of deviation on
each sub-role played. Where a sub-role was considered appropriate the score was zero. However, on the same unit the other judge might choose an alternative sub-role assigning deviation points between it and the sub-role played. The N, i.e., the number of sub-role units rated by both judges, was 271. The reliability coefficient obtained with the Pearsonian correlation method was .21, which was significant at the .01 level.

Again, as in the case of the degree of agreement between judges on rating the appropriate use of sub-roles on a "yes" or "no" basis, the degree of agreement here suggests that there was considerable discrepancy between the judges in terms of the criteria they had in mind.

The results of investigating the five questions presented above in regard to the ratings of sub-role behavior are listed here:

(1) According to the ratings of one judge the counselors frequently mis-used their sub-roles. Ratings by the other judge were more favorable with the greater share of the counselors utilizing their sub-roles appropriately. Neither of the judges assigned ratings which would indicate a normal distribution among the various counselors. The ratings by the former judge were positively skewed; the ratings by the second judge were negatively skewed.
(2) Judges agree, to a very limited degree \((r = .27)\), in rating the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles.

(3) Of the relatively few times that the judges selected alternative points at which time the counselor should have switched sub-roles, the degree of agreement between them was so slight that it was not given further consideration.

(4) There was considerable agreement between judges in selecting the same alternative sub-roles, significant beyond the .01 level.

(5) Judges agreed to a very limited degree \((r = .21)\) on the extent to which counselors deviated from using the appropriate sub-roles.

The next two questions that were investigated dealt with (1) the relationship of the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles to interview outcome and (2) the relationship of the degree to which counselors deviated from using the appropriate sub-roles to interview outcome. The judges' ratings for both dimensions of sub-role behavior were related to measures of interview outcome for each client and for all the clients of a counselor. These findings are presented for the two judges separately, because of considerable differences occurring as a function of the limited reliability of ratings between judges. Thus, the second judge's ratings of sub-role behavior as they relate
to interview outcome represent a type of cross-validation of the relationship of the first judge's ratings related to interview outcome measures.

6. The degree of relationship between the appropriate use of sub-roles as rated on a "yes" or "no" basis, and measures of interview outcome for each client and for all clients of a counselor, as rated by the two different judges.

It was hypothesized that in the degree to which a counselor utilizes the appropriate sub-roles he will obtain better interview outcomes.

The ratings were made on each of the three criteria separately after the reading of an entire interview. A fourth measure, the composite outcome, was obtained by summatating these three criteria ratings on each interview.

The first judge's ratings of sub-role behavior were related to each of the four measures of interview outcome as rated by the entirely independent judge (1) for each client, and (2) for all clients of each counselor. Pearsonian correlations were computed to measure these relationships. Table III gives the set of relationships obtained with the ratings of the first judge.
TABLE III. The relationship between the first judge's ratings of the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles and measures of interview outcome as rated by an independent judge for each of thirty-eight clients and for both clients of each of nineteen counselors.

Appropriateness of Sub-Role Scores for Each Client Related To:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appropriateness of Sub-Role Scores for All Clients of a Counselor Related To:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>.50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 level of confidence
** = .01 level of confidence

In the first set of relationships two of the four correlations were significant at the .01 level of confidence. One was significant at the .05 level. Three of the four correlations in the second set of relationships were significant at the .05 level of confidence. This indicates that the manner in which a counselor utilizes his sub-roles will have considerable influence on the outcomes of his interviews.
The same set of relationships were computed, using the second judge's ratings in order to obtain a cross-validation on the first judge's ratings in relationship to interview outcome.

TABLE IV. The relationship between the second judge's ratings of the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles and interview outcome for each of thirty-eight clients and for clients of each of nineteen counselors.

Appropriateness of Sub-Role Scores for Each Client Related To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related To</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appropriateness of Sub-Role Scores for Both Clients of Each Counselor Related To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related To</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 level of confidence  
** = .01 level of confidence

These coefficients are all considerably smaller than the ones obtained with the first judge's ratings. According to the ratings made by the second judge, the manner in which a counselor utilizes his sub-roles does not significantly influence the outcome of his interviews.
Some discussion of the inter-judge reliability of rating sub-role behavior has already been given. Its significance for explaining the discrepancy in the results obtained with the two judges will be discussed in a later section.

6. The relationship between the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles and measures of interview outcome.

It was hypothesized that the degree to which a counselor deviates from using the appropriate sub-roles along a dimension of division of client or counselor assumption of responsibility will be related to poorer interview outcomes.

When a sub-role was rated inappropriate, it and an alternative sub-role were placed along their respective points of the "degree of counselor or client assumption of responsibility," according to a fifty-point scale. The number of units between these two sub-roles was the deviation score for that sub-role unit.

The first judge's ratings were related to each of the four measures of interview outcome for each client and for all clients of each counselor. Pearsonian correlations were computed to show the degree of relationship.

It was hypothesized that an inverse relationship would exist, since those counselors who deviated from using
the appropriate sub-roles would also deviate from an optimal level of interview outcome to a corresponding degree.

TABLE V. The relationship between the first judge's ratings of the deviation of the counselors sub-roles from the optimum and measures of interview outcome as rated by an independent judge for each of thirty-eight clients and for both clients of each of nineteen counselors.

Sub-Role Deviation Scores of Each Client Related To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Role Deviation Scores for All Clients of Each Counselor Related To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( r .05 \) level of confidence  
** \( r .01 \) level of confidence

The results strongly support the hypothesis that there is an inverse relationship between the degree to which a counselor deviates from using the appropriate sub-roles and interview outcome. Six of the eight relationships were high and statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The same set of relationship was computed with the second judge's ratings, in order to obtain a cross-
validation on the first judge's ratings as related to interview outcome. These results are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI. The relationship between the second judge's ratings of counselor sub-role deviations from the optimum and measures of interview outcome as rated by an independent judge for each of thirty-eight clients and for both clients of each of nineteen counselors.

Sub-Role Deviation Scores of Each Client Related To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Role</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Role Deviation Scores for All Clients of Each Counselor Related To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Role</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Client Working Relationship</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Growth in Insight</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Criterion</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05 level of confidence
** = .01 level of confidence

The relationships obtained with the second judge's ratings were not in the expected direction, i.e., negative, as stated in the hypothesis, nor were they statistically significant at either the .01 or the .05 level of confidence. The coefficients were also considerably lower than the ones obtained with the first judge's ratings. This reflects what was previously noted; that the judges agreed to
a very limited extent as to the degree to which counselors deviate from the appropriate use of sub-roles \( r = .21 \) correlated according to the sub-role units). This relationship was low enough to permit the differences in the validity coefficients obtained with each judge.

Since the cross-validation study represented by the second judge's ratings did not hold up with either the sub-role deviation scores or with the appropriate use of sub-role ratings, the question is raised; which of these two judges represents the more accurate set of ratings? If the first judge's ratings are the more accurate, then there is a high relationship between the appropriateness of a counselor's sub-role behavior and interview outcome. If the second judge's ratings are the more accurate, then there would be an insignificant relationship between sub-role behavior and interview outcome. One way in which this could conceivably be resolved would have been to check on the reliability of these two ratings with other judges rating the same dimensions. However, additional ratings by different judges could not be done at this time because of practical limitations. Later research may provide further information on this question.

In summary, it is concluded from the results of this study that: (1) according to one judge, counselors frequently mis-used their sub-roles. Ratings by the other judge were more favorable with the greater share of the
counselors utilizing their sub-roles appropriately. Neither of the judges assigned ratings according to a normal distribution of appropriateness among the various counselors. The former judge's ratings resulted in a positively skewed distribution; the latter judge a negatively skewed distribution, (2) judges can agree at a statistically significant level in rating the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles. However, the degree of relationship is low, (3) judges failed to agree at any significant level in choosing alternative transition points where other sub-roles should be played. According to one judge, such points were quite infrequent, (4) in those instances where judges agree that a sub-role is inappropriate, they can agree to a statistically significant degree on the choice of a more appropriate sub-role; when they disagree the degree of disagreement tends not to be wide (average equals 20.262 points over a fifty-point scale), (5) judges can agree to a statistically significant degree as to the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles, although the relationship is low ($r = .21$), (6) there is a positive, statistically significant relationship between the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles and interview outcome, according to one judge's ratings, and a very low, not statistically significant relationship according to the other judge's ratings, and (7) a negative,
statistically significant relationship between the degree
to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-
roles and interview outcome, according to one judge's rat-
ings, and a very low, not statistically significant, rela-
tionship, according to the other judge's ratings.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The field of counseling has shown a rapid growth and assumed an integral part in elementary and secondary schools, in college student personnel programs, in vocational counseling agencies, in counseling units in hospitals, business and industry. More evidence of growth is reflected in the development of such professional organizations as the American Personnel and Guidance Association with its six divisions and the training activities and standards set up by Division 17 of the American Psychological Association.

Concomitantly, increasing research has been used to refine and constantly evaluate the counseling function within the last ten to fifteen years. Three major areas of research have contributed to this growth: testing, personality theory, and the study of interview dynamics. We are particularly interested here in the last of these areas.

The study of the dynamic interaction and communication of counselor and client has been previously carried out through analyzing verbatim transcripts of interviews. Following early methodological studies, which established that counseling interview behavior could be quantitatively analyzed, investigations were carried on in terms of the
analysis of single counselor and client remarks. Later studies used larger segments of the interview, e.g., discussion topic and interview fraction, in order to analyze the delayed effects of counseling techniques. Commenting upon this level of analysis as compared to the earlier studies, Robinson stated:

... earlier studies missed the important first step in counseling interaction, i.e., what counselor behavior determines or should determine client response. Furthermore, these earlier studies in using an atomistic single speech approach, tended to cover up an important factor in the dynamics of the interview, i.e., counselor roles (sub-roles). (59, p. 163)

Following through on this, Danskin (20) investigated the reliability with which seeming consistency in counseling purpose could be identified and labeled and found that counselors show a consistency in their behavior which seemed associated with their playing different sub-roles.

Hoffman (37) did a more extensive analysis of sub-role behavior in order to provide normative data regarding the total range and pattern of sub-roles used by college counselors. He concluded that counselor sub-roles are usually determined early in the conference series, regardless of the total length of the interview series, and that although variations occur with different clients, counselors have a tendency to stay within this repertoire of sub-roles once it has been established in the early interviews of a given series. Although from this, much is known as to the nature
of the use of sub-roles, little is known about their relationships to effective counseling.

It is with respect to this relationship that the present study is concerned. Questions concerning the reliability of evaluating the appropriate use of sub-roles and their relationship to interview outcome were investigated.

In carrying out the general investigation of the relationship between the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles and interview outcome, a number of specific questions were investigated as follows: (1) to what extent do counselors use the appropriate sub-roles? (2) to what degree do judges agree in rating the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles? (3) in the instances where a sub-role is considered appropriate for only a portion of the time during which it is played, can judges agree on the alternative transition points at which time the counselor should have switched sub-roles? (4) in the instances where the sub-role was considered inappropriate for the entire duration or for only a portion of it, can judges agree on alternative sub-roles considered to be more appropriate to the interview situation? (5) to what extent can judges agree on the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles? (6) what is the degree of relationship between the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles and interview outcome? It was hypothesized that a significantly positive
relationship would exist, and (7) what is the degree of relationship between the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles and interview outcome? It was hypothesized that those counselors who deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles would correspondingly deviate from good interview outcome. Thus a statistically significant inverse relationship would exist.

Since the purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of counselor behavior patterns, i.e., the degree to which appropriate use of sub-roles are related to interview outcome, it is necessary to utilize immediate criteria, which indicate progress as it occurs within the interview.

Three immediate criteria were chosen for this study after an extensive review of the literature utilizing different dimensions. The criteria were chosen on the basis of (1) having been used in the past with a high degree of reliability, (2) being sensitive to changes within the interview, i.e., when the nature of the interview shifts, the ratings of the particular dimension responds accordingly, and (3) having been widely used and subjected to considerable refinement. The three criteria chosen were Counselor-Client Working Relationship, Client Growth in Insight, and Client Assumption of Responsibility.
Obtaining the Data

A total of over 300 transcripts of interviews with randomly assigned clients from various university counseling centers, e.g., Minnesota, Ohio State, Missouri, Michigan and Chicago Universities, were available for study. The counselors were either advanced graduate students in counseling psychology or faculty members in the Department of Psychology and/or the University Counseling Center. From these interviews a sample was selected which would give a good picture of a counselor's sub-role behavior with different clients and in some instances different interviews with the same client. A total of 47 interviews were chosen which represented 19 counselors, 38 clients, and 271 different sub-role units played.

In an earlier study two or more judges had (1) located the transition points between sub-roles, and (2) labeled the sub-roles played. In the present study two additional judges, both advanced graduate students in counseling psychology, rated the sub-role units in terms of how appropriately they were used by the counselors.

The judges rated each sub-role unit in terms of (1) whether the sub-role played was an appropriate one to use in the interview situation, (2) any further transition points at which time the counselor should have switched sub-roles, rather than continuing as he did to play the
particular one, (3) an alternative, more appropriate sub-role in the event that the sub-role played was inappropriate (the judge could choose a second and a third alternative sub-role if he wished to do so), and (4) the degree to which the sub-role considered to be inappropriate deviated from the one chosen as being more appropriate. The degree of deviation was measured by checking the respective location of the inappropriate and appropriate sub-roles on the scale of the degree of counselor or client assumption of responsibility.

Three criteria of interview outcome were rated according to the degree to which each was present in an interview. The judge who made these outcome ratings had no knowledge whatsoever of sub-role ratings.

Treatment of the Data and Results

1. To what extent do counselors use appropriate sub-roles? According to the ratings of one judge the counselors frequently mis-used their sub-roles. Ratings by the other judge were more favorable with the greater share of the counselors utilizing their sub-roles appropriately. Neither judge assigned ratings approximating a normal distribution among the counselors. The ratings by the former judge were quite positively skewed; the ratings by the second judge were quite negatively skewed.
2. **The degree to which judges agree in rating the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles.** The four possible combinations of agreements and disagreements were: yes-yes, yes-no, no-yes, and no-no. The N was 271. The phi coefficient for this distribution was .27, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. While a stable relationship exists the degree of relationship was quite limited.

3. **The degree to which judges agree in the selection of alternative transition points for changing sub-roles.** While the earlier study identified the sub-roles played, it was considered important to let the new set of judges identify any new units if needed. It was planned that a chi square test of significance would be applied to the number of times judges chose the same additional alternative transition point in the sub-role units played. However, of the number of times that both judges chose additional points, they agreed only twice on the same points. Thus, a test of significance was not appropriate.

4. **The degree to which judges agree in the selection of alternative sub-roles.** A chi square test of significance was computed for those units where both judges chose alternative sub-roles, to see if they agreed beyond chance on the suggested sub-roles. The number of different alternatives in each case was 14. The judges agreed 20 times out of a
possible 58 on what alternative sub-role should be played. This gave a chi square value that was significant beyond the .01 level. In the 126 instances where judges disagreed as to the appropriate use of the sub-roles (and therefore only one judge selected an alternative sub-role), the average degree of disagreement out of a possible 50 points was 20.262 points. This was measured by summing the total of the deviations when only one judge rated a deviation score and dividing this total by 126.

5. **The extent to which judges agree on the degree to which counselors deviated from using the appropriate sub-roles.** This was determined by a measure of reliability of the judge's ratings as to the degree of deviation for each of the 271 sub-role units rated. The Pearsonian r was .21, which was significant at the .01 level.

6. **The degree of relationship between the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles and interview outcome.** It was hypothesized that a significant, positive relationship would exist in relationship to the four measures of interview outcome. Two sets of correlations, using the Pearsonian method, were computed; one set for each client and one set for both clients of each counselor. This was done for each of the two judges rating this dimension.

The results obtained with the first judge's ratings of sub-role behavior for each client (N = 38) in relationship
to the measures of interview outcome rated by an independent judge were: Counselor-Client Working Relationship \( .46 \); with Client Growth in Insight \( .43 \); Client Assumption of Responsibility \( .13 \); and with the Composite Criterion \( .41 \).

For the scores of both clients combined for each counselor \((N = 19)\), the results were: Counselor-Client Working Relationship \( .53 \); Client Growth in Insight \( .57 \); Client Assumption of Responsibility \( .19 \); and with the Composite Criterion \( .50 \).

For the first set of relationships, two of the four correlations were significant at the .01 level of confidence. One was significant at the .05 level. Three of the four correlations in the second set of relationships were significant at the .05 level of confidence.

In regard to the relationship between the second judge's ratings of sub-role behavior and interview outcome, the results were as follows: for the scores of each client \((N = 38)\) in relationship to Counselor-Client Working Relationship, the coefficient was \( .08 \), to Client Growth in Insight \( .08 \), to Client Assumption of Responsibility \( .11 \), and to the Composite Criterion \( .04 \). None of these relationships were statistically significant at the .01 or .05 level.
For the scores of both clients of each counselor (N = 19), the relationship to Counselor-Client Working Relationship was .13, to Client Growth in Insight .15, to Client Assumption of Responsibility -.08, and to the Composite Criterion .10. None of these four relationships were statistically significant at the .01 or .05 level.

In general, the correlations obtained with the ratings of the second judge suggests a very low degree of relationship between the appropriate use of sub-roles and interview outcome.

7. The degree of relationship between the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles and measures of interview outcome. It was hypothesized that the degree to which a counselor deviates from using the appropriate sub-roles along a dimension of division of client or counselor assumption of responsibility would be related to poorer interview outcome. Two sets of correlations, using the Pearsonian method, were computed; one set for each client and one set for both clients of each counselor; both in relationship to the four measures of interview outcome. This was done for each of the two judges rating this dimension.

The results obtained with the first judge's ratings for each client (N = 38) in relationship to measures of interview outcome rated by an independent judge were:
Counselor-Client Working Relationship -.56; Client Growth in Insight -.50; Client Assumption of Responsibility -.12; and with the Composite Criterion -.47.

For the scores of both clients combined for each counselor (N = 19), the results were: Counselor-Client Working Relationship -.64; Client Growth in Insight -.67; Client Assumption of Responsibility -.26; and with the Composite Criterion -.61.

Six of the eight relationships were statistically significant at the .01 level.

In regard to the relationship between the second judge's ratings of counselor sub-role deviations and interview outcome, the results were as follows: for the scores of each client (N = 38) in relationship to Counselor-Client Working Relationship, the coefficient was .07, to Client Growth in Insight .04, to Client Assumption of Responsibility .12, and to the Composite Criterion .07. None were in the expected direction, i.e., negative, and none of the four relationships were statistically significant.

For the scores of each client (N = 19) in relationship to Counselor-Client Working Relationship, the coefficient was .17, to Client Growth in Insight .18, to Client Assumption of Responsibility .06, and to the Composite Criterion .16. None of the relationships were in the expected direction and none were statistically significant.
In general, the correlations obtained with the ratings of the second judge indicate a very low degree of relationship, offering no support to the hypothesis.

The difference between the first judge's ratings and the second judge's ratings in relationship to interview outcome does raise some question. The reliability of ratings by both judges, while statistically significant, was low enough to permit a wide difference in validity coefficients between the judges.

The question which set of correlations represents the most valid relationships between ratings of counselor sub-role behavior and interview outcome cannot be answered with certainty. One approach is to measure the degree to which the two judges agree with other judges. However, due to practical limitations, this was not done.

It is interesting to note that the judge who rated the sub-roles that correlated most highly with outcome was the judge who tended to rate the greater share of sub-roles played as inappropriate.

It may be the case that disagreement between judges in rating the appropriateness of sub-role behavior and counselor sub-role deviations would occur over and over and among many different judges, simply because it is difficult to determine how appropriately a particular sub-role is being utilized and how far it deviated from a more
appropriate one. Further research is needed to answer this question.

In summary, it is concluded from the results of this study that: (1) According to one judge, counselors frequently mis-use their sub-roles. The other judge tended to rate the sub-role as being appropriately used. The distribution among counselors on the appropriate use of sub-roles as rated by the two different judges was quite different. The distribution of ratings by the first judge was positively skewed; the second judge negatively skewed, (2) Judges can agree to a statistically significant degree in rating the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles, although the degree of relationship is relatively low, (3) Counselors may occasionally or frequently play inappropriate sub-roles. They tend to be more sensitive to the points at which time different sub-roles should be played. Judges could not agree to any significant degree on more appropriate points, (4) In those instances where judges agree that a sub-role is inappropriate, they can agree to a statistically significant degree on the choice of a more appropriate sub-role; when they disagree as to whether the sub-role is appropriate the average degree of disagreement is not extreme, (5) Judges can agree to a statistically significant degree as to the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles, although the
degree of relationship is relatively low, (6) There is a positive, statistically significant relationship between the appropriate use of counselor sub-roles and interview outcome, according to one judge's ratings, and a very low, not statistically significant relationship, according to the other judge's ratings, and (7) There is a negative, statistically significant relationship between the degree to which counselors deviate from using the appropriate sub-roles and interview outcome, according to one judge's ratings, and a very low, neither negative or statistically significant relationship, according to the other judge's ratings.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


23. Dial, Harold. An investigation of the effects on certain judges ratings on interview typescripts when additional information is provided. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1950.


47. Neiman, L., and Hughes, L. The problem of the concept of role--a re-survey. *Social Forces*, 1951, 52, 141-149.


64. Sarbin, T. R., and Williams, J. D. Contributions to role taking theory. V. Role perception on the basis of limited auditory stimuli. Unpublished manuscript, 1953.


68. Sherman, Dorothy M. An analysis of the dynamic relationship between counselor techniques and outcomes in larger units of the interview situation. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1945.


73. Stock, Dorothy. An investigation into the interrelations between the self concept and feelings directed toward other persons and groups. *J. Consult. Psychol.*, 1949, 13, 176-180.


APPENDIX A

MANUAL FOR RATING ACTUAL SUB-ROLE BEHAVIOR
APPENDIX A

MANUAL FOR RATING ACTUAL SUB-ROLE BEHAVIOR

Preliminary work has indicated that during segments of the interview, a counselor demonstrates a certain consistency in his behavior as he tries to play one or another sub-role. Initial research has indicated that such sub-roles do emerge in the interaction process of the counseling hour and can be described with the same formal characteristics as the traditional concept of roles.

In this study the term sub-role will refer to that adjudged general purpose or intent which a counselor has for a particular period in an interview in order to produce certain relationships with the client which he hopes will serve to facilitate the client's solving his problem. This general purpose affects the nature of the counselor's speeches and when this general purpose changes, the counselor's remarks similarly are altered in pattern. These purposes can be investigated through patterns of verbal behavior which counselors use within the counseling interview.

In rating the sub-roles, the judge needs to be aware of at least three different methods of describing a counselor or his behavior. (1) One can speak, in general
terms, about the overall role of the counselor. In our particular culture, for example, a counselor is thought of as a person who helps individuals solve their problems, increase behavioral maturity, gain insights, make plans or decisions. (2) A counselor's behavior can also be described, especially for longer segments of the interview, as assuming sub-roles which change throughout the interview for the purpose of producing certain results in a particular situation at a given period of time. (3) A counselor's behavior, especially single responses, can also be described in terms of the specific techniques he is using, for example, general leads, interpretation, clarification, tentative analysis, etc.

This research is interested in the second method of description, that is, the identification of the changing sub-roles within the interview.

The judges, therefore, will be asked to make the following ratings:

1. Locate the transition points between counselor sub-roles.

2. Label the sub-role being played.

**The Transition Point**

In considering the first rating, the judge is to identify from verbatim typewritten transcriptions of counseling
interviews the transition point at which a counselor changes from one sub-role to another.

Definition: The transition point is defined here as that statement by the counselor in which he gives evidence of assuming a different sub-role with his client.

In the following example the counselor indicates that he is assuming a new sub-role at // in Line 247. Previous discussion was concerned with the counselor giving factual information to the student.

243 Co. Because it's something you sort of work up into and there'd be nobody that could predict that you would be able to do that. . . .

Clt. Of course, I don't know if I'd like that job. . . personnel manager. . . I think it's kind of. . . it's a. . . headache. . . . I think I mean. . . I mean. . . it's always. . . something going on and. . . (laughs) . . . something. . . .

244 Co. So many decisions having to be made. . .

244 Clt. Yeah. . . .

245 Co. So many. . . so much responsibility. . . and so on.

245 Clt. Uh hu.

(Long pause)

Clt. I think that's about it.

246 Co. That's sort about it for today?

246 Clt. I think so.

247 Co. Uh hu.//Well, why don't you finish the testing then. . . at your leisure. . . .
Co. Do you think you might be able to do that within the next week. . . .

Of course, not every interview will have as definite transition points as the example given. It is quite possible that a counselor might play the same sub-role throughout the entire interview. Also, a counselor might gradually shift his sub-role so that the exact transition point is not easily discernible. When this occurs, the judge is to select the point which seems "best" to him. More detailed instructions are given below under "procedures."

Another major problem which may arise in identifying sub-roles is: how short can a sub-role be? That is, do one or two counselor speeches make a sub-role or are several speeches of similar tone needed before the counselor is playing a sub-role? Generally, several counselors speeches would be necessary to constitute and to identify a sub-role. Within one sub-role, such as "participating," a counselor may use varying speech techniques from acceptance remarks to interpretation remarks, but there is an overriding purpose characteristic of all his remarks. In addition, if a counselor were playing one sub-role, such as "participating," and a client asked a specific question which required an answer by the counselor, the counselor's answer would not constitute a new sub-role if, after answering the question, he continued with the same sub-role of "participating."
However, if the counselor continued to give the client information, or changed the purpose or intent or tone of his speeches in some way from that "participating," he would be playing a new sub-role.

However, it is quite possible that a single long counselor speech, in itself, might constitute a sub-role. Within one sub-role, such as "structuring," relationship, a counselor might utilize one long speech indicating his relationship to the client and the usual counseling procedure. For example, he might be informing the client that the counseling relationship is one in which both counselor and client have their distinct responsibilities and in which both work together in a kind of partnership arrangement. While the typescript shows only one long speech, the student has probably been nodding his head in acceptance so that a sub-role unit is indicated.

In another situation, a counselor may finish sub-role A. Then for one or two speeches he may be playing sub-role B, and then go on and play a long new sub-role C. This could either be rated as two sub-roles (A and C) or as three sub-roles (A, B, and C), depending upon the definiteness of the brief "in-between" sub-role B.

In rating, a judge should not confuse a counselor's sub-role with the specific techniques used by the counselor. While an assumed sub-role will affect the techniques
used, a judge should also consider the tone of the interview. That is, if a counselor's techniques show a wide range, but the tone of the section seems similar, consider this as one sub-role.

Sub-roles will differ in their degree of definiteness. In selecting transition points between sub-roles and in labeling sub-roles, a judge should be as certain as possible that the counselor is playing one sub-role. The judge should not try to make every variation into a sub-role; neither should he see each counselor as playing only one sub-role. Check transition points where changes in sub-roles seem clear. If a section seems ambiguous, that is, seems to have differences and yet these variations are not clear, call it one sub-role and describe your reactions fully under "comments."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITION POINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
RATING FORM #2 FOR COUNSELOR SUB-ROLES

IDENTIFYING DATA

SCHOOL __________ TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS __________

COUNSELOR _______ INTERVIEW NUMBER _______ RATER _______

CLIENT __________ DATE __________

TRANSITION POINT

NUMBER OF FIRST COUNSELOR SPEECH IN SUB-ROLE UNIT ______

NUMBER OF LAST COUNSELOR SPEECH IN SUB-ROLE UNIT ______

COUNSELOR: SUB-ROLES

___ FRIENDLY DISCUSSION
___ INFORMATION GATHERING
___ DIAGNOSING
___ INFORMATION GIVING
___ SUPPORTING
___ STRUCTURING
___ A. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS
___ B. RELATIONSHIP
___ C. FOCUSING OF TOPIC

___ LISTENING
___ ASKING FOR ELABORATION
___ REFLECTING
___ PARTICIPATING
___ ADVISING
___ REJECTING
___ TUTORING
___ UNCLASSIFIABLE
___ OTHER (ELABORATE BELOW)

COMMENTS:

______________________________

______________________________
Procedures

Two separate ratings will be made: (1) locating the transition points between the counselor sub-roles, and (2) labeling the counselor sub-roles. At the top each rating form the judge will find blanks in which he is to insert the name of the school where the interview was recorded, the counselor code number, the client code number, the total number of interviews, the number of this particular interview, the rater's name and the date of the rating.

A. Locating Transition Points (use Rating Form #1 for Counselor Sub-roles)

1. Fill in the identifying information on each rating form used.

2. Read the typescripts looking for changes in sub-roles.

3. When a transition point is located, indicate the length of the sub-role unit on the rating form by writing (in the appropriate place) the numbers of the first and last counselor speeches in the unit. Use separate rating forms for each interview.

4. Do this for all 165 interviews.

B. Labeling Sub-roles (use Rating Form #2 for Counselor Sub-roles)

1. Rating sheets will already have been filled out with the identifying data.

2. Read the indicated sub-role unit and check which phrase best describes the sub-role played. Use a separate rating form for each sub-role unit.

3. When an interview has been completed, clip all of the separate rating sheets for that interview together. Check and see that all of the rating forms are properly labeled.
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MANUAL FOR RATING THE APPROPRIATENESS OF USE OF COUNSELOR SUB-ROLES

The following paragraph is a definition of the term sub-role as it is used in this study.

One can speak in terms of the overall role of the counselor. A counselor's behavior can also be described in terms of longer segments of the interview, as assuming sub-roles which change throughout the interview for the purpose of producing certain results in a particular situation at a given period of time. These sub-roles are larger in length than the single remark, since a number of single remarks that are similar in nature are considered as a given sub-role category. Thus, a counselor may vary the specific nature of his remarks, but if they have a general commonality among them they fall under the category of a particular sub-role. For example, a counselor may use different words in different remarks during the process of getting information from the client. Even though the specific phrases may be different due to choice of words, the general purpose of gathering information is operating, i.e., the counselor is playing the sub-role of "information gathering."
In rating sub-role appropriateness consider each sub-role in terms of how appropriate it is to the situation to which it is applied or used in the interview. At all times attempt to rate each sub-role in terms of the situation per se within the interview. Rate each sub-role in terms of the following:

1. If the sub-role is appropriate check "yes." If it is inappropriate check "no."

2. If the sub-role is appropriate for only a portion of the duration during which it is played and inappropriate thereafter, check "no" and indicate that counselor statement at which time the sub-role becomes inappropriate. Indicate the counselor statement by its number in the interview.

3. If the sub-role is rated as inappropriate at any time, i.e., checked "no," choose an alternative sub-role that you feel would be more appropriate. If it is difficult to decide on any particular alternative sub-role, make a second or even third choice of sub-roles.

4. Along the fifty-point scale of the degree of counselor or client assumption of responsibility, check the sub-role played by the counselor using an "A." Check the alternative sub-role you prefer along the scale with a "P," i.e., preferred sub-
roles. Thus, both the actual sub-role played and the sub-role or sub-roles chosen as alternatives will be plotted along the scale, indicating the degree to which responsibility is divided between counselor and client (actual sub-role) and should be divided between counselor and client (preferred sub-role). Be sure to mark the specific points by checking a particular dot in all cases. For example ........A ............F ..

Following are the fifteen different sub-role categories. A brief definition is given for each. Acquaint yourself with these different sub-roles according to these definitions. Utilize these definitions in rating sub-role appropriateness and in choosing alternative sub-roles. Remember these are counselor behaviors.

1. **Friendly Discussion.** This is typified by counselor statements that are, in general, non-problem solving in nature and primarily designed to maintain a positive rapport with the client.

2. **Information Gathering.** The counselor statements are directed toward obtaining specific information about the client and designed to inform the counselor without particularly furthering the client's insights.
3. **Information Giving.** The counselor supplies factual data to the client and offers authoritative information with no immediate pressure for action.

4. **Diagnosing.** Here the counselor directs his statements toward drawing out information or ideas from the client so the counselor can infer what some of the client's problems are and what the sources might be.

5. **Supporting.** The counselor helps the client feel more secure by reassuring the client that their joint efforts will produce positive gains.

6. **Administrative Arrangements.** The counselor makes plans for following interviews, makes arrangements for tests, etc.

7. **Structuring Relationship.** The counselor indicates the nature of the relationship which he will have with the client during the counseling hour.

8. **Focusing of Topic.** The counselor aims at changing the direction of the discussion by re-opening a previously stated topic or opening a new one, such as "Let's go back" or "Have you thought of?"

9. **Listening.** The client does most of the talking while the counselor says little or interjects nearly neutral statements such as "Yes, I see," etc., not implying approval or disapproval.
10. **Asking for Elaboration.** Counselor statements such as "What happened then?," "How do you mean?" are aimed at helping the client understand the origin of his difficulties.

11. **Reflecting.** The counselor's statements are characterized by an effort to clarify or reproduce the attitudes and feelings which are expressed in the responses of the client.

12. **Participating.** The counselor uses a range of techniques which may include clarification, acceptance remarks, interpretation, and lead questions so that both he and the client seem involved in arriving at some solution to the problem at hand.

13. **Advising.** Here the counselor's statements attempt to persuade the client to accept a particular point of view; an implication that the client should change his attitudes or behavioral activities.

14. **Rejecting.** The counselor's statements imply rejection or reluctance to accept insights or plans stated by the client. This does not include negative replies to direct questions asked by the client.
15. **Tutoring.** The counselor directs practice in some specific skill, manifesting behavior similar to that of a teacher or tutor.
APPENDIX C
MANUAL FOR RATING INTERVIEW OUTCOME

The definitions, instructions and rating scales for interview outcome appear in this manual in the order in which they are to be used. A global rating of each interview on each of the rating scales will be made.

Interview Outcome

All of the ratings are to be based on overall impressions of the entire interview rather than on a remark by remark basis. The scales are marked Md, Q1, and Q3 (median, first quartile, and third quartile). An interview which is believed to be slightly below average (for typical interviews occurring in a counseling situation with college students) on a certain characteristic would be checked below Md and Q1, and an interview believed to be better than three quarters or more than such interviews on a given characteristic would be checked to the right of Q3.

Counselor-Client working relationship

Good working relationship is the presence of mutual respect and warmth, of respectful consideration for each other's ideas, and of client willingness to explore his problems. It is also the absence of symptoms of resistance. At the other end poor working relationship is the presence of symptoms of resistance.
and absence of the positive signs of warmth, respect and willingness to explore problems. In judging poor working relationships, consider both frequency and severity of resistance, and make a global rating of the unit.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{12 1/2} & \text{25} & \text{37 1/2} \\
\text{Poor} & \text{Q1} & \text{Md} & \text{Q3} & \text{Excellent}
\end{array}
\]

Growth during the interview

Growth consists of evidences of new insights, gains in skill, self acceptance and plans. It is important to rate only gains carried over from a previous unit. Again as above, consider both number and importance of gains.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{12 1/2} & \text{25} & \text{37 1/2} \\
\text{Poor} & \text{Q1} & \text{Md} & \text{Q3} & \text{Excellent}
\end{array}
\]

Client interest in assuming responsibility

How much responsibility does the client want to take, discounting counselor techniques and their influence upon the amount of responsibility that the client actually assumes? That is, this is a measure of client interest in initiating behavior.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{12 1/2} & \text{25} & \text{37 1/2} \\
\text{Q1} & \text{Md} & \text{Q3} \\
\text{Client desires} & \text{Client desires to assume a great deal of responsibility} \\
\text{no responsibility} & \text{Client desires to assume a great deal of responsibility} \\
or even rejects it. & \text{Client desires to assume a great deal of responsibility}
\end{array}
\]
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