

71-28,663

MERCHANT, William Chadwick, 1942-
COUNSELING AND/OR CONSULTATION: THE EFFECTIVE-
NESS OF THREE PROCEDURES IN THE ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL.

The University of Arizona, Ed.D., 1971
Education, guidance and counseling

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

COUNSELING AND/OR CONSULTATION: THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF THREE PROCEDURES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

by

William Chadwick Marchant

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 1

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my direction by William Chadwick Marchant entitled Counseling and/or Consultation: The Effectiveness of Three Procedures in the Elementary School be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the degree of Doctor of Education

Q. C. Christensen
Dissertation Director

May 3, 1971
Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in its approval and recommend its acceptance:*

<u><i>Richard L. Fishman</i></u>	<u>3 May 1971</u>
<u><i>Paul W. Daniel</i></u>	<u>5-3-71</u>
<u><i>Bernice Thompson</i></u>	<u>5-3-71</u>
<u><i>Sarah M. Kirby</i></u>	<u>5-3-71</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, providing that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: William C. Murchant

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have been very helpful during the completion of this project.

Dr. O. C. Christensen, as dissertation advisor, has been supportive and encouraging about the project from the isolation of the original idea to the completion of the writing. Dr. Sarah Hervey provided timely help, suggestions, and encouragement at critical points in the process of designing and writing the research. Dr. Paul Danielson, Dr. Richard L. Erickson, and Dr. Hershel Thornburg have been supportive at all times. All of the above have been members of the graduate study committee for my three years of graduate study. Largely because of these people graduate study has been a rewarding experience.

Four people, who served as counselor-consultants for this study, deserve special mention and thanks. Mary Ann Haak, Betty Newlon, Peggy Nash and Robert Foley gave valuable time for small reward. Without their assistance the project would not have been successful.

The officials of Tucson School District Number One, the principals and teachers involved should be acknowledged but must remain unnamed in order to protect the anonymity of the children involved.

My wife, LaNila, and two sons, Mike and Pat, provided the impetus for beginning the doctoral study program and the strength to

complete it. Without them and their good natured acceptance of the problems associated with graduate study, I am doubtful that a doctoral program would have been attempted.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this work to my parents whom I love and respect.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	LIST OF TABLES	vii
	ABSTRACT	viii
I.	INTRODUCTION AND NEED FOR THE STUDY	1
II.	DERIVATION OF THE PROBLEM FROM AVAILABLE LITERATURE	4
	Statement of the Problem	17
III.	PROCEDURES	18
	Goals for Counseling	18
	Hypothesis	20
	Definition of Terms	20
	Sampling	21
	Treatment Schedule	24
	Instrument to Be Used	25
	Statistical Treatment of Data	28
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	29
	Results	29
	Homogeneity of Variance.	29
	Analysis of Variance	29
	Post Hoc Tests	30
	Further Data Analyses	31
	Summary.	34
	Discussion	34
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	37
	Summary	37
	Conclusions	38
	Recommendations	40

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
APPENDIX A: RAW SCORES OF TREATMENT GROUPS . . .	43
APPENDIX B: GAIN SCORES FOR FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS	45
APPENDIX C: FAVORABLE COMMENTS FROM TEACHERS AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE TREAT- MENT PERIOD	46
APPENDIX D: NEGATIVE COMMENTS FROM TEACHERS AFTER THE TREATMENT PERIOD	48
APPENDIX E: COUNSELORS' PLAN FOR VISITING SCHOOLS.	49
LIST OF REFERENCES	50

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST TO POSTTEST GAIN SCORES ON THE WALKER PROBLEM BEHAVIOR IDENTIFICATION CHECKLIST	30
2 TUKEY TESTS FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TREATMENT MEANS.	31
3 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH FOUR SCORES ELIMINATED FROM THE ANALYSIS	33
4 TUKEY TESTS FOR GROUP MEANS WITH FOUR SCORES ELIMINATED FROM THE ANALYSIS	33

ABSTRACT

Problem

Several attempts have been made to validate by empirical procedures a model for elementary school counseling. These attempts have usually emphasized either the counseling or the consultation component of a particular counseling model. The usual result, whether the emphasis has been on counseling or consultation, has been a failure to produce a positive behavior change in problem children. This study investigated whether counseling with consultation, consultation alone, or counseling alone produced positive behavior change in problem children when the techniques used were derived from an Adlerian model for elementary school counseling.

Procedures

Three experimental groups and a no-treatment control group were selected, each from a different school. The schools had been determined to have similar pupil characteristics by the research department of the participating school district. In each school the fourth and fifth grade teachers were asked to complete a behavior checklist for each of several children in their respective classrooms. The students with the highest scores on the behavior checklist were selected to participate in the study.

In that no student who scored below ten on the instrument was selected, the groups had unequal numbers.

After the groups had been selected, the treatment phase of the project began. Group one received counseling from a counselor who visited the school twice a week for five weeks. The teachers of the students in group one received consultation about the children's behavior problems and ways of dealing with the problem behavior. Each teacher was visited by the same person who was counseling the problem children from the classroom on the same day as the children were seen. The children in group two had no direct contact with the counselor. The counselor saw instead only the teachers of the children in this group. The teacher and counselor worked in a consulting relationship toward developing methods of changing behavior while the child remained in the classroom. Group three included children who received direct counseling from the counselor. The teachers of the children in group three had no counselor contact.

After the five week treatment period the teachers who had children participating in the study were asked to again fill out the behavior checklist for each of the target children.

The gain scores from the pretest to the posttest were used as the data for analysis. The data were analyzed by the use of the analysis of variance and a post hoc Tukey test.

Findings

The three treatment programs, counseling plus consultation, consultation alone, and counseling alone were all shown to be more effective than the absence of any treatment. Each treatment was found to be just as effective as the others. In other words, no differences in the effectiveness of each treatment was noted. All treatments were shown to be more effective than no treatment at the .005 significance level.

Conclusions

It was concluded that no differentiation in the effectiveness of counseling and/or consultation can presently be demonstrated. It was concluded, however, that counseling and/or consultation, either separately or in concert, can be effective in changing behavior when Adlerian methods are used.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND NEED FOR THE STUDY

Counseling in an educational setting has existed since before World War II. A recent development within the counseling movement is the practice of placing counselors in the elementary school. Faust (1968b) noted that a pronounced movement to place counselors in elementary schools began in the late 1950's and early 1960's. With the introduction of the journal, Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, in mid-1967 the elementary school counseling movement became more visible as a specialized discipline.

The workers in elementary school guidance and counseling, existing as specialists within the realm of general counseling practice, are faced with a basic problem which pervades the entire discipline; the empirical validation of techniques derived from counseling theory for use in counseling practice. The comparative infancy of the elementary school specialty would seem to indicate the appropriateness of expecting an early solution of the problem. The lack of established dogma in terms of theory and practice at this point in time helps to create the feeling that the time is ripe for empirical validation of specific techniques derived from counseling theory. To date, however, little progress toward

validating counseling techniques based on theoretical assumptions has been made. It has been advocated that more attempts should be made in subjecting counseling techniques to empirical test (Stefflre, 1963; Cottingham, 1967). These appeals for testing counseling models have produced little successful response. The fact is, as Thoresen stated, ". . . that most studies, as they are conceptualized, designed, executed and analyzed, make no difference to counseling theory and practice" (1969).

A notable theory of counseling which has been advocated for use in the elementary school is the Adlerian Family Counseling model proposed by Dreikurs (1968) and Dreikurs et al. (1959). This method is currently being taught at several universities throughout the United States, notably at The University of Arizona by O. C. Christensen; The University of Oregon by R. Lowe; and The West Virginia University by M. Sonstegard. If one estimated that each one of these programs is producing counselors at a moderate rate, the impact of a given model seen over a period of time is staggering. If in fact there is little or no validation of the point of view being employed by the counselor educators, one could raise serious questions as to the justification of such practice.

While the number of studies attempting to put the techniques derived from the family counseling model to empirical test is almost nil, one attempt has produced positive findings. Platt (1970) subjected the

model to experimental test with encouraging results. The current study is an attempt to further fill the empirical gap relative to the Adlerian counseling model and its effectiveness in the elementary school setting. The essential modification of the present study which differentiates it from Platt's is that the present study will attempt to validate techniques provided only in the school. Platt tested the model while providing services to the school and the home.

CHAPTER II

DERIVATION OF THE PROBLEM FROM AVAILABLE LITERATURE

The need for placing counselors in the elementary school has been proposed by several writers (Faust, 1968a; Meeks, 1968; and Hansen and Stevic, 1969). The most persuasive argument for elementary school guidance has been presented by Sievers:

Most counselors agree that all children could benefit from guidance during the elementary grades in school. Guidance for the gifted adolescent often comes too late to change his study habits or his educational plans; and early recognition of and help for children with physical, social and emotional difficulties might prevent delinquency, early dropouts from schools, and later unemployment as teenagers. Children of average ability can also benefit from an effective elementary school guidance program (1963, p. iv).

Opinion of writers in the field is unanimous regarding the need for elementary school counselors. There are, however, variations in emphasis regarding the activities to be engaged in by the elementary school counselor. Certain writers (Eckerson, 1967; Grams, 1966; Faust, 1968a; and Dinkmeyer, 1968) believe that the goals of counseling in the elementary school can best be accomplished by the counselor spending the bulk of time as a consultant with teachers on classroom problems. Other writers (Patterson, 1967; Nelson, 1967; and Van Hoose, 1968) see the guidance workers primary role as counseling directly with problem children.

Regarding the primacy of consultation as the major function of an elementary school counselor, Faust (1968a) noted that the counselor can most efficiently utilize available time in a developmental guidance program if he allows the teacher to be the chief agent of change in a school system, while spending the bulk of his time as a consultant to the teacher.

The opposite position is represented by Van Hoose (1968) in his statement, "Counseling is viewed as the key guidance activity" (p. 1). Van Hoose emphasized the importance of the counseling function when he stated, "consultation with . . . teachers is . . . a secondary function and derives from the primary function of counseling" (p. 115).

It is not surprising that someone should adopt a centralist position and state that counseling and consultation are complementary functions of equal value in a guidance program (Hume, 1970).

Thus, we are presented with three positions regarding the counselor-consultant controversy: advocates of counseling, advocates of consulting, and an advocate of equality of functions.

It should be pointed out here that there are remarkably few research studies of counseling or consultation in the elementary school setting extant. The most relevant are included here in some detail in order to develop conclusions based on the findings and conclusions of the reported studies.

A study by Winkler et al. had a stated purpose " . . . to determine the effects of selected counseling and remedial techniques in altering the grade point average and measured personality variables of underachieving fourth grade students" (1965). A group of 108 students were divided into the following treatment groups: individual counseling, group counseling, reading instruction, Hawthorne-effect, and control. The techniques used in counseling were described as "client-centered" and included specific activities such as role playing, drawing, telling stories, "rough housing," and other "acting out behavior," which was not discouraged. Counseling proceeded for one-half hour sessions for fourteen weeks. At the end of the experimental period there were no differences between any of the treatment groups or the treatment groups and control group on any of the measured variables. Similar results have been reported by Teigland et al. (1966) using the same methods but slightly different measuring techniques. Matthes (1968) reported a study in which he attempted to relate counselor conditions described as accurate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and counselor self-congruence to changes in elementary school student's sociometric status, attitudes toward school, and social skills. These counselor skills are reported to be from "client-centered" theory. The results reported by Matthes indicated with the presence of these elements the counseling relationship produced no change in the measured variables. Although the

variables are not defined in behavior as to what observable counselor characteristics occurred, Matthes concluded that, ". . . there appears to be no relationship between accurate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and counselor self-congruence that exists in the counseling sessions and change in the elementary school student's sociometric status, attitudes toward school and social skills" (p. 2074).

Moulin (1970) attempted to relate the effects of "client-centered" group counseling using play media and changes in intelligence, achievement and psycholinguistic abilities of underachieving primary school children. Moulin assumed that the process of counseling with play materials is based on an intercommunication between counselor and pupil which attempts to bring the significance of the material with which the pupil is playing to a level of understanding and cognition. He apparently assumed that the result would be visible as change scores on selected instruments. Moulin reported results that may or may not be interpreted as encouraging.

Using the California Test of Mental Maturity (short-form) as the criterion for changes in intelligence, Moulin reported no change in the language or total score but reported change in the non-language score. Moulin hesitated to interpret this change as significant in that it was due primarily to score regression in the control group rather than to significant score gain in the experimental group. Hence, the result should be

interpreted as indicating that no effect was noted on intelligence test scores.

Regarding changes in achievement scores, no pretest to post-test change was noted indicating that the counseling procedure did not seem to have an effect on achievement test scores.

The third criterion of change from counseling employed by Moulin was the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Changes of scores on several subtests of the ITPA enabled Moulin to conclude that there had been changes in the direction of increased meaningful language usage but not in the direction increased automatic language usage.

As with many experiments of this type utilizing client-centered methods, the results are difficult to interpret. There is no indication that changes in intelligence, achievement, or psycholinguistic abilities are defensible goals for counseling. The positive result on the psycholinguistic criterion would probably have resulted from any repeated verbal interaction with others and cannot be ascribed to counseling as a unique experience (Psycholinguistic Remedial Materials, undated). Thus, we are left with questionable results from a study based on weak assumptions and author-admitted design and sampling bias. One must wonder if such results are at all helpful in the evaluation of counseling. Moulin did indeed note that he had produced "little statistical evidence of the value of client-centered group counseling using play media" (1970, p. 95).

Kranzler (1968), in a review of efforts to evaluate elementary school counseling, noted an unpublished study by himself utilizing "client-centered" methods which resulted in no change in the measured variables resulting from counseling. Kranzler arrived at two possible conclusions about counseling and research based on his review of efforts to validate a "client-centered" model for elementary school counseling (p. 292): counseling is good, but the methods used to evaluate it were inadequate;" or (2) "the methods used to evaluate counseling were adequate; therefore, counseling is useless." While either or both of the above conclusions are tenable, there seems to be another quite obvious conclusion, which is just as tenable: that is that since the studies reviewed by Kranzler used the so-called "client-centered" methods exclusively, it could be that the specific methods used in these studies are what should be considered suspect.

The role of the counselor as a consultant has been evaluated by Oldridge (1964). Oldridge compared teacher and student perceptions of the effectiveness of a guidance worker acting as a consultant with the teachers of problem children. At the beginning of the study teacher and student perceptions of the desired role of the guidance worker were assessed. At the beginning of the study the preferred role for the guidance worker was that of a counselor acting in a traditional therapeutic individual counseling manner. Several schools were randomly selected

for placement of a traditional therapeutic counselor or a guidance consultant. During the period of the study, each worker in each school performed in the prescribed fashion: the consultant working with teachers and having no contact directly with problem children and the counselor working directly with the problem children with a minimum of contact with teachers. After the experimental period, the perception measures were readministered to teachers and students. Teachers in schools who had had the experience of working with a consultant changed their perception about the desired role for a guidance worker from a traditional therapeutic approach to the consultant approach. A more profound result was the change in the perceptions of the teacher who worked with the traditional counselor. This group of teachers changed their perception of the role to a preference for the consultant role. What had apparently happened during the experience was that those teachers who had worked with a consultant became aware of the value of such an approach while those teachers who had worked with the traditional counselor failed to see any continuing value for that approach. The result of the student perception change was also interesting. Students, who rated peers on classroom behavior, reported that those in the control group, who had received no treatment, were the only group who experienced positive behavior change to any significant degree (.05). The general conclusion derived from the data in this study reported by Oldridge is that for

guidance personnel with comparable training there is little evidence to support the notion of continued contacts with individual children while working toward the goal of observed behavior change. A posture of working as a guidance consultant would be more defensible.

Anderson (1968) completed a study comparing two procedures which could be utilized by elementary school counselors. The first procedure in Anderson's comparison was a combination of individual counseling and teacher consultation which was evaluated against the second procedure, which was consultation with teachers without contact with children. The methods used in both procedures are described as "client-centered." After an eighteen week experimental period an experimenter designed rating scale intended to be used as a rating of self-concept was administered. The results of the study are difficult to understand. At the fourth grade level individual counseling-consultation was seen as valuable. At the fifth grade level neither approach seemed to produce any result. At the sixth grade level the teacher consultation procedure was seen as the more effective procedure. The only general conclusion made by Anderson is that either procedure would seem to be more effective than no counseling at all. While Anderson guessed that there may be a developmental process associated with the development of a self-concept, as she was trying to measure it, difficulties in design, measurement, and execution of the project are possibilities that cannot be ignored in

explaining the differential effectiveness of the procedures at the different grade levels.

In a recent experiment, Lewis (1970) attempted to evaluate the differential effectiveness of a counseling and a consulting procedure in changing sociometric status and personality variables. No differences in the two procedures were noted.

Kranzler (1969) attempted to review experimental results obtained in comparisons of counseling and consulting procedures used by elementary school counselors. He reviewed one study reported herein and another unpublished study and concluded that neither counseling nor consulting has proven to be better than no counselor contact at all. Kranzler noted, however, that the studies he has reviewed all utilized "client-centered" procedures. Kranzler conceded that he has observed informally the work of "Adlerian" counselors, noting that they seem to work quite differently than the typical "client-centered" counselor, which may have a more easily observed resulting behavior change in the problem child.

At this point, several conclusions based on experimental results in the literature seem at least partially tenable. The first is that no one has demonstrated that "client-centered" counseling procedures produce a measurable effect on the elementary school child. The second is that no one has demonstrated that "client-centered" consulting procedures produce the desired result in the elementary school. The third

conclusion is, according to Oldridge, that consulting is at least perceived as more helpful than counseling by teachers. A possible fourth conclusion is that no one has presented evidence that different procedures than those herein reviewed will not produce a desired behavior change in the child. A final conclusion, which no one seems to want to accept, is that counseling is of no value whatsoever. This conclusion is hardly acceptable since of the realm of methods for producing behavior change in the elementary school classroom only a few have been subjected to empirical test.

All the foregoing conclusions have additional impact when the study by Platt (1970), mentioned above, is examined. Platt provided counseling, based upon the socio-teleological approach first articulated by Alfred Adler and later refined by Dreikurs (1968), Christensen (1969), and others, to fourteen elementary school students, their parents, and teachers. The students were seen in three groups periodically for nine weeks. The parents and teachers were seen for one hour per week for the nine week experimental period. Platt also had a placebo group which was seen by the counselor for listening to music and studying for the nine week period and a control group which received no treatment. In counseling with the children in the experimental group and consulting with the parents and teachers of these children Platt helped all three groups understand the purposefulness of children's maladaptive behavior

and dealt with specific methods of improving that behavior. Platt translated for parents and teachers a scheme for understanding the dynamics underlying misbehavior in children which enables significant adults in the child's life to deal effectively with misbehavior. Specific incidents were analyzed and alternative methods for dealing with the misbehavior were discussed. In the counseling sessions with the children, Platt utilized a four step process recommended by Sonstegard (1967). Within this process step one involves building a counseling relationship; step two involves exploring behavior situations. In step three the counselor communicates to the child an understanding of why they misbehave (disclosure of the goals of misbehavior); and in step four, the reorientation phase, alternative ways of behaving are discussed.

At the end of the nine week experimental period all children were rated on a behavior check list by parents and teachers. In the experimental group all children improved according to their ratings by the parents and all but two improved as rated by teachers. On a group basis, the pretest to posttest change was significant at the .05 level. The children in the control and placebo groups remained the same or became decidedly worse.

Obviously, something happened during the course of the study by Platt that apparently did not happen during the rest of the studies herein reviewed. It seems desirable to accept his results as valid until further

research can be undertaken to further validate the techniques used or provide contradictory data. Importance should be attached to the fact that Platt used both counseling and consultation procedures in the context of this study.

The importance of the results of Platt's study underscore the "education model" for elementary school guidance proposed by Christensen (1969). The education model assumes that maladaptive behavior is essentially the product of lack of knowledge, information, or experience rather than illness. Hence, such a model is more appropriate to an educational setting than those models based upon an intrapsychic personality problem.

The basis for counseling practice in the context of the education model is ". . . that people, if provided with new or pertinent information, are capable of applying the new information to their situation, making the corrections necessary to bring about change" (Christensen, 1969, p. 13).

This is the basis of the model employed by Platt and in the study reported herein.

The education model as presented by Christensen employs Adlerian theory in its basic assumptions about human development and behavior. The education model presents a rationale for working in the elementary school that includes teacher and parent consultation as well as direct counseling services to students. The implication being that counseling

and consultation are both important tasks for the elementary school counselor.

Except in Platt's (1970) study, no test of the Adlerian techniques employed in the education model has been attempted. While a summary of the literature reviewed herein must note that the "client-centered" techniques have not proven to be effective on any criteria, the literature contains no evidence that other procedures are ineffective. The issue of the relative effectiveness of counseling versus consultation likewise remains an open issue. Platt's study gave some support to techniques derived from Adlerian theory but did not help us with the counseling-consultation problem. Thus, the relative effectiveness of counseling and consultation when the techniques used are drawn from Adlerian theory was seen as worthy of study.

The present study derived from the above conclusions. A need was seen to further validate counseling and consulting techniques developed from Adlerian theory. The relative value of the direct counseling function and the consulting function for elementary school counselors is a continuing problem. Hence, it seemed desirable to evaluate the relative effectiveness of the techniques derived from the Adlerian counseling model for use in counseling and/or consultation.

Statement of the Problem

The problem for current study, then, was to test the relative effectiveness of (1) counseling directly with problem children, (2) consulting with their teachers, or (3) a combination of counseling and consulting techniques in accomplishing behavior change in the elementary school classroom, when the techniques used are derived from the Adlerian counseling model.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Goals for Counseling

None of the studies reviewed in developing the problem for study explicitly stated the desired outcomes for a counseling or consulting intervention. The present writer believed that an explicit statement of the goals to be reached through counseling or consultation would help to clarify the procedures needed to reach that goal.

The present study was based on a single goal for all counseling and consulting activities. The desired outcome for any counseling and/or consulting activity in the context of this study was an observed positive behavior change in the identified problem child.

Any statement of specific goals seems to be based on assumptions about behavior. Two major assumptions about behavior are at the core of the counseling and consulting procedures used and are thus presupposed in the stated goal for counseling.

One major assumption about behavior is that all behavior has social meaning.

We recognize that man is primarily a social being. The characteristics which make him distinctly human are a result of his social interaction with his fellow man in a given group

setting. It is only within the group that he can function and fulfill himself. Man is dependent upon group membership for his development (Dinkmeyer and Dreikurs, 1963, p. 8).

Within this context the behavior of a problem child in the classroom is a product of the interaction of that child and the teacher in the classroom. Thus the best way of understanding classroom behavior is by understanding the interaction between teacher and pupil.

A corollary of the above assumption is that if the child and the teacher are allowed to understand the nature of their interpersonal contracts and if plans are made to change the nature of these contracts, the result will be changed behavior.

A second major assumption is that the behavior of an individual tends to be influenced by the perception that individual has of another person or situation. This perception tends within the context of each individual to be biased. "A perception is never to be compared with a photographic image because something of the peculiar and individual quality of the person who perceives it is inextricably bound up with it" (Adler, 1957, p. 29). Behavior is, then, related to the interacting individuals perception of the other person. Within this context it is assumed that adult perceptions of children influence adult behavior toward children which in turn influences child behavior. The same may be said of children's perceptions of adults. Therefore, behavior can be changed by altering the perceptions of those individuals involved in an interaction.

The fundamental criterion for successful alteration of interactions and perceptions through counseling and consultation activities is an observed behavior change in the problem child. Thus, if behavior is changed as a result of the techniques used to influence interactions and perceptions, we are able to infer that these techniques are useful.

Hypothesis

Based on the results of the previous studies reviewed, the desired outcome for counseling or consultation, and the assumptions on which the desired outcome is based, the following hypothesis was presented.

It was hypothesized that a dual procedure consisting of counseling directly with problem children and consulting with the teachers of problem children will be more effective in producing behavior change in the child than will either of the procedures used independently, while a procedure of consulting with teachers will be more effective than direct counseling with children, and any of the three alternatives will be better than no treatment at all. The hypothesis might be described as follows: counseling and consultation < consultation < counseling < no treatment.

Definition of Terms

Counseling, for the purposes of this study, is that activity between a school staff person known as a counselor and a school pupil who

has been identified by his teacher as a classroom problem, involving identification of behavior dynamics of the pupil's problem behavior and development of strategies for changing that behavior.

Consulting, for the purposes of this study, is that activity between a counselor and the teacher of a problem child involving both persons in the process of developing methods of influencing the behavior of the problem child in the classroom.

Adlerian methods, philosophical and psychological ideas and methods developed by Alfred Adler and further developed and applied to the elementary school setting by Rudolph Dreikurs, O. C. Christensen, and Don Dinkmeyer, among others.

Sampling

The population which this study sampled was described as those children in the fourth grade of a large school district who are disturbing influences in the classroom as determined by teachers and principals. These children are disturbing for a variety of reasons including, but not necessarily limited to, various types of acting-out behavior, behavior that might be described as withdrawal behavior, varying degrees of distractibility from the task at hand, behavior characteristics of disturbed peer relations, or various behaviors sometimes characterized by the term immaturity.

Within the scope of this study it seemed unrealistic to attempt a random sampling from the entire population, hence a different procedure was used. Four target schools were selected, one for each of the treatment groups constituted for this study. The schools were selected on the basis of their comparability of size, socioeconomic level, and the racial composition of the student body.

The comparison groups were selected in the following manner. The principal of each of the target schools was asked to select a pool of children from the fourth and fifth grade classrooms of his school who are disturbing influences in the classroom. He was asked to select, to the best of his knowledge, the student who might benefit most from a counseling intervention and then rank the rest of the selected students according to the same criterion. The principal of the individual building was then asked to determine if any of the fourth or fifth grade teachers would be unlikely to desire help with identified problem children or be unwilling to accept such help if it were offered. The children from these classrooms who were on the ranked referral list were thus eliminated from consideration as possible subjects for this study. The foregoing procedure was essential in that much of this study was dependent upon the willingness of individual teachers to make adaptations of classroom procedures in an effort to produce behavior change in problem children. While this selection procedure may seem to bias the potential results of

this study the alternative of attempting to work with a totally uncooperative teacher might jeopardize the entire study. It should also be noted that such a practice is consistent with the realities of counseling in a school, to wit: some teachers do not want to work with a counselor.

After the above procedure was accomplished and it was ascertained that each of the selected teachers was indeed willing to work with a counselor, teachers of individual identified problem children were asked to complete the Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist (Walker, 1970, on page 25) for each referred child. At this point, a further selection was made based upon the scores obtained on the checklist. For this study only those children with high scores were used as subjects. The scores obtained by the referred group on the checklist were ranked from the highest to the lowest and beginning with the highest score, those children with the first ten to twelve scores in the ranking were selected for inclusion in the study.

The same procedure was followed for the selection of subjects for each of the three comparison groups in the study.

For the selection of the control group a slight modification in the selection procedure was necessary. It was necessary to keep the identity of children in the control group from their teachers. In order to do this the following procedure was used. After the principal of the school

from which the control group was selected had determined the rankings of the children on the referral list in the same manner as for the three other groups, several students were selected, using a table of random numbers, from the class lists of each of the fourth and fifth grade classrooms. The teacher was then informed that the school district was attempting to obtain certain kinds of demographic data on a randomly selected sample of the children in her class and would the teacher be so kind as to complete the behavior checklist for the several selected pupils from her class. This procedure was designed to mask the identity of the individuals in the control group from their teachers.

Treatment Schedule

After the children were selected for inclusion in one of the treatment groups, the treatment period began. The use of the behavior checklist for screening also served as data for the pretest.

The treatment period extended for a period of five weeks during which time the counselor visited the school twice a week. It should be noted that the time period for this study is a substantial modification from that used in the study by Platt (1970). Platt used a treatment period of ten weeks during which the counselor visited the treatment groups once a week. While counselor contact time in Platt's study and the present study were essentially the same, the present study compressed the treatment into a five-week period.

The various groups received different treatments as follows:

Comparison Group I received direct counseling from a counselor well trained in the prescribed Adlerian counseling techniques while the teachers of the children in this group received consultation about the behavior problems from the same counselor.

Comparison Group II experienced no direct contact between the counselor and individual problem children. The teachers of these problem children received consultation from counselors trained in the Adlerian techniques of counseling and consultation.

Comparison Group III entailed direct counseling contact between individual problem children and an Adlerian trained counselor while the teachers of these children received no counselor contact.

Comparison Group IV was the no treatment control group. This group received neither counseling nor consultation during the period of this study.

At the end of the five week treatment period the teachers of the identified problem children were again asked to complete the Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist for the children they had rated during the pretest.

Instrument to Be Used

The dependent variable for this study was the score change from the pretest to the posttest. The instrument used is the Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist (WPBIC) (Walker, 1970). An assumption basic to the development and use of this checklist was that the classroom teacher is in "an unique position to identify children with

behavior problems since she spends much more time in actual observation of the child than any other school personnel" (Walker, 1970). In addition, several research studies have demonstrated that teachers are capable of making valid judgments about classroom behavior (Beilin, 1959; Bower, 1958; and Maes, 1966). A further reason for using the WPBIC, especially in this study, was that since the classroom teacher, as the primary referral agent in the elementary school, is essentially the customer, she is the one who should be able to observe any result of a behavioral intervention.

The WPBIC is a fifty item checklist of behaviors which are either present or absent in a particular child. The items were drawn from a pool of three hundred items developed from the problem behaviors most frequently listed by teachers on referral forms. A panel of behavioral scientists assigned each item a relative weight from one to four based on the influence of a particular behavior in handicapping a given child's present adjustment. Therefore, on the checklist a behavior is either present or absent, and if present the degree of influence has been predetermined. Total scores on the checklist may range from zero to one hundred (Walker, 1970).

Several validity indices have been computed for the WPBIC. For the purposes of the present study the most important seems to be the contrasted groups validity. In developing a method for computing this

type of validity Walker (1970) compared scores obtained by subjects who had: (1) been examined by a psychologist and referred to a clinical facility as emotionally disturbed; (2) been given special educational provisions because of behavioral difficulties; and (3) received instruction at home because behavior difficulties prevented classroom instruction, and a randomly selected sample of subjects for whom no such provisions had been made. The checklist differentiated between these two groups at a significance level beyond .001.

A criterion validity was computed using a biserial correlation between scores on the checklist and the construct behavior disturbance as defined by the three criteria listed above. The biserial correlation between the checklist and the defined construct was .68 with a standard error of .039. The correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level.

Reliability was computed using a split-half method. Odd and even items of the checklist were correlated with a resulting reliability coefficient of .98, indicating that 97% of the variance of checklist scores in the sample was true score variance and 3% was error variance (Walker, 1970). Since the original duplication of the checklist reliability has been developed from test-retest data. Based on a sample of 350 over a four week period, test-retest reliability was computed to be .80 (Walker, personal communication, 1971).

Statistical Treatment of Data

The statistical procedure for the treatment of the data from this study involved an analysis of change scores. An appropriate statistic for such an analysis when multiple treatment groups are involved and the null hypothesis predicts no difference in treatment groups is the one-way or single classification analysis of variance (Popham, 1967). With a significant F , a Tukey test for sources of variation was applied (Glass and Stanley, 1970). The modification for groups of unequal numbers described by Kirk (1969) was employed.

The assumptions for the use of the analysis of variance in this particular study may not in truth be precisely tenable. Such assumptions, i.e., population values are normally distributed and have the same variance, can be violated without seriously affecting the validity of the results. Cohen noted that it is ". . . well established that moderate violations of these assumptions have generally negligible effects on the validity of null hypothesis tests. . ." (1969, p. 267). Scheffe (1959) and Winer (1962) provided further support to the negligible effect of assumption violation.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Homogeneity of Variance

A method of testing for homogeneity of population variances described by Popham (1967) was used before analyzing obtained data. The method involved obtaining the variances of the four groups and dividing the largest obtained variance by the smallest. The variance for group three was divided by the variance for group four to yield an $F = 3.91$. The obtained F did not approach significance at the .10 level. Hence, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was retained.

Analysis of Variance

The analysis of variance was used for testing simultaneously for differences between means of four treatment groups. The analysis of variance used herein was computed on the gain scores of the individual subjects in the study. Hence, the analysis of variance test was used to test for differences in the pretest to posttest gain scores of the individuals in the four treatment groups. In the use of the analysis of variance a significant F statistic would indicate variation among the four

treatment groups. Such a small variation would normally indicate the need for post hoc tests.

As presented in Table 1 the data indicate that the results of the analysis of variance are statistically significant. An $F = 8.05$ is significant at greater than the .001 level.

TABLE 1
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST TO POSTTEST
GAIN SCORES ON THE WALKER PROBLEM BEHAVIOR
IDENTIFICATION CHECKLIST

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between	3	1610.72	536.91	8.05	.001
Within	41	2734.93	66.73		
Total	44	4345.65			

Post Hoc Tests

With a significant F from the analysis of variance a post hoc test was indicated. The post hoc test of choice was the Tukey test described by Glass and Stanley (1970). The Tukey method is usually used when there are equal numbers in each treatment group. However, Kirk (1969) described a method for obtaining a pooled N for use with the Tukey test. The pooled N was used with the Tukey tests computed herein.

The results of the Tukey tests indicate that differences were evident between group one, which involved counseling and consultation,

and group four, which was the no-treatment control group; between group two, which involved consultation with teachers, and group four, the no-treatment control group; and between group three, which involved counseling with students, and group four. The results are summarized in Table 2. It should be noted that the significance level of the difference between group two and group four is lower than for the other comparisons. An explanation for this phenomenon is presented in a following section.

TABLE 2
TUKEY TESTS FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TREATMENT MEANS

$\bar{X} - \bar{X}$	T	P
$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$	1.58	NS
$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_3$	1.25	NS
$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_4$	5.08	.005
$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_3$	2.83	NS
$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$	3.50	.10
$\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_4$	6.33	.005

Further Data Analyses

Anecdotal evidence was available to indicate a possible need for a further comparison of the groups while eliminating several individual scores from the analysis. There was evidence that the teacher of two of the students who were members of group two did not apply the counselor's

recommendations. Since group two was the teacher consultation group, any change in the student depended upon the actions of the teacher involved. In the case of the particular teacher involved, evidence was available that while she was willing to work with one of three identified problem children in her classroom, she was unwilling to work with the other two children. The scores of these two children were eliminated from a further analysis of the data. These scores were scores in which no gain or minimal gain was evidenced.

It was also felt that two scores from group three might be eliminated for a further comparison. The scores that were eliminated were the two highest scores on the pretest. It was thought that there was a possibility that the teachers involved may have overmarked the behavior checklist. The two students involved exhibited the most profound change of any in the study. There was some curiosity about the possible outcomes of an analysis from which these two scores were eliminated.

An analysis of variance was conducted with the four scores discussed above eliminated from the analysis. The effect of eliminating the four scores was exhibited in a higher F statistic than in the original analysis. The summary of the second analysis of variance is presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH FOUR SCORES ELIMINATED
FROM THE ANALYSIS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between	3	1219.04	406.35	9.48	.001
Within	37	1585.45	42.85		
Total	40	2804.49			

The Tukey post hoc test was applied to the above data in the same manner as in the original analysis. The results of the Tukey test were essentially the same as in the original analysis. The exception is the comparison between groups two and four where the obtained t-statistic is tested at a higher significance level than in the original analysis. The net effect of eliminating the two scores from this group for a second analysis seems to be exhibited in the higher obtained t-statistic. The second Tukey test is summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 4
TUKEY TESTS FOR GROUP MEANS WITH FOUR SCORES
ELIMINATED FROM THE ANALYSIS

$\bar{X} - \bar{X}$	T	P
$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$.49	NS
$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_3$.27	NS
$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_4$	6.01	.005
$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_3$.21	NS
$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$	5.51	.005
$\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_4$	5.73	.005

Summary

The hypothesis as originally stated was partially supported by the data. A program of counseling with problem students and consulting with the teachers was shown to be more effective in altering behavior than no contact with either students or teachers. Similarly, consulting with teachers while having no contact with problem students was shown to be more effective than no treatment. In addition, a program of counseling directly with problem children produced a more desirable result than no counseling contact. Comparisons among counseling plus consultation, consultation alone, or counseling alone produced no results supporting hypotheses about the efficacy of one method over another.

Further analysis completed after eliminating four scores from consideration produced results reinforcing the foregoing summary.

Discussion

The results obtained from the analysis of available data present some rather interesting material in relation to the original hypothesis. It may be recalled that the original hypothesis predicted that there would be definite differences among the various treatments. More specifically, the hypothesis stated that counseling plus consultation would be more effective than consultation, which in turn would be more effective than counseling. The hypothesis also stated that all treatments would be

more effective in changing behavior than no counseling or consultation contact at all.

The results as obtained failed to support the part of the hypothesis dealing with differences among treatments. No such differences were noted. Contrary to expectations no results from this study are available to provide support to those who prefer to emphasize the pre-eminence of the consulting function over the counseling function or to those who would prefer the counseling function over the consulting function. At the same time it should be noted that a combination of approaches, the use of counseling and consultation, was not visibly more effective than either one used alone. Thus it seems that the most judicious route with the results of the present study is to interpret them as providing no evidence for conclusions about the efficacy of counseling or consultation as the preferred mode of operation in an elementary school.

The results of the data analysis give strong support to the second part of the hypothesis dealing with the differences between individual modes of treatment and no counseling or consultation. Each of the three alternative methods of working with problem children is shown to produce quite different results than giving no counselor contact to students or teachers. This result has added impact when one recalls the studies reviewed in Chapter II, most of which produced no result to show that either counseling or consultation was better than the absence of such

services. Remembering that the one study reviewed which produced significant positive results used the same counseling and consulting methodology as the present study allows one to grasp the potential importance of the methods used. These counseling and consulting methods, referred to as Adlerian techniques, have thus enabled two studies to be produced showing that counseling services can have a pointed impact in the elementary school. The two studies referred to are Platt's (1970) and the present study. It should be emphasized that no other single study or group of studies has appeared in the literature that have tested other counseling or consultation techniques against the absence of such techniques and produced significant differences.

The results of this study coupled with the results from Platt (1970) combine to indicate that Adlerian counseling and consultation techniques can be effective in changing problem behavior in the elementary school setting.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to provide information regarding the usefulness of counseling, consultation, or a combination of counseling and consultation in the elementary school when the methods used were based on Adlerian theory.

Four elementary schools selected by the school district research department, and believed to have similar student characteristics, were selected for use in the study. Three schools were used for the focus of the different treatments while the fourth school involved in the study included the students who were in the no-treatment control group. One school was the source for a group of identified problem children who would receive counseling about problem behaviors while the teachers involved would receive consultation from the same person who was counseling the problem children; the consultation related to helping the teacher develop new methods of working with the problem children. A second school was the focal point of a different treatment program involving teachers of problem children receiving consultation help from the counselor while the problem children were not seen directly by the counselor. In the

third school identified problem children received direct counseling services while the teachers of these children had no counselor contact.

Pretest data was gathered by the completion of a behavior checklist for each child. The teacher of the problem child was the respondent to the checklist. The period involved in the treatment phase of this study was five weeks during which an assigned counselor visited the school twice during each week. Following the five-week treatment period the same checklist was again completed by the participating teachers.

The raw data obtained were the pretest and posttest scores. Pretest to posttest gain scores were analyzed by an analysis of variance and a post hoc Tukey test.

The results of the statistical analysis indicated that there were no differences in the effectiveness of the three treatments used. The data did indicate, however, that all treatments were more effective than the absence of any counseling or consultation. The significance of the results was beyond the .005 level.

Conclusions

The results of the present study provide several conclusions when seen in isolation and in concert with additional information.

1. The present study provides support to both factions in the counseling versus consultation controversy. The issue of whether counseling or consultation is the preferred mode of conduct for an elementary

school counselor is still an open issue. It should be noted, however, that at least two of the teachers of students in treatment group three, the counseling only with no consultation group, expressed dissatisfaction at not being involved in the behavior change process. These expressions of dissatisfaction may indicate a need for delving into teachers' attitudes regarding their reactions to the various modes of counseling treatment. Appendix C provides a tabular presentation of positive teacher comments about this study while Appendix D provides a presentation of negative reactions. These reactions along with the study by Oldridge (1964) seem to indicate the need for further research on teacher attitudes about counseling.

2. Counseling plus consultation is clearly shown to be more effective in changing problem behavior than no such services.

3. Consultation with teachers with no direct counselor contact with problem children is shown to be more effective in changing problem behavior than the absence of such services.

4. Direct counseling with identified problem children is shown to be more effective than no counseling services.

5. The specific techniques used in this project seem to be the key element involved. It should be emphasized that no direct comparisons between the Adlerian counseling and consultation techniques used in this study and alternative methods were made as part of this study. But it should not be overlooked by the reader that the body of research

available on elementary school counseling provides no other examples of successful behavior change as a result of more traditional, i.e., client-centered, counseling and consultation. The study by Platt (1970) and the present study both show the effectiveness of counseling when an Adlerian methodology is applied.

Recommendations

The recommendations in this section derive from the present study in relation to past research efforts reviewed in Chapter II.

A replication of the present study with the modification of additional time for the counseling-consultation services is recommended. It may be possible to see differences in the relative effectiveness of counseling and/or consultation if the various treatments are administered over a longer period of time. A possible dynamic that may be operating is expressed by the teacher who said that she missed being in contact with the counselor while children in her class were receiving counseling (Appendix D). The dissatisfaction of teachers who receive no contact from the counselor may manifest itself either in a failure to comprehend possible favorable outcomes or to cooperate in reinforcing positive new behaviors attempted by the child, or may produce overexpectations about possible outcomes and therefore may result in the teachers assuming less responsibility for the behavior of the child in the classroom.

It may be possible at some future date to replicate the present study with a larger number of students. Such a modification may contribute to making apparent differences between counseling and consultation; that is, the statistic used may be more sensitive to a larger N.

Another modification to the present study would be to replicate the research including an additional data-gathering step several months after the counseling period or at various times during the treatment period. Differences among the various treatments may become apparent earlier in the treatment or after several weeks. One would expect, for example, that those teachers who received consultation help would tend to retain the new information about behavior over time and thus maintain the new behavior of problem children longer than would teachers who had no direct contact with the counselor.

Additional measurement devices should be tried in subsequent studies in an attempt to gain more information about the impact of the counseling process. The Adlerian model does postulate attitude change in addition to behavior change, which would seem to make attitude change as a result of counseling or consultation an appropriate topic for research. The attitudes of students and teachers should be considered.

Some final comments should be made relative to the question of whether this study was in actuality an adequate reality test of the Adlerian model, or of elementary school counseling. The method of

visiting the schools corresponds to reality in many school districts. Oftentimes one encounters situations in which the elementary school counselor is on an itinerant schedule among several buildings. In this respect the present study duplicated reality. An ideal situation would seem to be the presence of one counselor in one building on a permanent basis. The present study did not approximate this ideal.

There is every reason to believe that the counselors represented outstanding examples of persons trained in the use of the Adlerian model, as represented by Christensen (1969). Each of the four counselors involved was well trained in the application of Adlerian techniques in the school setting. All had experience as elementary school teachers. All had experience in training others in the use of the model. All had experience in presenting demonstrations of Adlerian counseling techniques to groups of counseling students and school teachers. Thus it seems that the counselors were representative of persons well trained in the use of the model.

The training of the counselors involved in the study presents one last recommendation. Perhaps the study needs to be replicated with people who are just entering the field from a training program. The impact of a novice counselor may well have the effect of producing less profound results than those of the present study. It may also produce more easily visible differences in the various treatments.

APPENDIX A

RAW SCORES OF TREATMENT GROUPS

This appendix contains the raw scores for the four groups on the pretest and posttest.

Group I

Pre	Post
19	3
29	6
19	7
26	16
24	10
27	22
27	18
25	9
33	5
22	13
23	8

Group II

Pre	Post
10	1
26	31
19	16
33	20
30	4
13	8
27	4
10	4
26	8
12	6

Group III

Pre	Post
53	18
26	7
26	14
35	21
26	8
29	11
25	21
28	17
29	11
32	30
25	4
45	9

Group IV

Pre	Post
11	6
23	12
21	28
13	19
23	15
22	20
10	8
18	19
12	13
13	12
12	7
10	7

APPENDIX B

GAIN SCORES FOR FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS

I	II	III	IV
16	9	35	5
23	-5	19	11
12	3	12	-7
10	13	14	-6
14	26	18	8
5	5	18	2
9	23	4	2
16	6	11	-1
28	18	18	-1
9	6	2	1
15		21	5
		36	3
N = 11	10	12	12 Total N = 45

APPENDIX C

FAVORABLE COMMENTS FROM TEACHERS AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE TREATMENT PERIOD

Dennis has definitely developed a positive attitude toward himself and others. He looks forward to helping me with the low spelling group and has adopted a "non-achiever." He smiles more and has an improved attitude toward school in general. His relationship with his peers has improved; he doesn't seem to be as afraid to mingle and is regularly bringing in things to share.

Bryan found the experience with younger children very satisfying. He wants to make arrangements to repeat a similar activity with the group and I shall certainly try to make sure that he is allowed to. Bryan's academic work has not changed appreciably in this short period but he seems more aware and somewhat concerned about his self-control in the classroom. He has asked to be seated in the back of the room so that he can try to be less disruptive and concentrate better.

Michele has shown some improvement in all areas.

Randy seems to be more confident and able to accept responsibility for his work and actions. However, he seems more interested in having my approval.

Robin still cries and feels others are picking on her, but not as frequently.

Jeff has improved but he still seeks attention by "playing dumb" or being very funny or cute.

APPENDIX D

NEGATIVE COMMENTS FROM TEACHERS AFTER THE TREATMENT PERIOD

I fail to see any change in this child and have spoken to the counselor. I do feel it is due to not being able to work together as a team in guiding and directing the child. Perhaps I have not circled all the areas I had before and have even included others I had not circled. I am certain her counselor will recall this child in his evaluation.

Tony missed two group sessions. He hasn't shown much improvement.

Mike has periods when he seems to be adjusting to working with others. He is still very aggressive and competitive. The boys complain of his sportsmanship. He has been in trouble for destroying another boy's mitt.

I would have liked to have had eight weeks of one meeting instead of meeting twice a week for four weeks.

It has been too short a time to really evaluate but the suggestions seem valid and I shall continue using them with Shanna, Mark and Doug.

APPENDIX E

COUNSELORS' PLAN FOR VISITING SCHOOLS

Coun- selor	1	School 2	3	4
	Counseling/ Consultation	Consultation	Counseling	Control
1	x	x		
2	x	x		
3	x		x	
4	x		x	

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adler, Alfred. Understanding Human Nature. New York: Fawcett World Library, Premier Books, 1957.
- Anderson, E. C. "Counseling and Consultation Versus Teacher-Consultation in the Elementary School," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 2 (May 1968), 276-286.
- Beilin, H. "Teachers and Clinicians Attitudes toward the Behavior Problems of Children - A Reappraisal," Child Development, Vol. 30 (1959), 9-25.
- Bower, E. "A Process for Early Identification of Emotionally Disturbed Children," Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Vol. 27 (1958), 1-111.
- Christensen, O. C. "Education: A Model for Counseling in the Elementary School," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 4 (1969), 12-19.
- Cohen, J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Cottingham, H. F. "Research Voids in Elementary School Guidance," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 1 (1967).
- Dinkmeyer, Don. "The Counselor as Consultant: Rationale and Procedures," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 2 (1968), 187-194.
- Dinkmeyer, Don and Dreikurs, Rudolf. Encouraging Children to Learn. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963.
- Dreikurs, Rudolf. Psychology in the Classroom. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Dreikurs, Rudolf, Corsini, Raymond, Lowe, Ray, and Sonstegard, Manfred. Adlerian Family Counseling. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1959.

- Eckerson, L. O. "Consultation in the Counselor's Role: An Invitation to Dialogue," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 1 (1967).
- Faust, Verne. The Counselor-Consultant in the Elementary School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968a.
- _____. History of Elementary School Counseling. New York: Houghton Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968b.
- Glass, Gene V., and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Grams, A. Facilitating Learning and Individual Development: Toward a Theory for Elementary School Guidance. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, 1966.
- Hansen, J. C., and Stevic, R. R. Elementary School Guidance. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1969.
- Hume, Katherine E. "Counseling and Consulting: Complementary Functions," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 5, Oct. 1970, 3-12.
- Kirk, Roger E. Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Company, 1969.
- Kranzler, G. "Elementary School Counseling--An Evaluation," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 2 (May 1968), 286-294.
- _____. "The Elementary School Counselor as Consultant: An Evaluation," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 3 (May 1969), 285-288.
- Lewis, Michael. "The Effects of Counseling and Consultation upon the Sociometric Status and Personal and Social Adjustment of Third Grade Pupils," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 5 (1970), 44-52.
- Maes, W. R. "The Identification of Emotionally Disturbed Children," Exceptional Children, Vol. 32 (1966), 607-613.

- Matthes, W. A. "The Relationship between Conditions in Counseling and Selected Outcome Variables," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28, 1968, 2073A-2074A.
- Meeks, Anne. Guidance in Elementary Education. New York: Ronald Press, 1968.
- Moulin, Eugene K. "The Effects of Client-Centered Group Counseling Using Play Media on the Intelligence, Achievement, and Psycholinguistic Abilities of Underachieving Primary School Children," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 5, Dec. 1970, 85-98.
- Nelson, R. C. "Counseling Versus Consulting," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 1 (1967), 146-151.
- Oldridge, B. "Two Roles for Elementary Guidance," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43 (1964), 367-370.
- Patterson, C. H. "Elementary School Counselor or Child Development Consultant?", Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 46 (1967), 75-76.
- Platt, John. "Efficacy of the Adlerian Model in Elementary School Counseling." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona, 1970.
- Popham, W. J. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Psycholinguistic Remedial Materials: Chehalis, Washington: Department of Special Education and Psychological Services, Lewis County Schools, undated.
- Scheffe, H. The Analysis of Variance. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.
- Sievers, C. Guidance for Children in Elementary Schools. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1963.
- Sonstegard, Manfred. The Teleoanalytic Approach to Group Counseling. Chicago: Alfred Adler Institute, 1967.
- Stefflre, Buford. "Research in Guidance: Horizons for the Future," Theory into Practice, Vol. 2 (1963).

- Teigland, J. J., Winkler, R. C., Manger, P. F., and Kranzler, G. D.
"Some Concomitants of Underachievement at the Elementary
School Level," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 44 (1966),
950-955.
- Thoresen, Carl. "Relevance and Research in Counseling," Review of
Educational Research, Vol. 39 (1969), 263-281.
- Van Hoose, W. Counseling in the Elementary Schools. Itasca, Ill.:
F. E. Peacock, 1968.
- Walker, Hill M. Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist
Manual. Los Angeles, Calif.: Western Psychological Services,
1970.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York:
McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Winkler, R. C., Teigland, J. J., Manger, P. F., and Kranzler, G. D.
"The Effects of Counseling and Selected Remedial Techniques on
Underachieving Elementary School Students," Journal of Counsel-
ing Psychology, Vol. 12 (1965), 384-387.