SOME FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH CONTINUANCE IN COUNSELING AT FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY OF GENESEE COUNTY IN 1963

by

Janet Grace Cook

In Partial Fulfillment of

Requirements for Master of Social Work Degree

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan

Joseph Heffernan,
Assistant Professor

May 1964

THESIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

Purpose and Background 1

Statement of the Problem. 1
Reason for the Study. 1
Background of the Problem 3

Survey of the Literature 4

The Study Focus. 10

II. Methods of the Study 13

Collection and Analysis of Data. 13

Definition of the Study Groups 15

The Sampling Method. 15

III. Results of the Study 18

Factors Significantly Related. 18

Table 1: Previous Contact at Family Service Agency 18

Table 2: Case Split Between Two Workers 19

Table 3: Number in Counseling From Same Family. 20

Factors Not Significantly Related. 22

Table 4: Family Income. 22

Table 5: Education. 23

Table 6: Occupation 24

Table 7: Age. 25

Table 8: Sex. 26

Table 9: Marital Status 26

Table 10: Chief Concern 27

Table 11: Source of Referral. 28

Table 12: Number of Children. 29

IV. Discussion of the Findings 30

Previous Contact 30

Number in Counseling 32

Case Split. 35

V. Conclusion 41

Appendix 42

Bibliography 45

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Background

The problem upon which this research project was based was that of the premature discontinuance by some clients of counseling service, when it seemed that they were really in need of this service. The purpose of this study was to determine which of a certain set of twelve factors were significantly related to continuance in counseling at Family Service Agency of Genesee County in 1963. The factors studied included family income, education, occupation, age, sex, marital status, client's statement of chief concern, source of referral, number of family members in counseling, whether case was split between two workers, previous contact at Family Service Agency, and number of children at home. It was a comparative study, comparing those who discontinued counseling after at least six interviews, with those who dropped out after two to five, and with those who terminated counseling after the initial interview.

Family Service Agency statistics indicate that many who come once to the agency do not return for further interviews.[1] In 1963, of 833 families who had at least one interview, only fifty-three per cent (443) continued beyond the initial interview, and only nineteen

---

[1]Family Service Agency of Genesee County, "1963 Casework Figures" (hand-written statistical record in file).

per cent (157) continued in counseling for six or more interviews. This is not simply a local agency problem, however, as national Family Service statistics indicated similarly that, in the previous year, only fifty-four per cent (70,368) of 130,000 families interviewed continued beyond that first interview and no more than twenty-four per cent (31,268) came in for at least six interviews.[2]

This poses a question as to whether the service was completed in this brief period or whether there were factors which prevented the clients from further utilizing the service. As only occasionally could the service be completed in one interview, this writer feels that it is important for social workers to be aware of factors that may prevent the client from utilizing the counseling service and of factors that may promote their using it. While these factors may be both client-centered and social worker-and/or agency-centered, this study assessed the level of association between twelve client-centered factors and continuance in counseling.

Therefore, the reason for this study was to attempt to identify factors significantly related to continuance in counseling, and thereby aid social workers in gearing their approach to clients in such a way that all these factors can be taken into consideration and the needs of clients better be met. The writer also wished to rule out any of the factors that are not significantly related.

The author's personal interest in this study stems from her Second Year Field Work placement at Family Service Agency of Genesee County.

---

[2]Family Service Agency of Genesee County, "1962 Casework Figures", 1963 (typewritten).

There is a growing concern in the social work profession regarding the high percentage of clients who discontinue casework counseling after the first interview. The literature regarding this problem has stated the growing need for individual agencies to analyze their own casework services to learn more about possible factors contributing to discontinuance of casework counseling after the initial interview.

This particular problem became of interest to the writer through several channels: casework class lectures and assigned readings by Perlman,[3] Stark,[4] Shyne,[5] and Pfouts and Rader[6] on the intake process in casework and the difficulty in maintaining clients beyond the initial interview; through reading the statistical report on Family Service Agency and Family Service Association of America previously mentioned; through reading the student theses of Ruth Buckner[7] and Catherine Farner,[8] who in 1954 and 1962, respectively, did research on continuance and discontinuance at this Family Service agency; through talking

---

[3]Helen H. Perlman, "Intake and Some Role Considerations", Journal of Social Casework, XLI, 4, (April 1960), 171-177.

[4]Frances Stark, "Barriers to Client-Worker Communication at Intake", Journal of Social Casework, XL, 4, (April 1959), 177-83.

[5]Ann Shyne, "What Research Tells Us About Short-Term Cases in Family Agencies", Journal of Social Casework, 38:5, (1957), 223-231.

[6]J. H. Pfouts and G. E. Rader, "Influence of Interviewer Characteristics on Initial Interview", Social Casework, XLIII, 10, (December 1962), 548-52.

[7]Ruth Buckner, "Factors Affecting Non-Return of Nineteen Clients After Intake Interview in Family Service Agency of Flint, Michigan", Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, Wayne State University, 1954.

[8]Catherine Farner, "A Comparative Study of Factors Affecting Continuance and Discontinuance of Clients", Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.

with the Executive Secretary of Family Service Agency, Miss Lorraine Lull, who said she would like to have this problem studied further; and through the writer's own experience at the agency which whetted her interest to study more about this problem.

Though the problem is widespread throughout the field of social work, this particular study of the problem was limited in setting to the Family Service Agency of Genesee County. This is a non-sectarian voluntary agency serving Flint and Genesee County since 1944, and supported by the Red Feather Fund. The central purpose of the agency is to contribute to harmonious family relationships, to strengthen positive values in family life, and to promote healthy personality development and satisfactory social functioning of various family members.[9] There is an open-door policy at Family Service Agency, which means willingness to give individual consideration to all client and community requests. The agency in 1963 was professionally staffed by an Executive, six professionally trained caseworkers, a psychiatric consultant, three case aids (college graduates but without professional social work training), and several student social workers from Michigan State University.

Survey of the Literature Relevant to the Study

There have been a number of studies and articles on continuance in casework and on short-term cases. Some dealt especially with attributes of the caseworker, and others with factors regarding the client. Quite a variety of factors have been examined with regard

---

[9] Scope and Methods of Family Service Agency. (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1953), p.3.

to the client, including motivation and capacity to use casework, specific psychological characteristics, and some more empirically verifiable factors such as age and socioeconomic status. This writer chose to study the latter type of factors.

Many authors discussed socioeconomic status, or some aspect of this (social class, income level, occupation and education) as a factor associated with continuance in casework, psychiatric, or psychological counseling. Many stated that they found a relationship to continuance that seemed to be significant. Regarding social class, eleven authors found that the middle and upper class members were more likely to continue than the lower class.[10-20] Five writers noted a higher economic level

---

[10]Shyne, Journal of Social Casework, 38:5, (1957), 223-231.

[11]Perlman, Journal of Social Casework, XLI, 4, (April 1960), 171-177.

[12]Buckner, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1954, p. 45.

[13]Lester K. Naden, "Worker-Client Perception of Presenting Problem as Related to Client Decision to Use Service", Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, Michigan State University, 1961, p. 70.

[14]R. Gibbey, B. Stotsky, E. Hiler, and D. Miller, "Validation of Rorschach Criteria for Predicting Duration of Therapy", Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18:3, (June 1954), 175-192.

[15]S. Imber, E. Nash, and A. Stone, "Social Class and Duration of Psychotherapy", Journal of Clinical Psychology, XI, (July 1955), 281-284.

[16]A. Winder and M. Hersko, "Effect of Social Class on Length and Type of Psychotherapy in a V.A. Mental Hygiene Clinic", Journal of Clinical Psychology, XI, 1, (1955), 77-80.

[17]N. Brill and H. Storrow, "Social Class and Psychiatric Treatment", Archives of General Psychiatry, III, (October 1960), 340-44.

[18]George Levinger, "Continuance in Casework and Other Helping Relationships", Social Work, 5:3, (July 1960), 40-51.

[19]J. D. Frank, L. Gliedman, S. Imber, E. Nash, and A. Stone, "Why Patients Leave Psychotherapy", American Medical Association Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, 77, (1957), 283-299.

[20]J. Coleman, R. Janowicz, S. Fleck, and N. Norton, "A Comparative Study of a Psychiatric Clinic and a Family Agency: Parts I and II", Journal of Social Casework, XXXVIII, (1957), 3-8, 74-80.

among continuers.[21-25] Four other researchers observed that housewives, managerial and professional workers tended to continue and that the continuers tended to have higher level jobs and higher occupational achievements.[26-29] These same ones noted that the continuers tended to have more education, with more being college graduates and that high school graduates tended to stay in treatment while less than grammar-school education predisposed to dropping out.

---

[21]E. Rubenstein and M. Lorr, "A Comparison of Terminators and Remainers in Out-patient Psychotherapy", Journal of Clinical Psychology, XII, 4, (October 1956), 345-49.

[22]F. Auld and J. Meyers, "Contributions to a Theory for Selecting Psychotherapy Patients", Journal of Clinical Psychology, X, (1954), 56-60.

[23]David Fanschel, "A Study of Caseworker' Perceptions of the Clients", Journal of Social Casework, XXXIX, (1958), 543-551.

[24]August Hollingshead and Frederick Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness: A Community Study, (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1958), p. 213.

[25]M. Lorr, M. Katz, and E. Rubenstein, "Prediction of Length of Stay in Psychotherapy", Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII, (1958), 321-327.

[26]Marouf Hasian and Franklyn Wosek, "A Comparative Study of Psychosocial Characteristics of Parents of Sixty Families Who Continued or Did Not Continue Recommended Treatment at Lansing Child Guidance Clinic", Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, Michigan State University, 1959, p.25.

[27]Patrick Sullivan, C. Miller, and W. Smelser, "Factors in Length of Stay and Progress in Psychotherapy, Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII, (1958), 1-9.

[28]Rubenstein and Lorr, Journal of Clinical Psychology, XII, 345-349.

[29]Frank, Gliedman, Imber, Nash, and Stone, American Medical Association Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, 283-299.

Three others found educational level completed was unrelated to continuance in counseling.[30-32] One author found income status unrelated[33] and another found occupational level not associated significantly.[34]

Thus, though there were some differences in the results and procedures of the various studies, it seems reasonable to say that the literature indicates a trend toward continuance in counseling which is in quite direct association to income, education, class, and occupation level. Some of the authors gave explanations as to why they considered there was this association. Lower class attitude towards social institutions is characterized by rebellion and a feeling that these institutions do not understand or try to help them.[35] Professional help is more easily available to middle-class then lower-class individuals and the former are more suited to it.[36] Agency community relations seem to be oriented toward middle-class clients.[37] Low social class seems to be significantly related to lower estimated intelligence, less education, tendency to see presenting problem as

---

[30]N. Siegel and M. Fink, "Disposition of Applications for Psychotherapy in an Out-patient Clinic", Social Casework, XLIII, 10, (December 1962), 545-48.

[31]Lorr and Rubenstein, Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII, 321-327.

[32]Farner, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, Michigan State University, 1962,p.47.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Lorr and Rubenstein, Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII,321-327.

[35]Winder and Hersko, Journal of Clinical Psychology, XI, 1, 78-79.

[36]Levinger, Social Work, 5:3, (July 1960), 44.

[37]Naden, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1961, p. 70.

physical rather than emotional, desire for symptomatic relief only rather than over-all help, lack of understanding of psychotherapeutic process, and lack of desire for psychotherapy.[38]

Regarding the factors of age, sex, and marital status, three writers found them unrelated to continuance.[39-41] Another noted a tendency for those over fifty to drop out.[42] Another observed an inclination for married females and for more of those in the twenties age group to continue.[43]

Three authors found that the chief concern presented by the client was significantly related to whether they continued.[44-46] Another said it was not.[47] Among the findings of the former authors were that over half of the clients with external problems but only one third with psychological problems were continuers; that more of the continuers had economic problems and were helped in this area;

---

[38]Brill and Storrow, Archives of General Psychiatry, III, (October 1960), 344.

[39]Farner, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1962, p. 48.

[40]Frank, Gliedman, Imber, Nash, and Stone, A.M.A. Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, 77, (1957), 287.

[41]Fanschel, Journal of Social Casework, XXXIX, p. 551.

[42]Hasian and Wosek, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1959, p.23.

[43]Siegel and Fink, Social Casework, XLIII, 10, December 1962, p.546-47.

[44]Hasian and Wosek, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1959, p.23.

[45]Lillian Ripple, "Factors Associated with Continuance in Casework Service", Journal of Social Work, 2:1, (January 1957), 93.

[46]Leonard S. Kogan, "The Short-Term Case in a Family Agency", Social Casework, XXXVIII, (1957), 371.

[47]Farner, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1962, p. 48.

but that there was no significant difference respecting the relative frequency of problems involving either marital difficulty or parent-child relationships.

Two found no significant differences with respect to the basis of contact, or the stimulus for contact, between the continuers and discontinuers.[48,49] However, another writer observed that the referral source was significantly related at the .05 level of significance to continuance.[50] They were more likely to continue if referred by pastors, less likely to continue if referred by attorney or court, but there was no difference between self-referrals and other agency referrals.

Regarding number of family members in counseling, one writer found that a greater proportion of those who discontinued after one interview appeared to expect casework with other family members too.[51] Another, in speaking of client-centered barriers to continuing, mentioned attitudes of family members which impede client's efforts toward solution and the burden of trying to involve resistant relatives in service.[52] In contrast, another researcher expressed that there was too much emphasis on necessity of working with both marriage partners.[53] However, a researcher who studied discontinuers at the same agency eight

---

[48]Kogan, Social Casework, XXXVIII, (1957), 371.

[49]Hasian and Wosek, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1959, p. 30.

[50]Farner, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1962, p. 50.

[51]Kogan, Social Casework, XXXVLLL, (1957), 371.

[52]Shyne, Journal of Social Casework, 38:5, (1957), 226.

[53]Buckner, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1954, p. 45.

years later, noted that families were more likely to continue when two or more in the family were involved in counseling and also when the case was split between two caseworkers, when more than one family member came.[54] The association was significant at a .05 level.

The above mentioned author also observed that previous agency contact at Family Service Agency and no children in the home were both conditions that were significantly related at .05 level to continuance in counseling.[55]

In this survey of literature concerning factors in continuance in counseling, there were a number of contradictions in the various findings. Factors were found related in some studies and unrelated in others. Some of this was due to the variety of kinds of agencies on which the studies were based and differences in the levels of significance which were accepted as indicating an association. The factor on which there was the most agreement and also the most study was the socioeconomic factor. There appeared to be a direct association between continuance and higher income, education, social class, and occupational level. In this present research project, this author studied each of these factors as they were related or unrelated to continuance at one family service agency.

The Study Focus

There was no hypothesis as such being tested, but instead the study was focused on a set of certain recognizable characteristics, of an empirical nature, of clients of Family Service Agency of Genesee

---

[54]Farner, Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, 1962, p. 50.

[55]Ibid.

County in 1963, to explore whether they were significantly related to the client's continuance in counseling at Family Service Agency. The level of significance which determined the acceptance or rejection of each of these projected associations was 0.01. The dependent variable was continuance.

This study focus emerged through a deductive process of reasoning from the author's survey of literature and as indicated earlier, there was much contradiction of findings among those who have previously studied this subject. However, the following twelve recognizable empirical characteristics[56] of clients were considered to see whether or not they were significantly related to continuance in counseling at Family Service Agency of Genesee County:

1. Family income--wages and salaries received by client and spouse.

2. Education of client--amount of formal schooling, in elementary and junior high, high school, and college.

3. Occupation of client--present employment.

4. Age of client at intake.

5. Sex of client.

6. Marital status at intake--married, single, divorced, or separated.

7. Source of referral--directed to or told of agency by whom.

8. Chief concern or reason for coming, as stated by the client--kind of problem which he says he is seeking help with from the agency.

9. Number of family members in counseling--number who had interviews at the agency.

---

[56]A thirteenth factor "race" was originally included in the design but was eliminated as there was insufficient information as to the race of the clients.

10. Whether case was split between two caseworkers, if more than one family member in counseling (or at least planned that it would be after intake, in such cases as clients did not return after initial interview).

11. Previous contact at Family Service Agency--whether previously came to this agency for interview(s).

12. Number of children at intake, at home--how many children client has living at home.

The study focus is limited by the number of characteristics or factors which were chosen for the study. Other factors could be operating and/or be of more importance. Also, statements of findings or interpretations should not be considered as explanations of causality, but merely statements of significant associations between above factors and continuance in counseling at Family Service Agency.

Following are operational definitions of several of the terms used in the basic study focus: clients--those people who have sought professional help with their problems at Family Service Agency and who came to the agency for at least one interview; counseling--interviews at the agency with a member of the social work staff of the Family Service Agency, regardless of the type of problem or content of the interviews; significantly related--associated to such a degree or level that the possibility of the association occuring by chance alone is only one in one hundred; continuance--returning to the agency for interview(s) beyond initial interview; longer-term continuance--continuing for six or more interviews at the agency.

CHAPTER II

METHODS OF THE STUDY

Collection and Analysis of the Data

The data collected was regarding the aforementioned characteristics of clients at Family Service Agency of Genesee County. The source of data was from the case records, specifically from the yellow statistical cards for 1963. It was supplemented when necessary by information from the intake interview guide and caseworkers' appointment books. This information is usually secured during the initial interviews, and as only information is elicited which is necessary for treatment with the client, sometimes the cards were not completely filled out. (This is a limitation of this source of data.) The cards are filed alphabetically, according to the year.

The data was pre-coded and placed on summary sheets according to the factors and the length of continuance. The factors were divided into the following classifications:[1]

<u>Family Income</u> (gross annual)

$4,000 or less
$4,100 - $6,000
$6,100 - $8,000
$8,100 - $10,000
$10,100 and above.

---

[1]Complete description of alternations and classifications will be provided in the Appendix.

Education (completed)

No years of high school
Partial high school
High school
Partial college, college, or graduate professional training.

Occupation (The classifications are a combination of Hollingshead categories, Bureau of Census Socioeconomic Index, and author's own.)

Unskilled workers
Semi-skilled workers
Skilled workers
Owners and managers of small business, clerical and sales workers, semi-professionals, lesser and major professionals
Housewives
Retired and students
Unemployed.

Age

19 or younger
20 - 39
40 or older.

Sex

Male
Female.

Marital Status

Married
Single
Divorced
Separated.

Source of Referral

Self, friend, or relative
Minister or doctor
Lawyer or court
Other social agency
Others, including school.

Chief Concern

Marital relationship
Parent-child relationship
Individual personality adjustment
Mental illness
Other, including economic, substitute care of child, and others.

Number in Counseling

One
Two or more.

Case Split?

Yes
No.

Previous Contact at Family Service Agency

Yes
No.

Number of Children Living at Home

None
1 - 3
4 - 6
7 or more.

The data was then placed in tabular form, with a table for each of the twelve independent variables, such as income and age, and the dependent variable throughout was continuance--the number of interviews before discontinuing counseling, as one, two to five, and six or more.

The statistical method of chi square was used to test for significant associations. When the probability that the association was attributable to chance was less than one out of one hundred, then that finding was considered significant in this study. Thus, the level of significance which determined the acceptance or rejection of the projected association between each characteristic and continuance was 0.01.

Definition of Study Groups

The previously mentioned characteristics or factors regarding three separate groups of clients were compared. After selecting the sample from the total file of statistical cards, the cards were then separated into the three groups: those of clients discontinuing counseling after the initial interview, those of clients continuing two to five interviews, and those of clients continuing for six or more interviews. The factor of how long they continued was the dependent variable in the study.

The Sampling Method[2]

The universe studied and sampled from consisted of people served by Family Service Agency of Genesee County in 1963. This, of course,

---

[2]Complete description of any change in sampling procedure and size will be provided in the Appendix.

represents only a portion of all the people and families in Genesee County and Flint with problems; it represents only those who have sought professional help with their problems at Family Service Agency. The size of the universe studied was eight hundred thirty-three individuals and families who terminated during the year plus two hundred twenty-three who continued on into 1964. (Another two hundred ninety-three contacted the agency only by telephone or correspondence, or someone contacted on behalf of the family.) Of the eight hundred thirty-three who discontinued, forty-seven per cent terminated counseling after the initial interview, thirty-four percent after two to five interviews, and nineteen per cent following six or more interviews.

The method of choosing the sample was the following: using the table of random numbers, a random sample of three hundred forty cases was selected from all the cases in the file for 1963. The writer expected that this likely would result in a representative proportion of each of the three groups.

The sample selected consisted of three hundred forty randomly chosen families and individuals, and after eliminating seventy-two of these which were telephone, correspondence, or on behalf of family contacts only and two on which the information was too slight, there were two hundred sixty-six families and individuals remaining in the sample. This consisted of one hundred twenty-four (46%) who kept one interview, one hundred three (39%) in which the family had two to five interviews, and thirty-nine (15%) in which one or more family members came for at least six interviews.

However, this writer was interested in studying the individuals who made up the families rather than the families as a unit, and thus the sample was broken down into three hundred fifty individual clients who came in to the agency for at least one interview during 1963. There were two or more in counseling from eighty-three of the families selected.

Thus, the final sample consisted of three hundred fifty individuals, two hundred sixteen (62%) of whom were dropouts after one interview, ninety-six (27%) who continued for two to five interviews, and thirty-eight (11%) who continued in counseling for six or more interviews.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Factors Significantly Related at .01 Level

TABLE I

PREVIOUS CONTACT AT FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY

Number of Interviews	Yes		No			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	20	44%	182	65%	202	14	
Two to Five	14	31%	74	26%	88	8	
Six or More	11	25%	24	9%	35	3	
Total	45	100%	280	100%	325	25	350

$X^2 = 11.43$ $P = .01$

There was a significant trend toward longer continuance when the individual had had previous contact at Family Service Agency. Of the forty-five individuals who had sometime previously been to Family Service Agency for at least one interview, only forty-four percent discontinued after the initial interview, while sixty-five of the two hundred eighty newcomers to the agency dropped out. Twenty-five percent of the group with previous contact at the agency continued for six or more interviews, while only nine percent of the first-timers continued for that long. The chi square test for the significance of this association indicated that the probability of it being attributable to chance was only one out of a hundred. (.01)

TABLE 2

CASE SPLIT BETWEEN TWO WORKERS

Number of Interviews	Yes		No			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	19	35%	70	65%	89		
Two to Five	23	43%	26	24%	49	2	
Six or More	12	22%	12	11%	24		
Total	54	100%	108	100%	162	2	164

$X^2 = 13.62$ $P = .01$

There was a significant trend toward continuance when a case involving two or more persons from the same family was split between two caseworkers. While only thirty-five per cent of the fifty-four individuals in split cases dropped out of counseling following the initial interview, sixty-five per cent of the one hundred eight individuals in cases in which both family members were seen by the same caseworker discontinued after the first interview. Of the split cases, twenty-two per cent of the individuals continued for six or more interviews, while only eleven per cent of the individuals in cases that were not split came for at least six interviews. The chi square test for the significance of this association indicated that the probability of it being attributable to chance was less than .01--less than one out of one hundred.

TABLE 3A

NUMBER IN COUNSELING FROM SAME FAMILY

Number of Interviews	One		Two or More			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	125	68%	89	54%	214	2	
Two or More	59	32%	75	46%	134		
Total	184	100%	164	100%	348	2	350

$X^2 = 7.02$ $P = .01$

There was a significant trend toward continuance when two or more from the same family were involved in counseling. While only thirty-two per cent of the one hundred eighty-four individuals who were the one member of their family receiving counseling at Family Service Agency continued beyond the intake interview for at least one more interview, forty-six per cent of the one hundred sixty-four individuals whose marital partner, parent, child, or sibling also came to the agency, continued for more than one interview. The chi square test for significance of this association indicated that the probability of it being attributable to chance was only one out of a hundred--.01.

However, this factor was significantly related at the .01 level to continuance only beyond intake but not to longer continuance.

TABLE 3B

NUMBER IN COUNSELING FROM SAME FAMILY

Number of Interviews	One		Two or More			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	125	68%	89	54%	214	2	
Two to Five	45	24%	51	31%	96		
Six or More	14	8%	24	15%	38		
Total	184	100%	164	100%	348	2	350

$X^2 = 8.01$ $P = .02$

While the relationship is still in the direction previously mentioned, the level of significance of the association is .02. Thus, the probability of the association being attributable to chance is two out of a hundred.

These findings are based upon the computation of the probability of a specified factor occuring with respect to three groups. The purpose was that of testing the significance of the degree of association between them. As such, no hypothesis was being confirmed. What was demonstrated was that other things being equal, any difference that was found probably did not occur by chance.

Factors Not Significantly Related at .01 Level, with Continuance.

TABLE 4

FAMILY INCOME (ANNUAL)

Number of Interviews	$4,000 or less		$4,100-6,000		$6,100-8,000		$8,100-10,000		$10,100- or above			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	49	69%	48	54%	48	60%	12	38%	15	65%	172	44	
Two to Five	18	25%	27	30%	23	29%	11	34%	17	31%	86	10	
Six or More	4	6%	14	16%	9	11%	9	28%	1	4%	37	1	
Total	71	100%	89	100%	80	100%	32	100%	23	100%	295	55	350

$X^2 = 16.97$ $P = .05$

There was not a significant association, at .01 level, between continuance in counseling and whether family income was less than $4,000, $4,100--$6,000, $6,100--$8,000, $8,100--$10,000 or above. The chi square test for significance of association revealed a .05 level of significance, but this was not sufficient to be accepted in this study. However, that the incomes of sixteen per cent of the three hundred fifty individuals was not known by this researcher may have affected the results of the study of this factor.

TABLE 5

EDUCATION (COMPLETED)

Number of Interviews	Not High School		Partial High School		High School		At Least One Year of College			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	8	62%	27	53%	39	56%	10	50%	84	132	
Two to Five	5	38%	16	31%	24	35%	3	15%	48	48	
Six or More	-	-	8	16%	6	9%	7	35%	21	17	
Total	13	100%	51	100%	69	100%	20	100%	153	197	350

$X^2 = 10.698$ $P = .10$

There was not a significant association, at .01 level, between continuance and whether the client completed none, some, or all of high school education or least one year of college. The degree of probability of a strictly chance relationship was .10--ten out of a hundred. However, the reliability of this finding is questionable, as the education completed by fifty-six per cent of the clients in the sample was not noted on the statistical cards, and, therefore, could not be studied. This may have affected the results of the study of this factor.

TABLE 6

OCCUPATION

Amount of Interviews	Unskilled		Semiskilled		Skilled		Professionals, Managers, Sales, Clerical, Ecc.		Housewives		Retired, Students		Unemployed			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	49	63%	23	53%	18	62%	10	53%	67	61%	11	58%	17	65%	195	21	
Two-Five	25	32%	14	33%	16	21%	5	26%	28	25%	6	32%	8	31%	92	4	
Six or More	4	5%	6	14%	5	17%	4	21%	15	14%	2	10%	1	4%	37	1	
Total	78	100%	43	100%	29	100%	19	100%	110	100%	19	100%	26	100%	324	26	350

$X^2 = 10.797$ $P = .70$

Very little association was found between continuance and the occupation of the client. Unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled employment were compared with clerical, sales, professional or managerial work, housewives, students and retired, and unemployed. Any relationship between them and continuance was found to be attributable to chance at a probability of .70--seventy out of a hundred.

Thus, none of the above measures of social class or socioeconomic status indicated a significant relationship, at a .01 level, to continuance in counseling. However, family income came quite close to being significant, with a .05 level, and perhaps should be studied further.

TABLE 7

AGE OF CLIENT (AT INTAKE)

Number of Interviews	Nineteen and Below		Twenty-Thirty-nine		Forty and Above			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	13	50%	109	63%	49	63%	171	45	
Two to Five	11	42%	46	27%	20	26%	77	19	
Six or More	2	8%	17	10%	9	11%	28	10	
Total	26	100%	172	100%	78	100%	276	74	350

$X^2 = 3.626$ $P = .50$

There was not a significant association between continuance and whether the client was a teen-ager, was in the twenty to thirty-nine age group, or was age forty or above. Any association had the probability of .50 of being due to chance. That the age of twenty-one percent of the clients in the sample was not known may have affected the results of the study.

TABLE 8

SEX OF CLIENT

Number of Interviews	Male		Female			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	79	56%	134	65%	213	3	
Two to Five	47	33%	49	24%	96		
Six or More	15	11%	23	11%	38		
Total	141	100%	206	100%	347	3	350

$X^2 = 4.007$ $P = .20$

There was not a significant association between continuance and whether the client was a man or a woman. The probability of any association being attributable to chance was twenty out of a hundred (.20).

TABLE 9

MARITAL STATUS (AT INTAKE)

Number of Interviews	Married		Single		Divorced		Separated			Don't Know	Widow[1]	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number		
One	149	62%	12	46%	13	72%	13	47%	187	26	3	
Two to Five	61	25%	12	46%	5	28%	11	39%	89	7		
Six or More	32	13%	2	8%	-	-	4	14%	38	-		
Total	242	100%	26	100%	18	100%	28	100%	314	33	3	350

$X^2 = 8.129$ $P = .30$

[1]Not included in study because of too few cases on which to base assumptions.

In Table 9, there was not a significant association between continuance and whether the client was married, single, divorced, or separated. Any association had the probability of .30 of being attributable to chance.

TABLE 10

CHIEF CONCERN

Number of Interviews	Marital		Parent-Child		Individual Personality Adjustment		Mental Illness		Other			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	107	58%	30	65%	30	54%	8	80%	41	77%	216	-	
Two to Five	54	30%	12	26%	16	28%	1	10%	11	21%	94	2	
Six or More	22	12%	4	9%	10	18%	1	10%	1	2%	38	-	
Total	183	100%	46	100%	56	100%	10	100%	53	100%	348	2	350

$X^2 = 13.756$ $P = .10$

There was not a significant relationship between presenting problem of marital, parent-child, or individual personality adjustment or mental illness, or other concerns such as economic, substitute care of child and others, and whether client continued. The probability of an association due to chance alone was .10.

TABLE 11

SOURCE OF REFERRAL

Number of Interviews	Self, Friend, Relative		Doctor, Minister		Attorney, Court		Social Agency		Other, including School			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	78	55%	36	72%	27	64%	27	55%	25	59%	193	23	
Two to Five	42	30%	12	24%	13	31%	12	25%	15	36%	94	2	
Six or More	22	15%	2	4%	2	5%	10	20%	2	5%	38	-	
Total	142	100%	50	100%	42	100%	49	100%	42	100%	325	25	350

$X^2 = 12.527$ $P = .20$

There was not a significant association between whether source of referral was self, friend, or relative, doctor or minister, attorney or court, a social agency or social worker, and all other, including school personnel, and whether the client continued. The probability of any association being attributable to chance was .20.

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF CHILDREN (AT HOME)

Number of Interviews	None		One - Three		Four - Six		Seven or More			Don't Know	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Number	
One	40	60%	119	63%	44	59%	6	60%	209	7	
Two to Five	20	30%	48	25%	23	31%	3	30%	94	2	
Six or More	7	10%	22	12%	8	10%	1	10%	38	-	
Total	67	100%	189	100%	75	100%	10	100%	341	9	350

$X^2 = 1.079$ $P = .99$

There was virtually no relationship between continuance and whether the client had no children at home, one to three, four to six, or seven or more.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The significantly related factors to continuance that were included in this study were previous contact at Family Service Agency and whether the case was split between two caseworkers. Also, whether more than one family member was involved in counseling was significantly realted to continuance after intake but not so significantly related to longer continuance.

Previous Contact at Family Service Agency

The clients who had previously come to Family Service Agency tended to continue in significantly greater proportion than the newcomers. This is logical on the basis that the ones who had previous contact at Family Service Agency were more aware of the service available and of how they could be helped by it, due to their previous contact. Thus, when they returned for further counseling it was more likely to be with a clearer idea of how to utilize the services of the agency to help cope with their present concerns.

A logical explanation would be that the clients who returned after previously coming are more likely to be ones who felt helped before and who have a positive attitude toward the agency and toward the caseworker who counseled with them previously. This was pointed out also by Catherine Farner, whose M. S. W. thesis has been previously mentioned, who recently did a further study on continuance. She

found that the number of agency applications prior to present application was significantly related to continuance. Clients with more previous applications prior to present applications are more likely to continue beyond intake interview. She felt that the attitude of these clients had been mostly favorable toward their previous contact with the agency.[1] (The caseworkers' handling of these clients and their concerns would be involved in this, too.)

In taking a look at the figures and percentages involved, we can see that while a significantly greater proportion of former clients than newcomers continued (fifty-six percent of former and thirty-five percent of new), it is still obvious that forty-four percent did not continue even though they had returned following previous contact with the agency and that thirty-five percent continued beyond intake without previous contact. Thus, though previous contact helps to explain, due to its significant association with continuance, why perhaps some clients continue, it does not explain why forty-four percent did not continue. Many other factors undoubtedly enter in to affect this. While previous contact and continuance are significantly associated, this does not imply that given the former, the latter will necessarily follow. A partial explanation would perhaps be that <u>some</u> of the clients were able to get the kind of help they were seeking in the one interview, and thus did not continue. Also, others may have a positive attitude toward the agency and a quite clear idea of how the service offered can be of help to them, even though it is

---

[1] Catherine Farner, "Factors in Continuance and Discontinuance in Casework Treatment", Unpublished research at Family Service Agency of Genesee County, 1964, chapter 2.

their first time at the agency. This writer would speculate that the attitude and motivation of the client are at least part of what makes this factor significant. However, in this research, that was not studied and thus the explanation given is really only speculation. This writer suggests that further research be done to find what there is about previous contact that is significantly associated with continuance. To be aware of this could be very helpful to social workers in counseling with their clients.

Number in Counseling from Family

The trend toward continuance when two or more family members are in counseling has been noted. Forty-six percent of the clients who had another family members also in counseling continued beyond intake interview, and this proportion was significantly greater than the thirty-two percent who continued from the group who came alone. However, a question arises regarding the fifty-four percent who did not continue in spite of having another family member come also, even though this is a proportion significantly less than the sixty-eight percent of the one-from-family group who dropped out of counseling after the intake interview. Other factors must also be involved.

However, that more than one member in counseling does have a strong relationship to continuance can be logically explained by pointing out the apparently greater interest and motivation of family members to work out satisfactory solutions to their problems, and the support that they lend each other by both indicating some feeling of responsibility for and involvement in the problem by seeking help with it. However, two or three of a family coming for counseling does

not in itself necessarily indicate such greater motivation and self awareness. There may instead be an unhealthy degree of dependence upon each other and/or a projection of the problem onto each other.

Catherine Farner, mentioned previously, found in her recent study that the more family members in treatment, the more likely that the client will continue in treatment. In attempting to explain this, she cross-tabulated a number of factors, and discovered that it is the caseworker involved in the case that is significant more than the number of family members in treatment. The continuance rates of some caseworkers' clients greatly reflected a difference between whether one or two were in counseling, while that of others did not. This seemed to reflect the caseworker's capacity to work with either one or two members of a family.[2]

A number of authors have discussed the matter of number of family members in counseling. Gomberg states, "We believe that because of emotional interaction in marriage it is logical that treatment, wherever possible, be made available to both partners. There is a technical question regarding the matter of proper timing for involving the second partner of the marriage in treatment. While experience demonstrates that, by and large, it is sound to see both partners, there are times when it is contraindicated."[3] Hollis says, "Increasingly in interpersonal adjustment problems, work is under way with two or more people in a family at the same time. The ultimate goals are often

---

[2]Ibid, chapter 2, page 3.

[3]M. Robert Gomberg, "Present Status of Treatment Program", Neurotic Interaction in Marriage, edited by V. W. Eisenstein, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956, p. 284.

common to the several people involved, but the intermediate objectives usually vary."[4] Scherz noted that "A family member more readily commits himself to treatment when others in the family share responsibility for the problem. The problem can be defined and clarified more quickly in multiple-client interviews because projections and distortions of reality are more easily identified and thereby are made accessible to modification."[5]

The writer also notes that the significance of number in counseling decreases when the clients continuing for six or more interviews are compared with those who discontinued before that. This could indicate that for those who are sufficiently motivated to keep coming for six interviews, it is not that all-important that another of their family be involved in counseling too. They are able to get some help for themselves, even though the mate or child involved in the concern does not come.

Thus, though it has been determined that the number in counseling is associated with continuance, this does not give the reason why. This writer suggests that further research be done to find what there is about the number in counseling that is associated with continuance. Various explanations have been given and speculations made by this writer and by others who were quoted, but a more clear-cut explanation substantiated by research findings is needed in order for this information to be truly helpful to social workers in counseling with their clients.

---

[4]Florence Hollis, Casework: A Psychosocial Therapy, New York: Random House, 1964, p. 213.

[5]Frances H. Scherz, "Multiple-Client Interviewing: Treatment Implications", Social Casework, 43:3 (March 1962), p. 121.

To insist on two or more from the family coming for counseling does not appear to be the solution to the problem of discontinuance, as there are obviously other factors involved also. However, neither can we ignore the significant association of number coming to continuance. A more comprehensive study of this factor is needed. Meanwhile, also, social workers would do well to evaluate their own skill in working with individuals and families to see how this may relate to their own rates of clients' continuance and discontinuance.

Whether Case Was Split

Splitting a family case between two caseworkers was significantly related to continuance in counseling at Family Service Agency of Genesee County, but this significance was much greater regarding continuance beyond intake than regarding continuance for six or more interviews. Number in counseling and whether the case was split are closely tied factors, as the latter only occurs when two or more family members are in counseling at the agency.

The subject of whether one or two caseworkers should carry a family case is a controversial one among writers in the fields of psychiatry, psychology, and social work. Following are several excerpts from those who advocate not aplitting the case between workers:

> Hollis said, "It is now widely accepted that in cases of marital difficulty, for example, there are very great advantages in seeing both the individuals involved, for diagnostic purposes at least and whenever possible for treatment also. Some therapists refuse treatment altogether unless such interviews can be arranged. Others, of whom the writer is one, would certainly favor interviewing all persons involved in a major way in a problem, but would not insist on it if the client is strongly opposed or if the others concerned are unwilling to participate." [6]

---

[6] Florence Hollis, Casework: A Psychosocial Therapy, New York: Random House, 1964, p. 173.

Ackerman stated, "It is apparent that in some circumstances the increased strength or health of personality of one family member becomes a threat to another . . . It is by no means rare to see one member of the pair get better in individual treatment as the other gets worse . . . This can occur when only one member of the family pair is in therapy or when both are in therapy with separate workers. Yet professional opinion varies widely on the solution to this problem. When neurotic family pairs need psychotherapy, the most efficient form of integration of the psychotherapies would seem to be achieved in the mind of a single therapist. Strong objections have been offered to such practice, however. The premise seems to be that two members of a family, interdependent but mutually distrustful and competitively destructive, would vie with each other for the therapist's favor and that this rivalry would jeopardize therapeutic control. Therefore, the argument goes, provisions for separate treatment are preferable. But this argument overlooks the difficulty of integrating the two therapies and the further problems that arise out of the failure to relate the psychotherapy of the neurotic pair to the total dynamics of family life. . . . Indeed, as the principle of separate treatment is generally applied at present, it is most difficult to pursue the goal of integrating the two therapies. Both in child and family guidance centers and in private psychiatric practice, effective collaboration is extremely rare . . . Thus, the two therapeutic experiences tend to get dissociated, and although the intrapsychic conflicts of each person may be ameliorated, successful readaptation to family relationships nonetheless fails . . . It seems increasingly apparent that individual therapy cannot be the sole answer to the mental health problems of our time. When each member of a family is given individual treatment and these therapies are not related to one another, the effects on the family are all too often indirect and nonspecific . . . Whatever the outcome, it is still therapy for individuals based on individual diagnosis and aimed at goals of individual improvement, . . . not a therapy of family relationships."[7]

Gomberg wrote, "At present we lean toward the practice of one worker carrying both partners, unless there are sound indications to the contrary. While it is technically more difficult and complicated, there are many advantages."[8]

Beatman said, "Where a caseworker is carrying both partners in a marriage, this requires an ability on the part of the worker to relate to each of the partners separately without becoming

---

[7]Nathan Ackerman, The Psychodynamics of Family Life: Diagnosis and Treatment of Family Relationships, New York: Basic Books, Inc., (1958), pp. 268, 269, 273.

[8]M. Robert Gomber, "Present Status of Treatment Program", Neurotic Interaction in Marriage, edited by V.W. Eisenstein, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956, p. 285.

over-identified with either. While this is more taxing than working with only one member of a family, it often leads to good results."[9]

Speaking more or less in favor of splitting cases between workers are the following:

"Approaching family diagnoses and family casework treatment places tremendous responsibility on the caseworker to have and continuously develop knowledge of human growth and development and dynamics of behavior to understand family interaction. This knowledge enables the caseworker to distinguish between symptomatic behavior which is observable and the underlying cause of the action observed . . . Therefore, we believe we can see one partner and on the basis of theoretical knowledge and experience begin to develop a sound psychosocial diagnosis and casework treatment plan and goal."[10]

Sholtis said, "The use of two workers and the selection of the husband as the primary client are alternative means for treating the small number of cases in which the husband initiates contact with the agency and demonstrates greater motivation for marital counseling then his wife. If a woman caseworker treats both partners, she usually finds herself in competition with the wife. When the wife experiences so much conflict about becoming dependent on a rival that she cannot use help, she may sabotage the efforts of her husband and the worker. Under these circumstances the wife should be assigned another worker, with whom she does not need to compete for her husband; thus allowance is made for appropriate dependence and hostile aggression is reduced. As a result of the gratification of her dependency needs the wife's energy can be channeled constructively toward improving her behavior. It is preferable, however, to assign one male worker to the case if the husband is the primary client. This approach avoids this kind of transference problem . . . If the case cannot be assigned to a male worker, then the proper management of the case indicates the assignment of two women workers, one for each partner. . . Most treatment failures in marital cases are thought to result from unresolved difficulties in transference and counter-transference, stimulated by the formation of the oedipal

---

[9] Frances Beatman, "Evolution of Treatment Methods", Neurotic Interaction in Marriage, edited by V.W. Eisenstein. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956, p. 266.

[10] Lorraine Lull, Catherine Farner, Ruth Spurlock, Fonda Williams, Warren Kennison, M.D., "Marital Research Study of Interaction", Family Service Association of America Research on Treatment of Marital Problems, 1964, p. 5. (Unpublished contribution to the research by Family Service Agency of Genesee County.)

triangle between the worker and the husband and wife. Problems of sexual competition and erotization may be avoided by assigning a worker whose sex is the same as that of the more motivated partner." [11]

Hamilton stated, "The question of separate workers for parent and child rests on consideration as to the age of the child, the degree of parental involvement, timing, and other factors. . . . Indications for division of a case are strengthened whenever there is a condition of overt hostility and aggression between parent and child. Some children because of insecurity about their parents' attitudes toward them, may not be able to form a relationship with the worker who sees the parent. The strongly ambivalent attitudes of the adolescent toward all parental figures usually make it desirable for him to have his own worker. A practical consideration also is that a very punishing or rejecting mother may arouse counter-transference in the worker, who sees the child suffering. Unless the worker is mature, self-aware, and constantly on guard, this is likely to influence treatment negatively for the mother by breaking the inner current of permissiveness and acceptance, even though controlled on the surface. After division of the case, treatment must always be closely coordinated, since sooner or later resistance to taking help will develop and be reflected in the child's behavior or in actually blocking the child from continuing in treatment."[12]

In Farner's research, she found that "when the case is split at intake, the client is more likely to continue beyond the intake interview. . . However, as I broke the sample down according to caseworker, I learned that it was the particular caseworkers involved in the splits that make this significant."[13] For example, one of her tables shows that there was no significant difference between continuance of split cases and continuance of single cases for Caseworkers B, F, and G; Caseworker C has a significantly higher rate of continuance

---

[11] Helen S. Sholtis, "The Management of Marital Counseling Cases," Social Casework, XLV:2, (February 1964), 76, 78.

[12] Gordon Hamilton, Psychotherapy in Child Guidance. New York: Columbia University Press, (1947), 310, 313.

[13] Catherine Farner, "Factors in Continuance and Discontinuance in Casework Treatment", Unpublished research for Family Service Agency of Genesee County, 1964, chapter 2, p. 2.

if case is split with another worker than if case is carried by Worker C alone; Caseworker A has significantly less long term continuance with a split case than with single cases.[14]

Other articles related to this topic, which the reader may be interested in reading, are by the following authors: Weisberg,[15] Pollak,[16] Scherz,[17] Beatman,[18] Sherman,[19] Shereshefsky,[20] Klein,[21] Bardill and Bevilacqua.[22]

Thus, there apparently are a number of pros and cons regarding splitting cases. One of the pros is that of continuance. In this writer's study, there was a significant association between the case being split and the client continuing beyond intake, and between the case not being split and the client discontinuing. Sixty-five percent of the split cases continued beyond intake, while sixty-five percent of the cases not split discontinued.

---

[14]Ibid.

[15]Mirium Weisberg, "Joint Interviewing with Marital Partners", Social Casework, XLV, 4, (April 1964), 221-230.

[16]Otto Pollak, "Entrance of the Caseworker into Family Interaction", Social Casework, XLV, 4, (April 1964), 216-221.

[17]Frances H. Scherz, "Exploring the Use of Family Interviews in Diagnosis", Social Casework, XLV, 4, (April 1964), 209-216.

[18]Frances Beatman, "The Training and Preparation of Workers for Family-Group Treatment", Social Casework, XLV, 4, (April 1964), 202-209.

[19]Sanford Sherman, "The Sociopsychological Character of Family-Group Treatment", Social Casework, XLV, 4, (April 1964), 195-202.

[20]Pauline Shereshefsky, "Family Unit Treatment in Child Guidance", Social Work, 8:4, (October 1963), 63-71.

[21]Alan F. Klein, "Exploring Family Group Counseling", Social Work, 8:1, (January 1963), 23-30.

[22]Donald Bardill and Joseph Bevilacqua, "Family Interviewing by Two Caseworkers", Social Casework, XLV, 5, (May 1964), 278-283.

Whether the case was split and number of family members in counseling are closely tied factors as the former only occurs when two or more family members are in counseling at the agency. However, in studying this factor, the writer only included the families where two or more were clients and thus the related factor of number in counseling and its own significant association to continuance was held constant.

On the basis of the literature, this writer sees several possible explanations for the significance of split cases. Among them are some caseworkers' difficulty in working with two members of the same family and their relative success with only one, the clients' transference feelings which may be a sabotaging factor in some cases which are not split and which may not be as stirred up in a split case, the clients' assurance of confidentiality as worker is not seeing other family member when case is split, less chance of negative counter-transference being stirred up when case is split. Some of the authors felt that very effective treatment can be carried out in split cases while others lamented what they felt to be less clear diagnoses and less integrated treatment plans for family members. Certainly, as continuance in counseling is a very necessary base for effective treatment, social workers would do well to consider the advantages of splitting cases. However, this writer feels that splitting cases should perhaps <u>not</u> be the routine plan any more than not splitting them should be. The decision to share a case with another worker should be based on several factors, including the diagnosis of the clients and the skill of the caseworker.

This writer suggests that further study of this factor is needed in order for social workers to see more clearly what there is about split cases that is significantly associated with continuance in counseling.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The focus of this study was upon a set of twelve recognizable empirical factors regarding clients of Family Service Agency of Genesee County in 1963, to explore whether or not they were significantly associated with continuance in counseling at Family Service Agency. Of these, nine--family income, education, occupation, age, sex, marital status, chief concern, source of referral, and number of children at home--were not found to be significantly associated with continuance. Previous contact at Family Service Agency and splitting cases involving two or more family members were found to be factors significantly associated with continuance, at the .01 level of significance. Also, two or more family members in counseling was strongly associated with continuance, at the .02 level of significance.

Quite a variety of viewpoints on these factors were quoted from a number of authors, and this writer speculated regarding possible reasons for the significance of these factors. To be truly helpful in applying these findings to social work practice, one needs to know more about the particular aspects of these factors that are significantly associated with continuance in counseling at Family Service Agency of Genesee County. This writer speculated that the attitude and motivation of the client and the skill of the caseworker in working with individuals and families are an important part of this. However, more comprehensive study of these factors is needed. Also, undoubtedly other factors are also associated which were not studied in this research project.

APPENDIX

CHANGES IN FOCUS AND METHOD

The purpose of this study has remained the same throughout. However, the writer has made a few revisions in various parts of the project, and these will be discussed here.

A thirteenth factor, race, was originally included in the design but was eliminated as there was insufficient information as to the race of the clients. Only rarely was it noted on the statistical cards.

In breaking down the factors into classifications, the writer made some revisions that became necessary as the project proceeded. Race, of course, was eliminated as mentioned above. The two lowest income groups, both considered by the writer to be marginal income for a family, were combined. Another reason for combining the two lower groups was that the writer could not be absolutely sure in some cases as to which of the two groups certain clients should be placed, due to the nature of their income, as welfare, unemployment compensation, support orders, and so forth. The seven original classifications of educational level completed were combined into four classifications, due to the sparsity of cases at both extremes. Elementary and junior high became "not high school" and partial college, college, and graduate professional training became "at least one year of college". The classifications of "partial high school" and "high school graduates"

remained in the study. Regarding occupational classifications, the writer had originally used Hollingshead's categories, but this had to be revised. The writer consulted the 1950 Bureau of Census Socioeconomic Index for Occupations, as printed in a book by Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status, as a guide to reclassifying the occupations.[1] The professional, managerial, clerical and sales occupations were combined into one group. The clientele of Family Service Agency in the sample did not represent persons from the two upper strata of Hollingshead's categories. Also, it was necessary to make a separate grouping for housewives, who were the largest single category represented in the sample, and for retired persons, students, and unemployed. Regarding the age classifications, the sixty or older group was combined with the forty-fifty-nine group to make a forty or older group. This was done because, having only nine individuals in the sixty or older group, the writer felt a valid assumption on continuance of this group could not be made. Regarding marital status, there were only three widows or widowers in the sample. The writer could not make a valid assumption on continuance on the basis of so few people. Also, this group didn't naturally combine with any of the other marital status groups, and thus was not included in the study. Regarding number of children, only two clients had ten or more children at home. As this was too small a group on which to make assumptions regarding continuance, it was combined with the seven-nine children group, to make a group for those with seven or more children.

---

[1] Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., (1961), 263-275.

The size of the universe studied was slightly different than that stated in the research design. This was due to the writer using 1962 statistics originally as the 1963 ones were not yet available when the design was written. However, the research was completed using 1963 statistical cards on clients, and 1963 statistics are stated in the research report. The size of the sample selected was increased from three hundred cases to three hundred forty cases to allow for the elimination of some cards due to insufficient information or telephone contact only. However, the number of such cards was greater than expected, leaving only two hundred sixty-six families to be studied. The writer decided to study the individuals in the families rather than the families per se, and thus the sample included three hundred fifty individuals, as there were two or more in counseling from eighty-one of the families selected. This change in focus from families to individuals was made because it is really the individuals who keep the appointments at the agency, and sometimes one mate may come for fifteen counseling interviews while the other comes only for two. Also, the factors studied, as age, sex, education, and so forth, applied much more to individuals than to families.

It was necessary for the writer to survey the literature again before discussing the significance of the factors of previous contact at Family Service Agency, split case, and number in counseling. These additional references are included in the Bibliography along with the references which were consulted in writing the research design.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Ackerman, Nathan W., The Psychodynamics of Family Life: Diagnosis and Treatment of Family Relationships. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958, 268-274.

Hamilton, Gordon, Psychotherapy in Child Guidance. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947, 1947, 310-314.

Hollingshead, August, and Redlich, Frederick, Social Class and Mental Illness: A Community Study. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Hollis, Florence, Casework: A Psychosocial Therapy. New York: Random House, 1964, pp. 173, 213.

Scope and Methods of a Family Service Agency. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1953.

Articles in Books

Beatman, Frances L., "Evolution of Treatment Methods", Neurotic Interaction in Marriage, edited by V. W. Eisenstein. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956, 262-269.

Gomberg, M. Robert, "Present Status of Treatment Program", Neurotic Interaction in Marriage, edited by V. W. Eisenstein. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956, 269-290.

Journal Articles

Auld, F., and Meyers, J., "Contributions to a Theory for Selecting Psychotherapy Patients", Journal of Clinical Psychology, X, (1954), 56-60.

Bailey, Margaret, "Family Agency's Role in Treating Wife of an Alcoholic", Journal of Social Casework, XLIV, No. 5, (May 1963), 273-79.

Bardill, Donald, and Bevilacqua, Joseph, "Family Interviewing by Two Caseworkers", Social Casework, XLV, No. 5, (May 1964), 278-283.

Beatman, Frances, "The Training and Preparation of Workers for Family-Group Treatment", Social Casework, XLV, No. 4, (April 1964), 202-209.

Brill, N., and Storrow, H., "Social Class and Psychiatric Treatment", Archives of General Psychiatry, III, (October 1960), 340-44.

Coleman, J., Janowicz, R., Fleck, S., and Norton, N., "A Comparative Study of a Psychiatric Clinic and A Family Agency: Parts I and II, Journal of Social Casework, XXXVIII, (1957), 3-8, 74-80.

Editorial Notes: "The Family as the Unit of Treatment", Social Casework, XLV, No. 4, (April 1964), p. 230.

Fanschel, David, "A Study of Caseworkers' Perceptions of their Clients", Journal of Social Casework, XXXIX, (1958), 543-51.

Frank, J. D., Gliedman, L., Imber, S., Nash, E., and Stone, A., "Why Patients Leave Psychotherapy", American Medical Association Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, 77, (1957), 283-99.

Garcea, R., and Irwin, O., "A Family Agency Deals with Problem of Dropouts", Journal of Social Casework, XLIII, No. 2, (February 1962), 71-75.

Gibbey, R., Stotsky, B., Hiler, E., and Miller, D., "Validation of a Rorschach Criteria for Predicting Duration of Therapy", Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18:3, (June 1954), 185-92.

Hollingshead, A., "Social Stratification and Psychiatric Disorders", American Sociological Review, 18, (1953), 163-69.

Imber, S., Nash, E., and Stone, A., "Social Class and Duration of Psychotherapy", Journal of Clinical Psychology, XI, (July 1955), 281-84.

Klein, Alan F., "Exploring Family Group Counseling", Social Work, 8:1, (January 1963), 23-30.

Kogan, Leonard S., "The Short-Term Case in a Family Agency", Journal of Social Casework, XXXVIII, (May, June, July 1957), 231-38, 296-302, 366-74.

Krause, Merton S., "Predicting Client Discontinuance at Intake", Journal of Social Casework, XLIII, (1962), 308-12.

Levinger, George, "Continuance in Casework and Other Helping Relationships", Journal of Social Work, 5:3, (July 1960), 40-51.

Lorr, M., Katz, M., and Rubinstein, E., "Prediction of Length of Stay in Psychotherapy", Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII, (1958), 321-27.

Lowry, Fern, "The Caseworker in Short Contact Services", Journal of Social Work, 2:1, (January 1957), 52-57.

Perlman, Helen H., "Intake and Some Role Considerations", Journal of Social Casework, XLI, No. 4, (April 1960), 171-77.

Pfouts, J. H., and Rader, G. E., "Influence of Interviewer Characteristics on the Initial Interview", Journal of Social Casework, XLIII, No. 10, (December 1962), 548-52.

Pollak, Otto, "Entrance of the Caseworker into Family Interaction", Social Casework, XLV, No. 4, (April 1964), 216-221.

Ripple, Lillian, with Alexander, E., and Polemis, B., "Motivation, Capacity, and Opportunity as Related to Use of Casework Services", Social Service Review, (June 1955), 172-94.

Ripple, Lillian, "Factors Associated with Continuance in Casework Service", Journal of Social Work, 2:1, (January 1957), 87-94.

Rosenblatt, Aaron, "Application of Role Concepts to Intake Process", Journal of Social Casework, XLIII, No. 1, (January 1962), 8-15.

Rubenstein, E., and Lorr, M., "A Comparison of Terminators and Remainers in Outpatient Psychotherapy", Journal of Clinical Psychology, XII, 4, (October 1956), 345-49.

Scherz, Frances H., "Exploring the Use of Family Interviews in Diagnosis", Social Casework, XLV, No. 4, (April 1964), 209-216.

Shereshefsky, Pauline, "Family Unit Treatment in Child Guidance", Social Work, 8:4, (October 1963), 63-71.

Sherman, Sanford, "The Sociopsychological Character of Family-Group Treatment", Social Casework, XLV, No. 4, (April 1964), 195-202.

Sholtis, Helen S., "The Management of Marital Counseling Cases", Social Casework, XLV, No. 2, (February 1964), 71-79.

Shyne, Ann, "What Research Tells Us About Short-Term Cases in Family Agencies", Journal of Social Casework, 38:5, (1957), 223-31.

Siegel, N., and Fink, M., "Disposition of Applications for Psychotherapy in an Outpatient Clinic", Journal of Social Casework, XLIII, 10, (December 1962), 545-48.

Sullivan, Patrick, Miller, C., and Smelser, W., "Factors in Length of Stay and Progress in Psychotherapy", Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII, (1958), 1-9.

Stark, Frances, "Barriers to Client-Worker Communication at Intake", Journal of Social Caseworker, XL, No. 4, (April 1959), 177-83.

Weisberg, Mirium, "Joint Interviewing with Marital Partners", Social Casework, XLV, No. 4, (April 1964), 221-230.

Winder, A., and Hersko, M., "Effect of Social Class on Length and Type of Psychotherapy in a V. A. Mental Hygiene Clinic", Journal of Clinical Psychology, XI, 1, (1955), 77-80.

Unpublished Material

Buckner, Ruth, "Factors Affecting Non-Return of Nineteen Clients After Intake Interview in Family Service Agency of Flint, Michigan". Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, School of Social Work, Wayne State University, 1954.

Family Service Agency of Genesee County, "1962 Casework Figures", 1963. (typewritten)

Family Service Agency of Genesee County, "1963 Casework Figures", 1964. (hand written record in file)

Farner, Catherine Balz, "A Comparative Study of Factors Affecting Continuance and Discontinuance of Clients in Casework Treatment in Family Service Agency of Genesee County". Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 1962.

Farner, Catherine Balz, "Factors in Continuance and Discontinuance in Casework Treatment". Unpublished research for Family Service Agency of Genesee County, 1964.

Hasian, Marouf, and Wosek, Franklyn, "A Comparative Study of Psychosocial Characteristics of Parents of Sixty Families Who Continued or Did Not Continue Recommended Treatment at Lansing Child Guidance Clinic". Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 1959.

Lull, Lorraine, Farner, Catherine, Spurlock, Ruth, Williams, Fonda, and Kennison, Warren, "Marital Research Study of Interaction", Family Service Association of America Research on Treatment of Marital Problems: Report on Family Service of Genesee County's Part in the Research, 1964.

Naden Lester K., "Worker-Client Perception of Presenting Problem as Related to Client Decision to Use Service", Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 1961.