R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 948 CG 001 679

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR--A VENTURE IN HUMANNESS.

BY- MAES, WAYNE R., ED.
ARIZONA STATE UNIV., TEMPE, COLL. OF EDUCATION

PUB DATE MAY 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.68 40P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS, *COUNSELOR ROLE, *COUNSELOR FUNCTIONS, DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDANCE, *CONFERENCE REPORTS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELING,

THIS MONOGRAPH IS A SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELING. THE MAIN TOPICS COVERED IN FOUR ARTICLES INCLUDE--(1) SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, AND IMPACT OF BOTH ON THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR, (2) HOW COUNSELING MAY SERVE TO INCREASE HUMANNESS, HOW COUNSELORS CAN IMPROVE THEIR ABILITY TO PROVIDE HUMANIZING RELATIONSHIPS, AND WHY THE PRECEEDING IS IMPORTANT, (3) IMPROVEMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL EXPERIENCES FOR CHILDREN BY INTRODUCTION OF NEW ADULTS OR CHANGING THE BEHAVIOR OF THOSE ALREADY INVOLVED IN THE CHILD'S LIFE, (4) THE COUNSELOR ROLE IN EFFECTING CHANGES IN CHILDREN, (5) A STRATEGY FOR COUNSELOR ROLE AND FUNCTION, (6) THREE MAJOR COUNSELOR FUNCTIONS, (7) HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS FOR THE ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS, (8) THE ANALYSIS OF A POSITION PAPER ON ELEMENTARY COUNSELING, (9) COMMENTS ON ADULT PSYCHOLOGY, AND (10) A CONFERENCE SUMMARY. (FS)

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR:

A VENTURE IN HUMANNESS

Wayne R. Maes, Editor

College of Education
Arizona State University

Published by the
Bureau of Educational
Research and Services

Merwin Deever, Director

Educational Services Bulletin 19

CG 001 679

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR: A VENTURE IN HUMANNESS

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELING

Edited by
Wayne R. Maes

Educational Services Bulletin No. 19

Published by
Bureau of Educational Research and Services
Merwin Deever, Director
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona
May, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Elementary School Counseling has burst upon the educational scene with a reverberating impact. The explosion was ignited by a recognition of the vast wastelands of human potential in our society along with an awareness of the importance of childhood experiences in the making of the man.

Elementary counselors were looked to by the United States Congress, through the National Defense Education Act and other legislation, to do something. The exact nature of this "something" was the puzzling question. The need for someone to give further assistance to the elementary school in developing the potential of youth to its fullest possible level was recognized and the challenge was accepted by many educators. Much debate has been conducted as to what a counselor should do.

The answer was not readily found in precedent. Only a few counselors had been or are now employed in scattered elementary schools across the country. Consequently, the emergence of elementary school counseling presents the welcome challenge of examining what we believe about people and what a counselor can do to help children grow to a fuller realization of their potential.

The articles in this monograph are a summary of the deliberations at the Western Regional Conference on Elementary School Counseling, which convened to consider a description of counselor role and function developed at Arizona State University. The majority of the participants were elementary school administrators, the people who will be primarily instrumental in implementing elementary school counseling.

In order to provide a broader perspective for the more specific deliberations during the conference, Dr. Farson fittingly began by directing the attention of the participants to the captivating question, "What Are People For?" The reader will be deprived of the magnetism of the personal presentation but can experience the provocative nature of the questions raised and the answers offered. The position paper on elementary school counselor role and function provided the "fodder" for ingestion and rumination and stimulated a mixture of reactions among the conference participants. Dr. Wrenn's scholarly but human reactions reflect his rich professional experience and give a much needed perspective to conference proceedings.

Dr. Blackham and Dr. McGreevy are deserving of a special debt of gratitude for their assistance in conference planning and their excellent efforts in preparation of the introduction and summary of this manuscript. Dr. Davis cleared administrative hurdles in making the conference possible and made invaluable suggestions as to the conference structure and process. Dr. Faust's creative efforts in designing and implementing the NDEA Institute currently in session at Arizona State University provided the soil in which this conference took root.

Special thanks are extended to the members of the 1965-1966 NDEA Institute in elementary school counseling at Arizona State University. They have been recipients of a counselor education program which was well conceived but fraught with problems of newness and the inevitable gap between innovation and implementation. They were especially helpful in reserving to themselves the right to disagree and thus put ideas to the test. Their assistance in the conducting of the conference was unstintingly given and gratefully received.

Wayne R. Maes

May, 1966

INTRODUCTION

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR IN THE SOCIETY OF TODAY AND TOMORROW

Garth J. Blackham
Arizona State University

We now are aware that changes are taking place in the United States that promise to modify the face of education. Beginning to develop in many places throughout the nation is a new commitment to problems of which we have been only dimly aware. The "pockets of poverty" have been brought into close view, and the disadvantaged child, who too often has been forgotten, poses problems that educators now are determined to solve. But even more important are movements afoot that support with great vigor a broader, more meaningful commitment to man in order that he may come closer to self-fulfillment.

Dynamic, rapid and unexpected technological, economic and social changes now appear to be permanent characteristics of our society. And, as these changes press upon us, we have become acutely aware of the toll that they have taken in people's opportunity to fulfill their destinies. Emotional and mental illness is on the increase, delinquency and crime is considered a national problem, drug and alcoholic addiction is occurring with greater frequency, and the incidence of suicide—even among children of elementary school age—now is considered a major problem. In the sixties and seventies, educational institutions will have to assume a major share of the responsibility for solving these problems—if they are to be solved at all.

It is difficult and certainly risky to attempt to forecast what ten or twenty years will bring. But certainly there is enough data available to note some significant general trends, and some attempt ought to be made to identify them.

Two trends which technological change has brought is job displacement and a mobile society. It has been estimated that in the world of the future a large percentage of people in the work force will have to change jobs three to four times during their working years because of

jobs being terminated by machines. In the period from 1940 to 1949, more than half the workers in America had two to four jobs. Consequently, people so effected will have to be retrained or become seekers of welfare.[3] Families will have to move often to new locations (frequently involving long distances) and begin a new kind of life. Rapid changes in the occupational picture lead naturally to excessive mobility. And, mobility frequently leads to a tentativeness about establishing community roots and limits opportunities for the crystalization of stable, meaningful values. With such trends, failures in the socialization of children are increasing, and more and more these problems are spilling over to the school to effect efficient and productive learning.

Sensitive to shifts in technology and culture, the family also is changing significantly. Bossard[1] pointed out some time ago that in America we are rapidly moving (especially in certain social classes) toward a small family system in which emotional relationships are concentrated and intense. If parent-child relationships do not develop to provide the foundations of a stable and healthy personality, the child becomes emotionally deadlocked and cannot find solace in readily available relatives. Consequently, his problems are transferred to school and beg solution.

Some believe that there will be even more far-reaching changes effecting the family.[4] The future is likely to bring "a consumer-oriented economy" with the compulsion to buy and explicit sanctioning of self-indulgence as a way of life. Coupled with high mobility, and inadequate or emotionally unfulfilling family ties, this trend is likely to move in the direction of splintered values in youth and a relative decline in the constraining and directing forces of the family. Children and adolescents will tend to move more in the direction of their peer groups for behavior definition and for personal identity. Consequently, the peer group will gain influence as a personality and character developing force. These forces will need to be skillfully guided and teachers will have to understand them clearly in order to capture their motivating power in learning.

The efficiency of machines and their potential for replacing man in the jobs that he performs will tend to create more leisure time for large segments of the work force.[4, 5] At first blush, this may seem to be a desirable and sought after consequence. I wonder if it is true? People often seem to be easily satiated in their need for leisure soon after a vacation begins. Every parent has been confronted by his child after about the second week of summer vacation with, "What can I do now, Dad?" Increased leisure may force increased interaction among family members, but it is questionable whether such a trend will enhance positive or emotionally satisfying relationships. Such a trend may confront the school as well as the helping professions with the necessity for providing assistance that will lead to more satisfying relationships as the family members confront each other for longer periods of time.

Another type of change, which is very much a part of our culture now and which will continue at an accelerated rate in the future, is the "explosion of knowledge." This trend has untold consequences for education. Children who are presently in the first grade of elementary school probably will find upon reaching the eighth grade a significant portion of their "knowledge" is outdated. The question of what shall be taught will be looked upon with renewed interest. We perhaps will realize that "facts" are highly perishable and have little resistance to time and change. Yet understanding the "structure of knowledge" as a jumping-off point for hypothesizing and creative work may have much greater longevity and produce greater dividends. Moreover, any curriculum will have to be regarded as tentative rather than fixed, and attention to inquiry skills, problem solving and "learning how to learn" may assume a more significant focus in the future.

HOW CHANGE MAY EFFECT EDUCATION

Having considered only a few of the changes that are likely to move our society in new and different directions, what significance do they have for education? We have considered a few but let us look at them more specifically. Perhaps the first mandate is that education will have to become more experimental and innovative in the use of teachers, teacher's aides, self-paced instruction and audio-visual aids.[4]

To meet the needs of the changing times, education will have to be extended horizontally and vertically. Programs will have to be more varied at all levels to satisfy more individual differences and needs. Elementary schools will be required to give more attention to the developmental and educational needs of the pre-school child—especially the disadvantaged child. Adults, faced with an expansion of their leisure time, may look more longingly to additional education to enrich their hours of leisure or to help them reach out for dimensions of themselves and the world. Indeed, a new concept of "life-long education" may be productively nourished in the primary grades.

The process of learning itself may assume quite a new image. For example, if a large portion of the work force will be required to learn three or four different jobs during the work years, retraining or relearning may assume great significance. Large numbers of workers will have to be quickly retrained to meet the needs of a dynamic, rapidly changing economy. Correlated with such changes, public education will be required to "tool up" to meet such educational and retraining needs. The nature of learning and the process by which people learn probably will be looked at with renewed respect in order to more efficiently achieve appropriate outcomes.

In the face of all these challenges, the nature of man, his goals, his dreams, and his struggles for self-fulfillment may be significantly altered. To a marked degree, he is likely to be pressed toward a "thing" or mechanistic orientation. He is likely to be subjected to pressures to "fit into the system," to become more the object of manipulation. In the face of this, the individual's attempts to give expression to his inner nature, to find deeper and richer meaning in life may be put to a difficult test.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR

In the midst of these many changes and the presence of varied needs, a new specialist, the elementary school counselor, is about to be given official birth. The nature of present and future social changes must be acknowledged as the training and role-dimensions of this specialist are forged. Since he will function in a society in which rapid change is usual, there ought to be some reluctance to use traditional counseling roles as the prototype for carving out his identity. Traditional counseling roles, we must remember, were carved out of the societal matrix of the past and were appropriate to those times. To the extent that past and future needs are similar, traditional counseling roles are valid and useful guides. But, the disparity between past and future needs should be closely examined.

It is not enough to acknowledge the nature of our changing society and its implications for education. Those forging the image of the elementary school counselor must understand and be sensitive to advances in the behavioral sciences. We now have substantial knowledge about the learning process, the developmental process, and the facilitation of growth.[2] The power of groups in enhancing appropriate educational outcomes is now better understood. We realize too, that educational outcomes, as evidenced in how well the child learns, are intimately related to the school's organizational structure and social system. An understanding of the forces which influence behavior is essential to the training of the counselor and the shaping of his role and function. Indeed, if his training and functioning do not reflect such understandings, much of the impact that he might potentially make may be largely lost.

While the roles that the elementary school counselor performs should be based on the "realities of the elementary school," it is questionable whether most of his time should be devoted to the pressing needs of a few. His function should promise more than counseling for a few disturbed children. He should be a faciliator, not primarily a therapist. Past experience seems to have taught us that unlearning and remediation is inefficient and has not lived up to earlier expectations. The elementary counselor may have to live in crisis situations but his role should not

be crisis-oriented. We may find that his most significant contribution is as a facilitator of growth, learning and psychological health, not a trouble shooter for the deviant or disturbed.

Perhaps we should not be too concerned, as some may be, by the prospect of a new specialist moving into the elementary school. For there is little danger that *all* of the educational and psychological needs of children will be completely met. Any specialist that asks for entry into the elementary school to provide services should perform functions that are soundly based on valid conceptions of development, learning, behavior facilitation and change. Moreover, the roles that he performs ought to lead to more meaningful dimensions in the education of children.

It was the purpose of this conference to take a few bold steps forward and attempt a conceptualization of a model for the elementary school counselor. The position paper offers a theoretical design for this type of conceptualization. It is not to be expected that such a rationale is the only one or necessarily the most valid one but it does offer a general structure for considering roles and functions which the elementary counselor can usefully perform in the elementary school.

[1] Bossard, J. *The Sociology of Child Development.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

[2] Gordon, I. J. "New Conceptions of Children's Learning and Development." *1966 Yearbook.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, pp. 49-71.

[3] Henry, J. *Culture Against Man.* New York: Random House (Vintage Books), 1965.

[4] Michael, D. N. *The Next Generation: The Prospects Ahead for Youth of Today and Tomorrow.* New York: Random House (Vintage Books), 1965.

[5] Wrenn, C. G. *The Counselor in a Changing World.* Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962.

WHAT ARE PEOPLE FOR?[1]

Richard E. Farson
Western Behavioral Sciences Institute
La Jolla, California

As any child knows, asking questions can get one into trouble. Children (and adults, too) ask questions as if the answers will somehow make life simpler for them. Of course, it is just the other way around. The answers make life more complex. Good answers seldom settle issues; more often they raise new ones. They lead the questioner to consider additional facts, further possibilities, and new questions. They usually require him to abandon his simplified notions and polarized thinking. Even worse — the more fundamental the question, the more likely it is that the answer will call upon him to think new thoughts and face new realities. So it is with Aldous Huxley's child-like and penetrating question, "What are people for?"[2]

It has been a particularly challenging question to me. I believe it is a valuable question for all of us who are involved, whether as counselor, therapist, teacher, minister, in helping other people grow and change through the medium of the counseling relationship, whatever form it may take. After all, this question can lead us to the basic problem of why we try to educate, counsel, and improve and rehabilitate people.

History has given us a variety of answers to the question, "What are people for?" People exist to till the soil, to fight the enemies, to reproduce themselves, to make possible the leisure and comfort of a privileged few, to serve the state, and so on. It is unfortunate that the answers one might hear today would be similarly exploitive and utilitarian. Indeed, when any of us in helping relationships define our task as that of "shaping useful and productive citizens," we are reflecting utilitarian values and thereby may be rendering people a disservice. With the rapidly changing nature of existence on this earth, with maturing human needs, and drastically altered patterns of work and play, such utilitarian answers will fall short of helping us live in the potentially abundant, leisure-filled world of the future.

The future demands a different answer to the question, "What are people for?" I would like to discuss, in the context of the helping relationship, my personal and very tentative answer.

People exist in order to exercise and enjoy their humanness.

Humanness is the potential of the human individual. It is what a person has at the time when he is fully himself. It is his irrationality as well as his rationality, his subjectivity as well as his objectivity. It is his playfulness, his anger, his tenderness, his pain, his excitement, his fantasy, his grief, his joy. It is what he enjoys at those peak moments of spontaneity and creativity, love of altruism, and what he suffers in those moments of sorrow and guilt, hate and fear.

For the balance of this paper I plan to consider how counseling may serve to increase our humanness, how we as counselors can improve our ability to provide humanizing relationships, and why in the coming world this is so important.

Counseling at its best, it seems to me, is a series of occasional moments of humanness — moments amid hours characterized by defensiveness and evasion, intellectualization and abstraction, game playing and role playing, with both client and counselor trying to be something they are not. The moments of humanness — of being oneself — are so significant, so meaningful, and so dramatic that they cannot help but compensate for the other times. Most important, they give the client new ways of expressing himself. New reference points against which to check future experience. This, to my mind, is the most, not the least, that one can expect from counseling.

I believe that we have not held the right expectations of counseling. We have been expecting it to bring about behavior changes, and by and large it doesn't. It does provide enriching moments of humanness.

This is perplexing; perhaps paradoxical. In counseling, which we have regarded always as a way of making it possible for individuals to change their behavior, we are at best able to measure externally only small changes. If counseling is compared with certain other experiences, it appears to offer little as an agent of change. Contrast the change one notices in people when they go to college, enter military service, join a new group, suffer serious illness or injury, accept a position of great responsibility, come into money, have a baby, etc. Without doubt, situational changes produce more behavior change than does the intrapersonal exploration characteristic of counseling.

The point is that the power of counseling does not lie in changing behavior, but in changing one's way of experiencing himself and his world. But these changes — broadened emotionality, trust in one's own feelings, liking oneself, etc. — we often do not value because they are not utilitarian.

I'm not saying that we can't produce constructive change in human behavior. We can. From a number of studies, including some of those

done at the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, we have found that it is relatively easy in certain experimental situations to produce behavioral changes.[3] We have seen, for example, how a randomly selected individual can become the most powerful person in a discussion group composed of strangers, when he simply is asked to be powerful. Many persons have accomplished this with such an easy mastery of the power role that no one could detect any behavior that didn't seem entirely natural to them. These people had seldom if ever played this role on the outside; nevertheless, the powerful behavior was there in full force, waiting to be liberated.

In another experiment[4] we enabled the person who participated least in a discussion group to move into a position of high participation simply by rewarding him for anything that he said. A set of red and green lights was placed before every member of the group, ostensibly to tell them when, in the opinion of judges who had heard the subject discussed many times, they were or were not making significant contributions to the discussion. Instead of responding to the content of what was said, the experimenter simply gave the richest diet of green lights to the person who had been the low participator in previous discussions. In fifteen minutes he moved to a position of high participation, and the others in the group came to value the quality of his contributions — although they did not know he was getting the most green lights. The new field of "behavior therapy," growing out of the operant conditioning experiments of B. F. Skinner and his students,[5] is apparently quite successful in bringing about specific behavior changes

In other words, it seems relatively easy in the laboratory to evoke high order behavior from individuals who, one would think, are not likely be capable of it. The change is dramatic and can be easily produced. It is quite another matter, of course, to evoke this behavior in "real life," but our experiments and a great deal of anecdotal evidence make it clear that we probably have placed too low a ceiling on our expectations.

If behavior change is what we want, then our science is almost ready to show us how to bring it about. But counseling is not the way. We must learn to value counseling for what it does best — and what it can do is to provide an experience in humanness. But don't sell this short. Given the world of tomorrow, this may become an increasingly valuable experience.

As a counselor — or just as an individual — you may ask, "What shall I do in order to provide these moments of humanness?" The answer is easy. Be yourself. Be what you feel. Communicate the attitudes that you actually have, whatever they are, at that moment.

The answer is easy enough, but the lesson is hard to learn. We usually feel that we should display only warm, accepting feelings to those we

want to help — that our attitudes must be continually "facilitative." Carl Rogers has helped me learn that when I try to make myself *feel* something that I do not, when I try to *be* something that I am not, I am most likely to fail at the relationship. On the other hand, If I can sense accurately what it is that I *do* feel, and if I can communicate this feeling genuinely, the relationship is more likely to be helpful.

"But," you may ask, "what if I feel bored or resentful or any number of 'non-facilitative' feelings? Surely I can't risk expressing this to the other person!" My personal answer is that I can hardly afford *not* to. There are two reasons. First of all, sometimes these feelings interfere with my ability to listen emphatically and to communicate a positive regard, a caring, and so I *must* clear the air so that I can become genuinely responsive and understanding.

The second, and perhaps the more important reason, is that these feelings, *whatever* they are, positive or negative, are *real.* They have arisen naturally from the interaction taking place. They represent rich data from the immediate present. If I can risk comforting the other person with these feelings, both of us can have a meaningful encounter from which we can learn.

This raises another point. Counseling at its best is a learning and growth experience for the counselor, too. Part of what makes a good counselor is his willingness to become vulnerable to the other — his willingness to learn from what the other person can tell him. So often we feel we must stay "one up." We are teachers, they are students. We are doctors, they are patients. They, not we, are to do the learning and changing. An important lesson for me has been to realize that the big moments in a relationship often come when I can allow myself to be vulnerable — when I can permit the possibility of change in myself. I seem to be able to do this infrequently, but it usually happens when I can risk being transparently genuine about my own immediate reactions.

More and more I am coming to trust these reactions — so much so, that now I consciously try to sense how this person makes me feel. What is my natural, immediate response to him? What is going on inside me? Why do I feel this way? Can I use myself as a sensing instrument? Can I let him have an impact on me? Can I trust my response to him? And can I share with him the experiences, fantasies, and feelings that result?

We often treat our feelings as enemies — we try to suppress and distort them. I have come to believe that especially in a counseling, helping relationship, our feelings are our best friends. We must learn to respect and trust them. To help others, we must learn to *use* our feelings.

Studies of the psychotherapeutic relationship show that of all the factors considered, whether or not the therapist *likes* the client seems to

be the best predictor of success in therapy. But what if I don't happen to like this person right now? Rather than *trying* to like him or acting *as if* I like him, I found it more helpful to behave in such a way that I can *come* to like him. That is, I accept my feelings of dislike, but I try to arrange the conditions under which I can begin to like him. Over and over again this has turned out to be simply my communicating to him what I genuinely feel — not as an objective evaluation of *him*, but as a tentative, subjective evaluation of a feeling that belongs to *me*. When I communicate what I feel in this way, the other person does not feel judged or rejected — rather he feels that he has been invited into a relationship with me. This kind of honesty embraces rather than alienates. And the consequences are uniformly the same — when I can be direct and open with a person, I *do* come to like him more. When I think I must hide my feelings, I come to like him less.

It is just such a confrontation which produces these moments of humanness — these basic encounters. If there is any reliable way to tell when these moments come, it is when the immediate truth of the relationship is revealed, when the real feelings that exist in the here and now of the encounter are exposed.

I'd like to give one or two examples of what seemed to me moments of humanness — times when I thought some humanness was revealed in me and in the relationship. I'm a little surprised at the incidents which first come to mind. I think of the time during my training as a therapist I first summoned the courage to tell a client what I was really thinking. She was a young woman I had been counseling who began coming to places where she thought I'd be — I'd go to a restaurant and she'd be there; I'd teach a class and she'd be outside waiting for me; she was silently asking me to talk with her, be with her all the time. I felt very much annoyed by this, but I thought I had to preserve the sanctity of the counseling hour by being a warm friendly person with her. But I found myself resenting her more and more, and at last I told her that I could hardly listen because I was too angry with her — and with my inability to cope with the way she was invading my private life. She became tense as I told her this, and I didn't know what to expect from her, but then she relaxed and said she was really relieved. She said she *knew* I wasn't listening to her; she *knew* we were in trouble, but because I didn't say anything about it, she didn't know what to say about it. And I could feel really warm and friendly again.

I remember another client who often bored me terribly. One day I was particularly tired and she was talking on and on, and for the first and only time in my career as a counselor, I leaned back and dozed off. I woke with a jolt. I thought she would be absolutely furious with me, just tear me to pieces. Here she was, paying for this hour in which I had

gone to sleep. Instead, she laughed and said, "At last I'm getting something real out of you . . . Of course you'd go to sleep with the kind of stuff I've been saying to you."

As non-therapeutic (in a traditional sense) as these incidents might have seemed, they did reveal something real, something actual in the relationship. One way of characterizing these incidents is that I became vulnerable to the client — available in a special way. In a sense that is all we have to give to another person — our own vulnerability.

For several reasons these moments of humanness are infrequent. For one thing, they give us a knowledge of ourselves which we cannot easily ignore. Like education, they confront us with possibilities which we didn't know about. They remind us of ourselves at our best. And here is the problem. Being ourselves at our best is difficult, demanding. To realize that we are functioning well below our capability may produce anxiety, for most of us prefer the comfortable self-deception that we are what we think we are right now, not something infinitely better.

Perhaps this is why, even though we try to bring about these moments of humanness, that we also resist them. I think much of our behavior is actually directed to making sure that such moments do not happen. Why? Because although these moments are dramatic, beautiful, and helpful, they are at the same time rather frightening. They face us with a situation in which we might discover something about ourselves — and we prefer to live with the person we already know about rather than to live up to the strengths and potentialities we might discover in ourselves.

Certainly this is the reason why education, rehabilitation and similar efforts to improve human behavior meet with such little success. They pose a fundamental threat because they ask us to be ourselves at our best. So do these moments of humanness, for they teach us about ourselves when we are fully functioning. And naturally we erect barriers to these experiences of being fully ourselves. Each of us has had a lifetime of practice in erecting such barriers.

The deep personal encounter which brings about, or at least accompanies these moments of humanness is a shared experience, and confronts both client and counselor with themselves as they really are. Small wonder that we avoid such moments.

Another reason why we avoid them may be because the inevitable consequence of such shared moments is increased emotional involvement. As much as we value intimacy — as much as we try to get close to those we are trying to help — we seem to avoid these emotional encounters, this closeness. For while closeness is rewarding, it is also threatening. Perhaps we feel additionally responsible for the other person, or come

to care too much. Perhaps we like the comfortable emotional distance we are used to when we treat the client or the other person as an object — to be studied, or changed — rather than as a person to encounter.

Perhaps this encounter, this closeness will change our relationship. Perhaps we want to retain our professional demeanor. Perhaps we want the other person to be dependent, to be sick, to need us as doctors, therapists, counselors, clergymen. Perhaps we want them to idolize us rather than to know us. Perhaps we don't want to have equalitarian relationships with them. Perhaps we don't want them to become something different from the way *we* are. It is clear that when we, as professional counselors, set as our goal the liberation of the human individual, we are not likely to meet many of our status needs. But then we might meet some of our higher-order needs — needs we hardly know that we have.

We have seen how difficult is the task of creating a relationship in which a person can, if only infrequently, experience himself more fully — can exercise and enjoy his humanness. It is a more than worthwhile goal today, but it is vitally necessary for the world which is nearly upon us. Perhaps for the first time in history people will actually be valued for what they are, not for what they can do, because, in the automated world of tomorrow, we as individuals will simply not be "useful" to society as we have always been before. The superior man of the future will be the person who can cope with a world without work. This person will not be able to depend upon the Puritan values of hard work, self-denial, and service to others for his self-esteem. Rather he will prize his ability to relax, to contemplate, to re-create, to attend to the world around him, to create, to fashion things, to be aware of his inner feelings, to enjoy others, to be what he is, to live in the present.

As work will change, so will play. Our present notions of play activities—bowling, TV, bridge—simply will not fulfill us. We will not use play as diversion or escape. Play will be our work—just as it is with children. And it must be similarly fulfilling.

Unfortunately, the same factors of technology, bureaucracy, urbanization, and communication, which make these new values necessary, also may inhibit their development. We seem to be living in an increasingly depersonalized world where physical proximity has brought about emotional distance. The objectivity of this scientific society has produced people remote from and distrustful of their own feelings. More and more we will need to have personalizing experiences, to become better acquainted with our world of feelings.

Presently, counseling is one of our best examples of a humanizing, personalizing experience. We can't, however, depend indefinitely upon

counseling to provide these experiences. We will have to move away from the idea that the presence of a professional person is necessary for a relationship to be therapeutic—there will never be enough of us to go around. We must face the fact that people help each other. They always have. It will be our job as professionals to arrange situations or conditions in which people can helpfully encounter each other—in which they may enjoy deeply personalizing experiences.

In a research program at our Institute we have shown that randomly composed self-directed groups—groups totally without professional leadership—are not only feasible therapeutic arrangements, but are almost indistinguishable from similar groups having professional leadership.[6] Apparently, if the group is made up of people who expect to derive benefit from the experience, the natural processes at work in such a group lawfully bring about a condition of significant therapeutic benefit, even without the intervention of a therapist.

I predict that such arrangements as these will be made not only in clinics but in the basic institutions of our community—schools, churches, clubs, businesses, neighborhoods, families. Eventually, the creation of personalizing experiences will become such an important and integral part of the program of these institutions that we will not be able to distinguish these humanizing activities from the other aspects of the program. Schools will humanize as well as "educate." Businesses will liberate the potential of the individual as well as produce goods and make profits.

As a civilization we are reaching an era which has the potential of elevating the individual to new heights of humanness. An educated and free society which has met the basic survival and security needs of its people can begin to fulfill their higher-order needs for self-actualization and creativity. If we are prepared to accept this destiny, plan for it, and cooperate with it, we will be richly rewarded. If, on the other hand, we continue to value only utilitarian goals, if we treat people as things rather than as persons, we will face a world full of despair, meaninglessness, and crippling anxieties.

I have tried to answer our basic question by indicating that we must come to look to the various kinds of counseling relationships not for behavior change but as model relationships for the creation of enriching moments of humanness. And we must come to value the person not for his usefulness, but for the degree to which he can exercise and enjoy his own humanness. After all, that is what people are for.

[1] Richard E. Farson, "What are People For?" *ETC.*, (in press).

[2] Aldous Huxley, "Human Potentialities," in California University Medical Center, *Man and Civilization: Control of the Mind, A Symposium*, ed. Seymour M. Farber and Roger H. L. Wilson, (New York, 1961), pp. 60-76.

[3] Richard E. Farson and James R. Johannsen, "Analysis of Social Power." Work carried out under ONR Contract #Nonr-3590 (00). WBSI *Reports* (in press).

[4] E. G. Aiken, "Conditioning and Generalization of Influence Behavior." *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1965 *20*, 159-165, (Southern Universities Press). Alex Bavelas, Albert H. Hastork, Alan E. Gross, and W. Richard Kite, "Experiments on the Alteration of Group Structure," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1965, *1*(1), 55-70.

[5] e.g., H. J. Eysench, (ed.) *Behavior Therapy and the Neuroses*, (New York, 1960).

[6] Betty Berzon, "Self-Directed Therapeutic Groups: An Evaluative Study." Paper presented at American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, September, 1964. Also *WBSI Report No. 1* of Special Series I, 1965.

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR: A POSITION PAPER*

Wayne R. Maes
Arizona State University

Certain visionaries, intent on providing better experiences for children and youth during their developmental years, have suggested that we need counselors in the elementary school. Assorted reactions to this suggestion are typified by the variety of questions raised. Some educators are asking, "Why do we need counselors? The teacher is the only true and effective guidance worker in the elementary school." Psychologists are asking, "Why a counselor? What we need are more psychologists." The visiting teachers, social workers, diagnosticians, helping teachers, and psychological examiners are saying that if more of *their* kind could be supplied, we could dispense with this talk of an elementary school counselor. Currently practicing secondary school counselors are asking, "How are elementary school counselors different from us?" and, "Why not move secondary school counselors into the elementary school so that they can develop and maintain individual inventory, information, counseling, and follow-up services?"

This proliferation of questions reflects the embryonic, and—to some extent— the dissonant nature of the emerging field of elementary school counseling.

One issue on which there seems to be considerable agreement is the fact that life could and should be made better for elementary school children, thereby warding off some of the untoward consequences in later life. Everything from mental illness to unemployment to college attrition is partially traceable to faulty child-rearing patterns in the home and to ineffective learning climate in the school. Accepting the assumption that many of our social ills can be traced to deficient experiences during the developmental years, our attention is directed to a question different from and probably more basic than those raised above. "What can we do about it? How can children's developmental experiences be changed so as to provide the groundwork for more effective attitudes and behavior in adulthood?"

*This paper was read by Dr. Sandford S. Davis at the Western Regional Conference on Elementary School Counseling.

A child's attitudes and behavior, to the extent that they are learned, are primarily influenced by significant adults in his life, usually parents and teachers. Changing attitudes or behavior in children calls for one or both of the following:

1. The introduction of a new significant person in the child's life.
2. Effecting changes in the significant people currently in the child's life.

It is the underlying assumption of this paper that desired changes can be effected in children through the intervention of a professionally trained person who can work directly with children and with their parents and teachers. It is not implied that such professionally trained people are nonexistent in the elementary school today, nor that secondary school counselors will be unable to affect desired change if employed in elementary schools, nor that the needed professional must be called a counselor (although he will be referred to as a counselor throughout the body of this paper). These are issues which are incidental. The main focus of this paper is to describe the role of a behavioral-science oriented professional in the elementary school whose purpose is to effect desired changes in children.

Any description of a counselor whose task is to effect changes in children assumes:

1. An understanding of what man should become, or of the "good life."
2. An understanding of how man learns and develops from birth to maturity.
3. An understanding of how to effect change during the developmental stages which will enhance growth toward the "good life."

WHAT IS THE GOOD LIFE?

Absolute answers to this question do not exist. It poses a philosophical, or more specifically, a value problem which inevitably generates consensus and disagreement in any group of people. To profess the possession of definitive answers would be highly presumptuous. However, there are some dimensions of positive human experience which would be subscribed to by a majority of lay and professional people in most segments of our society. A list of such dimensions is cited by Jahoda in the summary of her book, *Current Concepts of Positive Mental Health*. A paraphrase of some of the major characteristics of the "good life" which she cited is as follows:

1. A sense of personal identity; knowing who we are and where we are headed.

2. A realistic, positive self regard.
3. Active personal investment in living.
4. A healthy balance between impulse expression and control.
5. Resistance to stress.
6. Self-determination in decisions and nonconformity when appropriate.
7. A perception of reality which is relatively free of distortion.
8. The capacity for empathetic relations with others.
9. Mastery of the environment demonstrated in the ability to: love, work, play, solve problems, meet situational requirements, adapt and adjust.

For the purposes of this paper, the above statements are accepted as descriptive of the kinds of perceptions and behaviors which are desirable for children to develop.

HOW DOES MAN LEARN, DEVELOP AND CHANGE?

Answers to this question are less value-laden than the question of the nature of the "good life." However, this is not to say that propositions concerning how man learns, develops and changes are without controversy. The following propositions are presented as the most reasonable and established.

1. The nature of the child is that he is both an active and a reactive organism.
2. The younger the child the greater the influence of stimulus conditions over which he has limited control.
3. Because the child is dependent upon adults for physical survival and because he is to some extent a reactive organism, adults are in a unique position to influence his perceptions and behavior.
4. Being an active organism, the child will assert himself in his world in ways which appear to derive from congenital predispositions and will often express behavior and perceptions which resist the influence of significant adults in his life.
5. Being a reactive as well as an active organism who is less controlled by innate predispositions than lower animals, ultimate development is substantially determined by learning and greatly mediated by learned abstractions.

6. The environment (essentially people) supplies the necessary conditions for facilitating the development of the child in directions consistent with, as well as contrary to, his innate predispositions.

7. Perception is distorted and behavior becomes rigid in the face of threat and fear, while perception is enriched and behavior is more adaptive when threat disappears.

8. The counselor should consider the active and reactive nature of the child, in relation to desired perceptual and behavioral outcomes, in determining how he will function in the elementary school.

9. To be an effective facilitator of growth, learning, and behavior change, the counselor must be sufficiently insightful about himself, his need structure and personality, in order that he does not utilize relationships to distort the development of those whom he is trying to help.

10. Children are socialized in groups, are taught in groups, and fulfillment of innate potential is substantially determined by the experiences they have in groups.

11. A school is a social system and the extent to which it achieves its goals can be understood on the basis of the principles that explain the operation of social systems.

Each of the preceding propositions could be elaborated in great detail. From such an elaboration, numerous inferences could be drawn concerning the most effective ways for a counselor to behave to bring about change in children. The following description of counselor role and function represents one effort to describe counselor behaviors which are based upon assumptions as to how children learn, develop, and change. Counselor behavior is designed to facilitate the growth of children in the direction of positive human experience.

COUNSELOR ROLE AND FUNCTION

Many of the services typically provided by behavioral science oriented professionals currently in the public schools are incorporated in this model, but only if they effect desired changes in pupils. For example, the information services function is at best a tribute to man's penchant for organization unless it is used to effect desired changes in pupils. Since much doubt can be raised concerning the salutary effects of collecting information which is not used, the counselor would spend only as much time as is necessary to collect, record and transmit information which is useful in effecting change. This task will be delegated to com-

puters and clerks wherever possible. The well-prepared counselor with a professional commitment will not escape to information-gathering to avoid those activities which hold promise of effecting desired changes in children. The question is not, "Should a counselor test, provide an information service, a follow-up service, and so on?" but, "Is this the best way the counselor can use his time to effect desirable changes in children?" Sometimes the decision will be made that administering and interpreting a test has priority. More often the counselor will be working with children, parents, teachers, and administrators individually or in groups because he considers this the best way to bring about desired changes.

Two major functions should be performed by the elementary school counselor: (1) counseling, and (2) consultation. Counseling can be defined as

> ". . . a learning-oriented process . . . in which a counselor, professionally competent in relevant psychological skills and knowledge, seeks to assist the client by methods appropriate to the latter's needs to learn more about himself, to know how to put such understanding into effect in relation to more clearly perceived, realistically defined goals to the end that the client may become a happier and more productive member of his society."[2]

Caplan has said that consultation may be defined as a process in which

> ". . . the consultant attempts to help the consultee solve a mental health problem of his client or clients within the framework of his usual professional functioning. The process is designed so that while help is being given to the consultee in dealing with the presenting problem, he is also being educated in order that he will be able in the future to handle similar problems in the same or other clients in a more effective manner than in the past."[1]

These definitions both describe an interaction between a professional counselor and a counselee(s) or consultee(s). The major difference lies in the fact that counseling focuses upon the immediate relationship between counselor and counselee, the subject matter being the counselee's behavior and perceptions. Consultation focuses upon a problem outside the immediate relationship such as a specific child, a group of children, test data, curricular approaches, etc. Counseling focuses upon the immediate relationship between a counselor and counselee(s), while in consultation the consultant and consultee focus upon a problem external to their immediate interaction, the consultant's task being to contribute to the consultee's understanding of the event. These two functions may often merge in practice. For example, a parent may request an interview with a counselor to discuss developmental problems of a son or daughter. It

may become quickly apparent to the counselor that information may be helpful but that a much more meaningful way of relating is to assist the parent to explore his or her own feelings or perceptions of the situation. At that point the immediate relationship between the counselor and parent becomes paramount, the focus is no longer the child but is now the parent's behavior and perceptions.

COUNSELING

The counselor is committed to the notion that problems experienced by children and adults are seldom resolved by more information. When a person is depressed and feeling worthless and unloved it helps very little to learn that this stems from a discrepancy between the "real self" and the "idealized image." What is more often needed is to be accepted, understood and cared about. What is needed is someone who can respond in a way unlike that of most of the other significant people in the individual's life. When a teacher is distraught because she doesn't know how to handle impulsive children it helps very little for her to learn that she is really frightened over losing control of her own impulse life. However, it may be helpful if someone can create a relationship in which she can learn that her own feelings are really not so bad. Sometimes the worst vice is advice.

Counseling may be the outgrowth of a specific situation and when the situation is handled more effectively, counseling is terminated. Or, counseling may be provided to facilitate the changing of habitual ways of perceiving or behaving. Counseling may consist of one session or a number of sessions.

The counselor is faced with clientele in such numbers that using a large segment of his time for individual counseling often becomes impractical. However, in the face of this he doesn't throw up his hands and retreat to the safety of his Binet kit. He directs a considerable amount of his counseling time to working with groups. However, time economy is not the only reason for concentrating upon groups, for learnings can take place in group process which are more difficult to achieve in individual counseling.

Group and individual counseling may be provided for children, teachers, and parents. Specific needs and policies within a school district will determine, to some extent, the clientele served by the counselor. Sometimes changes in children can be effected best by providing group counseling for parents. Counseling is considered the most significant function of the counselor.

CONSULTATION

The counselor may consult with teachers, administrators, or parents. Two major types of consultation in the elementary school are (1) milieu-

oriented, and (2) child-oriented. These are not distinct and discrete but represent two distinguishable foci of consultation.

Milieu-Oriented Consultation. Milieu-oriented consultation is a relationship in which the subject of inquiry is some aspect of a child's (or children's) environment. It may be the home, the school or the neighborhood. More often than not, however, the focus of milieu-oriented consultation is the school learning environment. The counselor may meet with teachers individually or in groups to consider ways of enhancing the learning environment for pupils. Some examples of milieu-oriented consultation with teachers (by no means all-inclusive) are as follows:

1. The counselor may assist a teacher in the upper elementary grades (especially eighth grade) in developing a career and educational exploration unit based upon sound principles of career choice.
2. The counselor may assist a teacher in drawing implications for her instructional program from group test results. For example, the counselor may analyze achievement test items to provide information concerning specific skill strengths and deficiencies.
3. The counselor may consult with the teacher concerning various approaches to grouping as they relate to a variety of educational objectives. In doing so he may find it effective to go into a classroom and work directly with the children to demonstrate such techniques as inquiry training, brainstorming and "feeling-oriented" discussion groups.
4. The counselor may assist the teacher in designing units of study dealing with personal-social problems such as boy-girl relationships, delinquency, etc.

Milieu-oriented consultation will not be restricted to verbal communication between the counselor and teacher(s), but demonstration, audio-visual aids and any other effective means of conveying information may be a part of the counselor's repertoire.

Consultation may sometimes occur incidentally when a teacher stops the counselor in the hall or drops into his office, or the consultation may be scheduled. Sometimes consultation will be on a "one-shot" basis while at other times the nature of the problem will demand that a series of sessions be arranged.

Milieu-oriented consultation is by no means exclusively or even primarily the domain of the elementary school counselor. It is probably even more the focus of the efforts of many principals and curriculum consultants. The counselor's special concern is with the mental health aspects of the milieu. The counselor will work cooperatively with administrators and curriculum consultants. The structure of the particular school system will obviously affect the nature of the milieu-oriented consultation activities of the counselor.

Child-Oriented Consultation. Child-oriented consultation is a relationship in which the subject of inquiry is a child's (or group of children's) behavior. The emphasis is upon understanding the causes underlying the behavior through the application of theoretical propositions concerning personality, learning and child development. Evidence suggests that an increased understanding of child behavior can influence adult attitudes and behavior toward children.

1. The counselor may consult with teachers, administrators, or parents concerning the behavior of individual children. He would typically begin by meeting with the consultee to determine his perception of the problem behavior. The counselor would then gather pertinent data through observation, testing, interviewing, study of background data, etc. After such data were organized, an appropriate plan would be devised for conveying the information to the consultee. The focus may then shift to milieu-oriented consultation and the planning of appropriate learning experiences based upon the child's behavior.

2. The counselor may consult with teachers, administrators, or parents, the focus being upon an individual child's behavior but the primary purpose being the enhancement of the consultee's understanding of child behavior and not just the resolution of the problem presented by the particular child being studied. Such consultation is usually offered to groups of teachers, administrators, or parents.

COORDINATION

The coordinative functions of the counselor may include referring pupils to state and community resources, responsibility for the scheduling of group and individual counseling and consultation, maintaining records of counseling and counsultation contacts, and organizing and maintaining a pupil appraisal program includir g standardized testing.

SUMMARY

The major points developed in this paper are as follows:

1. Developmental experiences can be improved for children, thus enhancing their chances of leading effective lives.

2. Because of the significance of adults in the lives of children, changes in developmental experiences will inevitably involve introducing new and different adults into the lives of children or changing the behavior of adults already in the child's life.

3. This paper proposed the introduction of a counselor whose purpose is to effect changes in children as a new and different person in the child's life and to faciliate change in the adults already in the child's life.

4. The strategy for counselor role and function presented in this paper is based upon assumptions concerning:

   a. The nature of positive human experience.

   b. How man learns and develops from birth to maturity.

   This paper has briefly identified some of the more significant of these assumptions.

5. The counselor role and function described in this paper includes three major functions; counseling, consultation and coordination in that order of importance.

[1] Caplan, Gerald. *Concepts of Mental Health and Consultation.* Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

[2] Gustad, J. W. "The Definition of Counseling." In R. F. Berdie (Ed.), *Roles and Relationships in Counseling.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1953.

A PERSPECTIVE ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELING AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

C. Gilbert Wrenn

I should like first to comment on some of the historical antecedents to our present deliberations concerning the role of the elementary school counselor; to proceed then to an analysis of the position paper and the recorders' summaries of the conference discussion groups; and, finally, to comment on the psychology of adults, meaning all of us. Since Dr. Farson began this conference with an emphasis on people rather than programs, it seems fitting that I also conclude with a consideration of people.

HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS

At the White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1960, seven of the 18 forums comprising the conference stressed the need for counseling in the elementary school, a need that has been recognized repeatedly both before and after the White House meeting. What we are looking for now is a way to do the job effectively on a basis of sound psychological understandings. When Dr. Faust presented his elementary counseling proposal approximately a year ago, it not only looked fresh and different, but it seemed to be based on a sound understanding of human behavior. Dr. Faust and the elementary counseling staff (Drs. Blackham, McGreevy, and Maes) are primarily oriented in psychology and talk about counseling only in terms of human beings and how they behave.

I am a firm believer in the fact that the times produce men more then men produce the times. There comes a time when the conditions are right for a man to speak appropriately and be listened to. This approach could not have found support ten years ago even if Dr. Faust and the staff had been ready to present it.

There are antecedents to counseling in America which lend appropriateness to the deliberations of this conference. Since 1837 we have had a comprehensive high school curriculum, one calling for student choice. Approximately 80 per cent of our high school age youth are attending school, while 43 per cent of our young college age adults are engaged in

some form of education beyond high school. We have had the problem of heterogeneity and of choice for a long time at the upper levels of education as well as at the lower.

Another significant part of our historical background has been a philosophy of pragmatism. Right or wrong, in this country we have had an education for something, rather than an education "for its own sake." Adults must possess the essential skills of communication and socialization in order to "get along." Frequently we seek to justify the education that a high school student is receiving by asserting it will have impact upon his later life in the world of work. Consequently, vocational choice is now inextricably interwoven with educational choice and level of educational aspiration. Education at all levels seem almost too utilitarian, too vocationally oriented, but the fact remains that it is. This link between education and vocations was a major factor in the introduction of vocational counseling in our high schools.

Two basic psychological concepts have also contributed heavily to the present position of counseling in our schools today. The first is the concept of the personality as an integrated whole. This conveys the notion that what happens to a boy or girl outside of school, outside of the classroom, is important to what happens in the classroom. The second is the concept of individual differences as demonstrated by psychological measurement. This notion leads to differential treatment for individuals possessing different knowledges and skills.

Recently all of us have become keenly aware of the rate of change in our culture which has made knowledges and skills, formerly considered adequate, become obsolescent much more rapidly. Comprehensive high schools, a philosophy of pragmatism, psychological concepts of the whole child and of individual differences, along with a trend toward rapid obsolescence of both things and ideas — these factors form the background out of which counseling has developed. The magnitude of this development is revealed in the remarkable increase in the number of counselors during less than a decade. In 1958 there were 7,000 full time secondary school counselors. By 1964 the number had grown to 19,000, amounting to a 250 per cent increase in six years. That this increase in part reflects a national commitment is attested to by the fact that 15,000 counselors have, since 1958, received partial or full training under the sponsorship of the National Defense Education Act. The time has been right for counseling.

Now, I think, we stand on a new threshold in the field of elementary school counseling. We have dallied long enough. Today we recognize the need for action. This conference represents what may be a significant historical event in terms of the eventual development of a defensible program of counseling in the elementary school.

THE POSITION PAPER

The position paper speaks specifically of the role and function of the counselor in the elementary school. Before reading the position paper, I set up a series of criteria against which its adequacy could be estimated. One of these criteria could be described as two pairs of psychological contrasts: (1) the cognitive approach to behavior as represented primarily by Piaget, on the one hand, and the affective approach represented most basically by Freud on the other hand; (2) the sharpening of the self-concept, the development of an understanding of personal meanings of life and the existence of a subjective self on the one hand, and behavioral conditioning without the intervention of a subjective self on the other.

Another set of criteria has to do with the counseling emphases in the paper. In secondary school counseling there has been a movement in certain identifiable directions and I looked for them in the position paper. Secondary school counseling has moved from (1) a concern with the students only to a concern with the adults who are important in the students' lives; (2) from a concern about changes within the individual person exclusively, to a concern with changing his affective and cognitive environment; (3) from individual counseling to a concern with group approaches in counseling; (4) from a conception of the counselor as a generalist, who is an extension of the teacher, to a perception of the counselor as one who has special skills and knowledges.

How does this position paper look in terms of the above-mentioned criteria? In terms of the two psychological dimensions the paper has seemed to place an emphasis on the affective side of behavior somewhat more than on the cognitive approaches to behavior. Likewise, the stress seems to be somewhat more on the subjective self than on behavioral conditioning. Certainly Jahoda's criteria of mental health used in the position paper are primarily affective and self-concept oriented in emphasis. There is the danger of some loss here. If I were to choose personally between the two, I would have chosen in the same direction. The choice is probably not necessary, however, for cognitive and affective developments must be seen as parts of the same pattern. The counselor must make positive contributions to the cognitive development of the student as well as to his affective and social development. In serving the cognitive development he may contribute to affective release and behavior. The paper is not antithetical to this position, but it does stress affect more than cognition, and it also stresses the importance of changing perceptions of self and of others more than the conditioning of behavior.

The paper is a striking development in itself when seen in terms of the history of secondary school counseling. For it moves in the direction of significant frontiers of high school counseling by placing in the beginning stages of elementary school counseling, certain constructs which

have developed only after 25 to 30 years of secondary school counseling. I am speaking in particular of the inclusion of work with adults, responsibility for changing the pupil's learning environment, the use of group counseling procedures, and conceiving of the counselor as one who has special skills and knowledges.

The distinction between counseling and consultation seen in the position paper is most significant. It is as clear a statement as I have read in the literature on the way in which these two functions can complement each other in the work of the counselor. I think there is also merit in the suggestion that a counselor can move from one kind of relationship to the other. The idea that the relationship may shift from consultation to counseling within the course of a single personal contact is sound, but it remains for the evidence to demonstrate that it can be done.

I cannot say that I am sure that counseling is more important than consultation, as the paper suggests. That may sound strange coming from me, considering my long dedication to individual counseling. I am convinced that *the situation in which the counselor operates* will determine in large part whether that counselor finds counseling or consultation to be most important. Which of these is the more important will also depend upon *the nature of that counselor,* because some counselors are more comfortable in a counseling relationship, while others function better in a consulting relationship.

REPORTS FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Certain fears were expressed concerning the acceptance of the counselor by teachers and by boards of education. The question was raised as to the kind of evidence which could be presented to convince teachers and board members of the need for a counselor. Here I would like to repeat to you what I said in some meetings in England to the English headmasters who were facing the introduction of secondary school counselors. If the counselor is to be effective, the principal must *want* the counselor, and a substantial number of the teachers must *want* the counselor. We have had experience with superintendents and boards of education getting good ideas and unilaterally attempting to initiate educational change without consulting those whose task it is actually to effect the change. We have had enough of that kind of experience to know that teachers and principals must be involved in planning, and they must want the counselor if his work is to be a success.

There was a question in some of the discussion groups as to whether the counselor's initial work in the school should be primarily developmental or crisis oriented. Some have suggested that in the beginning he would, of necessity, be dealing with crisis situations and would gradually shift into a broader, more developmental focus as the school becomes ready. The problem arises, of course, as to whether a person can be

brought in, allow this crisis image of the counselor to develop and then shift into a broader concept of the job.

Some of you were wondering how to establish in advance some criteria for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the elementary counselor in order to be able to argue for the trial employment of such a person in the elementary school. A sound idea, but it is unrealistic to assume that such an evaluation can be made after the program has been in existence for one year. During the first year, much of what the counselor does, he is doing for the first time. The entire school is getting accustomed to the *fact of change* and neither he, nor the staff, nor the students, are really in a position to measure the *quality of change*. By the end of the second year, the counseling role may have become sufficiently an integral part of the school program that its impact can be measured. Changes in both teacher and pupil attitudes and behavior, and changes in the curriculum are some of the evaluative criteria which could appropriately be investigated. Some justifiable concern was expressed over the difficulty in measuring subjective changes through the use of objective measures, the fear being that some of the counselor's effectiveness cannot easily be made objective.

What is Counseling? Over and over again the question of counselor role was raised in the discussions. *The counselor must have a concept of role that he can live with*—partly a professional concept, partly a personal one. Then he must look for a school environment that bears the promise of providing mutual need-satisfactions for him and the school. I don't think one can assume that the counselor's role must be the same in every setting, because no counselor is a carbon copy of any other counselor. He is an individual in his own right and must remain so. You cannot assume that a counselor is a counselor is a counselor, nor that a role is a role is a role. Each counselor must determine his perception of role—partly in terms of professional considerations and partly in terms of his self-knowledge, and then attempt to work in a school environment in which he can both contribute and derive satisfaction.

Some of you have questioned whether the counselor should be a generalist or a specialist. I think it is possible for one to be both. He can be a generalist in the fact that he is concerned with the whole school and all of the children in the school, and he can be a specialist in his knowledge of human growth and behavior.

Counselor role and function must have a definable continuity and consistency, but must at the same time be in a continual state of change. It is a dynamic role in a dynamic setting. In a very real sense of the word, counselor education must give attention to the present situation and its demands, but also be able to look beyond and prepare counselors for changing roles in the future. I have heard it said that a counselor edu-

cation program should give equal attention (1) to a realistic perception of what the school needs now, and (2) to what the counselor can contribute to what the school can and should become. This broadening of the horizons to encompass *preparation for the future* is fully as important a contribution as meeting present needs with present skills.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TEMPTATIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Let me conclude by talking briefly about us as adults. Those of us who deal with other adults in close relationships as do administrators, teachers, or counselors have certain temptations, certain psychological problems that are peculiarly ours. Let me speak about the temptations of administrators.[1] Those readers who are not administrators need to be empathetic at this point, for it is likely that you are going to have to work with administrators and it is important that you understand their problems.

One of the temptations of the administrator is to *spend more time on programs than on people.* People are active as well as reactive organisms and they often don't come out the way you hope or expect! You can't change them with a squiggle of the pen, they respond individually and unexpectedly, and besides, they are kind of cantankerous at times. The administrator is tempted to escape the provoking problems of staff development by retreating to a desk full of imposing papers — orders for toilet paper and chalk and requisitions for this and that. I have seen administrators with very clean desks and the messiest staff relationships one could imagine. If I were an administrator, I could be tempted in the same way because I can easily tell myself that my desk ought to be kept clean so that anybody coming in would not be bothered by it. Sheer rationalization, but it might work with me just as it works with experienced administrators.

Another temptation the administrator has is *to make immediate decisions.* He may have the notion that he should not take more than two or three minutes to get his mighty brain to work and decide on something. This is his image of the administrator. Frequently, an administrator is called upon to make quick and accurate decisions and he is judged accordingly. But there are kinds of decisions involving people and their reactions which ought to be made over a considerably longer period of time. Rather than taking the time to let such a decision lay on his desk and on his heart, he is tempted to get the agonizing situation over and done with, without considering its implications for Mrs. Brown, Mr. Jones, or Miss Susie. Not until he has asked what their reactions might be, how the decision would affect their personal lives, and whether or not he should share the problem with them ahead of time, not until then can he comfortably take the responsibility for the decision. Generally an administrator is judged not on the quickness, but on the quality of his decisions.

Being human with hearts as well as heads, administrators may often be tempted *to be kind to an individual and in so doing be unkind to the group.* I have often brought to the attention of school, industrial, and business administrators that it is a grave error *not* to release a man who was obviously failing in his work and who has not improved after being given specific suggestions. Not only does the job and his associates suffer but the employee in question is uncertain of his status with his superior and is aware of numerous subtle hints that he is not getting along well. While the administrator is trying to be nice and not fire him, he is dying inside. This is unkindness of the greatest sort.

I think the problem of *democratic versus unilateral decisions* poses a constant dilemma for the administrator. I might have personal convictions as to how the decision should be made, but might lack the patience to allow people to muddle through and come up with a decision approaching the one I could have made a long time ago. The democratic procedure takes more time, more muddling, and never works out as clean cut as an administrative directive. *But it will have more support.* Administrators may talk about being democratic and in the next breath give a lie to it by making the decision themselves. They will cite the problem, pose a solution, and then ask the employees, "Now what do you think?" It is hard for the average subordinate to stand up to his boss and say, "I don't agree with you." You may even get an affirmative vote, when, in fact, three-fourths of the group is against you. Most of us would agree that policies should be established by those most affected by them. If the administrator delegates responsibility to the group, within limits, then he will be a true professional if he treats them as people of integrity. This means he will allow them to *act* within these limits and will treat their conclusions as worthy of support.

CONCLUSION

Only tentative answers have been provided to *some* of the questions raised during this conference. In fact more questions than answers have been raised in the one and a half days which we have spent together. Both leaders and participants still must live with uncertainty. The planners of this workshop are wondering whether they have adequately communicated their thoughts to you and whether they can assimilate your reactions.

On the other hand, many of you will return home wondering if you have obtained the answer you sought when you came. You may leave feeling defeated because you do not have answers or because you have only partial answers. For those of you who have received at least partial answers, the question may still remain with you whether you can translate these answers to the people with whom you work.

I hope each of us leaves this conference feeling that we have confronted problems of such magnitude that immediate solutions would be too much to expect. If you change just a little in a direction that is meaningful to you as a consequence of this day and a half spent together, this conference has been worthwhile. Many of us expect too much of ourselves. We may expect far-reaching changes within ourselves during the next year when it may take the next ten years. If you have in mind a series of ultimate objectives for your school, start off by identifying objectives along the way that can reasonably be met in one month, at the end of this year, and at the end of next year. In this way the ultimate objective seems less impossible and you will feel reinforced by taking steps forward.

I would like for each of us to depart feeling that we don't really know very much and possessing a good bit of humility about the changes we can effect. Although our knowledge is the best we have for today it is tentative and may not suffice for tomorrow. We have been learning as human beings for a million or perhaps one and a half million years. That seems like quite a while, and yet we are young as a species. If we can believe the earth scientists, life will continue to exist for another two billion years before being extinguished by increasing radiation from the sun. We have existed as a species for perhaps a million years and we may continue to exist—and to learn—for another two thousand million years. It is no disgrace to say that we are still pretty ignorant when we realise how infant-like we are as a species.

All knowledge is tentative but, writes Allport, there is the parallel principle of *commitment*. This calls for us to be committed to living—and dying if needs be—for the truth as we now see it. It is hard to be fully committed to a truth—to knowledge—that we *know* is not final, that may be superceded tomorrow by more valid knowledge. All workers with human behavior must be particularly influenced by both *tentativeness* and *commitment*.

If change in knowledge is the most consistent of realities then it should be no disgrace to accept change in ourselves. We must personally be open to change—without undue delay and without apology—since we are committed to a life of trying to help *others* change. Adjusting to changing reality strains our souls, meeting daily reality even more so. Albert Schweitzer told of waking early each morning to the noises of the hospital, to the cries of those in pain, to the facing of that day's realities. "And sometimes," writes Schweitzer, "sometimes, not always, when I look reality in the face I can stare right back." Such a conference as this will contribute most if it helps each of us to stare right back.

[1] Adapted from a more complete discussion in "The Psychological Temptations of an Administrator," *Minnesota Journal of Education*, 1957, 38:11-12, and in *Oregon Higher Education*, 1959, 11:29-30.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

C. Patrick McGreevy

Arizona State University

University professors have frequently been accused of generating theoretical notions which fail to hold up in practice. The wish to avoid the breach between theory and university training on the one hand and practice on the other was one of the major incentives for the planning of the Western Regional Conference on Elementary School Counseling. The interaction during the conference justified the above-mentioned concern, for school practitioners sometimes had to strain to be sure they were understood by the university personnel and vice versa.

However, one left this brief encounter, during the conference, with the impression that significant gains had been made in lessening this troublesome communication barrier. As Blackham noted in the introduction, the prime purpose of the conference was to communicate with public school administrators upon whose shoulders rests the ultimate authority and resultant responsibility to implement elementary school counseling services. This summary will identify some of the salient messages sent by the various presenters, the feedback transmitted from the receiving audience, and some implications for the future of elementary school counseling.

Farson's opening statement exemplifies the pervading theme of the conference. "Good answers seldom settle issues; more often they raise new ones." Farson's answer to his provocative speech title, "What Are People For?", namely, that people are for exercising and enjoying their own humanness, is deceivingly simple. One is led to ask, "What is this quality, humanness? How does one exercise and/or enjoy it? What role does the school play in fostering it in children?, and, How does this mythical counselor behave so as to facilitate humanness in the elementary school organizations and their members?" Perhaps the most critical question to be raised, however, is simply, "Do elementary schools, their staffs and supporting citizenry want to make the changes necessary to broaden their scope of services to include situations in which they can help one another to experience their humanness?" Even if this question were answered in the affirmative, the history of man suggests that we will tolerate unpleasant and sometimes hurtful conditions for fear that changing them might lead to something worse rather than better.

A prevalent theme of the conference was that all members of the learning process, administrators, teachers, students, everyone, ought to feel that they are active *participants* in this all important process. For too many years the student seems to have been regarded as a kind of passive spectator into whose brain was poured the "facts" deemed essential by the adult society. Historically, adults in education have thought *for* children. The insights gained through the advances of psychometry and developmental psychology led to a focus on thinking *about* children. One could speculate that this "clinical objectivity" phase increased the emotional distance between the observer (adult-teacher) and the observed (child-pupil). Farson noted that as our physical proximity to one another has increased, so has our emotional distance.

The papers presented at this conference suggest a relatively new approach, the intent of which, among other things, is to lessen emotional distance. A recurrent message during the conference was the necessity of considering children more as human with their attendant emotionality than as "students," for whom our concern would be limited to their cognitive processes. This approach is typified by the adult thinking and feeling *with* the child. Thinking with a person implies the equalitarian relationship also mentioned by Farson. As he noted, though, the equalitarian relationship is risky as all members of the relationship are vulnerable. One member cannot hide his humanness from the others. This means that the adults in the schools would "practice what they preach." Much "concomitant" or incidental learning is picked up by the child which may or may not have been intended by the teacher. If we really believe that the schools ought to work towards humanizing children along with conveying significant cultural achievements and values, then we must increase our attention to the style of behavior in communication as well as the specific words spoken. The total relationship between the teacher and the learner becomes of prime importance and ought to be characterized by its genuine humanness.

The following considerations have a significant bearing on the extent to which the counselor is able to assist in effecting humanness in the elementary school:

(1) Our society is clearly experiencing and will continue to experience tremendous changes, the effects of which will probably not be ascertained for many decades. In the face of these rapid changes the school administrator is being asked to incorporate a new professional into his staff in the person of an elementary school counselor. It would not be surprising if the administrator should ask whether this new person will solve problems or create new ones.

The administrator of the elementary school organization is of critical importance in determining the manner in which the elementary coun-

selor will be accepted and utilized. He possesses the necessary authority to introduce the elementary school counselor into the school. His attitude and behavior toward the counselor often determines the staff's reaction. Some administrators may jump at the chance to employ a counselor because it is "the thing to do" and is prestigious in educational circles. Other administrators may see the counselor as an intruder into an organization already cluttered with specialists and consultants. Whatever the administrator's motivation for employing a counselor, it remains the responsibility of the counselor to demonstrate that he can assist the administrator in solving problems.

(2) While there is a somewhat stable, definable role for the elementary school counselor, it is and probably should continue to be somewhat plastic. Hopefully we will be able to continue asking questions which not only resist clear "black and white" answers but invite further questions. It is important that we guard against reaching premature closure on our understandings of the elementary school counselor's role and function.

(3) A clear conceptualization of the role and function of the elementary school counselor must continue to be sensitive to the respective roles and functions of those professionals already employed in the elementary school.

The exercising and enjoying of one another's humanness is dependent upon our success in avoiding the ever present pitfalls of communication and thinking. Certainly, a prerequisite to this is to establish and *use* communication channels between all of us interested in this problem. The Western Regional Conference on Elementary School Counseling provided a good start.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

Arizona State University

Tempe, Arizona

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES BULLETINS

Educational Services Bulletin No. 10, **"Comparative Values of Different Methods of In-Car Instruction in Driver Education," R. Craig Rover, October, 1963, 29 pp., $1.50.**

Educational Services Bulletin No. 11, **"A Selected Bibliography of Professional Books for Elementary Schools," compiled by Janet Abbott, January, 1964, 44 pp., $1.00.**

Educational Services Bulletin No. 13, **"Fourth Annual Invitational Reading Conference Proceedings," Paul Hollingsworth, Ed., March, 1965, 51 pp., $2.00.**

Educational Services Bulletin No. 16, **"Report of Project Headstart in Central Arizona," Cameron Olsted and Melvin Zinser, 27 pp. $1.00.**

Educational Services Bulletin No. 17, **"Our National Crisis . . . Educational Imperatives for Survival," (Report of the Developing and Using Human Resources Conference), Warren T. Kingsbury, March, 1965, $ .50.**

Educational Services Bulletin No. 18, **"Fifth Annual Invitational Reading Conference Proceedings," Paul Hollingsworth, Ed., May, 1966, 52 pp., $2.00.**

Educational Services Bulletin No. 19, **"The Elementary School Counselor: A Venture in Humanness," (Summary of Proceedings of the Western Regional Conference on Elementary School Counseling), Wayne R. Maes, Ed., May, 1966, 40 pp., $2.00.**

These publications may be obtained through the Bureau of Educational Research and Services, College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe.