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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Guidance is an integral part of the total educational program and is based upon the democratic concept of the dignity and worth of the individual. Developing in the American culture, guidance services in the secondary school and student personnel services in colleges and universities place major emphasis upon assisting the individual to develop toward his own best self-realization. Similar objectives underlie the development and expansion of guidance services in the elementary school.

The growth and expansion of elementary school guidance services is a phenomenon of the past two decades. In 1954, Jones and Miller reported that the growth of guidance in the elementary school was one of the ten most significant trends in the pupil personnel services during


the period 1945 - 1954. In the same year, Sievers found 254 elementary school counselors working in 354 selected elementary schools. More recently, a 1961 Ohio Education Association survey revealed that 28 elementary schools in that state had the services of an elementary school counselor. Cottingham, in an article published in 1959, stated that the emphasis on guidance in the elementary school was an event of the 1950's. Evidence that the increase of elementary school guidance services is continuing into the 1960's is found in Meeks more recent statement that "One of the most important current trends in guidance is the growth of organized programs at the elementary level."^6

A most significant development in elementary school guidance is found in the extension of the National Defense Education Act by the 88th Congress. In 1964 Title V of the above act, which provided federal financial support for

---


secondary school guidance beginning in 1958, was extended to include financial support for guidance and counseling in the elementary school.\(^7\)

Thus it can be seen that increased attention is now being given to organized guidance services in the elementary school. This condition epitomizes what Wrenn has called the "new look in the elementary school pupil personnel work."\(^8\) Wrenn further characterizes this service as an emphasis upon the positive rather than upon the negative, upon the identification of pupil characteristics and talents, and upon the developmental needs of all pupils rather than deviate and problem students only.\(^9\)

The counseling service is widely recognized as a basic component of guidance at the elementary level. Meeks\(^10\) has suggested that the major focus of elementary school guidance should be upon counseling with the individual and with small groups of pupils. Hart\(^11\) reports that


\(^9\)Ibid., p. 149.


elementary teachers view counseling individual pupils as a major function of elementary school guidance workers. The ASCA task force committee on elementary school guidance places counseling pupils at the top of a list of eleven functions of guidance in the elementary school.

The ASCA study group emphasizes that all children encounter problems in the process of growing up and counseling can provide assistance in developing greater self-direction in problem solving. For many children, counseling is essential; some find it difficult to meet developmental tasks and others present behavior problems growing out of threats to the child’s feeling of security and self-esteem. There is a need for counseling that cannot be met by a teacher. The counselor by preparation and time available can be this person.

Counseling allows the child to establish a relationship with someone to help him see himself as a more adequate person, to find out things about himself, and then with this knowledge to work toward goals consistent with his maturational and developmental progress. Counseling helps us to look and listen to what the child is saying to us. Often the child is trying to communicate his need for help and this process provides an opportunity to become
more sensitive to the child's needs. This we call counseling.\footnote{Report of ASCA Committee on Elementary School Guidance (October, 1964), Mimeo.}

The evidence given above clearly indicates that organized counseling services in the elementary school setting is expanding rapidly. College and university programs for training counselors for work at this level are already organized in some states and several more are in the planning stage.

Concomitant with this rapid growth there have arisen some complex problems. One of the most troublesome of these has been the confusion about the techniques of counseling children in the elementary school setting. This confusion becomes readily apparent when one surveys the current literature in the field. As an example, Hatch and Costar\footnote{Raymond Hatch and James W. Costar, \textit{Guidance in the Elementary School} (Dubuque, Iowa: Little Brown and Company, Inc., 1961).} maintain that counseling techniques used with adolescents can be used with equal success in counseling with children. Brammer and Shostrom\footnote{Lawrence M. Brammer and Everett L. Shostrom, \textit{Therapeutic Psychology} (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 332.} however write that because of the child's immaturity and inexperience, modifications of counseling techniques are necessary.

\textsuperscript{12}Report of ASCA Committee on Elementary School Guidance (October, 1964), Mimeo.


Peters cites the child's minimal ability to verbalize his feelings as a major barrier to counseling with children and states that counseling techniques applicable to counseling adolescents cannot be transferred without modification to counseling children. The most extreme position is found in the writings of Eubanks who states that "the elementary school child is not ready for a formal counseling program."

Another major problem facing the worker in the field of elementary school counseling is that most of the literature and the research in this field deals with counseling disturbed children in mental health centers and child guidance clinics. The principal emphasis is upon such specialized techniques as play therapy, puppetry, and projective testing. Little or no research attention has been given to counseling normal children in the elementary school setting. Normal children are those who can attend and profit from participation in the typical American classroom. This is in contrast to those atypical children who may be housed in the same building as normal children but who may have some characteristic that is so deviant as to require special arrangements for learning.

---


16 O. W. Eubanks, Guidance Services in Louisiana (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: State Department of Education, Bulletin No. 969), not dated.
While the excellent work on counseling maladjusted children in a clinical setting may serve to provide the elementary school counselor with a necessary theoretical framework, there is little application to the daily activity of developmental counseling in the elementary school. The lack of research in counseling young children in the school setting becomes quite apparent when one tries to adequately answer such questions as: Does the immaturity of the child influence the counselor's techniques? If so, what techniques are appropriate? How much responsibility must the counselor assume for the progress and outcome of counseling? How much responsibility does the child assume?

The evidence given above clearly indicates that counseling is recognized as a key activity in elementary school guidance. Yet little if any research attention has been given to counseling at this level. The present study grew out of a concern for the identification of some of the counseling dimensions in the elementary school setting.

The Problem

The problem of this study was to analyze elementary school counseling in terms of technique and responsibility.
Questions

The present study sought answers to the following questions:

A. In reference to counseling techniques with elementary school children:
   1. How much responsibility is assumed by the elementary counselor?
   2. To what extent does the elementary counselor lead?
   3. What is the nature of the counselor's response to the child's feelings and needs?
   4. To what extent does the counselor respond to the core of the child's remarks?

B. In reference to the behavior of children during interviews with an elementary counselor:
   1. How much responsibility is assumed by the child?
   2. What is the quality of the counselor-child relationship?
   3. How much progress occurs during counseling?

Importance of the Study

The trend toward expanding guidance and counseling services at all levels of education has already been noted. As guidance becomes an accepted function of elementary education it is readily apparent that considerable attention will focus upon counseling in the elementary school setting.
Wrenn\textsuperscript{17} reports that many counselor educators feel that more attention should now be given to counseling in the elementary school. Lifton\textsuperscript{18} states that counseling in the elementary school is necessary to the development of vocational insights. He maintains that counseling at an early age would assist children in determining a self-concept for career development. Meeks\textsuperscript{19} believes that elementary school counseling is necessary for early identification of the underachiever.

These are recent pronouncements and reflect the growing concern of professional educators to provide counseling services to children in the elementary grades. Too, recent state and national conferences, and federal legislation discussed in a preceding paragraph, provide additional evidence that counseling is now viewed as a major function of the elementary school.

Thorough consideration of these facts bring into sharp focus the need for a detailed analysis of counseling children in the elementary grades. Peters\textsuperscript{20} has made a

\begin{enumerate}
\item[17]op. cit., p. 126.
\item[19]op. cit., p. 3.
\item[20]op. cit., p. 11.
\end{enumerate}
strong plea for an investigation of the differences between elementary and secondary school counseling. Kowitz and Kowitz\textsuperscript{21} have stated:

Although there have been a number of advances in therapy with children, few are within the area of counseling. This field deserves careful study and thorough research.

In view of the continuing emphasis on counseling children in the elementary grades, a clearer understanding of the nature of this service is a necessity. In particular studies of the techniques employed by counselors at this level will assist in the development of training programs for elementary school counselors and will provide the counselor with a framework on which to establish his contribution to the student and the school.

In summary, research on elementary school counseling should be of value in that it may:

1. Identify specific techniques for counseling in the elementary school setting.

2. Help counselor educators develop, extend, and refine training programs for elementary school counselors.

3. Yield information that will be useful to counselors presently working in the elementary schools.

4. Serve as a basis for justifying expanded counseling services.

5. Assist school administrators in planning and organizing for elementary school guidance services.

6. Serve as a stimulus to further research in the general area of elementary school guidance.

**Definitions of Terms**

Definitions of a few terms central to this report are given below. Descriptions of counseling dimensions are found in Chapter II.

**Guidance.**—That part of the total educational program that helps provide the personal opportunities and the specialized staff services by which a student can develop to the fullest of his abilities and capacities.

**Elementary school guidance.**—Services for pupils in grades K - 6 that provide specialized staff and makes provision for systematic, personalized, and individual help for all pupils.

**Counseling.**—A process whereby one mature and competent individual assists another individual, through the interview technique in a private setting, to resolve his concern. Counseling is a professional activity of a trained counselor.²²

Counseling, as the term is used in this report, refers to counseling normal children in the school setting. Major emphasis is placed upon the positive aspects of pupil functioning, and upon the developmental needs of pupils. The major objectives of counseling are catharsis, ventilation, reduction of emotional tensions and positive pupil growth. Counseling in the elementary school setting does not seek to bring about major structural changes in personality.

Limitations

The fact that elementary school counseling is still in its infancy placed some unavoidable limitations upon the present study. Too, the number of counselors with adequate training for service at the elementary level is limited.

The present research will be concerned only with those individuals who are presently functioning as elementary school counselors and who are so designated by title. In addition, the study used only those interviews recorded by counselors who have a minimum of 15 quarter hours of graduate level work in guidance. A minimum of 20 taped interviews, completed by 5 elementary school counselors in Ohio and Michigan constituted the data for this study.
Organization of the Remainder of the Report

The present chapter included an introduction to the subject under investigation, the statement of the problems, questions, the importance of the study, and limitations. Chapter II contains a review of the literature pertinent to the topic of this study. Chapter III describes the procedures and the statistical processes used in this investigation. The fourth chapter includes the findings and reports the statistical data of the study. The fifth and final chapter contains the summary of the information obtained from the investigation. Chapter V also includes conclusions drawn from the data and recommendations for further study and improvement of counseling in the elementary school.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In the previous chapter the development and expansion of counseling services in elementary schools and the consequent implications for research were discussed. It was concluded that one approach to the study of counseling dimensions at the elementary level might be undertaken by analyzing transcriptions of counseling interviews. This chapter will review the pertinent literature and research related to the study. First, the literature related to counseling with children will be reviewed. Second, a presentation will be made of counseling dimensions suggested by the literature. Included under this heading will be (1) dimensions of counselor techniques and (2) dimensions of client behavior. Finally, the previous research on interview analysis will be discussed.

Counseling with Children

A broad general definition of counseling was given in Chapter I. However, further discussion and additional definitions may help to clarify what is meant by counseling children in the school setting. Although these definitions
have been developed in settings other than the elementary school, they will serve as a backdrop for examining any unique characteristics of counseling children to be discussed in Chapters IV and V.

Robinson defines counseling as follows:

It is all types of two-person situations in which one person, the client, is helped to adjust more effectively to himself and to 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.\(^1\)

The above definition presents a broad and all-inclusive type of relationship between two people. Some definitions appear to be counselor-centered in that they describe what the counselor does for or to the client. For example, Smith gives the following definition:

Counseling is a process in which the counselor assists the counselee to make interpretations of fact relating to a choice, plan, or adjustment which he needs to make.\(^2\)

Other definitions appear to focus more on the client or to stress the relationship between client and counselor. Thus, Rogers has defined counseling in the following terms:

It is a process by which the structure of the self is relaxed in the safety of the relationship with


the therapist, and previously denied experiences are perceived and then integrated into an altered self.3

Shoben emphasizes the relationship between the client and counselor in the following definition:

Counseling is a warm, permissive, safe, understanding but limited social relationship.4

Wicca describes what counselors wish to accomplish in the definition given below:

Counseling is a relationship between two people, who utilize this relationship to help the client gain an understanding of himself, and through achieving this, be enabled to work out answers to his own problems.5

In a discussion of the roles of specialists in the elementary school, Martinson and Smallenberg describe the role of the counselor as follows:

The counselor provides the personalized services that enables boys and girls to adjust more effectively and to develop to the optimum level.6

It can be seen from the above definitions that counseling involves a close relationship between client and


counselor, and that counseling seeks to help the client understand himself which leads eventually to self-direction. As Knapp suggests, this is the end toward which elementary school counselors seem to be working today. The remaining paragraphs in this section are devoted to a discussion of the literature pertinent to counseling with children.

Many of the general theories of counseling have revolved around the construct of self. Attempts have been made to explain the various approaches in terms of the interpersonal relationships inherent in the one-to-one ratio. Too, much attention has been given to verbalized insights and to counselor and counselee responsibility for the interview. Concurrently, the discussion of counseling centered around two broad but distinct approaches: client-centered and counselor-centered.

Briefly, the basic dimension upon which theorists of the above two approaches seem to differ is that of the relative responsibility of counselor and client for decision making during the course of counseling. Rogers and other client-centered counselors take the position that the client has the basic responsibility for making all decisions, and that the counselor must strive to maintain his role as

---

a catalyst and non-decision maker. On the other hand, Williamson\(^9\) and many advocates of the counselor-centered approach, feel that the counselor must accept a share of the responsibility for decision making. However, most proponents of the counselor-centered approach accept the position that the final decision in counseling must lie with the client. They feel, however, that the counselor has a responsibility, by virtue of his training and experience, presumed insight and understanding, to present reasonable alternatives to implement the client's decision making.

The basic rationale underlying the brief description of the two points of view is the fact that each approach still has considerable impact upon current thinking in counseling. However, many questions relating to the relative responsibility of the counselor and client, and the quality of the counselor-client relationship, have not yet been answered.

Actually, as Knapp\(^{10}\) has pointed out, it is unlikely that the elementary school counselor will take a strong position on any particular counseling viewpoint. Knapp thinks, however, that if counseling in the elementary school setting is to be effective, the child must be an


\(^{10}\)Knapp, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
active participant in the counseling process and must take
primary responsibility for his plans and decisions. At the
same time, the counselor plays a vital role in that he
assists the child in selecting between alternative plans.

Brammer and Shostrom think that counseling with
children presents some special problems not covered by any
well-known point of view. They state:

Children are immature and pliable and when counseling
with children it becomes necessary to modify techniques
to meet this problem of immaturity. Because the child
is immature and not wholly responsible for his actions,
the counselor must accept some responsibility for
directing and protecting the client. These factors in
no way limit client dignity, value, and unique worth-
ness as an individual.11

Smith has described the role of the counselor in
assisting the client toward self-direction and self-ful-
fillment in the following statements:

The client is responsible for his own direction and has
the right to choose solutions to his own problems.
Each individual is regarded as possessing a drive toward
growth and self-realization and the goal of the (coun-
selor) is to act as a catalytic agent, encouraging free
expression of feeling. The (counselor) accepts the
feelings of the client in a tolerant non-judgmental way
and reflects, clarifies, or rephrases expressions to
help him gain insight.12

Thus, it appears from the foregoing that the elemen-
tary school counselor must take into consideration the

11Lawrence M. Brammer and Everett L. Shostrom,
Therapeutic Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:

12Donald Smith, Counseling and Psychotherapy in
uniqueness of the child, and that he must share with the client some responsibility for the conduct of the interview and for decision-making. The ultimate objective is client self-understanding, self-direction, and fulfillment.

With specific reference to counseling with children, Smith\(^{13}\) has described supportive and re-educational counseling as appropriate to the school setting. Supportive approaches include directive (counselor-centered) counseling, activity group therapy, environmental and educational therapy. Supportive counseling does not seek to produce major changes in personality structure, nor is it generally anticipated that the counselee will, by virtue of counseling, learn to cope with all subsequent difficulties. The emphasis is upon the release of emotional tension, the buttressing of existing defenses, and the relief of symptoms. The goal is that of inducing behavioral change rather than the internal reorganization of personality. Re-educative approaches are based on client-centered or relationship techniques and include individual counseling, play therapy, and interview group therapy. Re-educative counseling aims at developing insight into conscious or near conscious conflicts and the constructive modification of ego mechanisms, goals, self-concepts and symptomatic behavior. The

\(^{13}\)Ibid., pp. 16-17.
objective is social recovery and adjustment to current life or situational difficulties.

The relationship between the client and the counselor as a most essential dimension in counseling with children has been discussed by several writers. Clark Moustakas has devoted a major portion of his book *Psychotherapy with Children* to a discussion of relationship counseling. It is his view that

The relationship between counselor and client is the element which provides the significant growth experience for the child. The relationship is both a means and an end. In relationship counseling there is a respect for the unique nature of the child. The counselor does not view the child in abstractions, or from external judgments. He relates with the child in alive growth experiences. Through such a relationship the child feels a sense of self and self-value. He feels the warm human empathy of the adult and knows that the adult trusts him and believes in him. He comes to regard himself as a person of worth and importance. The counselor helps the child to gradually become himself, and to make creative, responsible use of his abilities and capacities.14

Peters15 is in accord with the above concepts and further, describes a new aspect of the counselor-client relationship. It is his view that relationship counseling enables the counselor to reflect himself as a model for living. The pupil is learning directly and indirectly, and the way in which the counselor lives in the school setting

---


15 Herman J. Peters, "Counseling Elementary School Children," Manuscript (Columbus, Ohio, 1964).
can be a subtle way of pointing out to the pupil some possible avenues for his direction. Peters emphasizes that specific techniques for elementary school counseling would include (1) appraising, (2) information alerting, (3) encouraging, (4) researching, (5) analyzing, (6) interpreting, (7) clarifying, (8) approving, (9) evaluating, and (10) reinforcing.

It should be noted that the present study has drawn a distinction between counseling with disturbed children in clinics and guidance centers and counseling with normal children in the school setting. In the clinic, the counselor generally relies heavily upon such specialized techniques as play therapy, puppetry, and projection. Several limitations prohibit the use of such techniques in the school setting. Among these limitations are time, physical facilities, and the qualifications of the elementary school counselor. Secondly, since the primary function of the school is instructional, it is questionable whether the clinical type services are justifiable in elementary schools.

The position of this writer is that the elementary school counselor assists all boys and girls and that this service can best be described as preventative and developmental. The elementary school counselor may assist the disturbed and maladjusted but he does not attempt long-term therapy nor major structural changes in personality.
Because of the nature of the service he provides and since he assists large numbers of children in an educational setting, the counselor in the elementary school will rely primarily upon the interview as a counseling technique. There is ample evidence that the interview is a useful technique for counseling with children.

Baldwin and Baldwin have written:

"Every child who has some fluency in speech, (i.e., aged three and upwards) can express his hidden mental processes as well as his conscious strivings and desires at a verbal level."

Segar emphasizes that both formal and informal interviews can be used effectively with young children. He claims that interviews can assist the child to understand certain cause and effect relationships, to make more desirable choices of behavior, to solve specific problems, and to develop a personal plan of action.

The use of the interview as a primary technique for counseling with children has been discussed by Yarrow. He describes the interview as a technique particularly well


adapted to uncovering subjective definitions of experiences, to assessing a child’s perceptions of the significant people and events in his environment, and to studying how he conceptualizes his life experiences.

The present research is concerned primarily with the interview as a counseling technique. An attempt will be made to identify dimensions of counseling through the study of verbatim transcripts and to determine the degree to which the selected dimensions exist in interviews with children.

**Dimensions of Counseling**

Controversies in the field of counseling in years past between the directive and non-directive points of view gave rise to a tendency to dichotomize the counseling process. These arguments have tended to confuse the issue by implying a dichotomous situation when in reality, a rather continuous variability seems to exist.

The realization that many counseling phenomena vary in a continuous rather than in dichotomous manner, led several authorities in the field to conceptualize counseling in dimensional terms. The sections which follow will present a brief review of some of these dimensions. Again the reader is urged to consider these as a backdrop for counseling children despite their foundations arising out of settings different from the elementary school situation.
One of the early attempts to conceptualize counseling in dimensional terms was undertaken by Porter.\textsuperscript{19} He devised 24 categories which he combined into four major groups: (1) defining the interview situation, (2) bringing out and developing the problem situation, (3) developing the client's insight, and (4) sponsoring client activity. A few years later, Bordin\textsuperscript{20} also proposed that the counseling process be viewed in terms of dimensions. Bordin described three different ways in which counseling methods varied and discussed how these differences could be viewed in dimensional terms. The counseling dimensions which he proposed were (1) division of responsibility (2) sensitivity of the counselor to the client's feelings and attitudes, and (3) type of counselor responses to clients attitudes.

More recently, Robinson has written:

The counselor in framing his remarks gives consideration to certain basic orientations toward the client. These orientations include (1) acceptance of the client, (2) dealing with the core of the client's remarks, (3) division of responsibility, and (4) amount of leading. Since each orientation can be varied in certain definite ways, these orientations


\textsuperscript{20}E. S. Bordin, "Dimensions of the Counseling Process," Journal of Clinical Psychology, IV, No. 8 (September, 1948), pp. 240-244.
represent "dimensions" of the counseling process which are useful in describing the counseling approach.21

The dimensions of Bordin, Robinson, and others have been investigated in a number of studies. It should be emphasized here that these investigations have dealt with counseling at the college level. To the writer's knowledge, no research has been completed on dimensions of counseling with children. However, several major findings from the research at the college level are pertinent to the present study. These findings are discussed in the sections that follow.

The present research will investigate several aspects of the dimensions of counseling in the elementary school under the headings of (1) Counselor Techniques and (2) Client Behavior. More specifically, the dimensions under investigation include:

A. Counselor Techniques

1. Counselor assumption of responsibility
2. Amount of lead
3. Responding to client feelings or content of client's speech
4. Responding to core of client's remarks

B. Client Behavior

1. Client assumption of responsibility
2. Client-counselor working relationship
3. Growth during the interview

The next several paragraphs will define the above dimensions and will make reference to the research pertinent to each. Illustrations are given when additional clarification seems advisable. Appendix B, Manual for Judges, also contains several excerpts from interviews which are illustrative of the several dimensions.

Dimensions of Counselor Techniques

1. Counselor assumption of responsibility. This dimension refers to the amount of responsibility which the counselor himself assumes, which he permits the client to assume, or which he forces the client to assume during the interview.22 The variation in counselor assumption of responsibility may be illustrated by the following example.

The counselor who opens the interview by saying: "Why don't you tell me why you came in today?" gives considerably more responsibility to the client than the counselor who opens the interview by saying: "I understand you want some advice on study habits."

Three of the dimensions used by Porter23 were related to this dimension. Porter combined counselor responsibility and client responsibility into one dimension.


23Porter, op. cit., p. 218.
Following Porter, Elton\textsuperscript{24} differentiated between client responsibility and counselor responsibility, using each as a separate dimension.

Several additional studies have used this dimension in transcript research and report it to be quite reliable. Carnes\textsuperscript{25} using the Spearman-Brown formula found that the ratings of three judges correlated $+.84$ for this dimension. Elton, using the same rating procedure, reports a reliability coefficient of $+.86$. Data from the above studies suggest that this dimension is quite sensitive and can be reliably rated through the study of transcripts. Each of the two studies mentioned above report that counselors in their sample ranged from complete control of the interview to assigning primary responsibility to the client. The scale which Elton developed for rating this dimension is used in the present study. The scale is found in Chapter III and in Appendix B.

2. \textbf{Amount of Lead}. It is generally agreed that a counselor should make such responses in the interview as will help the client discuss his problem. In describing this dimension Robinson has stated:

\begin{quote}
The counselor's remarks should have a close relationship to the client's just previous remarks. That is,
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{24}Elton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 69.
\item\textsuperscript{25}E. F. Carnes, "Counselor Flexibility: Its Extent and its Relationship to Other Factors in the Interview" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1959).
\end{itemize}
the counselor's remarks should be relevant to the client's needs and interests and should be at the next "rung" above the client's present thinking.

Variation in the amount of lead is a technique used by counselors to stimulate client thinking and development. The degree to which a counselor leads depends upon (1) how far the content of the counselor's remark seems to be ahead of the client's last remark and (2) the degree of pressure or definiteness in the counselor's remarks used to bring about acceptance of new ideas.

The following excerpt may serve to illustrate this dimension:

S.... The situation at home is pretty bad. There's always a lot of arguing and fighting. (pause)

(a) The counselor who desires to provide much lead would respond,

C.... Could you tell me more about that?

(b) The following counselor remark is indicative of general lead.

C.... I see. Things are really pretty bad.

(c) The counselor who provides little or no lead would respond,

C.... Mm. Mm.

---

26 Robinson, op. cit., p. 80.
Several of Porter's categories were concerned with the degree of counselor lead, e.g., developing topic with the client, expressing approval or disapproval, shock, or other personal reaction in regard to the client. Sherman used this dimension in her investigation of counseling techniques. The four lead techniques which she found occurring most frequently were (1) clarification, (2) tentative analysis, (3) interpretation, and (4) urging. She developed a five point scale for rating the technique used most often. This scale was later used in investigations conducted by Davis and Robinson and Elton until it was revised by Carnes.

In a later study, Davis made some slight revisions in the 50 point scale developed by Carnes for use in

27 Porter, op. cit., pp. 221-224.


30 Elton, op. cit.

31 Carnes, op. cit.

rating amount of lead in a counselor remark. This scale is being used in the present research.

The reliability with which this dimension can be rated is suggested by the following findings. Carnes reported a Spearman-Brown combined reliability coefficient of +.84 when three judges rated amount of lead. Elton found a Spearman-Brown coefficient of +.93 when he combined the ratings of two judges. Davis combined the ratings of two judges and reported a reliability coefficient of +.92 for this dimension.

The sensitivity of the amount of lead dimension is indicated in the studies of Elton and Davis mentioned above. Each investigator reports that not only do counselors differ from each other in the amount of lead used, but that they also tend to use a wide range of leading techniques. Davis found that the counselors in his study varied in mean amount of lead from 10 to 30 points on a 50 point scale.

The available research on this dimension indicates that it can be rated with reasonably high reliability. Rating scales used in previous studies hold considerable promise for additional counseling research.

33 Carnes, op. cit., p. 127.
34 Elton, op. cit., p. 141.
35 Davis, op. cit., p. 148.
3. Responding to client feelings or content of client's speech. One of Bordin's major dimensions in counseling is the degree of attention or sensitivity of the counselor's responses to client's attitudes and feelings. Bordin writes that most counselor responses show considerable attention to the content of the client's remarks, but relatively little attention to the attitudes that are expressed in this content. He holds that responses to feeling is more important than responses to content, while others maintain that both are important and neither can be neglected.

The following excerpt may clarify this dimension.

S.... I always seem to make low grades. But I study; (short pause) study quite a lot. I just can't seem to keep my mind on it. School is not too interesting, and I always seem to think of other things.

(a) A counselor responding primarily to content says,

C.... You study but still get low marks.

(b) A counselor responding more to the attitude or feeling expressed says,

C.... You don't find school very interesting.

The only attempt to study this dimension to date was made by Elton in 1951. He devised a scale for

---


37 Elton, op. cit., p. 73.
classifying the two extreme responses of this dimension, i.e., whether the counselor responded to content or whether he responded to the feeling aspects of the client's speech. In addition, an unclassifiable category was provided for counselor remarks which could not be rated for either content or feeling. He found that his judges could agree to a reasonably great extent in rating this dimension. His report also shows that most counselors tend to respond to content most of the time.

The scale used by Elton has been slightly revised for use in the present study. An example of the revised scale is found in Chapter III and in Appendix A.

4. Responding to the core of the client's remarks. This dimension as described by Robinson is based on the assumption that a client usually tries to express a central or "core" idea in each of his remarks. Even when the client expresses several ideas in one remark, one of these is of primary importance. If the client is to profit from counseling, the counselor must deal with the point of most interest to the client rather than irrelevant aspects of the client's speech. Since clients often express their ideas in a vague and inarticulate way, the counselor must be particularly skilled and remain alert so that responses are to the significant aspects of the client's remarks. The

---

Robinson, op. cit., p. 75.
following examples illustrate the two extreme points in this dimension.

S.... Every time I try to study at home they interrupt. My brother plays the transistor all evening. Rock and roll, and the top forty. I asked my mother to make him stop so I could finish my work. She just grunted. My father plays the TV and argues with my mother. Can't get anything done.

(Counselor response to core remark)
C.... You don't feel you get any consideration at home.

(Response to non-core aspect of client speech)
C.... Why don't you study at school?

To the writer's knowledge, the only research on this dimension was completed by Elton.\(^{39}\) He devised a four category rating device for use by three judges in rating this dimension. The actual categories into which judges were asked to classify counselor remarks were (1) Core, (2) Secondary, (3) New, and (4) Unclassifiable.

Elton's instructions for judges emphasized that the main criteria to consider in classifying a counselor speech as a core response was whether the client would probably feel that the counselor was primarily interested in his preceding remark. Counselor responses considered core

\(^{39}\)Elton, op. cit., pp. 70-72.
responses were restatement, clarification, tentative analysis, interpretation and urging.

Although a counselor may respond to the core of the client's speech, he may often inadvertently respond to an idea that is secondary to the problem as it is expressed by the client. Elton, therefore, provided a category on the rating scale for counselor responses to secondary aspects of the client's speech.

Elton also felt that some counselor responses may deal with an entirely new idea following a client speech. The category into which this type of counselor response was placed was labeled "new." In addition, he instructed his judges that some counselor remarks could not logically be placed in either of the above schema. These remarks were to be placed in an "unclassifiable" category.

In his analysis of the results Elton obtained chi-square values indicating a high degree of reliability of the extent to which the counselors dealt with the core of the client's remarks. His report indicates that there are wide differences in individual counselor techniques on this dimension when different topics are discussed in the interview. For example there were significant differences in counselor response to skill topics, and adjustment topics.

It should be noted that the clients in Elton's study were college students and that he was primarily
interested in counselor behavior in interviews dealing with skill topics and adjustment topics. The rationale for including this dimension in the present study was to determine the interview behavior of counselors with children with regard to the core remark. However, no attempt was made to classify the topic discussed in the interview.

**Dimensions of Client Behavior**

1. **Client assumption of responsibility.** The willingness on the part of the client to take responsibility for attacking the problem being discussed and for facing new problems as they arise is widely recognized as a desirable outcome in counseling. The responsibility dimension has received major attention from both Bordin and Robinson. This dimension is based on the assumption that it takes two to make a conference and that both have to work together for the conference to be effective. As used in the present study "Client Assumption of Responsibility," is the counterpart of the counselor dimension "Counselor Assumption of Responsibility," discussed in a preceding section.

   When a client assumes primary responsibility the counselor still plays an active role. He remains alert to

---

what is happening so that he can assist the client to move on to the next stage. Client responsibility simply means that the client feels that he is directing what is taking place in the interview.

Responsibility taking may vary from moment to moment to meet the needs of the situation. For example, at the start of a conference the client may assume total responsibility for describing the nature of his problem. The counselor assumes primarily the role of the listerner; he may indicate from time to time that he understands or ask for further elaboration. Later, the counselor may assume more responsibility as in the case of providing information or describing possible alternative plans of action for the client.

Judges for the present study were instructed to concern themselves primarily with client behavior when rating this dimension, as opposed to counselor technique when rating "Counselor Assumption of Responsibility." That is, judges were asked to rate the willingness and the ability of the client to assume responsibility for the interview. Client assumption of responsibility means not only responsibility for the interview, but also includes responsibility for planning a solution to the problem at hand.

The following examples are illustrative of this dimension.
(a) The client assumes major responsibility for discussing the problem.

S.... I just can't get along with them. Dennis, Ted, Karl, and all of them...., they pick on me and call me names. Yesterday I tried to play touch and they wouldn't let me... They say I'm a cry baby and that I cheat.

C.... I see. Mm.

S.... Then last night on the way home they got my cap and kept tossing it until it fell in the water and got wet. I hit Ted on the arm...and I'll get him good...just wait.... and all of them.

C.... (Long pause) You seem to have several difficulties with most of the fellows in your class. (pause) Have you considered how you might help the situation?

(b) The client refuses to accept responsibility for solving the problem:

S.... No. They don't like me anyway, so what's the use?

(c) The client may assume some responsibility as shown in the following remark.

S.... Un., well I guess. If I knew what to do.

(d) The client who accepts major responsibility for solving his problem may respond as follows:

S.... Yes. I want to be friends with them. Maybe if I tried to ......

One of the first workers to investigate this problem was Sherman.\(^2\) She used a five point scale ranging from situations in which the counselor took complete

\(^2\)Sherman, op. cit.
responsibility, to situations in which major responsibility was assumed by the client.

The rating scale developed by Sherman was used by several investigators until Carnes and Elton pointed out the desirability of conceiving responsibility-taking in two dimensions (Counselor Assumption of Responsibility, and Client Assumption of Responsibility) instead of only one. The scale which these research workers developed for rating client assumption of responsibility was later used by McCormick and Muthard.

Reports from the above studies reveal that this dimension can be rated with a high degree of reliability. McCormick reports an inter-judge reliability coefficient of $+.88$. Muthard obtained a Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient of $+.73$.

Elton reports that the ratings of his judges were well distributed over the fifty point scale. Carnes

---

43 Carnes, op. cit.
44 Elton, op. cit.
46 J. E. Muthard, "The Relative Effectiveness of Larger Units Used in Interview Analysis" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1952).
47 Elton, op. cit., p. 129.
48 Carnes, op. cit., p. 144.
found a range of ratings from 10 to 46 on a fifty point scale.

One of the major arguments in elementary school counseling centers around whether the child can or will assume responsibility for the counseling interview and for finding a solution to his problems. The writer believes that the scale developed by Carnes and Elton can be reliably used for measuring this aspect of interview behavior in children and it will, therefore, be used in this study.

2. Client-counselor working relationship. The quality of the relationship between the client and the counselor has long been recognized as an important determinant of progress in the counseling interview. A good working relationship refers to the degree to which client and counselor exhibit mutual trust, acceptance, warmth, and respect. A good working relationship also refers to cooperative attempts on the part of the client and counselor to find solutions to the problem at hand.

Poor working relationship may be characterized by client passivity, resistance, and even belligerence. The client may refuse to talk about the problem, he may give monosyllabic responses, change the subject, or attempt to terminate the interview as soon as possible.
The following excerpt is illustrative of a poor working relationship. In this case the client is not only resistant to counseling, but rejects the counselor as well.

C.... Hello, Mike.
S.... (Silence)
C.... Would you like to sit down?
S.... (Sits. Remains silent)
C.... Your teacher thought you should see me again today, Mike. She felt that you had several problems and maybe we could discuss them.
S.... Mm.
C.... (Short Pause) Would you like to discuss these things with me?
S.... No! You can't help. Besides I don't know why she sent me.

A good working relationship might be characterized by the following client responses.

C.... Mike, we are here to help you when we can and when you need us. If you like, we can discuss the problem now.
S.... Alright....uh, uh....(pause)
C.... Just tell me what you can about it.
S.... Yes. Well the big problem right now is......

The first systematic investigation of working relationship was completed by Sherman. Using a five-point

---

49 Sherman, op. cit.
scale she obtained perfect agreement with another judge 69 per cent of the time on ratings for 28 interviews.

Carnes and Robinson\textsuperscript{50} studied the relationship of the amount of client talk in the interview to working relationship. They computed the "talk ratio," i.e., the proportion of client talk to total talk, for each unit discussed. They found that talk ratio correlated only $+ .31$ with working relationship. They concluded that while there tends to be a slight relationship between client talk and working relationship, the amount of client talk should not be used as the sole measure of working relationship.

Several research workers have used similar versions of the Sherman scale for rating this dimension. The 50 point scale developed by Carnes\textsuperscript{51} appears to be the scheme most widely used and several reports indicate that it is probably the most reliable.

Carnes combining the ratings of three judges in his study reports a reliability coefficient of $+ .81$ for the rating of working relationship. Davis\textsuperscript{52} found a Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient of $+ .77$ between himself and another rater.

\textsuperscript{50}E. F. Carnes and Frances F. Robinson, "The Role of Client Talk in the Counseling Interview," \textit{Educational Psychological Measurement}, VIII (Spring, 1948), pp. 635-644.

\textsuperscript{51}Carnes, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{52}Davis, op. cit.
The spread of the ratings obtained in various studies points up the sensitivity of this dimension. Sherman\textsuperscript{53} found a range of ratings from 2 - 5, on her five point scale. A similar range of ratings was reported by later research workers such as Carnes,\textsuperscript{54} Good and Robinson,\textsuperscript{55} and Elton.\textsuperscript{56} For example, Muthard\textsuperscript{57} found that the ratings of his judges ranged from 11 to 45 on a 50 point scale.

3. **Client growth during the interview.** This dimension is defined as client movement toward the development of insight into his problems. Studies of this concept have also attempted to measure client objectivity and the ability of the client to achieve a realistic appraisal of himself.

While growth during the interview is an important dimension of client behavior, it has proved to be somewhat more difficult to rate reliably than the other dimensions. There are several reasons why it is difficult to judge the degree of client growth during the interview. First, some clients, out of politeness to the counselor, will state

\textsuperscript{53}Sherman, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{54}Carnes, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{55}Good and Robinson, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{56}Elton, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{57}Muthard, op. cit.
that the conference has helped them when in reality they have no intention of following through on planning. Second, it is difficult to assess acceptance remarks such as "mm hm" which the client makes following suggestions made by the counselor. Is the client agreeing, or is he merely responding in a way which he feels will satisfy the counselor? Finally, it is impossible to rate any insight or growth which remains unverbalized. 58

The five-point scale devised by Sherman 59 and later used by Good and Robinson 60 has produced a broad variability of ratings for this dimension. Sherman found agreement between herself and one other judge in only 42 per cent of the cases analyzed. Good and Robinson report a Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient of +.856 for their three judges.

Following the above studies, Carnes 61 revised the Sherman scale and obtained a reliability coefficient of +.86 between himself and one other judge. McCormick 62 used the Carnes revision; however, his results are not clearly reported.

59 Sherman, op. cit.
60 Good and Robinson, op. cit.
61 Carnes, op. cit.
62 McCormick, op. cit.
While previous research on this dimension tends to show some inconsistency in reliability of rating, it is felt that the findings by Carnes are sufficiently reliable to warrant further research. The Carnes scale has been expanded into a five category (50 point) continuum scale for use in the present study. A copy of the present scale is found in Appendix A.

Research on Interview Analysis

The first attempts to use verbatim transcripts in counseling research were made in the early 1940's. The pioneer research workers were faced with the task of determining whether verbatim transcripts were a legitimate field of scientific inquiry. The now classic studies of Porter and Snyder in 1943 served to prove that transcripts could be reliably used in counseling research. Sherman's 1945 study of the relationship between counselor technique and outcomes gave further impetus to the use of transcripts as a field of inquiry.

One of the major problems facing the early research workers in transcript analysis was the choice of a unit of the counseling interview that would permit observation of

63 Porter, op. cit.

the variables under investigation. The next few pages will discuss the various units previously used in interview analysis.

The single remark unit

The earliest studies used single counselor and client remarks and portions of single remarks as units for interview analysis. Porter, in his attempt to quantify procedures in the counseling process, used separate counselor speeches as his unit of analysis. He developed a checklist which was used to categorize the techniques used by counselors in 19 recorded interviews. His categories were combined into five major counselor functions: (1) defining the interview situation, (2) developing the problem situation, (3) developing the client's insight, (4) information-giving and explanation, and (5) sponsoring client activity or fostering decision making. Porter reports that his three judges placed counselor responses in the same broad category 63 per cent of the time.

Following Porter, other investigators used the single remark as a unit of analysis for a number of purposes. Carnes, Elton, and Davis have all used the

65 Porter, op. cit.
66 Carnes, op. cit.
67 Elton, op. cit.
68 Davis, op. cit.
single remark unit in studying amount of lead in counseling. Davis and Robinson⁶⁹ used the single remark unit in their study of techniques used by counselors to reduce client resistance during the interview.

The single remark unit has certain advantages and disadvantages in interview analysis. Some of its major advantages are (1) it can be easily identified in a verbatim transcript, (2) it gives some measure of the reaction of one participant to a remark of the other, and (3) it permits study of the characteristics of various kinds of client and counselor speeches.

Some of the limitations of this unit include: (1) a single remark may contain several ideas or feelings which cannot be logically classified, (2) many single speeches are quite short and are difficult to rate reliably, and (3) it is difficult to judge the effects of preceding remarks when rating only a single remark.

The idea unit

In an attempt to overcome some of the limitations of the single remark unit, several investigators have employed another type of analytical unit known as the idea

The idea unit may be described as a group of consecutive or counselor words that express a complete idea or thought.

Snyder used the idea unit in his investigation of the relationship of counselor remarks to client responses. He divided his recorded interviews into idea units, and then had his raters categorize both counselor and client ideas in terms of content and feeling expressed.

Several other workers have found the idea unit useful in typescript research. Dollard and Mowrer, in their investigation of methods of measuring tension in documents, report that the idea unit is more useful as an analytic technique than the single word or sentence unit. Good and Robinson used the idea unit as the basis for their determination of the Discomfort-Relief-Quotient for each of their interviews.

The major advantage of the idea or thought unit is that the interview remarks can be divided so as to include only a single expression of feeling regardless of the amount of talk present in a statement. However, previous

70 Snyder, op. cit.
research has pointed up the difficulty of obtaining reliable ratings of the idea unit. It is felt that the size of the unit is a major factor in obtaining reliable ratings. Because of these difficulties, the idea unit has not been used widely in transcript research.

The interview fraction

Fractions of interviews have been used as a unit in a limited number of investigations of counseling dimensions. Lewis,73 in her study of the responses of six delinquent girls, divided each of several interviews into deciles. In describing this unit, Lewis noted that a tenth of the total course of interviews was accepted as comparable to the same tenth of the course of the interviews in another case. This division into units formed the basis for comparison, but was not regarded as a functional concept derived from the material.

The chief advantage of the fractional unit appears to lie in the fact that it permits observation of trends in client and counselor behavior at different points in the interview.

The major weaknesses of this unit have been described by Davis.74 He notes that the interview fraction

74Davis, op. cit.
divides the interview without due regard for the dynamics within the interview. That is, the division may fall in the middle of a discussion of some topic, thus excluding later material which may be quite relevant to an understanding of the dynamics of that part of the interview. These weaknesses appear to place serious limitations upon the use of the fractional unit in counseling research.

The discussion topic unit

A fourth type of Analytical unit that has been used in counseling research is the discussion topic unit. Davis\(^75\) has defined this unit as "all the client and counselor talk pertaining to a single topic." There may be several discussion topics within a single interview. For example, the client and counselor may first discuss the client's poor grades; later they may shift to a discussion of his reading problem as a factor in poor achievement.

Sherman\(^76\) was the first to use the discussion topic unit in transcript research. Her three judges were in agreement 95 per cent of the time on the location of the unit divisions. Following its initial use by Sherman, this unit was used by Good and Robinson\(^77\) in their study of

\(^75\)Davis, op. cit.

\(^76\)Sherman, op. cit.

\(^77\)Good and Robinson, op. cit.
client talk during the interview. Elton\textsuperscript{78} used this unit in his investigation of client responsibility taking. Davis\textsuperscript{79} discussed the discussion topic unit at some length in his study of client characteristics in the interview. His comments are summarized below:

1. Topics within the interview can be reliably identified.
2. It permits study of the delayed effects of counselor remarks.
3. It is a psychologically meaningful unit in that it consists of all client and counselor talk about a single topic.
4. It lends itself readily to a study of the characteristics of client and counselor behavior in connection with any particular topic.

The above remarks are illustrative of the statements of several investigators who have used this unit. Thus, it appears that the discussion topic is a reliable unit for use in counseling research.

The whole interview as a unit

The largest unit which has been used in transcript research is that of the entire interview. In this case all client and counselor talk during a single interview is analyzed. Representative studies using this unit have been reported by Raimy and Davis.

\textsuperscript{78}Elton, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{79}Davis, op. cit.
Raimy investigated the relationship between client self-evaluative remarks and immediate outcomes of counseling through the use of the entire interview as a unit. He had three judges classify client remarks according to whether they contained positive, negative, or ambivalent references.

Davis used the whole interview as an analytical unit in his investigation of client characteristics shown in interview behavior. He reports that this unit is one of the most valuable known units when the investigation involves only one interview with each client.

The major advantages of this unit are that it enables the investigator to describe all the important dimensions in a given interview and it permits observation of client and counselor behavior at different points in the interview. As Robinson has stated:

An over-all rating can indicate the general counseling plan used and helps determine whether the interview was effective or ineffective.

The major disadvantage of this unit is that many of the interactions that take place in an interview cannot be identified.

---


Davis, op. cit.

Rationale for the unit used in this study

Each of the analytical units described above has definite advantages and disadvantages. When used in counseling research their usefulness will vary depending upon the nature of the problem under investigation and the purpose of the researcher.

For purposes of the present study a unit is desired that will permit an observation of technique used by an elementary school counselor and which will enable the investigator to determine client reaction to these techniques. The single remark, the idea unit, the interview fraction, and the discussion topic unit were discarded as being too limited in scope to give valuable clues to counselor techniques and client behavior. It was then decided to use the whole interview as the analytical unit with the thought that the smaller units might tend to obscure the variables under investigation. Too, previous research has revealed that raters are more adept at identifying the general processes used in the interview when an over-all rating is used.

SUMMARY

This chapter has reviewed the literature pertinent to this study. Major emphasis has been given to examining concepts of counseling with children, dimensions of
counseling, and the research on transcript analysis. An understanding of these factors is essential to an investigation of counseling dimensions with children.

It was noted that to date, no careful investigation of counseling children in the elementary school has been completed. Distinction was made between counseling disturbed children in the clinic, and counseling normal children in the school setting.

The dimensions of counselor techniques and client behavior selected for use in the present study were described. These dimensions are as follows:

A. Counselor Techniques
   1. Counselor Assumption of Responsibility
   2. Amount of Lead
   3. Responding to Client Feeling or Content
   4. Responding to Core of Client's Remarks

B. Client Behavior
   1. Client Assumption of Responsibility
   2. Client-Counselor Working Relationship
   3. Growth During the Interview

The rationale for the use of the entire interview as an analytical unit was given in the final section of Chapter II.

In Chapter III, the procedures, design, and methodology of this study will be described.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Previous research, as set forth in the preceding chapter, has shown that transcript research is a legitimate field of scientific inquiry. Several notable investigations of counseling have been predicated upon the notion of viewing counseling in dimensional terms. Following this lead, the present study analyzed elementary school counseling in terms of counselor techniques and client behavior.

This chapter includes a description of the procedures used in this research. A discussion on the selection of data used in this study is given. The selection and training of judges is described. The dimensions selected for use in this study are defined. Finally, the statistical procedures used in the study are explained.

SELECTION OF THE DATA

Verbatim transcripts of counseling interviews with elementary school children comprise the basic data used in this study. In an effort to permit broad generalizations of the findings, transcripts from three separate school systems were used. A total of twenty interviews were used,
of which ten were from schools in City A, five from schools in City B, and five from the City C school system. Table 1 shows the number of interviews by grade used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>City A</th>
<th>City B</th>
<th>City C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counselors who participated in the interviews were asked to record at random several interviews with elementary school children. They were informed that the transcripts would be used in counseling research; however, they were not advised of the nature of the research. When the transcripts were submitted to the researcher, two of the four counselors stated that two of their interviews had been recorded prior to their agreement to participate in the study. These four transcripts are used in the study.
A total of 26 electrically recorded interviews were collected. One was discarded when it was discovered that the interview consisted primarily of coaxing the child to stop crying and return to the classroom. A second transcript was not used because another child entered the counseling room and remained for several minutes. In two cases the quality of the recording was very poor and the transcripts were discarded on that basis. Two additional transcripts were arbitrarily discarded by the investigator in order to have an equal number of interviews from each participating counselor. Thus, in this study, five transcribed interviews for each of the four participating counselors were used making a total of twenty transcribed interviews.

The counselors who participated in this study were all experienced school counselors who had completed at least a master's degree in guidance and counseling. Three were employed as counselors in the public elementary schools. One was of professional rank who regularly teaches courses in counseling and who also serves as a part-time counselor for the public schools. These four counselors are in all probability representative of the counselors serving in the elementary schools.

The interviews from the several schools are considered representative of the types of problems and counseling procedures found in those schools. Most of the
interviews seem to deal with functional non-incapacitating problems. For example, the problems which the children bring to the counselor range from situational, i.e., study habits, grades, and peer relationships, to minor personal disturbances. In a large percentage of the cases, the referral is made by the teacher or the parent. Other school specialists, such as the visiting teacher, school psychologist, nurse and speech therapist, regularly refer children to the elementary school counselor. It is presumed that a majority of children who receive the services of a counselor in the elementary school fall within the normal range. The use of interviews representing a variety of problems from grades 1 - 6 would seem to provide a reasonably sound basis for generalizing from the results. Table 2 gives the type of problems which the participating counselors labeled "primary" in each of the twenty interviews.

The Judges

The experimenter and three other persons served as judges and rated each of the interviews used in the study. All judges have had considerable experience in guidance and counseling. Two hold doctorates in the field; one is an elementary school counselor, and one is a former counselor who now teaches educational psychology and guidance at the college level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Referred by</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underachievement</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underachievement</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Problem</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying in Class</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationships</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationships</td>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Promotion</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Phobia</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying and refusing to take spelling test</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Interpretation</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Another Student</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Behavior</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Behavior</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Conduct in Class</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The training of the judges involved a general meeting with the experimenter and a detailed discussion of the purposes and methods of the study. Second, a manual of instructions was prepared. (See Appendix B.) After the judges had studied the manual of instructions, a second training session was held for the purpose of discussing the rating scale and to clear up points of misunderstanding. During the rating period, the experimenter maintained weekly contact with the judges in an effort to clarify problems and to answer questions.

Rating Procedure

One of the major questions confronting any investigator who attempts to analyze the counseling process is whether primary attention should be focused upon the counselor or upon the client. Both counselor technique and client behavior in the interview are important determinants of counseling outcome and each has been the subject of several investigations. It logically follows that if the primary interest of the research worker is to determine counselor methods, counselor attitudes, counselor responsibility, and numerous other counselor variables, then research attention will focus upon counselor behavior in the interview. On the other hand, if the researcher is concerned with the way in which the client experiences the counseling relationship, the responsibility which the
client assumes for solving his problem, and the growth that takes place as a result of counseling, then the investigator must necessarily give maximum attention to client behavior in the interview.

The present investigator was interested in answers to such questions as the following:

1. What techniques did the counselor use?
2. What was the general plan of counseling?
3. Are the techniques employed by the elementary school counselor similar to or different from those used by counselors of adolescents?
4. Did the client assume some responsibility for counseling?
5. What is the quality of the client-counselor relationship?
6. Can dimensions of counseling with children be identified and characterized?

Thus it can be seen that answers to these questions necessitated research attention to both counselor technique and client behavior. The rationale for the more global type analysis of elementary school counseling and for the use of the research methods employed herein are given below.

First, counseling with children in the elementary school setting has not yet been carefully investigated. It is believed that the present study can make a significant contribution to the field of counseling by describing the characteristic nature of counseling dimensions with children. Second, research on counseling dimensions with
adults has proved that counselor techniques and client behavior can be identified and characterized through an analysis of recorded interviews. This body of research data will aid in making comparisons of the results and interpretations of the present study. Third, adequate and reliable scales have already been developed for measuring counseling dimensions. The availability of reliable scales is of particular importance when the research is in an area where relatively little research has been attempted.

The dimensions used are believed to be adequately representative of counselor technique and client behavior for the purpose of this study. A brief definition and the method of measuring each of the dimensions investigated is presented below.

Counselor techniques

1. Counselor assumption of responsibility. This dimension refers to the amount of responsibility which the counselor assumes, which he permits the client to assume, or which he forces the client to assume during the interview.

Previous research has shown that responsibility-taking is two-dimensional, i.e., counselor and client. Hence it is necessary in the present study to distinguish between responsibility-taking as a counselor technique, and responsibility-taking as client behavior. The method of
measuring client responsibility-taking is discussed in a succeeding section.

In rating this dimension, judges were instructed to disregard the amount of responsibility which the client actually took in the interview. The task of the rater was to decide whether the counselor intended to assume major responsibility for the interview and for solving the client's problems, or whether he intended the client to take that responsibility. The scale used in rating this dimension is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor assumes primarily responsibility</th>
<th>Counselor assigns primarily responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complete responsibility</td>
<td>divided responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible</td>
<td>responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bility</td>
<td>bility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive phrases indicating various degrees of responsibility-taking were developed in an attempt to refine the scale and to permit statistical treatment of the several ratings.

Judges were instructed to make a global rating for each transcribed interview. That is, on the basis of counselor remarks, judges were to determine the degree of responsibility which the counselor assumed or which he assigned to the client. A numerical score for each interview was obtained by counting the dots from the left point on the scale to the point designated by the judges check ( ). Since four ratings were made on each interview,
the mean of these ratings was used as the score for that interview.

2. **Amount of lead in counseling.** The most adequate definition of this dimension is found in Robinson's book on *Student Counseling*. He states that lead is a technique used by many counselors to help the client develop an idea, to attempt to assist the client in discussing his problem, or to help the client see himself more clearly. The degree to which the counselor's remark "leads" the client depends upon: (1) how far the counselor remark seems to be ahead of the client's last remark, and (2) the degree of definiteness or pressure in the counselor's remark. The rating scale developed by Carnes and used in the present study is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silence</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
<th>General Lead</th>
<th>Tentative Analysis</th>
<th>Urging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to treat the data derived from this scale statistically, it was necessary to devise a scheme whereby the ratings from one judge could be compared with the ratings of the other judges. This was accomplished by

---

labeling the extreme left of the scale zero units of lead, while the extreme right of the scale was called fifty units of lead. Judges were instructed to determine the extent to which each counselor remark "leads" the client. For example, if there were ten counselor speeches in the interview, there would be ten checks ( ) on the scale. The ratings were totaled and a median rating for each counselor and each interview was obtained.

3. Responding to client feelings or content of client's speech. According to Bordin\(^2\) a most important dimension in counseling is the degree of counselor sensitivity to the client's attitudes and feelings. Following Bordin's lead, several investigators have attempted to determine whether the counselor gives more attention to the client's feelings about the topic discussed in the interview, or to the subject matter in the client's statements. In the present study an attempt was made to identify and characterize this dimension in counseling interviews with elementary school children.

The categories used by Elton\(^3\) for investigating this dimension are used in the present research. Categories


were provided for the two extreme points on the dimension, i.e., content and feeling. In addition, an unclassifiable category was provided for counselor remarks which could not be rated for either content or feeling. The scale for rating this dimension is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Unclassifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Judges were instructed to place each counselor remark in the appropriate category. Ratings were then totaled for each interview. Then the mean number of ratings in each category was used as the score for a given interview.

4. Responding to core of client's remarks.

Robinson has stated that a major dimension in counseling is the "counselor response to the core of the client's remarks." He maintains that if the client is to benefit from counseling, the counselor must talk about the point of most interest to the client rather than irrelevant aspects of the client's speech.

An attempt was made in the present study to determine whether this dimension could be reliably measured as well as to characterize its general nature when counseling with children. The present investigator has relied heavily
upon Elton's categories for measuring this dimension. He postulated that although a counselor may respond to the core of the client's speech, oftentimes the counselor may respond to an idea that is secondary, or that the counselor may deal with an entirely new idea following a client speech. The Elton categories for measuring this dimension are used in the present study. These categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Unclassifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Judges for the present study were asked to determine whether the counselor responded to the main idea of the client's speech, whether he dealt with a secondary aspect of the remark, or whether the counselor's responses represented a new idea or topic. Any counselor response which could not be logically placed in the above three categories was placed in the "unclassifiable" category. A rating was made on each counselor remark. Ratings were then totaled for each interview. Then the mean number of ratings in each category was used as the score for a given interview.

Client behavior

1. Client assumption of responsibility. This is the counterpart of the counselor dimension described in a
preceding section. Client-responsibility refers to the willingness on the part of the client to work toward the solution of his problems and to face new problems as they arise.

The scale used for rating this dimension has five major divisions, with intervening points to permit intermediate ratings. This scale is given below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Q}_1 & \quad \text{Md.} \quad \text{Q}_3 \\
\text{Client assumes} & \quad \text{Client assumes} \\
\text{no responsibility} & \quad \text{a great deal} \\
& \quad \text{of responsibility}
\end{align*}
\]

The extreme left point on the scale was arbitrarily labeled zero units of responsibility assumption, while the extreme right of the scale was called 50 units of client responsibility assumption. A numerical rating was then obtained by counting the dots from the left end of the scale to the point designated by the judge's check mark. The ratings of the four judges was then averaged to determine a single score for each interview used in the study.

2. Client-counselor working relationship. The quality of the working relationship between the counselor and the client has long been recognized as an important determiner of counseling outcome. Working relationship refers to the degree of mutual trust, respect, and acceptance existing between the counselor and the client.
Working relationship was rated on a global basis. That is, the judge listened to the transcript and rated this dimension by placing a check (✓) at some point on the scale given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Q₁</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>Q₃</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A numerical rating for each interview was then obtained by counting the dots from the left end of the scale to the point designated by the judge's check mark. The ratings given each interview by the four judges was then averaged to determine a single score for each of the interviews used in the study.

3. Growth during the interview. This dimension refers to the development of new insights, gains in skill, self-acceptance, and planning on the part of the client. Several scales have been developed for rating this dimension and the various researchers report a wide range of results. The scale used by Carne appears to offer the most promise and was therefore used in the present study. This scale, showing the five major divisions for rating client growth, is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little or no growth</th>
<th>Q₁</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>Q₃</th>
<th>Much Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This dimension was rated on a global basis. That is, each judge listened to the transcript and rated the interview by placing a check mark at the appropriate point on the scale. The score for a given interview was obtained for each of the 20 interviews used in this study.

**Description of Statistical Terms**

**Analysis of variance.** The total sums of squares of each one identifiable with a given source of variation. The "F" test was used.

**Analysis of covariance.** The extension of the method used in the analysis of variance to segregate from comparable groups of data the covariance in two or more measured variables.

**Covariance.** The mean of the products of paired deviations of two variables.

**Significance of difference.** A process by which mean scores of groups can be compared to determine whether the difference between the two values are occurring by chance only.

**Multiple regression analysis.** In a multiple regression analysis the regression equation is a linear equation used to estimate the mean value of a dependent variable from the given values of the independent variable. The regression coefficient is a constant in the regression equation.
Statistical Procedures Used

The data of the study were processed in IBM cards and a multiple regression analysis was performed on the IBM 7090 Computer. The Numerical Statistics Laboratory, The Ohio State University, performed all statistical analyses. Variables were introduced into the multiple regression analysis and their actions and interactions were taken into consideration in arriving at the mean differences. Using a one-tailed test, differences at the .05 per cent level of confidence were considered significant, i.e., differences as great as these could not have happened by chance in 95 trials out of a hundred. Interactions within and between groups that are reported in this chapter are significant at the .05 per cent level of confidence.

SUMMARY

The basic data for this study consists of twenty electrically recorded interviews with children in grades 1 - 6. The interviews were recorded by four counselors in three school systems located in Ohio and Michigan. These interviews were used for analyzing counseling with children in terms of (1) counselor technique and (2) client behavior.
A scale was prepared for rating the following dimensions of counseling:

1. Counselor assumption of responsibility
2. Amount of lead in counseling
3. Responding to content or feelings of client's speech
4. Responding to core of client's remarks
5. Client assumption of responsibility
6. Client-counselor working relationship
7. Client growth during the interview

Following instruction by the investigator, four judges listened to the transcribed interviews and completed a rating for each interview. The rating scale and instructions for the judges are found in Appendix A and B respectively.

A discussion of the results of this study is found in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This investigation was conducted in an attempt to find answers to seven questions relating to counselor techniques and client behavior in the interview. The first four questions are related to the behavior of the counselor in the interview and are placed under the heading of counselor techniques. The last three questions deal with the behavior of the client in the interview and fall under the heading of client behavior. These questions will be restated prior to the presentation of the analysis of data which relates to each question.

Counselor Techniques

Question 1

In counseling with children how much responsibility is assumed by the elementary school counselor?

Counselor assumption of responsibility was measured on a fifty point scale (Appendix A). In order to analyze question 1 mean scores for each counselor with each of five clients were determined. Tests on the significance of difference between means were performed and the mean
difference on the dimension of counselor responsibility assumption was determined.

It will be noted that judges were instructed to determine whether the counselor intended to assume major responsibility for the interview or whether he intended the client to assume that responsibility. In general, a rating falling to the left of the median would be indicative of counselor assumption of responsibility, while a rating on the right side of the median suggests that the counselor intends that the client assume major responsibility for the interview. Tables 3 through 8 present the data which were obtained from the analysis for question 1.

**TABLE 3.**—Mean amount of responsibility assumed by Counselor A with each of five clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Responsibility Assumed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.7 .......................... 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.5 .......................... 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.7 .......................... 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.2 .......................... 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.2 .......................... 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reveals that counselor A has assumed primary responsibility in the interviews with clients 2 and 4. The mean score of 34.2 with client 5 on this dimension suggests that the counselor assigned primary responsibility for the
Interview to the client. In the case of clients 1 and 3 the scores are sufficiently close to the median to warrant the conclusion that responsibility was evenly divided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores on responsibility assumption for Counselor B indicate that he assigned primary responsibility to only Client 1 of his five clients. Responsibility taking in the interview with Client 2 is quite close to the median and is almost evenly divided. The scores for interviews with Clients 3, 4, and 5 fall significantly to the left of the median on the scale and are indicative of counselor assumption of primary responsibility.

A wide variation of counselor techniques with different clients is shown for Counselor C in Table 5. It will be noted that in two cases, clients 2 and 3, the primary responsibility for the interview has been assigned to the client. In the interview with client 5 the
counselor appears to have assumed complete responsibility. The responsibility is almost evenly divided in the interview with client 1.

### TABLE 5.—Mean amount of responsibility assumed by Counselor C with each of five clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Mean Amount of Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 reveals that Counselor D has assumed primary responsibility for the interview with three of his five clients. The mean score of 29 on the counselor technique of responsibility assumption with client 2 suggests that the counselor has assigned primary responsibility to the client. In the interview with client 3 responsibility appears to be almost evenly divided.

Table 7 shows the mean difference for counselors and judges on this dimension. These differences were not significant at the .05 per cent level of confidence.
TABLE 6.--Mean amount of responsibility assumed by Counselor D with each of five clients

Client No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7.--Mean difference on counselor responsibility assumption for counselors and judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>262.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87.45</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>392.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130.97</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7174.41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7829.68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of ratings for the four counselors are given in Table 8. The range represents points on the scale used for rating this dimension and are based upon responses made by a counselor in the interview.
TABLE 8.—Range of ratings on counselor assumption of responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Range*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ratings were made on a 50 point scale.

The data in Tables 3 through 8 suggest that elementary school counselors use a variety of techniques with different clients on the counselor assumption of responsibility dimension. The data presented for this dimension lead to the general conclusion that elementary school counselors intentionally assume some responsibility for many of their counseling interviews. It should be emphasized, however, that with some clients, the elementary school counselor does assign primary responsibility to the child. It is also important to note that in a number of interviews responsibility was evenly divided.

The mean score on responsibility assumption for all counselors was 21.56. As noted above this shows a slight tendency toward counselor assumption of primary responsibility.
Question 2

To what extent does the elementary school counselor lead?

This dimension was rated on a 50 point scale. That is, zero represented no lead, 25 represented general lead, and a rating of 50 was indicative of much lead. Tables 9 through 15 present data on the technique of leading in elementary school counseling.

TABLE 9.—Mean amount of lead for counselor A with each of five clients

Client No.        | 24.5 | 22.2 | 28.5 | 23 | 21.8 |
------------------|------|------|------|----|------|
1                 |       |      |      |    |      |
2                 |       |      |      |    |      |
3                 |       |      |      |    |      |
4                 |       |      |      |    |      |
5                 |       |      |      |    |      |

The data in Table 9 suggests that counselor A used leading techniques in interviews with each of his five clients. Four of the five scores are near the median which suggests the use of general lead techniques with these four clients. The score of 28.5 units of lead in the interview with client 3, while not significantly high, does suggest that in some of his remarks, counselor A used much lead.
Table 10 shows that counselor B also relies heavily upon the general lead technique. It should be noted, however, that in two interviews the score of counselor B suggests the use of tentative analysis in the interview.

TABLE 10.—Mean amount of lead for counselor B with each of five clients

Client No.  | Mean Amount of Lead
--- | ---
1 | 25.2
2 | 22.5
3 | 27.7
4 | 28.2
5 | 22.5

The mean scores for counselor C on the lead dimension shows some variation in lead techniques with different clients. The data in Table 11 reveal the use of general lead with two clients, clarification with client 3, and a tendency to lead considerably with clients 4 and 5.

TABLE 11.—Mean amount of lead for counselor C with each of five clients

Client No.  | Mean Amount of Lead
--- | ---
1 | 22
2 | 21.8
3 | 19
4 | 29.5
5 | 30.3
Table 12 shows that with one exception, counselor D appears to lead consistently. In the interview with client 2 the mean score of 13.2 indicates that little lead was used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 provides some additional information on this dimension in that it reveals the range of techniques used by counselors on the lead dimension. The range represents points on the scale based on counselor responses during the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14.--Mean amount of lead for each of four counselors; each with five clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>23.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio of the between group variance divided by the within group variance was 0.805. This was not significant at the .05 level of confidence and hence no further F ratios were tested.

TABLE 15.--Mean difference on amount of counselor lead for counselors and judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Scores</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>110.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.87</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>55.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1666.49</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1832.19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the elementary school counselors in this study tend to use such lead techniques as clarification, general lead, and tentative analysis in their interviews with children. It appears significant that no counselor relied heavily upon such client-centered
techniques as silence or acceptance in their interviews.

On the other hand the data in Tables 9 through 12 show that the four counselors in this study are consistent in their use of general lead techniques in interviews with children.

**Question 3**

What is the nature of the counselor response to the child's feelings and needs?

This question was analyzed in terms of counselor response to the content of the client's speech and counselor response and sensitivity to the feelings and needs expressed by the client. A three category scale was used for classifying counselor responses. These categories were (1) feeling, (2) content, and (3) unclassifiable.

Tables 16 through 21 present the data on this dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 16.—Means of total remarks of four counselors made in five interviews each; classified according to content, feeling, and unclassifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that counselors C and D made considerably more responses to both content and feeling in
client talk than did counselors A and B. One factor which may account for this difference is the length of the interview. Table 17 shows the percentage frequency of counselor remarks for each of the above categories.

TABLE 17.--Percentage frequency of total remarks made by four counselors in five interviews each; classified according to content, feeling, and unclassifiable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>54.04%</td>
<td>49.26%</td>
<td>53.10%</td>
<td>63.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>39.24%</td>
<td>39.02%</td>
<td>25.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable</td>
<td>7.72%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7.88%</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences appear between the mean scores for counselor response on this dimension. These differences provide the data for Tables 18 through 20.

TABLE 18.--Significance of difference between mean scores for counselor response to content of client speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19.—Significance of difference between mean scores for counselor response to feeling aspects of client speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20.—Significance of differences between counselor responses which could not be classified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Tables 16 through 21 indicate that there are wide differences in individual counselor behavior on the content dimension. For example, 49.26 per cent of the responses of counselor B were content responses, while counselor D responded to content 63.40 per cent of the time. The F ratio of the between group variance divided by the within group variance was 0.318 which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.
The most significant findings on the content aspects of this dimension are that counselors vary widely in their responses to content expressed in client speech. For three of four counselors more than 50 per cent of all responses were to content aspects of client speech. The reliability coefficient among the four judges rating this dimension was .76.

It will be noted that in rating this dimension judges were instructed to determine whether a given counselor responded to the content of a client's speech or to the feeling expressed in the client's speech. Tables 16, 17, and 19 present data on the feeling aspects of this dimension. The only instance of significant difference between counselors occurs when one compares counselors A and C. The coefficient of reliability among judges on the feeling aspect of this dimension was .52. This suggests that response to feeling is somewhat more difficult to rate than response to content.

The data in Table 20 reveal only one instance of significant difference between counselors on responses which could not be classified. However, when the data in Table 21 are analyzed, significant differences are noted. The coefficient of reliability among judges in rating the unclassified aspects of this dimension was .34. This reliability is low; however, it is suggested that the
length and the highly subjective nature of this variable makes it extremely difficult to rate.

TABLE 21.—Mean differences on unclassified counselor responses for counselors and judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>134.12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182.88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented appear sufficient to answer question 3. In interviews with children, elementary school counselors tend to respond most frequently to the content aspects of a client’s speech. Counselors differ significantly on this dimension, and these differences do not appear to be influenced by client differences.

Question 4

To what extent does the elementary school counselor respond to the core of the client’s remarks?

In order to examine this question four categories were provided for counselor response to a client’s statement. These categories were designated as core, secondary, new, and unclassifiable. Judges were instructed to place
each counselor remark in the appropriate category. The scale used for rating this dimension is found in Appendix A. Tables 22 through 30 present the data used in analyzing this question.

**TABLE 22.**—Mean of total remarks of four counselors made in five interviews each; classified according to core, new, secondary, and unclassifiable responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that both counselors C and D appear to respond more often to the core of the client's remarks than counselors A and B. While no attempt was made in this study to measure the length of the interviews it is suggested that these differences may be the result of interview length.

The significance of the data in Tables 22 and 23 appears to be the relationship between total counselor remarks, and response to core aspects of a client's speech. For example, counselor D appears to respond to all client talk most frequently and at the same time the majority of
counselor D's responses are to the core of client talk. Comparatively, counselors A and D had the highest percentage frequency of responses to content. These same counselors made significantly fewer responses to secondary aspects of their client's speeches. The statistically significant differences between the mean scores for counselors on response to core, secondary, and new aspects of client's speech provide the data for Tables 24 through 26.

TABLE 23.—Percentage frequency of total remarks of four counselors made in five interviews each; classified according to core, secondary, new and unclassifiable responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>56.66%</td>
<td>52.09%</td>
<td>47.24%</td>
<td>63.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>25.08%</td>
<td>34.10%</td>
<td>18.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
<td>12.63%</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable</td>
<td>7.43%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>8.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 24.—Significance of difference between mean scores for counselor response to core of client's speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 25. -- Significance of difference between mean scores for counselor response dealing with a secondary aspect of client's speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 26. -- Significance of difference between mean scores for counselor response dealing with a new aspect of client's speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coefficient of reliability among the four judges rating the core aspects of this dimension was .67. For response to secondary and new aspects of client speech, the coefficient of reliability was .66 and .42 respectively. Tests on the difference between counselors for unclassified responses produced no significant values. It should be noted that the unclassifiable category is difficult to
treat statistically due to the small number of counselor responses which were placed in the unclassifiable category. Tests on agreement among judges in rating the four aspects of this dimension produced some significant differences. The results of these tests are shown in Tables 27 through 30.

TABLE 27.—Mean difference on response to core remarks for judges and counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>599.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199.91</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1879.42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2502.38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 28.—Mean difference on response to secondary aspects of client speech for judges and counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>591.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2047.35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2639.95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 29.—Mean difference for judges and counselors on responses dealing with a new aspect of client speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>175.53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210.38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 30.—Mean difference for judges and counselors on responses which were unclassifiable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>175.31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Tables 27 through 30 show some areas of significant difference among judges in rating the four aspects of this question as well as significant differences among the counselor's response. The counselors in this study differed in the core, secondary, and new categories.
They performed similarly only on the unclassifiable aspect of this dimension. However, the agreement of the judges in classifying all counselor responses with the exception of those labeled unclassifiable is noteworthy. Again, it should be noted that the length of the unclassifiable dimension is quite short and is, therefore, difficult to handle statistically.

The reader will note that the question deals with the extent to which the elementary school counselor responds to the core of the client's remarks. An analysis of the data presented on this question reveals that the majority of counselor speeches in interviews do in fact deal with the core aspects of client speech. It is suggested, however, that there is considerable variability among counselors on the core dimension. No attempt was made in this study to treat statistically such factors as age of the client and type of client problem as a determinant of counselor response. It will be noted that the researcher was one of the four judges and rated each interview. On the basis of this experience it is suggested that age of the client and type of problem did not significantly influence counselor response to the core aspects of a client's speech.
Client Behavior

Question 1

How much responsibility is assumed by the child during the interview?

The major consideration in answering this question was to determine the willingness of the client to work toward the solution of his problem and to face new problems as they arose. The client responsibility dimension was rated on the fifty point scale found in Appendix A. The extreme left point on the scale was labeled zero units of client responsibility assumption, while the extreme right of the scale was called 50 units of client responsibility assumption. Intervening points to permit intermediate ratings were labeled $Q_1$, median, and $Q_3$. Tables 31 through 34 present the mean scores for each of 20 clients as assigned by each of the four judges.

The data presented in Tables 31 through 34 indicate that there are wide differences between the behavior of children on the responsibility dimension during the interview. For example, if the four ratings for client number 5 are compared, it will be noted that in each case the judges feel that this client has assumed considerable responsibility. Conversely, it will be noted that in three of four ratings client number 15 has assumed very little responsibility. It is of interest here to note the number of
TABLE 31.—Mean score on responsibility assumption for each of 20 clients according to ratings of Judge 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 32.—Mean score on responsibility assumption for each of 20 clients according to ratings of Judge 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 Md</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 33.--Mean score on responsibility assumption for each of 20 clients according to ratings of Judge 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 34.—Mean score on responsibility assumption for each of 20 clients according to ratings of Judge 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
clients whose behavior suggests an average or higher degree of responsibility assumption. Judge 1 and Judge 3 each rated 7 clients at or above the median on the scale. They agreed within 5 points on 4 of the 7 cases. Judges 2 and 4 each rated 6 clients at or above the median on the scale and were within a five point range of agreement in 5 of the 6 cases. In one case, one of the judges rated a client in the Q₁ range (9 units) on the scale; that is, according to that judge the client assumed a minimum of responsibility. Ratings for the remaining 3 judges for the same client were 14, 12, and 16 which were at or above the Q₁ point.

TABLE 35.—Mean scores on client responsibility assumption for 20 clients; classified according to counselor with each counselor interviewing 5 clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 36. —Range of median scores for 20 clients on responsibility assumption classified by judge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Range^x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^xRange based on a 50 point scale.

TABLE 37. —Mean differences for judges and counselors on client responsibility assumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>243.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>225.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.27</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2343.10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2593.19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coefficient of reliability for the 4 judges in rating this dimension was .54. While this reliability is not high it is suggested that the subjective nature of this dimension contributes greatly to the difficulty of rating. The F ratio to test the significance of difference between client behavior was 2.34 which was not significant at the .05 per cent level of confidence.
In general the data in Tables 31 through 37 suggest that children in the elementary school do assume some responsibility for the counseling interview and for solving problems through counseling. Only one case was found in which the client assumed little responsibility for the interview. However, approximately 60% of all clients in this study assumed slightly less than an average degree of responsibility for the interview. A study of Table 35 reveals that three of the four groups of clients received mean scores on this dimension of 21.55, 23.05, and 21.95, or slightly below the median. The group of five clients interviewed by counselor A had a mean score of 25.85 or slightly above the median.

On the basis of the data presented it may be inferred that children in the elementary school are able to assume responsibility to the degree necessary for counseling through the use of interview techniques. However, it is suggested that children tend to assume less responsibility for counseling than adolescents or adults. The relative immaturity of the elementary school child is probably a major factor in responsibility assumption.

Question 2

What is the quality of the counselor-child relationship in elementary school counseling?
As used in this study, relationship is the presence of respect, trust, consideration, and warmth which the client and counselor exhibit toward each other during the interview. It is recognized that the behavior of both counselor and client is an important factor in a working relationship. However, in this study it was postulated that the counselors involved were sufficiently trained and skilled in the techniques of establishing a working relationship necessary for effective counseling. The judges were instructed to remain alert to cooperative instances of behavior of both client and counselor. They were given specific instruction to note such client behavior as resistance to the counselor or counseling, belligerance, or attempts to terminate the interview.

The rating procedure on working relationship was somewhat different from that used for the previous dimensions. The 50 point scale was used, with zero representing poor working relationship and fifty representing an excellent client-counselor working relationship. No attempt was made to score each counselor or client remark. The rating assigned by each judge was a global rating; that is, after listening to the transcript, the judge made one check ( ) indicating the score for that interview. Tables 38 through 43 provide the data used to analyze this question.
An adequate interpretation of the data in the above tables necessitated that some value designations be made for several points on the scale. It will be recalled that the extreme left of the scale was labeled poor working relationship and that the extreme right point of the scale was designated excellent working relationship. During the process of analyzing the data for this dimension the experimenter arbitrarily assigned value labels to two additional points on the scale. Thus, ratings of 30 and above are considered good working relationship while ratings of 20 and below are labeled poor working relationship. The median on the scale is 25.

Table 38 shows a wide range of differences among the 20 cases on the working relationship dimension. When using the criteria described above, six of the 20 interviews were assigned scores of 30 or above which suggests a good working relationship between the client and the counselor. It is also revealed that judge 1 rated five interviews at or below 20 units which suggests poor working relationship. Scores for the remaining 9 interviews fall between 21 and 29 and working relationship is considered adequate.
TABLE 38.—Ratings assigned by Judge 1 on working relationship for each of 20 interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ratings for judge 2 show that in only four of the 20 interviews was the working relationship considered good. The same judge assigned scores of 20 or below to seven interviews. Again, the nine remaining cases are within the range considered adequate for effective client-counselor working relationship.

Table 40 shows that judge 3 rated the working relationship good in only four of the twenty interviews. The same judge rated only three interviews at 20 or below on this dimension. It should also be noted that judge 3 rated only one interview above 30. This was case number 6 which received a score of 31. Thus, approximately 80 percent of the cases received ratings which are considered adequate.

The ratings of judge 4 are given in Table 41. This judge rated four of the 20 interviews good, and five poor on the working relationship dimension. It is interesting that three of the five interviews rated poor by judge 4 also received poor ratings from judges 1 and 2.
### TABLE 39—Ratings assigned by Judge 2 on working relationship for each of 20 interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No.</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 40.—Ratings assigned by Judge 3 on working relationship for each of 20 interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 41.—Ratings assigned by Judge 4 on working relationship for each of 20 interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of previous reports on the difficulty of rating this dimension of counseling, it was felt desirable to compare the ratings given by each judge for each of the 20 interviews. Table 42 shows the number of cases of agreement and disagreement among judges on the working relationship dimension.

TABLE 42.--Agreement between four judges on rating the working relationship dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge N=20</th>
<th>Agree*</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 with 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 with 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 with 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 with 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agreement within five points

While the data in the above table are not central to this study it does have implications for the validity of the scale used and for the reliability of judges in rating this dimension. It is, therefore, suggested that agreement between judges is sufficiently high to warrant the conclusion that the working relationship dimension can be
identified and rated from the verbal content of the counseling interview.

**TABLE 43.**--Mean scores on working relationship for 20 interviews; classified according to counselor with five interviews for each counselor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, it might be expected that significant differences would occur between clients on this dimension as a result of counselor behavior. However, among the counselors in this study no significant differences were found.

The coefficient of reliability for the four judges in rating this dimension was .67. The F ratio to test the significance of difference between client behavior was 1.61 which was not significant.

The preceding tables, number 38 through 42, provide data which suggest that the working relationship between elementary school counselors and their clients is sufficiently good to warrant counseling through the use of the interview. In the majority of cases the level of
communication, trust, and understanding between the child and the counselor appears to be adequate. On the basis of the data presented above it appears that skilled counselors influence the establishment of the working relationship in a positive manner and that the age of the client is not the major factor in working relationship.

Question 3

How much growth occurs during counseling?

This dimension has been previously described as client development of new insights, gains in skill, and planning. Judges were instructed to rate this dimension on the basis of the client's verbal behavior during the interview.

In general, the procedure for rating and analyzing this question was the same as that used for the working relationship dimension. Labels indicating levels of growth were attached to several points on the scale. Specifically, scores of 0-10 were labeled little or no growth; scores of 11-19 were designated some growth; scores in the 20-29 group were called average; 30-39 scores were labeled significant, and scores of 40 or above were considered indicative of much growth.

The data on the client growth dimension is presented in Tables 44 through 49. The discussion of the significance of this data follows Table 47.
TABLE IV.—Ratings assigned by Judge 1 for each of 20 clients on growth during the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 4 2 5</td>
<td>8 2 6 1</td>
<td>9 2 2 5</td>
<td>10 2 2 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 45.—Ratings assigned by Judge 2 for each of 20 clients on growth during the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Md.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 46.--Ratings assigned by Judge 3 for each of 20 clients on growth during the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Md.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 47.—Ratings assigned by Judge 4 for each of 20 clients on growth during the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client No.</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 44 through 47 reveal a wide range of client behavior on this dimension. While there is limited agreement between the four judges on specific cases, it is evident that each judge noted some growth in most clients. Judge 1 found that little or no growth had occurred in five of the 20 cases. His ratings at this end of the scale is in agreement with Judges 2 and 4 in only one case. Also interesting is the fact that Judge 1 was the only rater finding a case of much growth. Table 48 shows the distribution of judges ratings on the growth dimension.

TABLE 48.—Distribution of ratings on client growth during the interview; classified by judge and showing the number of clients in each category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Little Growth</th>
<th>Some Growth</th>
<th>Average Growth</th>
<th>Significant Growth</th>
<th>Much Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be recalled that all ratings in this study are based upon single interviews. Since it is recognized that any significant client growth may require several interviews with a counselor it is not surprising that
significant growth was noted in only a small number of the clients in this study. It is suggested that the ratings on this dimension may be influenced by the personal characteristics of the judges and by the behavior of the counselor during the interview.

**TABLE 49.--Agreement between four judges on rating client growth during the interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 with 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 with 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 with 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 with 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coefficient of reliability among the four judges on this dimension was .26 which is quite low. The F ratio testing the reaction of clients of different counselors was 3.10 which was significant at the .05 per cent level of confidence. The F ratio on the significance of difference of the ratings of the four judges was 2.93 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence.
On the basis of the data available on the client growth dimension it appears that question 3 cannot be adequately answered. If measurable growth does occur during one interview it would be expected that judges would be in agreement on more cases than is indicated in Table 49.

There are several logical explanations for the difficulties encountered in rating this dimension. It may be that the instrument used for measuring this dimension is unreliable. Or, it is possible that client growth is such a nebulous factor that it is impossible to measure in an analysis of a counseling interview.

SUMMARY

This chapter has described the statistical terms and discussed the procedures used in processing the data for the study. An interpretation of the data relating to the seven questions of the study was presented.

The data presented shows that elementary school counselors tend to assume primary responsibility for the counseling interview. However, there is a wide variance of counselor techniques on this dimension with different clients.

Elementary school counselors appear to use several techniques of leading when counseling with children. All counselors in the present study relied heavily upon such
techniques as clarification, general lead, and tentative analysis.

In terms of the counselors response to the clients feelings and needs during the interview, it appears that the majority of counselor remarks deal with the content of the client's speech. This counselor technique varies between clients and in some interviews the counselor appears to deal effectively with the feeling aspect of the client's speech. There is a wide variation between counselors on total counselor remarks during the interview. The most logical explanation for this difference is the length of the interview.

The data presented in this chapter reveals that elementary school counselors generally respond to the core aspects of the client's speech. Again, considerable variability among counselors on the core dimension was noted.

The last three questions in this study dealt with the behavior of the client during the interview. An attempt was made to analyze client responsibility assumption, client-counselor working relationship, and client growth during the interview.

In most cases it was found that elementary school children assume a level of responsibility for counseling through the use of the interview. Clients vary widely on
the responsibility dimension and this difference does not appear to result solely from the age or the type of client problem.

The working relationship dimension proved somewhat difficult to rate in this study. It appears, however, that an effective working relationship is established in most cases when counseling with children.

The question in this study dealing with client growth during the interview could not be adequately answered. It is suggested that client growth is difficult to measure and cannot be analyzed on the basis of one interview.

Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the present study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of whether counseling children in the elementary school differs significantly from counseling in other settings has been of continuing interest among workers in the field of guidance and counseling. There appears to be several areas of disagreement on counseling techniques which are effective in counseling with children. There has also been much discussion in the literature on whether the elementary school age child possesses the maturity and verbal ability necessary for counseling through the interview method.

To the writer's knowledge no previous attempt has been made to analyze counseling in the elementary school. While there are numerous factors associated with counseling children in the school setting, two stand out as being of major importance: (1) The technique of the counselor and (2) the behavior of the client during the interview. An investigation into the nature of the above factors would appear to be a worthwhile task.
The purpose of the present study was to analyze elementary school counseling in terms of counselor techniques and client behavior during the counseling interview. Counseling was defined as a professional activity whereby one person assists another individual in a private setting to resolve his problems or concerns. It was emphasized that counseling, as the term is used in this report, refers to counseling normal children in the school setting. Counseling at this level is developmental; it emphasizes positive pupil growth and does not seek to bring about major structural changes in personality.

In the present study, counseling was conceptualized in dimensional terms. The dimensions which were investigated included (1) counselor assumption of responsibility, (2) amount of lead in counseling, (3) response to feeling or content of client speech, (4) response to core of client remarks, (5) client assumption of responsibility during the interview, (6) client-counselor working relationship, and (7) client growth during the interview. Several aspects of these dimensions were measured by an instrument used in several previous investigations and revised by the present researcher (Appendix A). The seven questions investigated follow:

A. Counselor Techniques

1. How much responsibility is assumed by the elementary school counselor?
2. To what extent does the elementary school counselor lead?

3. What is the nature of the counselor's response to the child's feelings and needs?

4. To what extent does the elementary school counselor respond to the core of the client's remarks?

B. Client Behavior

1. How much responsibility is assumed by the child?

2. What is the quality of the counselor-client working relationship?

3. How much progress occurs during counseling?

SUMMARY OF METHODS

This section will present a brief discussion of the interviews used in the study, the selection and training of judges, and the rating procedure used in this investigation.

The Interviews

Twenty electrically recorded interviews were used. The interviews were selected from a total of twenty-six submitted by elementary school counselors from four school counselors from four school systems in Ohio and Michigan. Five interviews for each of the four participating counselors were used. The clients were all elementary school pupils. The distribution of clients by grade was: three pupils from grade one, five from grade two, two from grade
three, three from grade four, five from grade five, and two pupils from grade six. The interviews are felt to be representative of the types of counseling procedures used in the above schools and of the types of problems which children bring to the elementary school counselor.

The Judges

The writer and three other judges rated each of the transcripts used in the study. Each judge has a graduate degree in guidance and considerable counseling experience. The experimenter prepared a manual which was used by each judge in the rating process (Appendix B). The manual described the dimensions to be rated and provided directions for rating each dimension. After the judges had studied the manual, two training sessions were held, involving sample ratings and clarifying general rating procedures. In summary, the ratings used have been made by competent judges who were adequately trained for the task required by this study.

Rating and Scoring Procedure

Rating of the interviews involved listening to each transcript and completing the seven item transcript analysis scale. Each of the four judges made an
independent rating for each interview. The seven counseling dimensions under investigation were rated and scored as follows:

1. **Counselor assumption of responsibility.** Each judge made an overall rating for the interview using a fifty point scale. A numerical rating was obtained by counting from the left of the scale to the point designated by the judge's rating.

2. **Amount of lead.** On this dimension, each counselor remark was rated for lead. The ratings for each remark were totaled and a mean for each judge and each counselor was determined.

3. **Counselor response to content or feeling.** Each response made by the counselor during the interview was categorized according to content, feeling, and unclassifiable. Frequency counts for each category were made.

4. **Responding to core of client's remarks.** Four categories for counselor response were provided. These categories were: core, new, secondary, and unclassifiable. Each counselor response was placed in one of the above categories.

5. **Client assumption of responsibility.** Each client statement was rated on a fifty point scale. A numerical rating was then obtained by counting from the left of the scale to the points designated by the judge's ratings.
6. Client-Counselor working relationship and client growth during the interview. For each of these dimensions, the four judges made an overall rating for each interview. The numerical score for each dimension was obtained by counting from the left of the fifty-point scale to the point designated by the judges' check (√) mark.

Findings

The findings for each of the seven questions in this study are presented under the headings of (1) Counselor techniques and (2) Client behavior.

Counselor techniques

There appears to be considerable variation among elementary school counselors on the dimension of counselor responsibility assumption. The range for the interviews in this study was from situations in which the counselor assigned primary responsibility to the client, to cases in which the counselor himself assumed primary responsibility. It was also found that responsibility was evenly divided between counselor and client in approximately 30 per cent of the interviews. This leads to the hypothetical conclusion that the amount of responsibility which a given elementary school counselor assumes in the interview is dependent upon the client. The significance of this finding is that elementary school counselors appear to be quite
flexible on this dimension and their technique seems to be greatly influenced by the needs, receptiveness, and maturity of the client.

For the four counselors in this study, no significant differences were found in the mean amount of lead used with their clients. Counselors appeared to behave consistently in their use of such lead techniques as clarification and general lead. However, the amount of lead which a given counselor uses varies considerably between clients. It is felt that this variation can be accounted for in terms of client differences and differences in discussion topics. The question on the lead dimension is best answered by the statement that counselors in this study are consistent in their use of lead techniques in counseling interviews with children.

Significant differences were found between the four counselors on the dimension of response to content and feeling of client speech. Counselors also differ significantly on the total number of responses to client speech during the interview. Since a significant difference between counselors of their use of this technique was found, it is suggested that this difference may be the result of differences in personal characteristics of counselors rather than differences between clients. It appears that most elementary school counselors respond more often
to the content rather than to the feeling aspects of a client's speech. However, some cautions are necessary before broad generalizations on this dimension are attempted. In this study no attempt was made to measure response to content and feeling on the basis of the topic discussed during the interview. It may be that the same counselors would react differently when counseling another group of clients with different problems.

The data on counselor response to the core aspects of client speech show several instances of significant differences between counselors. There appears to be a relationship between total number of counselor responses and response to the core dimension. That is, counselors who respond more to all client talk (Counselors C and D), also seem to deal more often with the core remarks. It is also interesting to note that these two counselors made significantly fewer responses which were rated new and unclassifiable. It is suggested that the differences between counselors on this dimension could be due to the length of the interview. In general, the data presented are sufficient to warrant the conclusion that in most of their interviews, elementary school counselors respond consistently to the core aspects of the client's speech.
Client behavior

The data presented in this report show wide differences between the behavior of children on assumption of responsibility during the interview. One case was found in which three of the four judges agreed that the client assumed little or no responsibility. Conversely, in seven cases, three judges were in agreement on their rating of much responsibility assumed by the client. The numerical ratings for the remaining twelve cases fell slightly below the median on the fifty-point scale. The immaturity of the elementary school child would logically account for the lower ratings.

In general, it can be concluded that most children in the elementary school are able to assume responsibility to the degree necessary for counseling through the use of interview techniques. While children are able to make plans and to solve problems through counseling, it is suggested that the elementary school counselor will need to consider the relative immaturity of the child when counseling with him.

In a previous section it was noted that both client behavior and counselor technique are important factors in the working relationship dimension. In this study, however, working relationship was viewed primarily as a client dimension.
On the working relationship dimension a wide range of client behavior was found. However, no significant differences were found when ratings were made according to counselor.

The ratings of the four judges revealed that working relationship between client and counselor was good in four cases, poor in three cases, and adequate in the remaining thirteen interviews. It is, therefore, concluded that the client-counselor relationship in the majority of cases in the present study is sufficiently good to warrant counseling through the use of the interview method. That is, the level of trust, understanding, and communication necessary for verbal counseling is present when counseling with children.

Several difficulties were encountered in rating the dimension of client growth during the interview. Comparisons of the ratings of the four judges revealed little agreement on this dimension. It is suggested that client growth is extremely difficult to rate on the basis of one interview. Further, it is possible that the instrument used for rating this dimension is unreliable. It appears that the data presented are unreliable; therefore, the question on client growth during the interview cannot be answered in the present report.
Recommendations for Further Research

1. The results of this study are based upon interviews with children from four school systems. Comparable investigations using a larger sample of elementary school counseling services would present a clearer and more comprehensive picture of counseling children in the school setting.

2. Several factors influence counselor technique and client behavior during the interview. It is suggested that the topic discussed is of major importance and that investigations dealing with the influence of the topic or problem discussed on both client and counselor behavior would be highly desirable.

3. The present study focused upon seven dimensions of counseling with children. It is suggested that the relationship between these dimensions be investigated.

4. The scale used for analyzing transcripts had not been previously used in studies of counseling with children. Research on the validity and reliability of this instrument in analyzing counseling with children should be considered.

5. Periodic evaluation of the techniques used by elementary school counselors would provide information of great value concerning the selection and training of counselors for elementary schools.
6. Counseling services, as a unique part of the elementary school program, are developing rapidly in many schools throughout the country. The present study investigated only limited aspects of these services. It is recommended that all major aspects of counseling with children be investigated in an effort to more clearly define these services.
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Transcript Analysis Scale
Transcript Analysis Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade of Counselee | Sex | Transcript No. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Referral

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Counselor Techniques

1. Counselor Assumption of Responsibility
(The amount of responsibility which the counselor assumes, which he permits the client to assume, or which he forces the client to assume. Judges should make one check mark as an over-all rating for the interview.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor assumes</th>
<th>Counselor assumes</th>
<th>Responsibility assigned</th>
<th>Responsibility assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>evenly</td>
<td>primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>divided</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Amount of Lead in Counseling
(The judge should attempt to determine the extent to which each counselor remark "leads." If there are ten counselor speeches, there should be ten checks on the scale. The techniques indicated on the scale may be used as reference points.)

- Silence
- Clarification
- General
- Tentative Analysis
- Urging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little or no lead</th>
<th>Much lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Responding to Client Feelings or Content of Client's Speech
(The judge should attempt to determine whether the counselor gives more attention to counselee's feelings about the topic or to the subject matter in the client's statements. Place a check mark ( ) in the appropriate category for each counselor remark.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Unclassifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Responding to Core of Client's Remarks
(The rater should determine whether the counselor responds to the main idea of the client's remark, whether he deals with a secondary aspect of the remark, or whether the counselor's response represents a new idea or topic following client's speech. Any counselor remark which cannot logically be included in the above three categories should be placed in the Unclassifiable Category. Place a check mark ( ) in the appropriate category for each counselor remark.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Unclassifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. Client Behavior

1. Client Assumption of Responsibility
(This dimension refers to the amount of responsibility which the client assumes for facing the problem, for finding solutions, and for making decisions. Place one mark on the appropriate point on the scale for each client remark which is indicative of client assumption of responsibility.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client assumes no responsibility</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Client assumes a great deal of responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Client-Counselor Working Relationship
(Good working relationship is the presence of mutual respect, consideration, trust, and warmth which client and counselor have for each other. Poor relationship is the presence of symptoms of resistance and the absence of positive signs of acceptance, and mutual consideration. In rating this dimension, make one rating for the entire interview.)

.................................
Poor Q1 Md. Q3 Excellent

3. Growth During the Interview
(Growth consists of the development of new insights, gains in skill, self-acceptance, and planning. The rater should consider both number and importance of gains; however, only one mark should be placed on the scale.)

.................................
Little or Q1 Md. Q3 Much
go growth 1 growth
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Manual for Judges
Introduction

The general purpose of this study is to investigate counseling dimensions with children. The procedure followed will be to obtain ratings by four judges for the following counseling dimensions:

A. Counselor Techniques
   1. Counselor assumption of responsibility
   2. Amount of lead
   3. Response to client feeling or content
   4. Responding to core of client's remarks

B. Client Behavior
   1. Client assumption of responsibility
   2. Client counselor-working relationship
   3. Client growth during interview

The judging procedure will be as follows:

Each judge will be furnished 20 transcripts of interviews with children in grades 1 - 6 and a supply of rating scales. Judges will complete one scale for each interview. Each judge should rate each of the seven dimensions on the scale.

The first step in judging will be to fill in the blanks at the top of the rating scale: (1) judge, (2) transcript number, (3) grade of client, (4) sex, (5) date, and (6) reason for referral. Next, following the order on the rating scale, judge each of the seven counseling dimensions.
A brief definition of each of the seven dimensions being rated along with instructions for rating that dimension are found on the scale. Judges should refer to these definitions and instructions before completing the scale. It may be necessary to listen to a transcript several times before completing the rating scale.

It should be emphasized that judges are rating both counselor techniques (A, 1., 2., 3., and 4., on the scale) and client behavior (B, 1., 2., and 3., on the scale). A given dimension may be identifiable at any point on the transcript.

A discussion of the dimensions to be rated is given in the following paragraphs.

Counselor Techniques

1. Counselor assumption of responsibility. This dimension refers to the amount of responsibility which the counselor himself assumes, which he permits the client to assume, or which he forces the client to assume during the interview.

In some situations the counselor assumes considerable responsibility. For example, he may ask direct questions and make suggestions. In response to a question from the client, he may give an extended answer. At the end of a client remark, he may ask for elaboration or for additional information.
When the client has primary responsibility, the counselor still has an active role to play. He remains alert to what is happening and often assists the client to move on to the next stage.

Responsibility for the interview may be varied from moment to moment to fit the needs of the situation. As is often the case, when the client is making progress, he is given primary responsibility, but when he runs into difficulty the counselor steps in to help. Thus, responsibility shifts back and forth, depending upon the situation at hand.

Some examples appropriate to this dimension are given below:

S.... One of the reasons my grades are low is that I don't read well.

(a) The counselor who wishes to assume complete responsibility might reply,

C.... Yes. Well I'll get you in the remedial reading class.

(b) The counselor who wishes to share responsibility might reply,

C.... I understand. Let's see if we can find out what's causing the problem.

(c) The counselor wishing to force the client to assume responsibility might reply,

C.... Uh huh.

In rating this dimension judges should keep in mind that we are interested in the counselor's intentions regarding the assumption of responsibility. We are not concerned
with whether the client actually accepts the responsibility since this latter dimension is rated elsewhere on the scale.

2. Amount of lead in counseling. In defining this dimension it has been noted that the counselor's remarks should have a close relationship to the client's just previous remark. That is, the counselor's remarks should be relevant to the client's needs and interests and should be at the next step above the client's present thinking. Variation in the amount of lead is noticeable in most interviews and is a technique which counselors use to stimulate client thinking and development. The degree of leading will vary from situation to situation.

Some examples of this dimension are as follows:

S.... They're giving the Iowa Tests to all fifth graders next week and I dread it. I'm afraid I won't do so well. Last year we had the same tests and Mrs. B.... said I had a pretty low score. I always have trouble with tests. I wish I didn't have to take them.

(a) The following counselor remark is an example of much lead.

(Urging)
C... Well, of course you have to take them. Everybody else does. I think you should just make up your mind and give it a good try. Don't you think you should?

(b) In the following remark the counselor is not pushing the client but is setting up an idea for him to examine.
(tentative analysis)
C... Do you think it would help if you calmed down and stopped worrying about failing?

(c) The counselor may attempt to get the client to discuss his problem more fully.

(general lead)
C... What do you think causes your problem with tests?

(d) Sometimes the counselor will help the client see his problem more clearly.

(clarification)
C... You feel pretty unsure of yourself when taking a test?

(e) The following excerpt is an example of little or no lead in counseling:

S... I'm afraid I'll make the lowest score in class.

C... Uh huh.

3. Responding to client feelings or content of client's speech. This dimension has reference to the counselor's degree of sensitivity to the client's attitudes and feelings. Judges should attempt to determine whether the counselor's remarks give more attention to the client's feeling about the topic or to the subject matter in the client's statements. In rating this dimension judges should decide whether each counselor remark is related to feeling or content. In some cases it is not possible to determine whether a response is made to content or feeling. In such cases the judge should place the remark in the
unclassifiable category. The illustrations given below will help to clarify the rating for this dimension.

S.... I like school, and Miss J.... is a good teacher, but I'm not getting very good grades. On my last report card I had two D's. I don't know. I spend a lot of time building model cars and planes. Maybe I don't spend enough time on my homework.

A counselor responding to content may reply:

C.... You like school but you spend too much time on other things.

A counselor responding primarily to feeling would reply:

C.... You feel badly about your poor grades.

The following counselor speeches are examples of unclassifiable remarks.

C.... Good morning, John, how are things today?

S.... My mother said I should talk to you about my low grades in arithmetic.

C.... Are you taking music lessons this year?

S.... Yes. I really don't like arithmetic. I do much better in history.

C.... Uh huh....

4. Responding to the core of the client's remark.

The "core" is the main idea which the client attempts to express during each of his speeches. A client may actually express several ideas in one speech, but one of these is of primary importance. The judge should determine whether the counselor responds to the main idea of the client's speech,
whether he deals with a secondary aspect of the remark, or whether the counselor's response represents a new idea or topic following the client's speech. Any counselor remark which cannot be logically classified in the above three categories should be placed in the unclassifiable category. Judges should rate each counselor remark.

The following counselor responses are illustrative of counselor sensitivity to the core remark or to a secondary aspect of the client's speech.

S.... My brother and I fight a lot. Then my mother gets angry and whips me. Sometimes I wish I could leave home. (pause) My father gets pretty mad too and he shouts and curses me. He stays mad too and keeps me in my room.

(Core) C.... Things are really pretty bad at home.

(Secondary)
C.... You don't get along too well with your brother.

The introduction of a new idea is represented by the following counselor remark to the above client speech.

(new) C.... How are you getting along with other pupils in your class?

Such counselor responses as "I see," "Yes," and "uh huh" or other simple acceptance speeches are generally placed in the unclassifiable category.

Examples of unclassifiable remarks for this dimension are the following counselor speeches.

S.... Tomorrow I'm going with my mother to Florida. We'll be away for a week.

C.... I see.
S....  Since we have three days off for Easter I will miss only one day of school.
C....  Uh huh.

Not all "uh huh" or "mm mm" statements are classifiable. For example, the following speeches would not be so classified.

C....  Mm Mm. How do you feel about that?

or,

S.... Did I do O.K.?

C....  Uh huh.

CLIENT BEHAVIOR

1. Client assumption of responsibility. The willingness on the part of the client to assume responsibility for facing the problem at hand is widely recognized as a desirable goal in counseling. The extent to which a client assumes this responsibility is thus an important dimension of client behavior in the interview. This is the counterpart of the counselor dimension, "Counselor Assumption of Responsibility," discussed in a preceding section. Judges should determine the degree to which the client assumes responsibility for facing the problem, for finding solutions, and for making decisions. Place a (✓) on the appropriate point on the scale for each client remark which is indicative of client assumption of responsibility.
The following client remarks are illustrative of client assumption of responsibility.

C.... There are several problems here that you need to work on. The big one seems to be getting your studying and homework done on time.

(Little or no responsibility)

S.... Well I don't know much about what she wants in the first place. It doesn't help much to study when you're not sure.

(Client assumes average responsibility)

S.... Sometimes I'm not sure of what she wants but I guess I could ask her after class. I will try to spend more time on my homework.

(Much responsibility)

S.... Yes I know. I'll just have to be certain of the assignment. Then I'll get down to work and get the assignment done on time.

2. Client-counselor working relationship. The quality of the relationship between the client and the counselor has long been recognized as an important determiner of progress in the counseling interview. As used in this study, a good Working Relationship refers to the degree to which counselor and client exhibit mutual trust, warmth and respect. Working relationship also refers to cooperative attempts on the part of counselor and client to find a solution to the problem. It may also be defined as the absence of resistance on the part of the client.
Poor working relationship is characterized by numerous instances of resistance and even belligerance on the part of the client. The client may refuse to talk about the problem, he may give monosyllabic responses, change the subject, or attempt to terminate the interview as quickly as possible.

The following excerpt is an example of a poor working relationship. In this instance the client is antagonistic and rejects the counselor at the outset.

C.... Hello Tim.

S.... Mm. (silence)

C.... Your teacher felt you should see me today. She thought maybe we could work on some of the things that bother you.

S.... What does she know about it? Besides you can't help me.

A good working relationship might be characterized by the following client responses.

C.... Tim, we are here to help you when we can. If you like we can discuss the problem now.

S.... Alright.

C.... Would you like to tell me about it?

S.... Yes. Well, the big problem right now is.....

In judging this dimension it is necessary to consider the emotional state of the client as well as the severity of the problem. For example, the client may be unable to discuss the problem simply because it is too difficult for him to face. In this instance the working
relationship would not necessarily be poor. Too, silence and yes and no responses at any one point may not be serious, but if they continue throughout the interview an uncooperative or resistant attitude may be present.

3. Growth during the interview. Client growth in insight into the nature of his problem and willingness to work toward a solution is an important goal in counseling. Evidence of growth consists of gains in skill, self-acceptance, understanding, and positive planning.

This dimension is probably one of the most difficult to rate reliably. First, some clients are often desirous of pleasing the counselor and may state that the conference has helped them regardless of their true feelings. Secondly, it is difficult to rate such client accepting responses as "yes," "uh huh," or "alright," after the counselor has suggested a plan of action. Thirdly, it is impossible to rate any growth which is not verbalized.

This dimension has been used by several investigators with results ranging from acceptable to quite low reliability. The decision to include this dimension in the present study was based on a desire to attempt to refine it.

The following illustrations may be of some assistance to judges in rating this dimension.
C.... So you see Tim, you can avoid problems with your classmates if you work at it.

(Little or no growth)

S.... Ah, I doubt it. They don't like me anyway.

(Some growth)

S.... Yes, I guess so. Maybe I can try to be more friendly.

(Much growth)

S.... I'm sure I can. I'll volunteer to help with the project and I'll be kind to all of them.

In rating this dimension it is necessary to consider both the number and importance of client gains during the interview. However, only one check (✓) should be placed on the scale.
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First Interview with Second Grade Boy
Referred by Teacher for Personal Counseling
First Interview with Second Grade Boy
Referred by Teacher for Personal Counseling

C-1: Hi Larry.

S-1: Hi.

C-2: What would you like to talk about today?

S-2: Um. (Pause). About cars having wrecks on train tracks.

C-3: About cars having wrecks on train tracks. O.K. What would you like to say about it?

S-3: Uh. That it kills them.

C-4: Kills the people in there?

S-4: Uh-huh.

C-5: Uh-huh.

S-5: It kills them.

C-6: It sure does.

S-6: I couldn't hear it in there.

C-7: No. We have to play it back, see? Well, first we have to say something on it, then it will play back. (Short pause). What was this story you were telling me about throwing rocks at a girl and then making friends with her? Tell me about that.

S-7: Uh. I was waiting for her at the door and she came out and I walked with her home.

C-8: Uh-huh. Did it make you feel pretty good to make friends with her again?

S-8: Yeah.

C-9: Yeah.

S-9: Now I'm going to stay with her and watch her while she's on patrol.

C-10: Uh-huh.
S-10: She's right next door.
C-11: She's a friend of yours now, huh?
S-11: Uh-huh. She lives right near us.
C-12: Uh-huh. So you see her quite often?
S-12: Uh-huh. (Pause).
C-13: What happened good today?
S-13: Uh. (Pause).
C-14: Any nice things?
S-14: I don't know.
C-15: Any bad things?
S-15: No bad things!
C-16: No bad things, huh?
S-16: Nope.
C-17: Anything make you mad?
S-17: Nothin'.
   (Long pause).
S-18: Can we hear it now?
   (Counselor plays back the recorded interview).
C-18: Did you like that?
S-19: Yes!
C-19: You like to hear your voice?
S-20: Uh-huh. I would like to stay here with you until I
   go home.
C-20: You would?
S-21: Yes.
C-21: Well, we can talk some more. (Pause). Tell me a
   little about yourself.
S-22: Can we talk about my daddy?

C-22: Anything you want to.

S-23: He's nice. His name is....

C-23: I see. You like your daddy.

S-24: I like him but he's not here. They want to take me up there to pick cotton but I don't want to go.

C-24: You don't want to pick cotton?

S-25: Hum-uh. I don't like, I don't like to go night and day, and night and day up to Missouri.

C-25: Uh-huh. Then you don't really want to be with your daddy, huh?

S-26: Mm. No. I like him when he is here.

C-26: But you don't want to be in Missouri.

S-27: No. I don't like to drive night and day.

C-27: Uh-huh.

S-28: What's this?

C-28: Just to play with. Just a box. (Long pause).

S-29: I like my mommy, and she got a new baby from the hospital and I like him, too. And I like my grandma, too.

C-29: You like about everybody.

S-30: Uh-huh. I like to be here. I like you, too. Can I come back tomorrow?

C-30: You'd like to come back tomorrow?

S-31: Can I come back tomorrow?

C-31: Well, I won't be here tomorrow. I'll be here next week and maybe you could come back then. I would like you to.

S-32: Oh. (Short pause). The chairs are falling, the trees are falling, everyone's dying. (Pause).
C-32: Would you like to see all that happen?
S-33: No. I don't like it.
C-33: You wouldn't like that to happen?
S-34: No. But I would like to see Billy fall down. I hope he would skin his leg.
C-34: Oh, why would you like to see that?
S-35: 'Cause. 'Cause, uh, he tells Miss Adams when I do something.
C-35: I see. He tells your teacher.
S-36: Yes, and he and Ricky said I spit on them.
C-36: Uh-huh. (Pause). You don't like Ricky and Billy?
S-37: Um-uh.
(The phone rings).
S-38: The phone is ringing.
C-37: Maybe we can pretend we don't hear it.
S-39: Yeah. Maybe it will fall down. Maybe the chairs, and books, and trees and people will all fall down, too.
C-38: You like to see things fall?
S-40: Yeah! Plop, plop, plop. Down they fall. (Walks around desk). What is this?
C-39: It holds fountain pens and pencils.
S-41: Can I see it?
C-40: Yes, you may. Here, let's take the pencils out. (Long pause).
S-42: Is this your book?
C-41: Uh-huh. (Pause). Do you like books?
S-43: Uh-huh. Is this your name?
C-42: Yes.
S-44: I'm going to cut it up. Right there, I'll cut it up.

C-43: The book?

S-45: With your name.

C-44: Would you like to do that to me?

S-46: Mm. (Pause). There are lots of books here. Big books.

C-45: Uh-huh. Do you have some books?

S-47: Uh-huh. I have a blue book and a red book at home. And I can read in both of them.

C-46: You like to read?

S-48: Yeah. Uh. I better go now. I left my coat.

C-47: It's time for you to go home.


C-48: Well, Larry, I'll see you next week.

S-50: Could I come back tomorrow 'cause I like to come in here?

C-49: I like to have you come but I won't be here again until next week. (Pause). So I'll see you when I get back, O.K.?

S-51: O.K.

C-50: Bye Larry.
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First Interview with Fourth Grade Girl
Self Referral

C-1: Hello Kathy. Do you want to sit there?
S-1: Hi.
C-2: What did you wish to see me about?
S-2: I have a little reading problem. I read too fast, and talk too fast. I need to read slow so they can understand me better.
C-3: Uh-huh. I looked at your cumulative records and I see that you went to summer reading school.
S-3: Uh-huh. Mrs. W......, she was my teacher this summer. I didn't finish, though.
C-4: You decided to quit or something?
S-4: My father got put on the day shift and I couldn't get there this summer.
C-5: I see.
S-5: Just before last year I had trouble with reading, too. Last year it got worse, though. They couldn't understand me at all. Now I have the same trouble.
C-6: Do you do well in your other subjects?
S-6: Uh-huh. I never hardly had any trouble. I got good grades in other things and this summer my sister got good grades on her last report card. I never had a U on my report card but then I got a D because I was reading too fast.
C-7: You talk pretty fast, too, don't you?
S-7: Yes. In girl scouts we get a lot of books to read and I read them and sometimes my mother goes over them and helps me with them. I read them to get badges.
C-8: Uh-huh. Do you usually understand what you read?
S-8: Sometimes I do. Sometimes I, oh, I look back at it and I have to change it. After I read another one
I get confused about it. But I look at the pictures and then I can remember it better. One time when I was in the third grade I was in the next to the highest reading group. We had fourth grade readers and I could read well.

C-9: Do you read any at home now?

S-9: I've been reading some stuff about Thanksgiving.

C-10: Just for fun.

S-10: I have seventeen books that my aunt had. She gave them to me to read. Some are for sixth graders but Mrs. W.... said I read between the third and fourth grade level.

C-11: Uh-huh.

S-11: I have my sister, she's in the second grade and I help her read. She draws better than I can. At Sunday School she made a hand and tried to make a trick with it. I get books for her at the public library and help her read them.

C-12: It's nice that you help your sister.

S-12: We have a set of Encyclopedias but my brother cut two of them all to pieces.

C-13: How old is your brother?

S-13: Three.

C-14: Kathy, we have a reading teacher who is here twice each week. Have you seen her?

S-14: No, but one of the boys in class, Charles, he has trouble in reading, too, and he is in the special class. My mother talked to her and she don't have room for any more now. (Pause).

C-15: Sometimes there is a waiting list. (Pause). Sometimes we can get people in, though. Why don't you read some for me and let's see if we can find out what the trouble is.

S-15: (Laughs). I get nervous 'cause I read too fast.

C-16: I understand. Sometimes we all get excited. Just do the best you can. O.K.?
S-16: Alright.

C-17: I think you will find this quite easy.
(Counselor administers oral reading test).

C-18: Kathy, I think we should see if Mrs. K.... can get you into her class. Would you like that?

S-17: Yes, because I can't go to summer school and I want to get promoted.

C-19: Uh-huh. I'll talk with Mrs. K.... She won't be in tomorrow afternoon. I could see her then and then talk with you on Thursday.

S-18: You want me to come back here Thursday?

C-20: Yes, Thursday morning. Can you do that?

S-19: Yes. I'll have to ask Mrs. C.... 'cause she don't like to let us out so much. She's always after the girls for staying too long when they take the lunch money to the office.

C-21: Uh-huh. Well, here. Give her this note, O.K.?

S-20: O.K.

C-22: I'll see you Thursday, then.
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C-1: Good morning, Philip.

S-1: Good Morning.

C-2: Come on in.

S-2: (Silence).

C-3: Well, how have things been going for you so far this week?

S-3: Well, they've been going O.K.; I'm looking forward to Tuesday.

C-4: Looking forward to it?

S-4: Um hum, we're going on a picnic.

C-5: Oh, I see; you're going on a picnic. (Short pause).
Well, I wondered if you did any thinking about some of the things we discussed the other day?

S-5: Well, I've been doing a lot of thinking about my lessons, and swimming, and I've thought of my trumpet. (Silence).

C-6: O.K., could you tell me a little more about it?

S-6: Well, I've got one problem with my trumpet, (short pause) not practicing.

C-7: Um hum.

S-7: And, uh . . . well, I . . . uh, .... I can't seem to get through.

C-8: You mean you don't have enough time.

S-8: Well, I have it, but I just don't use it. And I do something else. (Long pause). Yesterday, uh . . . when we got home from our lesson, which was real late because, uh, the man who was supposed to give me a ride forgot. . .

C-9: Um hum.
S-9: ... and so I didn't get home until 3:15, and then I went out and trimmed our hedge a little bit and ... when I got in, I did my homework and ... 

C-10: ... and so you didn't have too much time for your trumpet.

S-10: Um hum.

C-11: And you feel it's important for you to spend some more time practicing for your trumpet lesson.

S-11: Yes, because, well, ah, I want to do the best I can.

C-12: You want to be the best?

S-12: Well, I mean, I don't want to be the best of everybody. I just want to do the best I can.

C-13: Um hum.

S-13: And I feel that I should spend more time. (Short silence).

C-14: And then you think it would be important for you to learn to do as well as you can.

S-14: Yes.

C-15: Um hum.

S-15: Very! Because, well, ah, I may take something else and I may take piano. We just rented a piano and I may take that, too (short pause) because, well, this trumpet, uh, I've taken it since fourth grade and, well, it's taught me a lot about my notes, and ... I can play about any song you give me. I can play the melody. I can't play with both hands, though. I can pick out songs.

C-16: So, the trumpet has been quite helpful to you, then.

S-16: Um hum. Very.

C-17: Uh-huh (low voice).

S-17: And it's helped my singing, too.

C-18: And it's also helped your singing.
S-18: Because, I can sound out the notes. I mean... now that I know where they go and what they sound like, uh, it's a lot easier for me to sing. It used to be that I couldn't carry a tune two notes and a heck and, uh,... well, now I'm pretty good.

C-19: So you're quite interested in music now.

S-19: Um hum (silence).

C-20: Well, uh, how is your typing coming along?

S-20: I did some last night. I didn't practice. I mean I didn't take the book out. I just got a piece of paper like that, and I mean it had something on it, and I just copied that down, and I try to do it as fast as I can and I time myself.

C-21: Does your father time you?

S-21: No, I timed myself. (Short pause). I did this over at his office.

C-22: Oh, I see.

S-22: That's where they've got the best typewriter.

C-23: And, uh, I believe you told me the other day that, uh, you were the only one in your class who was learning to type. Is that right?

S-23: Oh, yes, I think so. I don't think many others, well, uh, they just don't want to. I don't think we really need to know how to type yet. (Silence).

C-24: You don't think you really need to know how.

S-24: No, but it's fun, I think and uh...

(C interrupts)

C-25: ... but you think you might like to learn how.

S-25: Um hum, because, uh, now I write books, I mean just little books for myself and... I keep some of my things in it and... I type them so they look the best they can. I've got a stamp collection and on the first page it says All United States stamps by Philip Macomber and, uh, that was all typed out. That was before I started taking lessons...
C-26: Um hum.
S-26: ... or taking, using a book.
C-27: And that looked pretty good to you.
S-27: Yeah, uh, uh, (laughter) I had to do it a couple of times because, well, I had to make x's all the way around it, and it wasn't easy and, well, I just like to type.
C-28: Do, uh, the other boys and girls in your room know that you're typing?
S-28: I've only told a couple.
C-29: You'll probably, uh, tell more of them next year after you've learned more about it.
S-29: Yeah.
C-30: How do you think they'll react to it, when you tell them?
S-30: I think they'll act, react, react, pretty surprised.
C-31: Surprised?
S-31: Um hum. Because, well, my dad didn't learn to type until, I think, he went to college, but now, he can type pretty good. My mom can ... I can type almost as fast as my mom, but she can't type very fast. I can type words that I know how to spell faster because then I don't have to look to see how they're spelled.
C-32: Um hum.
S-32: Like, ah, I was typing a word, uh ... (pause), oh, well, it was a real ... .
(C interrupts)
C-33: ... I, ah, I think I know what you mean. But, uh, you think the boys and girls will be surprised because, uh, you'll be the first one your age to learn how.
S-33: Um hum.
C-34: Um hum. (Short pause). Well, you seem like you feel pretty good about all that.
S-34: I do. And my lessons on swimming have been coming real good and I've had lots of fun. (Pause) I'm not going to get to take one today because we're going on a picnic.

C-35: Um hum.

S-35: But, uh, I'll get to take one some other time. But . . . I mean all of us are allowed to do this. (Pause) But, uh, if they wouldn't, uh, I'd skip the picnic and take my lesson.

C-36: Then, uh, you think it's more important to take your swimming lesson.

S-36: Because we'll go swimming anyway, but I won't learn anything.

C-37: Um hum.

S-37: I'll just splash around, uh . . .

C-38: How often do you take the swimming lessons?

S-38: Everyday.

C-39: Everyday, um hum.

S-39: About an hour. (Short pause). Down at Lakeside Nursery School (laughter), (pause), and, uh, the teachers are all nice. They try to help us . . . everyone, almost . . . and we get about fifteen minutes play period where we practice everything. Uh, we don't have to. We can get out and warm up, and, uh . . . , we stand in the pool for about forty-five minutes and uh, when we have to wait in line, uh, it gets sort of cold and, uh, in other words, they don't have it heated, but I get to kickboard on free time and I have lots of fun doing that.

C-40: I believe you told me the other day that, uh, most of the boys and girls in your class already knew how to swim.

S-40: Yeah, there's only two others.

C-41: Besides yourself . . .

S-41: . . . Yeah, uh, Jimmy and David and that's all.
C-42: Um hum. You think this will be a big help to you.
S-42: To learn how to swim?
C-43: Um hum.
S-43: Yes. (Silence).
C-44: Are you swimming with some of your classmates?
S-44: No.
C-45: No.
S-45: I've made friends with a couple.
C-46: I'm sorry, I didn't get that.
S-46: I made friends with a couple of the children, a boy and a girl. I'm the oldest one there, um. We just started to, uh, float on our backs.
C-47: Um hum.
S-47: We've been doing the prone float, and I, ah, like to do that.
C-48: Um hum. Evidently it doesn't bother you too much because you are the oldest one there.
S-48: Um! (Shakes head no).
C-49: It's more important to learn how.
S-49: Yeah. (Pause) I just like to be in the water.
C-50: Um hum. (Silence)
S-50: And I can swim a little bit, I mean I can't swim very good (pause) but, ah, I, before I took my lessons, I could only dog-paddle, but now that I've been doing, (pause) I've been using the kickboard, I can swim a little. (Laughter)
C-51: Uh, I was wondering, if, uh, you ever got those bulletin boards finished you were talking about the other day.
S-51: Yes, we did and the day after that, uh, one of our student teachers took them down and uh . . .
C-52: And, excuse me.

S-52: And boy, that made us mad, the people who were on the committee, because we just put them up, and they were pretty hard to put up and, uh, it had, "What Do You Know About Trees," and it had all this stuff about Alaska, and, uh . . . see, we used to have lumbering under there.

C-53: Um hum.

S-53: And today I found out the teacher changed it and says, "What Do You Know About Alaska." (Pause). But the other bulletin board we put up, she didn't change. I'm glad of that.

C-54: You have two of them?

S-54: Yeah, that we put up. And then, uh, there's three more that somebody else put up and then we've got two real small ones, and they're about, oh, about that high and about that wide. We have announcements on one of them. And the other one way back in the corner of the room, we don't use that one. (Silence)

C-55: And you felt maybe you should have had a chance to look at that bulletin board a little bit longer?

S-55: Well, yes, it was only up there a day, (pause) a day and a half (pause), and the teacher took it down.

C-56: You didn't get a chance to tell the rest of the class about it. (Pause) You think that would be pretty important.

S-56: Yeah, because, uh, well, we were talking about lumbering in the Northwest. Then she puts up stuff the day after that about Alaska. (Laughter).

C-57: So nobody really got a chance to see anything.

S-57: That's right.

C-58: Um hum.

S-58: I mean I read some of the maps that Bobby brought and they were pretty interesting. And I was hoping that some of the other children would . . . .
C-59: ... get a chance to see them, too.

S-59: Um hum.

C-60: It's pretty important to share things, isn't it?

S-60: Um hum.

C-61: I believe you said there were three people on the committee besides you.

S-61: Yeah. (low voice)

C-62: Two boys and two girls, is that right?

S-62: Um hum.

C-63: Um hum. (pause) Uh, maybe you can tell me how you, uh, decided on some of the activities for your committee.

S-63: Uh, the other boy didn't work at all, I mean, uh, he was as good as nothing. And, uh, really only Kathy and I worked on it. And we just uh ... we didn't have any argument. I mean, uh, she asked me something and, uh ... she had a ... we had one board, uh, on the Fourth of July, and we did have a big firecracker up there and it said, "What are you going to do on the Fourth of July?" and, uh, she had a big piece of construction paper as a big fire cracker and I didn't like that and ... no argument ... she cut it down, and it looks a lot better now and we're both satisfied.

C-64: You mean you just told her you didn't like it.

S-64: Um hum, and I think she asked me something.

C-65: Um hum.

S-65: And I agreed.

C-66: So you got along pretty well.

S-66: Yeah.

C-67: Um hum. Well, uh, why was it you said the other two people didn't do too much?
S-67: I don't know. Well, uh, Susan, she helped at the end when we put up the letters. She handed Kathy the pins, and I gave Kathy the letters to put up there, and Kathy pinned them on, and then we stapled them on. Kathy stapled a couple.

C-68: Um hum.

S-68: I think Kathy did the most work.

C-69: Um hum.

S-69: She should get most of the credit. (Pause). When the teacher took it down, she asked us, could we and of course, we could hardly argue, because we'd just lose . . . . I mean, uh, that's just how it goes.

C-70: You mean you couldn't argue about whether she took it down or not.

S-70: Yeah, but I don't see why she asked, uh, she just took it down.

C-71: You think she should just have gone ahead and taken it down.

S-71: Yeah, because we wouldn't have done much but argue and, it wouldn't have helped any.

C-72: Um hum.

S-72: Like yesterday, she gave an assignment for . . . . we all had to draw a map of Alaska freehand, and the kids were real mad, but, uh, we ended up doing it. But I don't mind. I like to draw things freehand, not that they're very good when I'm done, but, uh, it's fun.

C-73: You say you were mad.

S-73: Yeah. I wasn't . . . .

C-74: Um hum.

S-74: . . . . because it didn't bother me any. It's a lot easier than some of the other things.
C-75: Um hum. (Pause). I just wondered too, if you, uh, I'm sure you have, discussed rules in your own classroom with your teacher about how you should work in committees.

S-75: What do you mean?

C-76: Uh, good rules to follow when you work in committees.

S-76: Yes . . .

C-77: . . . Uh huh. (Pause) How do you feel your committee did? Did they follow the rules? (Silence)

S-77: We have a program every Friday. It's our English Club. (Short pause) and, uh, they give book reports and have a play, and, uh, this week the committee that had the play, uh, they, uh, didn't do much.

C-78: Um hum.

S-78: So, uh, there's going to be another committee, that's going to have to get it done real quick. It's tomorrow morning. And, uh, (pause), well, I don't think that committee followed the rules, uh, because I, uh, don't think they did anything.

C-79: Um hum.

S-79: They found a story, but . . . and I think it's part of the class, uh, see, there are two boys that aren't liked very well, and uh, they had picked some of the people to be in it, and the people said O.K., and then all of the kids dropped out.

C-80: Ohhh . . .

S-80: Um hum. (Pause). How do you see these committee rules? Do you think they're pretty good?

S-81: Most of them.

S-82: Teacher assigns people to give book reports. I give one this week (esee), (Pause), and she said we had to read a little bit out of the book, uh, you know, the best part, and, uh, I just started my book this morning.

C-83: Uh huh.
S-83: (acting out) About that thick, Guadalcanal Diary.

G-84: Um hum.

S-84: I . . . think I can get it done, or most of it done.

G-85: You don't seem too worried about it.

S-85: What?

G-86: You don't seem to be too worried about it.

S-86: No.

G-87: Um hum. (Silence)

S-87: Because I can work on it tonight (pause) and during reading tomorrow morning. (Pause). If I can wake up early enough, that's when I do a lot of things.

G-88: Uh huh.

S-88: Last night I didn't get to bed until almost 10:30 and I was bushed, so I didn't take a bath. (Laughter). I took it this morning.

G-89: You were pretty busy last night?

S-89: Oh, my dad went over to his office, and, I had to come with him cause my mom went to rehearsal; she's in the Three Penny Opera.

G-90: Um hum.

S-90: And, uh, she went with Mr. Thomas, and I rode in his um, Corvette. That's fun.

G-91: Um hum.

S-91: I'd never ridden in a Corvette, (pause), and my dad wasn't ready until (short pause) almost 10:15.

G-92: Uh huh.

S-92: Then we had to go upstairs to the third floor to see my mom and, and I almost fell asleep in the car going home and uh, of course the speech building is only down here . . .

G-93: Um hum.
... and, so my dad told me I didn't have to take a bath and I woke up at 7:15 this morning and ... took a bath. I usually get up at ... well, at 7:30.

C-94: You got up a little bit earlier then.

S-94: Yeah. Oh no, I usually get up at twenty minutes till eight, and, it gives me fifteen minutes to get dressed. I usually watch T.V. while I get dressed. And ... my mom fixes my breakfast, and my breakfast is usually from eight, eight-ten, until about twenty after. But today, I got do ... on, and my breakfast was ready at 8:00, and I got done at 8:10 and I had ... I plucked around on the piano, and ... I got my things ready. That's how I usually get organized, uh ... .

C-95: ... Um hum. Your feeling a little bit tired today because maybe you were up too late last night.

S-95: Yeah. I'm going to really be tired after our picnic.

C-96: Um hum.

S-96: I'm going to try to get to bed earlier, or take a nap. (Silence).

C-97: Well, uh, I think that's probably enough for today. Uh, is there anything else that you wanted to bring up?

S-97: Yeah, I have something. (Pause). Oh, it's about ... sort of ... it's just like my trumpet. Uh, my parents tell me something to do and I never get it done. I had to clean up my room and I didn't get it done until the day after ... and, trim the hedge. I was supposed to do that the day, I, uh, was supposed to clean my room and, uh, I didn't get either of it done. That's another problem I have I'm going to try to solve.

C-98: You mean not getting things done on time.

S-98: Uh huh. And the next day I cleaned up my room. And yesterday I trimmed part of the hedge.

C-99: This is pretty important to get things done on time.

S-99: Yeah.
C-100: . . . because your parents want you to.
S-100: Yeah.
C-101: UH-HUH.
S-101: 'n, I don't want to be bawled out or anything.
C-102: Uh huh.
S-102: Because I want to get my things done. (Pause)
But, uh, . . .
C-103: Sometimes, maybe, there's other things you'd like
to do, too.
S-103: Yeah, like play.
C-104: Oh. (Silence)
S-104: I just started something, (pause) nothing else to
do, I mean, it was hot outside . . . cooler in our
house than it is outside. So I tried to catch
some flies, and I make rocket ships out of clay . .
C-105: Oh, I see.
S-105: . . . and send them up for space flights. (Silence)
C-106: Well, how did you feel about this?
S-106: I felt pretty bad because, uh (pause) well, I try
to get my things done. Sometimes I get them done
and sometimes I don't. This happens once in a
while and uh . . .
C-107: It bothers you somewhat.
S-107: Uh huh.
C-108: . . . because I let it go, and, uh, it's mostly
cleaned up now. I've still got some things . . .
things I don't know what to do with. I, uh, I've
got an extra bed which always gets piled up with
things . . . ironing . . .
C-109: Uh hum.
S-109: . . . My desk, and my dresser and my . . . I've got a T.V. in there. It's just a case, just a (pause) well, there's no tube in it . . . because, uh, it went black and I usually have that in there. So since we had an extra T.V., uh, I could watch the shows I wanted to and they could watch the shows that they wanted to.

G-110: This makes everybody feel better.

S-110: Yeah.

G-111: Yeah.

S-111: Because, uh, there are some shows they want to watch and some shows I want to watch. But they don't watch much T.V. anymore because, well, summer shows aren't as good as winter shows. (Pause). And, uh, (pause), well, the T.V.'s just stuck in there and it's stuck right by a black chest that I have a lot of my things in. And, uh, it's hard to get to the chest. I can't open up the doors all way. I have to almost get inside (pause) of the chest to see what I am doing.

G-112: So you think it's kind of important to be able to do some of these things to please your parents but also, uh . . .

S-112: . . . to please me.

G-113: Yeah, to please you. (Pause). Yeah.

S-113: I'd like it when they get that T.V. chassis out and . . . so it'd leave me more room and . . . I've got a big train table in there.

G-114: Um hum.

S-114: I told you about that my last time.

G-115: Um hum.

S-115: And that takes up, oh, so much room.

G-116: Um hum.

S-116: And, uh, my room's just stuffed. I mean there's hardly much room to walk around there.
C-117: Um hum.

S-117: So if I want to take anything big out, I have to take it into our family room.

C-118: I see. Um hum.

S-118: I usually make that another room of mine and, I play with my baseball cards in there, and . . . I'm a baseball fan.

C-119: Um hum. (Pause). You haven't discussed this problem with your parents?

S-119: They discuss it with me.

C-120: They discuss it with you.

S-120: Yeah.

C-121: Could you be a little more clear?

S-121: Well, I mean (laughter) I don't come up to them to tell it.

C-122: Oh, I see.

S-122: They come up to me.

C-123: Um hum.

S-123: and (laughter) that's the hard way, (laughter) and then I get yelled at more.

C-124: Um hum. (Silence).

S-124: And sometimes I like a joke, like yesterday . . . see, I, I usually get home around 2:15, and instead I was an hour late, and my mom was at rehearsal, of Three Penny Opera . . .

C

C-125: Um hum.

S-125: . . . and, uh, she wasn't home when I got home, but of course, she had no idea that mybride didn't come and, so when I got home, I got right to work. I had lunch, but I didn't eat much, cause I couldn't. I had some crackers, um . . . .
C-126: What do you mean, you couldn't eat much?
S-126: Because, I, I was going into the pool . . .
C-127: Oh, I see.
S-127: . . . in just about, oh, a half-hour . . . later, because I get home at twelve, and, it's at one, and I usually don't get home at twelve. I mean we get out of school at twelve.
C-128: Um hum.
S-128: I get home around 12:15, if I walk. And then I eat maybe five minutes later, and that would give me an hour wait . . .
C-129: Um. (Silence).
S-129: And so I, I don't have very much.
C-130: Um.
S-130: And so when I come home, I have a little more (umm) and then I got . . . I started trimming the hedge. When my mom came I said, "I'm sorry, but I didn't get much done." And she said, "Why not?" (Laughter) And I said, "I didn't get home until 3:15." She looked at me, you know. I told her my ride never came. (Pause), uh, (Silence).
C-131: She accepted that.
S-131: Yeah, uh. (Laughter).
C-132: Um hum. (Pause). Well, uh, I don't want you to get late for your music lesson. It is almost time, so, if you'd like to do some more thinking about the things we've discussed here today . . .
S-132: O.K.
C-133: . . . it might be helpful and, uh, if you feel it would be helpful for you to come back and talk to me again, I'd be glad to have you come back.
S-133: Anytime.
C-134: Um hum. Well, do you think you would like to come back. (Client shakes head, yes.) O.K., uh, let me see. I believe next Wednesday we have an opening. (Pause) Do you have anything special scheduled on Wednesday during school?

S-134: At what time?

C-135: Well, nine, ten, or eleven.

S-135: Or eleven. Uh, you mean nine, ten, or eleven o' clock?

C-136: Um hum.

S-136: Any of those times . . .

C-137: . . . Any of those times. How about ten next Wednesday? Would that be O.K.?

S-137: Yeah.

C-138: Thank you. Alright, well then, I'll see you next Wednesday.

S-138: Thank you.

C-139: Thank you for coming. (Silence)

S-139: Goodby.

C-140: Goodbye.
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