1

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION™ RESOLUTION TARGETS

PIONEERS IN METRYLUM BLUE TESTING SINCE 1974

MICRO

1000 COUNTY ROAD 6, BURNING WOOD, WV 26031 USA
TEL. 812 426 7827 FAX 812 426 7827 TLA 010000000

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file   Votre référence

Our file   Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**A Process Evaluation of Counsellor Verbal Performance
Within a Leisure Counselling Program**

Tessie L. Oliver

August 6, 1992

**Presented to the Department of Psychology
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
Masters of Arts Degree**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file   Votre référence

Our file   Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-79903-X

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

A PROCESS EVALUATION OF COUNSELLOR VERBAL PERFORMANCE
WITHIN A LEISURE COUNSELLING PROGRAM

submitted by Tessie L. Oliver
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

_____
Thesis Supervisor

_____
Chair, Department of Psychology

Carleton University
September 1, 1992

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation was to conduct a process evaluation of a leisure counselling program. The subjects were four counsellors of an Eastern Ontario Rehabilitation Hospital, whose experience ranged from three months to five years. The evaluation involved examining the counsellors' verbal performance during their counselling sessions. The sessions were video taped and their verbal interactions were coded in conjunction with the program's goal list and a set of verbal response categories. The data indicated that the counsellors were functioning within the confines of the leisure counselling program, while maintaining their own counselling styles. The program is ready for outcome evaluation research in order to determine whether or not the leisure counselling services are having the desired impact on the clients. Finally, this investigation has also led to the development of a methodology that may be used for future research.

Acknowledgements

I am truly grateful for the opportunity of working with an excellent advisor, Dr. Tom Ryan, who has provided me with continual support and advice throughout the study. I would like to thank him for the time, energy, and expertise that he contributed to this project. Dr. Ryan was always available for consultation and I am incredibly grateful for his efforts. Thank You!

Secondly, I would like to thank the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research for the grant that enabled Dr. Ryan to purchase the necessary equipment for this project. Without this support, my study would not have been possible.

Thirdly, I would like to thank the counsellors of the Recreation Department at the Eastern Ontario Rehabilitation Hospital. The investigation would not have been possible without their support and cooperation, for which I am grateful. In turn, I would like to thank the clients for agreeing to participate in the study. Finally, a special thanks to Trish Henry who was my liason at the hospital. Her hard work on the project and her friendship has been very much appreciated.

Table of Contents

Introduction	page 1
Method	page 25
Procedure	page 27
Results	page 38
Counsellor A	page 39
Counsellor B	page 45
Counsellor C	page 50
Counsellor D	page 54
Paired Categories	page 58
Discussion	page 72
Program Goals	page 72
Verbal Response Categories	page 75
Usefulness of Study	page 80
Limitations of Study	page 84
Suggestions for Future Research	page 85
References	page 89
Appendix A	page 95

A Process Evaluation of Counsellor Verbal Performance
Within a Leisure Counselling Program

The purpose of the present study is to conduct a process evaluation of a leisure counselling program for people who are physically challenged. The program's goals list facilitated the assessment of the counsellors' verbal performance during counselling sessions, the counsellors' perception of each goal's importance, and the congruency between the counsellors' written and verbal performance. This study is important because process evaluations provide feedback about a program's functioning, accountability and set the stage for outcome evaluation research. A review of the literature including leisure's role for people with physical challenges, leisure counselling, and program evaluation provides the basis for the study.

Leisure has its importance in society. The 20th Century brought a beginning of the Recreation Movement in which the value of leisure for most people, increased (Kraus, 1978). Three traditional views of leisure represent it as time, an activity or a state of mind. One view defined leisure as a state of mind; it is a way of being, of being at peace with oneself and what one is doing. It is doing what one wants and chooses to do (Neulinger, 1977). Another viewed leisure as that portion of an individual's time which is not devoted to work or work-connected responsibilities or to other forms of maintenance activity and which therefore may be regarded as discretionary or unobligated time (Kraus, 1978). The third view defined leisure as activity - apart from the obligations of work, family, and society - to which the individual turns at will, for either relaxation, diversion, or

broadening his knowledge and his spontaneous social participation, the free exercise of his creative capacity (Dumazedier, 1967).

Although each view emphasizes a different aspect of leisure, all are necessary for understanding the concept of leisure.

Leisure for the Disabled

There is no one accepted definition of leisure (Brannan, Chinn, and Verhoven, 1981). However, regardless of the perspective one supports, the important influence of leisure on the mental health and life satisfaction of an individual has been documented (Kaplan, 1975; Tinsley, 1975 and 1982). Leisure as an activity, time and/or a state of mind may help to provide a positive state of mind and ideally, promote self-esteem and acceptance. Regardless of the type of leisure experience, most agree leisure is a necessary part of life (Neulinger, 1974).

For the physically challenged population, leisure pursuits may be even more important and valuable. Leisure provides people with physical challenges a constructive outlet that perhaps, both work and leisure fill for nondisabled populations. Leisure may play an important role for people with challenges who are not able to work by helping to fill a void, while increasing the opportunities for personal growth. Every individual has the right to strive for self actualization and fulfillment; the individual with a physical challenge must often strive for these needs through leisure pursuits, while the larger population can do so through work and leisure (Amoroso, Fisher, Kent, Pasquine, and Rubin, 1977).

Leisure activities provide a means of overcoming or compensating for the physical limitations of a disabled individual

(Nesbitt, 1977). There are psychological benefits for people with physical challenges who participate in leisure activities. A person with a disability may experience feelings of competence and fitting in, which in turn may promote self growth and confidence. Feelings of alienation from the larger population are frequent among physically challenged people (Neulinger, 1974). Participation in leisure activities may alter their psychological perception of being "different". In accordance with the definition of leisure as a state of mind, leisure is important for altering one's negative perception of his or her abilities, to a more positive state of mind. A positive state of mind is one benefit of leisure participation for people with physical challenges.

Leisure participation for people with disabilities may not only minimize their personal barriers, but also minimize society's negative attitude towards their participation in leisure. Much of the leisure deprivation of the disabled is caused by society's failure to assist them to engage in activity to the full extent of their potential (Kraus, 1978). A common belief of society is that a person with a physical challenge is not able to participate in leisure pursuits, due to the disability. A disabled person may actually fear rejection from others which would inhibit attempts at participating in leisure activities. Functioning effectively and successfully in leisure pursuits may alter the perceptions of the disabled person, as well as the perceptions of others. Each person, including a disabled individual, functions within the environment almost in direct relationship to their ability to accept others, to others capacity to accept them and to their tolerance and acceptance of themselves (Adams, Daniel, McCubbin, and

Rullman, 1982). One's successful participation in leisure may improve the degree of acceptance by his or her peers and themselves. This feedback loop may be instrumental in changing the attitudes of society and disabled people. Thus, an individual with a disability who is active in leisure pursuits, may decrease societal barriers through increased acceptance.

In sum, there are two consequences of leisure participation for the physically challenged population. First, leisure may reduce the personal barriers a challenged person experiences. For example, acquiring a skill for a particular leisure activity may increase one's confidence about his or her abilities. Believing in oneself may minimize the personal barriers that promote inactivity. Second, the social barriers experienced by people with physical challenges may be reduced. The negative beliefs about the abilities of the physically challenged may be altered to more favorable beliefs. The larger population may become more accepting of disabled people, which in turn, could facilitate their feelings of belonging. Overall, people with physical challenges have much to gain by participating in leisure. Leisure may serve as a vehicle for mainstreaming the physically challenged population into activities dominated by the larger population, or may simply increase their opportunities for participation in leisure.

In addition, there are at least seven benefits associated with participation in leisure by the physically challenged population, other than the reduction of personal and societal barriers (Kraus, 1973). The seven benefits of leisure participation for physically challenged people include: First, leisure activities may provide a variety of

enjoyable, voluntary opportunities for individuals with an extra amount of time. Second, leisure participation may promote creative satisfaction and develop one's personality. A third benefit is the relief for those family members or individuals responsible for the care of a disabled person involved in leisure. Fourth, leisure participation may enhance social independence of a person with a disability and provide satisfying group experiences through socially integrated settings. Fifth, leisure involvement may provide compensatory activities where one's disability is not an important factor and personal achievement in other areas is obtained. Sixth, leisure participation may incorporate exercise which will help prevent physical deterioration due to misuse. Finally, leisure participation offers people with physical disabilities increased involvement in community life, which complements their social, vocational, educational, or civic involvements. These benefits are available to people with physical disabilities if leisure is part of their everyday lives. From personal growth to social interaction to community involvement, people with disabilities can lead rewarding lives. Therefore, it may be argued that leisure is a valuable and important aspect to anyone's life, but may provide special benefits to the physically disabled population.

Leisure Counselling

Given that leisure can play a significant role in one's life, we cannot assume that disabled individuals are fully aware of their leisure choices. Although some individuals are no doubt able to gain the benefits of leisure independently through creative use of their time, others may need to turn to qualified professionals for

assistance (Tinsley and Tinsley, 1982). Individual growth cannot be left to accident or fortuitous chance (Shivers, 1963). Leisure counselling is a means by which people with physical challenges can learn about appropriate leisure activities. The overall purpose of therapeutic recreation and leisure counselling programs is to provide the necessary intervention in the existing life style of patients that will enable them to become involved in adequate and appropriate activities of community leisure living (Curtis, 1979). Thus, leisure counsellors facilitate the adaptation of a leisure lifestyle for people with physical challenges.

Different definitions of leisure counselling exist in the literature. For example, one defines leisure counselling as a helping process which facilitates interpretive, affective, and/or behavioral changes in others toward the attainment of their total leisure well being (McDowell, 1975). Another defines leisure counselling as a formal intellectual discussion designed for those who need to explore life patterns and attitude changes including those pertaining to recreation and leisure (Stracke, 1977). Regardless of the definition one supports, both definitions imply a process toward the accomplishment of some or all of the goals of self discovery, adjustment and improved quality of life (Epperson, Witt, and Hitzhusen, 1977).

Leisure counsellors have many responsibilities when counselling people with physical challenges. Their responsibilities range from providing information about appropriate activities for a disabled person's abilities, to assessing any post counselling leisure involvement. There is a considerable need for outcome research

within leisure counselling programs; and although it is not a goal of this investigation, the present research should serve to promote future outcome studies. Leisure counsellors strive to alter a nonactive lifestyle of a person with a disability to a more active lifestyle.

The goals of leisure counselling will be reviewed to facilitate an understanding of the role of leisure counsellors with the physically challenged population. Leisure counselling has been described as a process that involves (a) cataloging activities, (b) examining the feasibility of activities with respect to client's abilities (intellectual and physical) and resources (financial and transportation), (c) providing information to the individual, (d) helping the individual overcome obstacles to attempts to engage in activities, and (e) assessing post-involvement satisfaction (DiLorenzo, Prue, and Scott, 1987). Goals a, b, c, and d, are closely related to the goals developed by the Leisure Counselling Program being evaluated in this study. Both sets of goals emphasize the importance of informing people with disabilities about appropriate leisure activities and promoting involvement in these activities.

Another set of goals proposed for leisure counselling reflect a slightly different perspective (Witt, Ellis, and Niles, 1984). The first goal is to increase the perceived control of people with physical challenges involved in leisure experiences. For example, increasing a disabled individual's ability to perceive and make choices before, between, and during leisure experiences demonstrates the first goal of leisure counseling. The second goal involves attempting to increase their perceived competence in leisure experiences, with an example

being an increase in a disabled person's perception of their "success" in leisure activities. The third goal of leisure counselling is to increase people with physical challenges' intrinsic motivation. For example, increasing their personal sense of wanting to engage in leisure activities is a priority. The fourth goal is to increase the depth of involvement in leisure of people with physical challenges. An example of the fourth goal involves leisure counsellors promoting activities that match disabled peoples' abilities to the task demands. The final goal of leisure counselling is to promote a sense of playfulness within leisure activities. That is, leisure counselling should increase people with physical challenges' ability to show joy and a sense of humor while engaging in leisure activities. The five goals, as well as, the goals discussed earlier, exemplify the benefits people with physical challenges could experience through participation in leisure activities as a result of leisure counselling. Perhaps, the second set of goals has a stronger orientation towards the disabled individual's state of mind. The perspective involves altering the cognitive patterns of a disabled individual, which should ultimately lead to a change in one's leisure lifestyle. Because the focus of the present study is a process evaluation, the second set of goals, although important, are not relevant. These goals and success in achieving them might more appropriately be evaluated by outcome, summative evaluation research. Process and outcome evaluations are both needed; however, a process evaluation is the initial phase when evaluating a program.

In rehabilitation, the ultimate goal of all disciplines is to restore as much as possible the functional capabilities of the disabled person

so that he or she may be reintegrated into their community as an independent and vital force (Amoroso et al., 1977). Leisure counselling services are one aspect of the rehabilitation process. The leisure counselling program is offered by personnel who provide activities and services which meet basic recreation and leisure needs of all people and activities designed to contribute toward rehabilitation, treatment or habilitation, and remediation (Nesbitt, 1977). Leisure counselling programs are implemented with the hopes of facilitating a satisfying leisure lifestyle for those with physical challenges. Although it is convenient to assume that leisure counselling programs are complying with their intentions, that program goals are being attained and that clients are gaining valuable leisure knowledge through participation in such programs, this assumption may not reflect reality. There is ample evidence that programs are not always implemented according to their plan (Rutman, 1980). Thus, there is a need to determine the extent to which leisure counselling programs are actually meeting their desired goals and following their program plan. In other words, there is a need to evaluate leisure counselling programs.

Program Evaluation

As with other disciplines in psychology, perspectives of program evaluation research are diversified. One perspective regards program evaluation as the process that leads to judgements about the worth, effectiveness, and efficiency of programs and strategies (Lee and Sampson, 1990). A second perspective views program evaluation research as a robust arena of activity directed at collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information on the need for,

implementation of, and effectiveness and efficiency of intervention efforts to better the lot of humankind (Rossi and Freeman, 1989). A third perspective regards program evaluation as a systematic inquiry into the operations of a program, the services it delivers, the process by which those services are provided, the costs involved, the characteristics of the population served, and the outcome or impact of the program on its participants (Zigler and Finn-Stevenson, 1988). Finally, a fourth perspective views evaluation research as the application of scientific principles, methods and theories to identify, describe, conceptualize, measure, predict, change, and control those factors or variables important to the development of effective human service delivery systems (Rutman, 1980; Struening, 1975). Regardless of one's interpretation of a program evaluation, the common goal of evaluation research is to examine the effectiveness of a program. Therefore, in the present study, an evaluation of a leisure counseling program involved a detailed examination of the goals and procedures associated with leisure counselling. The evaluation was a useful and important initial approach in determining the effectiveness of the program.

The importance of evaluating social programs should not be underestimated (Rossi and Freeman, 1989). Program evaluation may be conceptualized as a tool, responsible for helping to establish the progress a particular leisure counselling program has made. Considering the number of leisure programs available to people with physical challenges, this tool is important in distinguishing "effective" programs from "ineffective" ones.

The evaluation of a leisure counselling service is necessary for two reasons. The first reason involves the issue of accountability. That is, program evaluations provide some basis for holding those who spend public funds on particular programs accountable for their decisions (Sjoberg, 1975). In the long run, program evaluations may lead to changes in government policies that provide funding for social programs. The advantages of evaluations for providing information about the accountability of social programs are twofold. First, program evaluations may inform the government or other sponsoring agencies that their funding is providing an effective service. The sponsor may then decide to continue or increase the funding a particular program is receiving. Thus, a government sponsor can rationalize spending taxpayers money because the people are receiving an important and valuable service. The second advantage of an evaluation also involves the information it provides about a social program; however, the evaluation may discover that the program is not effective. Again, the government has gained valuable knowledge. Realizing there is a need to reallocate funds or to change an existing program is another advantage of program evaluations. The therapeutic recreation service should be accountable to the patient or client, administrative funding sources and the therapeutic recreation profession (Dixon, 1980). A program evaluation would ensure that all groups involved are participating in and offering a program that is effective and beneficial to everyone's needs. Accountability is a major reason for conducting program evaluations.

The second reason, although related to the first, that leisure counseling program evaluations need to be conducted is the advantage of feedback. For example, an athletic coach skillfully shapes and refines the performance of an individual or team toward continuing improvement (Isaac and Michael, 1981). The value of feedback as a means for improving a leisure counselling program is great. Observing programs for the purpose of improving services are reasonable and justifiable expenditures of time and effort (Gunn and Peterson, 1978). Evaluation feedback provides the opportunity to improve a program through revealing weaknesses in a program's goals, procedures, and/or facilities. Inherent in the notion of feedback is the desire to improve a program's services, which in itself is valuable. Furthermore, program evaluations are useless unless they are used to improve and further develop a program (Keene and Stewart, 1989). Thus, a fundamental advantage of conducting program evaluations is to provide feedback about the utility of a program for the purposes of accountability and/or improvement of a program.

Evaluations exist to facilitate intelligent decision-making (Edwards, Guttentag, and Snapper, 1975). Information is gathered on major aspects of a program's design and operations, which enable objective decisions to be made (Peterson and Gunn, 1978). Based on the information gathered programs may be expanded, revised, maintained, or terminated. A program evaluation's role in aiding this decision process should be major; the decision to terminate or fund a program "just because" is insufficient. Program evaluations provide the information necessary to make qualified judgements about the

fate of social programs and without an evaluation, decisions are made unsubstantially. Program evaluations foster decision-making that can be based on actual program performance. The value and importance of evaluation research is illustrated by the following quote:

Research can do much to reduce the uncertainty with which every human service agency must deal by providing the administration with a clearer picture of the social problem he is expected to affect, by separating what is significant from what is merely prominent, by testing the accuracy of assumptions about clients to ensure the agency is dealing with the population it believes it is serving, and by describing in detail the nature of services or treatment provided in an effort to deter and assure that agency programs as formally defined are in fact being carried out (Twain, 1975).

Program evaluations are necessary to provide information for competent decision making and to protect against unwarranted funding of social programs.

Until this point, it may have been implied that program effectiveness is a unilateral concept. That is, there is only one aspect involved in determining a program's effectiveness; however, effectiveness can refer to different aspects of a program. The underlying focus of a program evaluation will change depending on the question one seeks to answer. An administrator may wish to know how a program is impacting a client. Or, perhaps one may want to determine the extent to which a program has been implemented according to its original design. These two issues are applicable to

one program, yet each emphasizes a different aspect of the program and would require an evaluation of a different nature. There are three major types of program evaluations: formative evaluation, summative evaluation, and process evaluations. Each exemplifies a different component of a program that may be evaluated, but all three are equally important for determining the overall effectiveness of a program; in the long run, all aspects of a program should be evaluated (Zigler and Finn-Stevenson, 1988).

The first type of an evaluation that may be conducted within a leisure counselling program is formative research. The overall purpose of formative research is to facilitate program development (Rutman, 1980). It refers to evaluation efforts and processes that are conducted while a program is being planned or during its implementation (Peterson and Gunn, 1978). It is useful during the planning stages of a program because evaluative activities are undertaken during the design and pretesting of programs to guide the design process (Rossi and Freeman, 1989). Also, a formative evaluation provides insights into any differences between a program's original design and reality. A detection of such differences will allow for modification of a program prior to its full implementation. Overall, formative evaluations are conducted during the early stages of a program's design and implementation.

One example of a formative evaluation involves testing and assessing a program using a small sample of target subjects prior to the program's full implementation. This procedure was utilized during the planning stages of *Sesame Street* (Rossi and Freeman, 1989). There was a concern about which particular TV characters

should be chosen as the agents of the messages to be communicated to the children. Experiments were conducted in which the same learning message was communicated by different characters and different sequences. Children viewed the presentations on TV's and any variations in their attention was measured. The results of this simple study impacted the decisions about the format of the program. This example illustrates the importance of formative evaluations during a program's designing stages. A formative evaluation may be regarded as an initial type of evaluation that a program can undergo. For the present study, formative evaluation is not applicable because the leisure counseling program has been in operation for several years.

A second type of evaluation research is summative or outcome research. Summative research is distinguished from formative research in two ways (Johnson, 1970). First, summative research is an evaluation of a finished product. Second, summative research is an overall evaluation that relates to those purposes of evaluation that involve making an overall decision. In other words, summative evaluations involve determining whether a program has had the impact on the target population that was intended. Did the interventions produce their intended effects? Similarly, summative evaluations are conducted on a program in operation to determine its value (Peterson and Gunn, 1978). Summative evaluations are performed to assess a program's effectiveness and determine if a program's objectives have been met. The assessment of outcome is a critical aspect of any program. Essentially, an entire program can be

undermined if an evaluation determines it to be ineffective in producing the desired effect on a target population.

Inherent within summative or outcome evaluations is the notion of a comparison. Determining impact requires comparing the conditions of targets who have experienced the intervention with those of targets who have experienced something different (Rossi and Freeman, 1989). Similarly, outcome evaluations may be conducted by testing target populations before and after intervention to determine its effects (Sainsbury, 1975). Generally, summative evaluations indicate that the target population has gained the intended outcome upon participation in a social program.

A study utilizing a pretest and posttest that measured the effects of a short-term leisure education program upon the leisure functioning of young people with spina bifida (Zoerink, 1988) will illustrate an outcome evaluation. The Leisure Diagnostic Battery, Long Form Version A was used to measure pretest and posttest scores from subjects who were involved in a six-week leisure education program. Although the results were mixed with respect to the effects of the program due to small sample sizes, the author's acknowledgement of the possible limitations of the program is important. First, he suggested that the length and intensity of the program may not have been sufficient to dramatically improve all subjects' leisure functioning. Secondly, the content of the program relied heavily upon the use of cognitive skills (i.e., reading and writing); for some subjects the completion of these tasks was laborious and decreased verbal interaction. Furthermore, the author noted that the length and involvement of the subjects in the physical

activities was not intense enough to influence their leisure functioning. Overall, this study may appear to have failed to produce the desired impact on the subjects' leisure functioning. However, the valuable knowledge gained from the study cannot be undermined. The author's acknowledgement about the program's shortcomings is applicable to future studies. The outcome evaluation allowed the author to refine his program to one that will have the desired impact on the target population. Summative evaluations are valuable and necessary for determining a program's worth. The present study will not focus on outcome evaluations because the extent to which a program is, in fact, implemented, must be evaluated prior to major studies on program impact (Rutman, 1980).

Thus, the third type of an evaluation which may be used to assess social programs is a process evaluation or what is also referred to as program monitoring. A process evaluation is defined as an assessment of the actual implementation of a program or service (Zigler and Finn-Stevenson, 1988). Process evaluators ask the question: Were the designed content and processes of a program followed? A process evaluation monitors indicators of progress toward the objectives (Isaac and Michael, 1981), through monitoring the daily program operations which occur in an agency. This type of an evaluation is not concerned with what should be, but rather what has, in fact, occurred (Chelimsky, 1985).

A process evaluation is a systematic attempt to examine the extent to which a program is reaching its target population and to measure the degree of congruence between the planned for and provided services (Rossi and Freeman, 1989). It is necessary to

continuously monitor program operations to obtain input as to the extent to which programs are attaining their goals, where goals are defined in the context of daily agency or program operations (Smith, 1987). Most agencies have goals or procedures that represent the delivery of services; process evaluations ensure that the goals or procedures are delivered accordingly. An example of a process evaluation involved the monitoring effort in Head Start programs to guarantee that each Head Start center delivered the services mandated by the program (Appleford and Ryan, 1977; Moffitt and Ryan, 1975; Rossi and Freeman, 1989; Ryan and Moffitt, 1974). Process evaluations are useful for monitoring the everyday occurrences of program delivery at an agency.

The three types of evaluations contribute to the overall judgement of a program's effectiveness. Formative evaluations provide feedback about a program in its early stages of development. Process evaluations assess the implementation of a program; and outcome evaluations verify a program's impact on the target population. Although evaluating each aspect of a program is important, there is no point being concerned with impact of a program unless it has taken place and served participants the way it was intended (Rossi and Freeman, 1989). Process evaluations are necessary to determine which aspects of a program are actually in effect. Without this information, one would not know what part(s) of the program is having the desired impact on the target population. Evaluations may be viewed as a process itself. One must understand the manner with which a program functions and is delivered in order to understand its outcomes. Therefore, for this reason and the fact

that leisure counselling itself is viewed as a process (Epperson et. al., 1977), the focus of this study is a process evaluation.

Understanding a program's structure requires detailed knowledge about several components of the program. For example, program process information includes data on the services or activities provided to the participants; the particular approaches used to implement the program; and the timing and frequency of the services or activities (Rutman, 1980). Upon closer examination of the above components, the issue of responsibility arises. Who is responsible for delivering a program's services? The counsellors are responsible. Evaluating the performance of the individuals responsible for a program's service is an initial approach in determining the extent to which a program's actual implementation differs from its intended implementation. The following quote illustrates the advantages of examining leisure counsellors' performance as an approach for understanding a program.

Understanding the exact nature of leisure counsellors' performance as a means of determining the program's effectiveness is important. Isolating the important behaviors and other competencies that have a causal relationship to client change is necessary to refine theories and techniques for clinical interventions, for designing educational programs and training methods, to improve professional credentialing procedures, for developing better ways of assessing trainees' readiness to practice, and as a component of all scientific investigations concerning the therapeutic relationship between client and practitioner (Scofield and Yoxheimer, 1983).

Because leisure counsellors may be regarded as the basis of their program, in terms of being responsible for program delivery, it seems logical to initiate a process evaluation with them. An evaluation of their performance does not mean that one will judge which, if any, of the counsellors is more effective; rather, an evaluation would assess what each one does within the confines of the program. A profession that becomes involved with evaluative research gains increased credibility and respect (Peterson and Gunn, 1978).

This study involves conducting a process evaluation of a leisure counselling program by examining the verbal performance of leisure counsellors who deliver the program. As discussed previously, the purpose of a leisure counselling program would be to acquaint the client with the great variety of leisure possibilities in the community, to assist one in making realistic choices from among these possibilities, and to help one develop a leisure plan to be followed upon discharge (Acuff, 1966). Leisure counsellors are responsible for increasing a person with a physical challenge's awareness about their leisure wants and needs, in order to facilitate an active leisure lifestyle. The key to an effective leisure program is good counselling, whether in an institution or community (O'Morrow, 1970). Evaluation of professional competence in rehabilitation counselling occurs routinely in professional education programs, certification and licensure, and rehabilitation agencies; however, these evaluation procedures used may not be fully adequate (Berven and Scofield, 1980). Thus, a process evaluation is necessary to assess leisure counsellors' performance to ensure the leisure counselling program is

being implemented according to its plan. The evaluation will help the counsellor, as well as the program, build credibility.

A process evaluation of leisure counselling services serves four important purposes (Kunce and Derrieux, 1984). First, the timely designation of evaluation tasks makes expectations of counsellor roles and functions clear both to the counsellor and administrator. Second, a well-executed evaluation provides feedback that is useful to the counsellor in improving job performance. Third, the adequate evaluation of counsellor performance is essential to the agency itself in documentation of its own effectiveness. Finally, the process of defining and analyzing the goals of an organization may in and of itself increase the efficiency of the organization (Durkin and Durkin, 1975). Hopefully, this study will increase awareness about the counsellors' roles, improve their job performance, document the program's effectiveness, and increase the efficiency of the organization. Overall, an evaluation of counsellor performance may convey that a program is being implemented in accordance with its plan; as well as, promote an improvement in job performance.

Two studies reviewed below, are important in understanding (a) that it is possible to conduct useful investigations of actual counselling sessions, and (b) that process evaluations have largely been ignored in client outcome studies. The purpose of the first investigation was to assess and categorize the counsellors verbal interaction styles using a sample of fifty-four rehabilitation counsellors (Bolton, 1974a). Three verbal interaction styles were established: information providers, therapeutic counsellors, and information exchangers. Information providers were found to

provide general administrative information, specific details about services, and information tailored to the client's needs. Therapeutic counsellors were characterized as listeners, explorers, reflectors, and provided support to their clients. Information exchangers solicited information from their clients, provided educational and occupational information, discuss various topics, and offered advice. The Rehabilitation Counselling Interview Subrole Behavior Scale was utilized as a procedure for quantifying and analyzing the actual content of the rehabilitation counselling interviews. Future research might involve the application of Bolton's model of leisure counselling; however, the approach of the present study is to focus on the behaviors of leisure counsellors in relation to the goals established by their department. The importance of his study at this point is the illustration that leisure counselling interviews can be studied in a manner similar to that which will be employed in the present study.

The second investigation addressed the issue that most client outcome studies do not assess the amount or quality of the services provided to client groups (Bolton, 1974b). That is, process evaluations were not conducted to assess leisure counsellors' performance. The thrust of evaluation studies within leisure counselling examine outcome variables of clients, and disregard the importance of assessing counsellor performance. In accordance with Bolton's conclusions and the need to conduct process evaluations in order to fully appreciate the information outcome studies reveal about programs, a process evaluation was utilized in this study.

One method of assessing counsellor performance involves determining points of conflict between counsellors. Different

interpretations of what the program is about, based on differing and often unarticulated goals and assumptions about how to reach them, appear to be major sources of intra-program conflict (Grant and Grant, 1975). Leisure counsellors involved within one program, may have different ideas about the program's goals and the importance of each goal. A process evaluation would specify whether the leisure counsellors have the same assumptions about the program's goals and the goals' importance. Counsellors should be promoting the program goals in order for the program to be effective. Without a clear adherence to program goals, a program is lacking its proper implementation and therefore, will not be achieving what it initially set out to achieve.

In addition to assessing the counsellors' verbal performance in terms of the program goals, it is necessary to determine verbally, how the counsellors are achieving the goals. For example, are they informing clients about appropriate leisure activities or are they ordering the clients to become involved in leisure? It is necessary to determine the extent to which the program goals are being discussed within the counselling sessions, as well as understand how the counsellors respond to their clients. In order to facilitate an understanding about how the counsellors are responding to their clients during leisure counselling sessions, a Counsellor Verbal Response Category System (Hill, 1978) was utilized in this study. The category system, which includes 14 verbal response categories, was developed for measuring specific counsellor verbal behaviors. For example, the "Information" category involves counsellors providing facts, data, resources, or theory with neutral intent; whereas, the

"Direct Guidance" category consists of directions and advice the counsellor gives to the client in a more commanding manner. See Table 1 for the names of the remaining verbal categories and Appendix A for the definitions of the categories. The program goals provided the format for understanding "what" is being discussed during the counselling sessions; whereas, the response categories allowed for an examination of "how" the program goals were being discussed. Therefore, both methods of assessing the counsellors' verbal behaviors compliment one another and were the basis of the process evaluation.

The purpose of this investigation involves (a) observing leisure counsellors' behavioral performance during interviews with physically challenged people to assess consistency between the counsellors' verbal behaviors and each program goal, (b) ascertaining the leisure counsellors' views about the importance of each program goal through the use of a questionnaire and (c) comparing the counsellors' perceptions of each goal's importance with their actual counselling behavior. The investigation will adhere to a flexible approach in which the three purposes will serve as a framework for the evaluation. Thus, understanding of program activities will emerge from experience with the program; theories about what is happening in a program are grounded in this experience, rather than imposed on the program a priori (Patton, 1980). This process evaluation of the counsellor performance will be an initial phase in determining the effectiveness of the leisure counselling program at an Eastern Ontario Rehabilitation Hospital.

Method

Subjects

The entire counselling staff which consisted of four female leisure counsellors served as the subjects for the program evaluation. The counsellors' experience within the leisure counselling field ranged from three months to five years. Their education backgrounds are varied. One counsellor has a diploma in therapeutic recreation; another has a graduate diploma in counseling psychology and a Bachelor Degree in Physical Education; the third counsellor has a Honors Bachelor Degree in Physical Education and a Bachelor Degree in Psychology; and the fourth counsellor has a Bachelor Degree in Recreation. Initially the program consisted of five counsellors, however, due to program cutbacks one position was deleted.

Apparatus

The primary apparatus for taping the interviews was a Panasonic PV-602K VHS Camcorder. The tapes were viewed through the use of a JVC HR-D400U VHS Recorder and a Panasonic 14V41 TV/Receiver. The camera was mounted on a DAVECO TR13 Tripod. Finally the taping was recorded on Fuji VHS high quality tapes.

Materials

The counsellors' verbal responses were coded in accordance with the Verbal Response Category System as adapted from Hill (1978), the names of each category may be viewed in Table 1 with the definitions provided in Appendix A. The categories utilized in this investigation were the same as those formulated by Hill (1978), with two exceptions. First, after coding the practice tapes, it was

Table 1
Counsellor Verbal Response Category System

- 1. Minimal Encourager Type A**
- 2. Minimal Encourager Type B**
- 3. Approval/Reinforcement**
- 4. Information**
- 5. Direct Guidance**
- 6. Closed Questions**
- 7. Open Questions**
- 8. Restatements**
- 9. Reflections**
- 10. Nonverbal Referent**
- 11. Interpretation**
- 12. Confrontation**
- 13. Self-Disclosure**
- 14. Silence**
- 15. Listen**
- 16. Other**

apparent that the counsellors were using two types of Minimal Encourager responses. For the purposes of the evaluation, the Minimal Encourager category was divided into two responses. The first was the Minimal Encourager Response Type A which signified simple agreement, acknowledgement, and/or understanding counsellor responses while maintaining eye contact with the client. The second response was the Minimal Encourager Type B in which the counsellors responded with simple agreement, acknowledgement, and/or understanding while discontinuing eye contact with a client. Another category that was added to the response system involved a Listen Response in which the counsellors said nothing, but simply listened to the clients talk.

A list of goals as determined by the Leisure Counseling Department is presented in Table 2. The Goals List was employed for two purposes. The first was to assist the investigator in categorizing the counsellors' goal related verbal behaviors that were assessed in the interview sessions. The second purpose was to generate a questionnaire to assess each counsellor's perception of the appropriateness of each goal. The questionnaire is presented in Table 3.

Procedure

Pilot data was accumulated using four simulated interviews with one of the leisure counselors from the hospital and two volunteer university students. University students were used for the pilot data because it was not possible to use the Rehabilitation Center's Clients. The students assumed the identities of three

Table 2

Leisure Counselling/Education Goals Sheet**A. Leisure Awareness**

1. To develop skills and personal resources for leisure
2. To develop personal values about leisure
3. To develop knowledge and understanding about leisure
4. To develop positive attitudes about leisure

B. Activities Development

5. To learn recreation activities:
  - a) sport
  - b) craft
  - c) hobby
  - d) social

C. Community Resources

6. To inform about community recreation resources available
7. To assist in involvement with community programs or services (e.g., community visits, RAS)

D. Equipment/Resources

8. To learn where to obtain equipment/resources to develop/continue/resume a hobby/activity at home
9. To learn about assistive devices for recreation

E. Barriers

10. To learn how to overcome barrier(s) to participating in leisure activities:

- a) transportation**
- b) financial**
- c) accessibility**
- d) physical limitations**
- e) time management issues**

Table 3

Questionnaire on Perceived Importance of Goals

The Goals Sheet of the Department of Recreation Therapy was developed through a collaborative effort of the therapists. This questionnaire was designed to assess the degree of importance that individual therapists attribute to each program goal. Please respond in terms of your own perception of each goals' appropriateness by circling the number that corresponds to your position, as indicated by the scale below. Thank you for your cooperation.

Degree of Appropriateness

Least			Medium			Most
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. How appropriate do you consider the goal of developing a client's leisure awareness?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. How appropriate do you consider the goal of developing a client's recreation activities? (e.g., sport, craft, hobby, social)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. How appropriate do you consider the goal of informing a client about the available community recreation resources?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. How appropriate do you consider the goal of assisting a client's involvement with community programs or services?

(e.g., community visits, RAS)

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. How appropriate do you consider the goal of informing a client where to obtain equipment/resources to develop/continue/resume a hobby/activity at home?

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. How appropriate do you consider the goal of informing a client about assistive devices required for recreation?

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. How appropriate do you consider overcoming a client's barrier(s) to participation in leisure activities? (e.g., transportation, financial, accessibility, physical limitations, time management)

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

physically disabled people: (a) one with chronic pain (b) a quadriplegic and (c) an individual with an amputation below the knee. Each counselling session was approximately 30 minutes. There were two reasons for conducting the pilot study. The first reason was to determine the feasibility of the 30 second time interval. Initially, this time period was acceptable, but given the extensive data that were involved, a shorter time interval of 15 seconds was adopted to allow for more accurate data coding. The second reason was to categorize and relate the counsellor's verbal behaviors to the program's goals, with examples provided in Table 4. The list of goals and the corresponding verbal behaviors were examples and were not intended to be an exclusive list.

The first phase of the evaluation involved a brainstorming session (Ezrin, 1977) between the investigator and the leisure counsellors to obtain an understanding of each counsellor's objectives while providing counselling services. In other words, the goal of the brainstorming session was to ascertain each counsellors' definitions or beliefs about the program goals without informing the counsellors that their statements were being used as a guideline for coding their verbal responses. The investigator recorded the counsellors' statements and upon completion of the meeting, determined which verbal statements corresponded to each goal. Counsellor involvement in this process was necessary to ensure that the behavioral criteria are not only meaningful to the counsellors (Simpson, 1966), but also the involvement of the counsellors in the evaluation process may increase cooperation (Rutman, 1980).

Table 4

Examples of Goals and the Corresponding Verbal Behaviors**GOAL:** Developing Leisure Awareness**Verbal Behaviors:**

- "My job is to look at quality of life issues and improve your quality of life within a leisure context"
- "We want to find activities that will make you happy"
- "Would you like to get involved in activities again?"
- "We have a motivation issue to deal with first"
- "There are many positive aspects of volunteer work-sense of commitment and helping others"

GOAL: Activities Development**Verbal Behaviors:**

- "What are your interests in leisure/sport before and after your accident?"
- "Is there anything you have never tried that you would like to try?"
- "Would you like to go out with people in your own age group?"
- "Swimming is a total body muscle movement and we recommend it"

GOAL: Information on Community Resources**Verbal Behaviors:**

- "There is a community swimming pool on Elgin"
- "I'll look up the times for Aquafit and we can go next week"
- "Are you open to an outing at the pool?"
- "I'll go with you to put your name in at the volunteer agency"

GOAL: Information About Equipment/Resources**Verbal Behaviors:**

- "You would use forearm crutches with mini skis"
- "I'll give you a video about downhill skiing to watch at home"

GOAL: Overcoming Barriers**Verbal Behaviors:**

- "Do you feel you have the time to continue these activities?"
- "Learning to cope with the physical pain is the problem"
- "Is transportation a problem?"
- "We like to have people volunteer close to home so they do not have one less incentive to go to their volunteer job"

Upon completion of the brainstorming session taping of the counselling sessions commenced. At the counsellors insistence, the investigator taught them how to use the camera. The counsellors wanted to tape their own sessions because it was less inconvenient if the sessions could be taped at any time rather than having to rely on the times when the investigator was available. The camera was set up in one office, where all the sessions were taped. To ensure a consistent camera angle and picture distance, the floor was marked where the camera was situated. This also made the process easier for the counsellors because they only had to be responsible for taping on the camera.

The exploratory nature of this investigation warranted a flexible approach to coding the data. Instead of focusing data collection entirely on confirming initial field hypotheses, the evaluator was sensitive to looking for alternative explanations and other patterns that would invalidate initial insights (Patton, 1980). The investigator attempted to code the data two ways. First, a 15 second interval method was employed, in which the taped sessions were broken down into 15 second intervals and it was determined whether or not any goal statements and/or verbal responses had occurred. The second method involved transcribing the counsellors' verbal statements prior to coding them into corresponding categories. The first method was determined to be more feasible than the second method because it required less time and provided the same information.

The investigator provided the counsellors with the tapes necessary for taping their sessions. Generally, one tape held two

counselling sessions. Once a counsellor had completed taping a tape, the investigator was responsible for obtaining the tape. This aspect of the procedure was beneficial in the sense of the taping as subsequent coding was an ongoing process.

Each counsellor's first tape was used as a practice coding tape. In order to gain comfort with the goals, verbal categories and coding process the investigator and the undergraduate student coded each counsellor's first tape together. Using the clock on the VCR, they played a 15 second interval and recorded the goals and categories each believed were applicable. After each interval, the results were discussed and if any disagreements between the two scorers occurred, then the interval was replayed. The discussion between the scorers was aimed at gaining a similar understanding of the goals and verbal categories and was not aimed at coercing one of the scorers to change their results. This process was time consuming but necessary in order to ensure that the scorers viewed the goals and verbal categories similarly. After each counsellor's first tape was coded by the two scorers together, and each scorer felt comfortable with the coding process, then coding commenced. It should be noted that each counsellor's first tape was then recoded and included in the final analysis.

The primary investigator coded three sessions for every one session the undergraduate student coded. Tapes were administered to the scorers at random, depending on when counsellors finished taping a tape. Upon completion of coding the first four sessions, the scorers then each coded the next two sessions separately. This was done to ensure that the two scorers were maintaining a similar

understanding of the goals and verbal categories. The interscorer reliability for the first sessions coded together was 86%, which was deemed acceptable. After these two sessions were coded and the reliability was estimated, then each scorer was again responsible for coding their sessions. This process occurred four more times and during the coding of the two sessions together, the interscorer reliability consistently ranged between 81% and 88%. The primary investigator coded the remaining four sessions.

Upon completion of the coding process, the data were entered into the computer. Before data entry could begin, the investigator calculated the frequencies pertaining to each goal and verbal category for each session. At first, each session was divided into three equal time parts and the frequencies of the goals and verbal responses were calculated for each part. This process was deemed inappropriate because it did not provide the investigator with any new information. Calculating the frequencies for each session overall provided the same information and was less time consuming, therefore, the data were examined for each session overall. Data were entered into the Excel Spreadsheet Program, which was considered the most appropriate program for the existing data.

The investigator also realized that the nature of the counselling sessions may have varied depending on the type of client the counsellor is interviewing. That is, some clients may have cognitive impairments due to brain injury for example. However, no clients exhibited cognitive impairments, thus this was not an issue with respect to the evaluation. Similarly, it was not possible to conduct separate analyses on different disability groups because the sample

size did not warrant this as the clients revealed different disabilities. Therefore, no comparisons between the counsellors' verbal behaviors and clients' disability could be made.

Upon completion of their taping, each counsellor was administered the questionnaire to determine their views on the appropriateness of each goal. The questionnaire was developed from the program's goals list (see Table 3), and consisted of seven statements representing each goal. Each counsellor was asked to circle a number from one to seven that reflected their perception of each goal's appropriateness, one being the least appropriate and seven the most appropriate. The questionnaire was administered after their taping had been completed to avoid behavioral reactivity of the counsellors to any pretest activity (Nunnally, 1975).

The final phase of the procedure involved an individual feedback session between the investigator and each counsellor. After responding to the questionnaire, the investigator explained each counsellor's results using the graphs the investigator had produced. Any verbal comments made by the counsellors were recorded and included with the results.

Results

The primary investigator and an undergraduate student were responsible for coding the counselling sessions. Training was done using each counsellor's first taped sessions. The training allowed the scorers to gain comfort with the coding method and develop a clear understanding of each category. The training continued until an 85% inter-rater reliability score was attained which was deemed

acceptable due to the nature of the coding and investigation.

Subsequent reliability estimates ranged from 82% to 88%.

The results for each counsellor will be reported both separately and in conjunction with the other counsellors to fully appreciate the patterns associated with each one's sessions. Table 5 shows the number of sessions and clients associated with each counsellor. The patterns associated with the goal and verbal categories will be presented over all clients and sessions, as well as, individual sessions and clients. Also, the results will be discussed in relation to the questionnaire data and other verbal comments made to the investigator during discussions with each counsellor about their results.

Counsellor A

The results for Counsellor A in terms of total goal statements over all sessions and clients are indicative of the pattern that occurred during each client's sessions. Leisure Awareness was the goal most frequently discussed (see Figure 1). The order of the remaining goals from most to least frequent are: Barriers, Community Resources, Activities Development, and Equipment/Resources. Clearly, Leisure Awareness dominated the discussions. The four remaining goals were addressed with roughly equal frequencies but at a substantially lower rate than Leisure Awareness. It is important to note that Counsellor A addressed all five goals during the course of the investigation which is reflective of the counsellor's adherence to the program goals.

Table 5

The Number of Sessions and Clients for Each Counsellor

	COUNSELLORS			
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>
SESSIONS	10	13	9	3
CLIENTS	5	7	4	1

FIGURE 1

Total Goal Frequencies for Counsellor A

In responding to the questionnaire on the appropriateness of each goal, Counsellor A rated Community Resources and the Barrier goals with a seven, Leisure Awareness with a six, Activities Development and Equipment Resources with fives. Thus, there is a discrepancy between Counsellor A's perception of the most appropriate goal(s) and the goal most frequently addressed during sessions. When questioned about the discrepancy, the counsellor was not surprised. She confirmed her belief that the Community Resources and Barriers goals were more important than Leisure Awareness, but realized that Leisure Awareness was given more attention for a reason she could not identify. Importantly, Counsellor A did rate each goal with at least a five, reflecting agreement that all the goals were appropriate.

In addition to being the most frequently discussed goal, Leisure Awareness was addressed in every session with all clients and was the most frequent goal in each session except for one, in which Community Resources dominated. In essence, Leisure Awareness was addressed during 10/10 sessions. Community Resources were discussed during 9/10 sessions, with each client receiving information on community resources at least once. Barriers were addressed during 8/10 sessions. Again, each client received some discussion about barriers applicable to their situation. Activities Development was addressed 7/10 sessions, and each client received information on particular activities of interest to them on at least one visit. Finally, the Equipment Resources goal was addressed 4/10 sessions between three clients. Two clients did not receive any information about Equipment Resources; however, the two clients

only required one session with the counsellor, so it may not have been an issue.

Overall, for Counsellor A, Leisure Awareness remained the most consistently discussed goal in all sessions and with all clients. The other four goals vary in terms of frequencies for each client which could reflect differing client needs. Three of the five clients received information concerning all five program goals at one point during their sessions with Counsellor A. The discrepancy between the counsellor's perception about which program goals are most appropriate and actual counselling behavior is of interest and may require further investigation.

Whereas the goal related behavioral patterns reveal the content of discussions during Counsellor A's sessions, the verbal response categories provide insight about how a counsellor is discussing the goals. A profile of Counsellor A's verbal responses can be viewed in Figure 2. The corresponding name for each symbol is presented in Table 6, while the definitions are presented in Appendix A. The graph illustrates the frequencies of each verbal response category and the relationship between the different categories when the data are collapsed over all sessions and clients. The four most frequent verbal response categories from most to least frequent include: First, a Minimal Encourager response while maintaining eye contact with the client was the most frequent response made by Counsellor A. Second, providing Information was the next most frequent response. Third, a Minimal Encourager response without maintaining eye contact occurred with the next

FIGURE 2

Total Frequencies for Verbal Responses for Counsellor A

Table 6

Corresponding Name for Each Symbol as Viewed in the Figures

<u>SYMBOLS</u>	<u>NAME</u>
ME A	Minimal Encourager with Eye Contact
ME B	Minimal Encourager without Eye Contact
AR	Approval/Reinforcement
CF	Confrontation
IN	Information
DG	Direct Guidance
CQ	Closed Questions
OQ	Open Questions
RS	Restatements
RF	Reflections
IT	Interpretation
SD	Self-Disclosure
O	Other
S	Silence
L	Listen
NR	Nonverbal Referent

highest frequency. Finally, the Closed Question category was the fourth most frequent verbal response.

These frequencies reveal that typically the counsellor provided simple agreement, acknowledgement and/or understanding while maintaining eye contact more often than she withdrew eye contact. Also, Counsellor A's role includes providing information to clients in the form of data, facts, theory, and/or resources about leisure. Furthermore, this counsellor utilizes a closed question format to determine a client's interests and understanding of leisure.

An examination of the verbal response categories that occurred with the four lowest frequencies also provides useful feedback. The four lowest verbal responses from most to least frequent include: the Confrontation response, the Reflection response, the Self-Disclosure response, and the category with the lowest frequency was the Nonverbal Referent response.

Subsequent discussions with Counsellor A about the results provided possible explanations. For example, she explained that as leisure counsellors, they are encouraged not to discuss a client's disability or encourage a client to discuss their disability. The counsellor's explanation provided an understanding as to why the Nonverbal Referent category's frequency was low. Similarly, the counsellor explained to the investigator that she did not feel it was appropriate to "self-disclose" with a client until she knew a client well. Because most clients only received two or three sessions, this may not have been adequate time for Counsellor A to get to know a client, which may explain the low frequency of Self-Disclosure. The counsellor also responded positively to the fact that the

Confrontation verbal response category was low. She explained that she does not like to confront her clients, but there are times in which it is necessary. Counsellor A had no other feedback in terms of the Reflection and Interpretation Categories.

Overall, the verbal response categories remained consistent between clients and sessions. The Minimal Encourager response with eye contact was the dominant response in all sessions, with Information occurring as either the second or third most frequent in each session. The pattern of results remained consistent in terms of the highest frequencies cluttering in the first eight categories on the graphs (see Figure 2). The profile of Counsellor A suggests that she is an information provider who maintains eye contact with her clients. Direct Guidance is provided, but only when the counsellor must resort to telling a client to do something. Closed questions are the dominant form of questioning utilized by Counsellor A and she frequently restates a client's response. Approval/Reinforcement responses consistently occurred with an overall ranked frequency of 7/16 categories; however, in accordance with the counsellor's reaction to this finding, the category's frequency could perhaps, be higher.

Counsellor B

The results for Counsellor B in terms of the total goal statements over all sessions and clients are presented in Figure 3. Overall, Leisure Awareness dominated Counsellor B's sessions for every client. The order of the remaining four goals' frequencies was as follows: Activities Development, Community Resources, Barriers, and Equipment Resources. The frequencies of these four goals were

FIGURE 3

Total Goal Frequencies for Counsellor B

less than Leisure Awareness' frequency, and the latter three were roughly comparable to each other. The ratio between Leisure Awareness' frequency and the next highest goal's frequency (Activities Development) was 2:1. Thus, Counsellor B made two Leisure Awareness statements for every one Activities Development statement. Importantly, all five goals warranted some discussion during Counsellor B's leisure counselling sessions which may reflect her agreement with the program goals.

In relation to the questionnaire, all goals were rated as seven, except Leisure Awareness, which was rated as a six. One could argue that the difference between a six and a seven is not substantial; however, the response on the questionnaire was opposite to what actually occurred within Counsellor B's sessions. The counsellor viewed Activities Development, Community Resources, Equipment Resources, and Barriers equally and as the most appropriate goals for the program, and yet, Leisure Awareness dominated the discussions. This may reflect client differences in terms of the goals that needed to be addressed. The counsellor was surprised at the difference in frequencies between the five goals. The investigator provided examples of Leisure Awareness statements to Counsellor B that consistently occurred within her sessions. For example, Counsellor B expressed to her clients the importance of a balanced leisure lifestyle that included physical, social, and sedentary activities. Counsellor B agreed that she did provide this information but she never considered it as information that developed a client's Leisure Awareness. Upon consideration of the investigator's comments, she agreed that it was, in fact, developing Leisure Awareness. Generally,

Counsellor B's perceptions of the program goals' appropriateness differed from the actual content of her counselling sessions.

In addition to dominating the discussion, Leisure Awareness was discussed in every session and all clients received information about Leisure Awareness during every visit. Activities Development was addressed in every session but three, and all clients except for client #5, received Activities Development information. Community Resources were discussed in 9/13 sessions, and all clients except for client #6 received Community Resources information. Barriers were addressed during 8/13 sessions with all clients receiving some discussion about the appropriate barriers. Finally, Equipment Resources were addressed in only 2/13 sessions with the same client. Thus, 6/7 clients did not receive any information on Equipment Resources. Overall, only 1/7 clients engaged in discussions with counsellor B about all the program goals; while 6/7 clients did not receive information about every program goal, with Equipment Resources being the goal consistently not addressed by this counsellor.

A profile of Counsellor B's verbal responses may be viewed in Figure 4 and the corresponding names are shown in Table 6. The graph illustrates the frequencies of the Verbal Response Categories and the relationship between each category when the data was collapsed over sessions and clients. Overall, the four most frequent Verbal Response Categories from highest to lowest include Information, Minimal Encourager with eye contact (ME A), Minimal Encourager without eye contact (ME B), and Restatements respectively. Counsellor B's most frequent response involved

FIGURE 4

Total Frequencies for Verbal Responses for Counsellor B

Table 6

Corresponding Name for Each Symbol as Viewed in the Figures

<u>SYMBOLS</u>	<u>NAME</u>
ME A	Minimal Encourager with Eye Contact
ME B	Minimal Encourager without Eye Contact
AR	Approval/Reinforcement
CF	Confrontation
IN	Information
DG	Direct Guidance
CQ	Closed Questions
OQ	Open Questions
RS	Restatements
RF	Reflections
IT	Interpretation
SD	Self-Disclosure
O	Other
S	Silence
L	Listen
NR	Nonverbal Referent

providing leisure information to her clients. Eye contact was maintained more often than not when Counsellor B responded in terms of simple agreement, acknowledgement, and/or understanding. Finally, restating clients' responses was a frequent approach utilized by Counsellor B.

The Verbal Response Categories that occurred with the lowest frequencies also provide useful information about the nature of Counsellor B's responses. The four most infrequent responses from most to least infrequent include: Self-Disclosure, Listening, Reflections, and Nonverbal Referent. Again, Nonverbal Referent was the category that occurred the least frequently, which was expected. Counsellor B agreed with Counsellor A in terms of not encouraging clients to discuss their disabilities. Self-Disclosure is a response that Counsellor B feels is more appropriately used for clients whom she knows well. Because most clients received a maximum of two sessions, this may not have been adequate time to get to know a client. Counsellor B had no other comments with respect to the low frequencies of the remaining categories.

Overall, Counsellor B is an information provider who, on average, maintains eye contact with clients, but there is a strong tendency to withdraw eye contact during Minimal Encourager responses. Closed Questions were consistently the dominant form of questioning, with Restatements following a client's response. The frequent use of Restatements may reflect Counsellor B's ability to listen and understand a client. The Approval/Reinforcement responses in the form of emotional support, consistently occurred during each session; however, in accordance with discussions with

Counsellor B about this result, the frequency of the Approval/Reinforcement category could be higher. Generally, Counsellor B's primary mode of discussion is providing information about the program goals with a strong emphasis on Leisure Awareness.

Counsellor C

The results for Counsellor C in terms of total goal statements over all sessions and clients reflect the patterns of statements for individual sessions. Leisure Awareness dominated the goal discussions occurring with the greatest frequency. The order of the remaining goals', from most to least frequent include: Barriers, Community Resources, Activities Development, and Equipment Resources (see Figure 5). The ratio between Leisure Awareness and the next most frequent goal of Barriers, is approximately 2:1. Overall, four of the five goals were addressed during Counsellor C's nine sessions, and the only goal not addressed was Equipment Resources.

Counsellor C's perceptions of goals' appropriateness were different from her actual goal related verbal behaviors. Providing a client with information about Community Resources was rated the highest with a seven, but statements about Community Resources occurred with the third highest frequency overall. The Activities Development goal, with a two was rated the least appropriate and ranked fourth in terms of frequency with which it was discussed. The Equipment Resources goal was rated four in terms of appropriateness, but was never addressed. Leisure Awareness was rated with a five in terms of appropriateness, but it was the goal most frequently discussed during the counselling sessions. Thus,

FIGURE 5

Total Goal Frequencies for Counsellor C

there is a discrepancy between Counsellor C's perception of the program goal and her actual counselling verbal behaviors.

Finally, the Barriers goal with a rating of six was the second most appropriate program goal. Counsellor C's appropriateness rating of the Barriers goal did correspond with the actual verbal behaviors in that the Barriers goal was the second most frequently addressed. Therefore, Counsellor C's rating of the Barriers goal corresponded to the frequency with which the goal was addressed within the counselling sessions.

An examination of individual sessions revealed that not only was Leisure Awareness the most frequently discussed goal overall but was the dominant goal addressed in each individual session except for one, during which Community Resources dominated. Another indication of the dominance of Leisure Awareness comments was that Leisure Awareness was discussed in each of the nine sessions that were included in this study. Barriers were addressed in seven of the nine sessions; the Activities Development goal was addressed during six of the nine sessions; Community Resources information was provided during five of the nine sessions; and finally, the Equipment Resources goal was not addressed during any of the nine sessions. Furthermore, one client received information about all of the goals except for Equipment Resources. The second and third clients received information about all of the goals except for Equipment Resources and Community Resources. Finally, the fourth client received information about all of the goals except for Equipment Resources and Barriers. Thus, Leisure Awareness was the

goal consistently discussed with all clients; whereas, Equipment Resources was the goal consistently not discussed by Counsellor C.

The goal related verbal behaviors reveal the content of the discussions during Counsellor C's sessions. The Verbal Response Category System provides insight into how the counsellor is responding to her clients. A profile of Counsellor C's verbal responses may be viewed in Figure 6 and the corresponding symbol names may be viewed in Table 6. The graph illustrates the frequencies of Counsellor C's verbal responses representing the data collapsed over the nine sessions and clients. The four most frequent verbal responses from most to least frequent included: Minimal Encourager with Eye Contact, Direct Guidance, Information, and Restatements respectively. Counsellor C's most frequent verbal response involved providing simple agreement, acknowledgement, and/or understanding while eye contact was maintained. Telling a client to do something in the form of directions, advice, and/or suggestions was a more frequent response of Counsellor C than simply providing information in a neutral manner. Finally, Counsellor C restated or rephrased a clients' statements, which constituted the fourth most frequent verbal response.

The verbal response categories that occurred with the lowest frequencies included: Nonverbal Referent, Listening, Self-Disclosure, and Silence from the least to most frequent respectively. Again, as with the other two counsellors, the Nonverbal Referent response occurred with the lowest frequency. Subsequent discussions with Counsellor C about this result lead to a possible explanation. She informed the investigator, as did the other counsellors, that they do

FIGURE 6

Total Frequencies for Verbal Responses for Counsellor C

Table 6

Corresponding Name for Each Symbol as Viewed in the Figures

<u>SYMBOLS</u>	<u>NAME</u>
ME A	Minimal Encourager with Eye Contact
ME B	Minimal Encourager without Eye Contact
AR	Approval/Reinforcement
CF	Confrontation
IN	Information
DG	Direct Guidance
CQ	Closed Questions
OQ	Open Questions
RS	Restatements
RF	Reflections
IT	Interpretation
SD	Self-Disclosure
O	Other
S	Silence
L	Listen
NR	Nonverbal Referent

not encourage a client to discuss his or her disability, and the counsellors avoid making reference to one's disability as well. Counsellor C did not have any feedback about the low frequencies for the remaining three categories. Overall, Counsellor C provided information in the form of Direct Guidance which involved advice and suggestions for clients, as well as telling clients to do something. Counsellor C also provided recreation information to clients in a more neutral manner by providing facts, resources and theories about recreation. Eye contact was maintained consistently during Minimal Encourager responses which were categorized by simple agreement, acknowledgement, and/or understanding. Closed Questions remained the dominant form of questioning throughout the nine sessions, which were consistently followed with Restatements. The Approval/Reinforcement category was the seventh most frequent of the sixteen categories; however, in accordance with the discussions with Counsellor C, the frequency of this category could have been greater. Counsellor C's verbal responses appeared consistent between clients and sessions.

Counsellor D

The results for Counsellor D in terms of total goal statements may be viewed in Figure 7. Leisure Awareness was the dominant goal discussed when the data was collapsed over the three sessions. The order of the remaining goals from the highest to lowest frequencies were: Community Resources, Activities Development, Equipment Resources, and Barriers. There was a 2:1 ratio between Leisure Awareness and the next most frequent Community Resources goal. Overall, four of the five goals were addressed throughout the

FIGURE 7

Total Goal Frequencies for Counsellor D

three sessions. Barriers comprised the one goal that was not addressed by Counsellor D.

In responding to the questionnaire on the appropriateness of each goal, interestingly, Counsellor D rated all the goals with a six or seven except for Leisure Awareness which was rated as four. In essence, the pattern of Counsellor D's actual goal related verbal behaviors was opposite to the responses on the questionnaire. Leisure Awareness was addressed the most during the sessions and was rated as the least appropriate in relation to the other goals. Importantly, however, Counsellor D rated all five goals with at least a four or better, which may reflect her agreement with the program goals.

An examination of individual sessions also provided useful information. Leisure Awareness statements dominated the goal discussions for two of the three sessions. During the one session in which Leisure Awareness was not the most frequently goal discussed, Community Resource statements were dominant. Also, Leisure Awareness was the only goal addressed in all three sessions. Activities Development was addressed in two of the three sessions. Community Resources and Equipment Resources were discussed in one session. Counsellor D did not discuss the Barriers goal during any of the three sessions. Overall, the client received information about four of the five program goals.

The goal statements reveal the content of Counsellor D's discussions with clients, whereas the Verbal Response Categories provide information about how the counsellor responded to her clients. A profile of Counsellor D's verbal responses may be viewed in

Figure 8 and the corresponding symbol names may be viewed in Table 6. The graph illustrates the frequencies of Counsellor D's verbal responses when the data was collapsed over three sessions. The four most frequent verbal responses, from most to least frequent, include the following: Information, Approval/Reinforcement, Minimal Encourager with Eye Contact, and Closed Questions. Counsellor D's most frequent response involved providing information to her client. Emotional support was a frequent response of Counsellor D which comprised the Approval/Reinforcement category. Eye contact was consistently maintained when Counsellor D responded in terms of simple agreement, understanding and/or acknowledgement. Finally, Closed Questions were the fourth most frequent verbal response.

The four least frequent verbal responses also provide useful information about the manner with which Counsellor D responded to her client. The four most infrequent verbal responses, from most to least infrequent, include the following: Reflections, Listening, Silence, and Nonverbal Referent. As with the other three counsellors, the Nonverbal Referent response was the least frequent verbal response. Counsellor D relayed similar feedback to the investigator concerning the Nonverbal Referent response. She stated that as Leisure Counsellors, they do not reinforce the "poor me" syndrome, which may explain the low occurrence of the Nonverbal Referent responses.

In conclusion, the Verbal Response Categories remained consistent between the sessions. Counsellor D consistently provided Information in a neutral manner to her client as Information remained the most frequent response during each session.

FIGURE 8

Total Frequencies for Verbal Responses for Counsellor D

Table 6

Corresponding Name for Each Symbol as Viewed in the Figures

<u>SYMBOLS</u>	<u>NAME</u>
ME A	Minimal Encourager with Eye Contact
ME B	Minimal Encourager without Eye Contact
AR	Approval/Reinforcement
CF	Confrontation
IN	Information
DG	Direct Guidance
CQ	Closed Questions
OQ	Open Questions
RS	Restatements
RF	Reflections
IT	Interpretation
SD	Self-Disclosure
O	Other
S	Silence
L	Listen
NR	Nonverbal Referent

Counsellor D also provided emotional support to her client as the Approval/Reinforcement category had the second highest frequency. Eye contact was maintained when Counsellor D responded in terms of simple agreement, understanding and/or acknowledgement which comprised the Minimal Encourager category. Finally, Counsellor D utilized Closed Questions as the tool for attaining information from the client which were consistently followed by a Restatement of the client's response.

Questionnaire

In order to facilitate an understanding of the counsellors' responses to the questionnaire, the data is presented in Table 7. The table reveals each counsellors' perceptions of the appropriateness of each goal. The questionnaire was based on a seven-point rating system in which a rating of seven indicated a goal as being the most appropriate and a rating of one indicated that a goal was least appropriate. Because the questionnaire contained two questions that pertained to one goal, for example the Community Resources Goal, the investigator decided to combine and average the counsellors' responses for the two parts if there was a difference of two or less between each part. The table illustrates any similarities and differences between the counsellors perceptions.

Paired Categories

In order to facilitate an understanding of the counsellors' verbal responses, some of the categories were paired into groups (e.g., Closed and Open Questions), and comparisons were made between the corresponding categories. The results for each counsellor

Table 7

The Appropriateness Ratings of the Program Goals

	COUNSELLORS			
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>
LFISURE AWARENESS	6	6	5	4
ACTIVITIES DEVELOPMENT	5	7	6	7
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	7	7	7	7
EQUIPMENT RESOURCES	5	7	6	6
BARRIERS	7	7	5	6

are presented to determine any patterns and/or inconsistencies between the verbal responses of the four counsellors.

The first pair of categories examined involved the Minimal Encourager verbal responses. These categories included the simple agreement, acknowledgement and/or understanding responses, with the distinction between the two categories being eye contact. Table 8 shows the average number of Minimal Encourager responses and the percentage of Minimal Encourager responses over all sessions for the four counsellors. The Minimal Encourager Type A response occurred when a counsellor maintained eye contact; whereas, the Type B response occurred when a counsellor withdrew eye contact while providing a Minimal Encourager response. The Type A Minimal Encourager responses occurred more frequently than the Type B responses for all four counsellors. The percentages associated with the type A and B responses are: for Counsellor A, 67.8% and 32.2%, Counsellor B, 56.7% and 43.3%, Counsellor C, 79.2% and 20.2%, and Counsellor D, 80.5% and 19.5% for the Type A and B responses respectively. Although the counsellors' results were comparable with respect to Type A being the dominant response; each counsellor's use of the Type B response varied. Counsellor A utilized the Type B response more frequently during her first sessions and its use thereafter decreased. Discussions between the investigator and Counsellor A suggested the reason for the frequent use of the Type B response during the first sessions only, was due to the fact that session one is generally an assessment/intake session, during which eye contact is infrequent because the counsellor is writing. Counsellor A suggested that she would attempt to make more of an effort to

Table 8

Average Number and Percentage of Minimal Encourager
Responses Over All Sessions

	COUNSELLORS			
	A	B	C	D
# Minimal Encourager- Eye Contact (ME A)	84.8	126.2	141.8	34.3
# Minimal Encourager- No Eye Contact (ME B)	40.2	95.8	35.8	8.3
Percentage of ME A Responses	67.8	56.7	79.8	80.5
Percentage of ME B Responses	32.2	43.3	20.2	19.5
Percentage of Minimal Encourager Responses Overall	22	39.1	31.3	7.5

look at the client even during the assessment session. For Counsellor B, the Type B response did not decrease after each client's first session as this counsellor showed a consistent tendency to withdraw eye contact during simple agreement, acknowledgement and/or understanding responses. For Counsellor C and D's use of the Type B Minimal Encourager response was consistently infrequent. The Type A responses were the dominant response during every session except for one of Counsellor C's sessions. Both counsellors maintained eye contact when responding to their clients in terms of simple agreement, acknowledgement and/or understanding and infrequently withdrew their eye contact.

The second pair of verbal response categories examined involved the Closed and Open Questions. Table 9 shows the average number of questions and percentage of questions overall sessions for all counsellors. All four counsellors used more Closed than Open Questions overall. With respect to the number of questions asked, Counsellor A asked 73.3% of Closed Questions and 26.7% of Open Questions. Counsellor B asked 67.8% of Closed Questions and 32.2% of Open Questions. Counsellor C asked 79% of Closed Questions and 21% of Open Questions. Finally, Counsellor D asked 84.4% of Closed Questions and 15.6% of Open Questions. Counsellors A and B's results revealed that Closed Questions were more frequent than Open Questions during every session except for one; Counsellors C and D utilized more Closed than Open Questions in every one of their sessions. Generally, all four counsellors asked the most questions during a client's first session. This result makes intuitive sense because the first session is an intake session aimed at gathering data

Table 9

The Average Number of Questions and the Percentage of
Questions Over All Sessions For the Four Counsellors

	COUNSELLORS			
	A	B	C	D
# Closed Questions	33.2	51.7	46.2	30.3
# Open Questions	12.1	24.6	12.3	5.6
Percentage of Closed Questions	73.3	67.8	79	84.4
Percentage of Open Questions	26.7	32.2	21	15.6
Percentage of Questions Overall	21	35.3	27.1	16.6

about a client, which was the explanation provided by each counsellor. Questions and 15.6% of Open Questions. Counsellors A and B's results revealed that Closed Questions were more frequent than Open Questions during every session except for one; Counsellors C and D utilized more Closed than Open Questions in every one of their sessions. Generally, all four counsellors asked the most questions during a client's first session. This result makes intuitive sense because the first session is an intake session aimed at gathering data about a client, which was the explanation provided by each counsellor.

Subsequent discussions with the counsellors about the use of Closed and Open Questions provided interesting feedback. Counsellors A and C suggested that they like to use both types of questions but believed that they used more Open Questions which clearly was not the case. Counsellor C was accurate in suggesting that she asked more Closed Questions than Open Questions during session one. Counsellor A, however, claimed that she asked more Open Questions during session one when in fact, Closed Questions were dominant.

Counsellor B has a preference for Open Questions but attempts to have a balance of both Open and Closed Questions during counselling sessions. Clearly, Closed Questions were the dominant form of questioning. Counsellor B's explanation for the high frequency of Closed Questions when Open Questions are preferred, was that the nature of the assessment tools she utilized limits the type of questions to Closed ones. However, during the second sessions in which the assessment tools were not used Closed Questions still were more frequent.

Counsellor D conveyed the importance of using both Closed and Open Questions during counselling sessions. Furthermore, Counsellor D suggested that she used more Closed Questions during a client's first session and more Open Questions during later sessions. Closed Questions were in fact, more frequent during a client's first session; however, the frequency of Open Questions actually decreased after the first session rather than increased. Thus, Counsellor D was accurate with her perceptions about the use of Closed Questions but the use of Open questions was not as frequent as she believed.

The third pair of verbal categories examined included the Information and Direct Guidance responses. Direct Guidance is theoretically different in intent from Information in that Information is neutral and gives facts, whereas Direct Guidance tells the client to do something (Hill, 1978). Table 10 shows the average Direct Guidance and Information responses and the percentage of these responses over all sessions for the four counsellors. Overall, Counsellors A, B and D provided more Information than Direct Guidance responses. The percent of Information responses for the above three counsellors were 72.1%, 75.2% and 81.2%, with the percentages of the Direct Guidance responses being 27.9%, 24.8% and 18.8% respectively; whereas Counsellor C provided more Direct Guidance than Information responses with percentages of 53.4% and 46.6% respectively. Information was the dominant response during each of Counsellor A, B and D's sessions. They had similar views about providing Information and Direct Guidance to clients. Each one suggested that the primary role of a Leisure Counsellor is to maintain a neutral position by providing leisure Information to a client. The

Table 10

The Average Number of Direct Guidance and Information
Responses and the Percentages of the Two Responses Over All
Sessions

	COUNSELLORS			
	A	B	C	D
# Direct Guidance Responses	22.2	42.6	101.3	19.7
# Information Responses	57.5	129.5	88.5	85
Percentage of Direct Guidance	27.9	24.8	53.4	18.8
Percentage of Information	72.1	75.2	46.6	81.2
Overall Percentage of Direct Guidance and Information	14.6	31.5	34.7	19.2

counsellors also suggested that they would be willing to provide Direct Guidance to a client who may not be entirely motivated and requires an extra "push" to utilize Information; however, all three counsellors had a preference for providing clients with Information, which was indicative of their results.

Counsellor C's results indicated that Direct Guidance was a more frequent response than providing Information over all sessions and clients. An examination of the counsellors' individual sessions provided a slightly different perspective of the relationship between these two categories. Information responses were more frequent than the Direct Guidance responses during six of the nine sessions. Although, Counsellor C provided more Direct Guidance to her clients than neutral Information overall, Information was the dominant response in more than half of Counsellor C's sessions.

Interestingly, Counsellor C's perceptions of providing Information and Direct Guidance differed slightly from her actual verbal responses. Counsellor C also suggested that the primary role of Leisure Counsellors; however, she did not believe that it was appropriate to tell a client to do something, as one does with the Direct Guidance response. Direct Guidance occurred more frequently than the Information response overall, but Information was provided more frequently during a greater number of sessions than the Direct Guidance response. In essence, Counsellor C's views were comparable to her actual verbal responses. She consistently provided Information, however, Counsellor C consistently provided Direct Guidance to her clients as well, which she deemed inappropriate.

The fourth pair of verbal categories examined included the Approval/Reinforcement and Confrontation responses. Table 11 shows the average number of responses and percentage of responses over all sessions for the four counsellors. With respect to the four counsellors, the Approval/Reinforcement responses occurred more frequently than the Confrontation responses. The counsellors consistently provided emotional support to their clients rather than engaging in confrontations. The percentages clearly indicate that the Approval/Reinforcement responses were dominant.

Counsellors A, B and C had similar views about the importance of providing emotional support to clients. During discussions with the investigator, each of the three counsellors suggested that providing emotional support to clients was an important aspect of the counselling process. However, the counsellors views about providing emotional support differed from their actual Approval/Reinforcement verbal behaviors. The actual frequencies for the category were lower than any of the three counsellors expected. Each would have preferred a higher frequency for their respective Approval/Reinforcement category.

Counsellor D, on the other hand, negated the importance of providing emotional support to her clients. She maintained that providing Approval/Reinforcement responses was not an important aspect of the counselling process. Counsellor D's views about this category differed from her actual verbal behaviors in the sense that she engaged in Approval/Reinforcement responses frequently.

Table 11

The Average Number of Approval/Reinforcement and
Confrontation Responses and Percentage of Responses Over All
Sessions

	COUNSELLORS			
	A	B	C	D
# Approval/Reinforcement Responses	24.8	38.7	49.2	49.3
# Confrontation Responses	3.4	7.4	8.4	4.3
Percentage of Approval/Reinforcement Responses	87.9	83.9	85.4	92
Percentage of Confrontation Responses	12.1	16.1	14.6	8
Percentage of Approval/Reinforcement and Confrontation Responses Overall	15.2	24.9	31.1	28.9

The fifth pair of verbal categories compared included the Restatement and Reflection responses. Table 12 shows the average number of Restatement and Reflection responses and percentage of responses over all sessions for the four counsellors. Within every counsellors' sessions, Restatements were more frequent than Reflection responses. Restatements were consistently within the top most frequent categories for the four counsellors; whereas, Reflection responses were consistently among the most infrequent categories. Counsellors A and D's results revealed that Restatements occurred with the highest frequency during a client's first session, which corresponds to the highest frequency of questions being asked at this time as well. The four counsellors agreed with each other concerning the role of Restatements within the counselling process. Each advocated the use of Restatements as a positive tool during leisure counselling sessions.

Overall, the counsellors' results are comparable. They responded within the counselling sessions similarly while maintaining their individual styles. Leisure Awareness was the goal discussed most frequently within each counsellor's sessions; and Minimal Encourager responses dominated the verbal response categories.

Table 12

**The Average Number of Restatement and Reflection
Responses and Percentage of Responses Over All Sessions**

	COUNSELLORS			
	A	B	C	D
# Restatement Responses	26.5	60.3	55.7	16.3
# Reflection Responses	2.9	1.3	5.2	1.3
Percentage of Restatement Responses	90.1	97.9	91.5	92.6
Percentage of Reflection Responses	9.9	2.1	8.5	7.4
Percentage of Restatement and Reflection Responses Overall	17.3	36.3	35.9	10.4

Discussion

The inter-rater reliability estimates ranged from 82% to 88%, which was acceptable. One aspect of the study was to develop a methodology for conducting evaluation research of this nature. The reliability estimates indicated that the scoring system devised for the evaluation was effective and could be utilized in future studies. Perhaps, the reliability scores could have been higher with more training; however, due to the subjectivity of the scoring process, the inter-rater reliability scores were quite acceptable.

Program Goals

The results for the four counsellors may be combined to provide general conclusions about the goal related verbal behaviors of the counsellors during leisure counselling. It is important to note that Counsellors A and B discussed all five goals during the taping of their sessions; and Counsellors C and D discussed four of the five goals during taping, with the exception being Equipment Resources and Barriers respectively. Overall, the counsellor's goal discussions may reflect their adherence to and agreement with the program goals. This is a positive finding for the Leisure Counselling program because it reveals that the counsellors are corresponding to each other. With respect to the Equipment Resource and Barrier goals not being addressed by Counsellors C and D respectively, this may reflect their disagreement with the goal or perhaps, could reflect client needs. That is, their clients may not have required information about Equipment Resources or Barriers, therefore, these goals were not discussed. Counsellor C dealt solely with Chronic Pain Clients, whom generally do not require Equipment Resource information. Similarly,

Counsellor D only counselled one client and in accordance with the client's needs, the Barriers goal was not an issue. Hence, it may be premature for the investigator to convey Counsellors' C and D's disagreement with certain program goals based on the lack of discussion that occurred within their sessions.

Another issue which may be explained by client needs is the varying frequencies with which the goal related verbal behaviors occurred between each counsellor's sessions and clients. Each client required information about different goals during different sessions. Thus, the frequencies of goal related verbal behaviors between sessions and clients for each counsellor were not consistent. The varying frequencies of each goal may simply reflect the client's needs. Perhaps, through the use of a content analysis of the counselling sessions, one could determine what specific questions, for example, a counsellor was asked by each client. Certain questions could stimulate a Leisure Awareness response or a Barrier response. A content analysis may clarify whether or not the differences between the counsellors' discussions of goals were largely produced by client needs as reflected in their questions.

With respect to the goal appropriateness questionnaire, the lowest rating over all counsellors was four. The range of responses was consistently between four and seven, with the counsellors' ratings of each goals' appropriateness varying slightly. The counsellors agree that the program goals were appropriate; however, they each had a different perspective about the level of each goals' appropriateness. In essence, the counsellors are following the goals that constitute the recreation program, each to a varying degree. In

accordance with their appropriateness ratings, there appears to be some discrepancy between each counsellors views and their actual goal related verbal behaviors.

Interestingly, Leisure Awareness was not chosen by any of the counsellors as the most appropriate goal, and yet was the goal most frequently discussed during each counsellor's sessions. This finding requires further investigation to discover a possible explanation for the result. Perhaps, there are inconsistencies between the counsellors' beliefs and their actual verbal behaviors; or it may just be easier to discuss one goal than another goal. For example, overcoming a Barrier may be accomplished by simply providing a phone number to a client for Para Transpo, whereas Leisure Awareness would require more in depth discussions since it contains many more surrounding issues. Another possible explanation for the differing frequencies of goal statements involves the issue of client needs. The client sample may have required information about issues concerning Leisure Awareness more so than other goals. For example, motivational issues may have been an obstacle for the particular client sample utilized within this evaluation. Nevertheless, the counsellors perceptions are clearly different from their actual verbal behaviors. Thus, further feedback to each counsellor regarding all their data in the study including goal behaviors, questionnaire responses, and the verbal response categories is required. Also, the counsellors need to understand completely how their verbal behaviors were scored. This data may assist the counsellors to fully appreciate what, in fact, they do during leisure counseling sessions. Once each counsellor has an appreciation of the nature of their

results and of the evaluation, they may wish to alter some of their verbal behaviors. Finally, a reassessment of their views about each goal may also be necessary. The feedback process is an important aspect of the evaluation procedure and is necessary to promote change within the leisure counselling sessions and the program itself.

Verbal Response Categories

Bolton's (1974) study involving the Three Verbal Interaction Styles of Rehabilitation Counsellors used a similar approach to the present investigation. The purpose of Bolton's study was to delineate patterns of verbal interview behavior in a national sample of rehabilitation counsellors. The three interaction styles were: (a) information providers, who provide general administrative information, specific details about services, and information tailored to the client's needs; (b) therapeutic counsellors, who listen, explore, reflect, and provide support to their clients; and (c) information exchangers, who solicit information from clients, provide educational and occupational information, discuss various topics and offer advice. The results from the present investigation may be compared to Bolton's work.

In accordance with the results of the verbal responses, the three interaction styles may be applicable to the present investigation. Because the Verbal Response Category System utilized in the present investigation did not differentiate between the two types of information responses as did Bolton's work, the conclusions are limited. Nevertheless, the counsellors engaged in more "information" than "therapeutic" responses overall. Each counsellor may be categorized as an Information Provider/Exchanger, as the

frequency of the Information response was in the five most frequent verbal responses for each counsellor. Each counsellor provided information to their clients which combined the two interaction styles of Information Provider and Exchanger as determined by Bolton.

The counsellors may also be classified as Therapeutic Counsellors, but to a lesser degree than the Information types. The Approval/Reinforcement category most clearly mimic the therapeutic counsellor definition. Counsellors A, B and C's results revealed that the Approval/Reinforcement category did not occur within the five most frequent responses. Counsellor D, however, provided Approval/Reinforcement responses with the second highest frequency overall categories; therefore, in relation to the other counsellors, Counsellor D may be regarded as a Therapeutic Counsellor.

The results of this study can be related to another study conducted previously. Hill (1978) designed the Verbal Response Category System utilized within the current evaluation. The categories were useful for the evaluation in terms of providing a way of categorizing the counsellors' verbal statements. The present study focused on leisure counselling which differed from Hill's study which focused on psychotherapy. The Verbal Response Category System was designed for counselling sessions involving psychotherapy and some of the categories were not as applicable to the leisure counselling sessions. For example, Hill notes that the Interpretation and Confrontation categories are primary tools of psychoanalysis, which was one of the theoretical orientations of the counsellors in

that study. During the present study, the frequencies of these two categories were low and inconsistent between counsellors and sessions. Therefore, future evaluations utilizing Hill's system may consider eliminating certain categories that are not applicable to leisure counselling.

With respect to Hill's study, the measure of counsellor verbal activity was obtained by counting the number of counsellor responses per third of each session. Thus, each session was divided into three equal time segments and the frequencies were calculated for each category and comparisons were made between the results of each third. The present investigation followed the procedure of dividing each counsellor's sessions into three equal time parts and drawing comparisons between each segment and overall sessions. The procedure was useful. It provided information to the investigator that each third was more or less the same and thus, there was no need to look at the separate parts. Calculating the frequencies for each category over each session was a more practical and useful approach.

The present evaluation's results of the Verbal Response Category System indicate that there was consistency between the counsellors. The consistency existed in terms of the seven categories that appeared most frequently over all counsellors. The seven categories included: Minimal Encourager Type A and B responses, Closed Questions, Information, Direct Guidance, Approval/Reinforcement, and Restatements. These seven categories appeared in each counsellors' profile; however, the order with which the categories appear differed for each counsellor (see Figures 2, 4, 6,

8). There was one exception with Counsellor D's results in which the Minimal Encourager Type B response did not occur within the seven most frequent responses, whereas Self-Disclosure did.

There are two findings that require some discussion. First, the counsellors may wish to reflect upon their use of the Minimal Encourager Type B response which involved simple agreement, acknowledgement, and or understanding without eye contact. All counsellors engaged in this response, each with a different frequency however. Nevertheless, maintaining eye contact did not always occur. The counsellors emphasized that during intake sessions, they are writing down client information which may account for these results. This is a valid explanation. Perhaps, the counsellors should attempt to maximize their eye contact as it may convey a less positive message to their clients when eye contact is minimal.

The second finding involved the Nonverbal Referent response. This response was consistently not utilized by the counsellors. They all provided a similar reason for not utilizing the response. The reason was that as Leisure Counsellors they are encouraged not to discuss or make reference to a client's disability and they all behaved in the same manner and thus, this category may well be deleted from future studies.

With respect to the paired categories, the importance of these data can be illustrated with each pair. First, the Minimal Encourager responses reflect the counsellors' use of eye contact. Eye contact is an important element during the counselling process as it helps reveal a counsellors' attentiveness to a client. The counsellors maintenance of eye contact during this investigation was consistent and withdrawing

eye contact appeared to occur when a counsellor was recording information.

The second pair of verbal response categories which included the Open and Closed Questions, revealed that Closed Questions were dominant form of questioning for all counsellors. Perhaps, Closed Questions are a more impersonal method of questioning clients. Open Questions may permit clients to feel comfortable discussing their concerns more freely, which is an important aspect of the counselling process. The Information and Direct Guidance responses which comprised the third pair, revealed whether or not a counsellor maintained a neutral position or a more directive approach with their clients. Consistently, a neutral position was maintained with the directive approach surfacing when a client required an extra "push" into action. The effectiveness of providing leisure Information in a neutral manner has yet to be demonstrated, and perhaps a more directive approach is necessary within the leisure counselling domain. Future research may help to determine an effective approach for leisure counsellors.

The fourth pair of responses, the Approval/Reinforcement and Confrontation responses, revealed that the counsellors consistently engaged in more supportive responses than negative ones. The importance of providing emotional support to clients cannot be negated. It is a necessary aspect of the counselling process. Although the counsellors utilized more supportive responses than Confrontation responses, the Approval/Reinforcement response could have occurred with a greater frequency in conjunction with the comments of the counsellors. Finally, the Restatement and Reflection

responses indicated that Restatements were consistently used by all four counsellors, whereas Reflections were consistently not used. Restatements are a positive tool that counsellors may incorporate within their sessions. Restatements convey to clients that counsellors are attentive, listening as well as understanding the nature of the clients concerns or responses. ..

Overall, the results for the verbal responses revealed that each counsellor had her own style of responding to clients. In relation to the goals, the counsellors seemed to be conforming to the program goals as all the goals were discussed with varying frequencies during the course of taping. Hence, the counsellors are following the program format, while maintaining their own styles of communication with the clients. There are two issues that these results bring forth. First, it should be recognized that counsellors were able to conduct their sessions differently within their own styles while managing to implement the program goals. Second, it may be important to match counselling styles with client variables to achieve the optimal chance for successful counselling relationships.

Usefulness of Study

There were several useful aspects of the present evaluation in terms of the knowledge it provided about the methodology and the counselling program itself. The methodology utilized within the evaluation proved to be a useful approach. First, the instruments used complimented one another and each was necessary to fully appreciate the manner with which the counsellors verbally behaved during their sessions. The program's goals list provided information about the general content of the leisure counselling sessions. The

investigator was able to determine how each counsellor responded within the confines of the program as determined by the program goals. Because the counsellors are encouraged to follow the program's goals list while providing leisure counselling services, utilizing the list was useful for understanding the extent to which each counsellor complied.

The second instrument utilized for the evaluation was the Verbal Response Category System which also proved to be useful. This tool provided an understanding about the nature of the counsellors' interaction with clients, as well as the nature of each counsellor's counselling style. Although the Verbal Response Category System was designed for more of a psychotherapy orientation than a leisure counselling one, it was still a useful tool. Because some of the categories did not directly apply to leisure counselling the investigator would recommend eliminating these categories, resulting with a more efficient response system for future studies. Hence, the response system was useful for the present investigation and will become even more compatible with evaluating leisure counselling programs in the future through the elimination of irrelevant categories.

The final instrument used was the questionnaire, which was useful. It provided interesting information about the similarities and differences between each counsellor's views about the program goals and their actual goal related verbal behaviors. The information provided by the questionnaire was not as abundant as the information provided by the other measures; however, it was still

necessary in order to understand how the counsellors viewed the appropriateness of each goal.

Another useful aspect of the study related to the methodology was the feedback session between the investigator and each counsellor. In general, the counsellors appreciated the individual feedback and took an active role in understanding their results. Feedback about the goal statements allowed each counsellor to recognize how frequently each goal was addressed during her sessions. Likewise, feedback about the verbal response categories was useful because it provided each counsellor with insight into her style of counselling and it enabled each counsellor to understand how she responded to clients. Knowing whether or not one is maintaining eye contact for example, or providing emotional support is important. The feedback session may be regarded as an important first step for any changes the counsellor deems necessary. Providing feedback to the counsellors was a useful aspect of this study and should be an important part of any evaluation.

Not only was the evaluation useful for providing information about the methodology utilized, it was also useful for providing information about the leisure counselling program itself. The investigation was fundamental for increasing awareness about the similarities and differences between the counsellors' verbal behaviors. It was beneficial for the program to understand and appreciate the manner with which those responsible for providing the program, were different and similar in their approach to leisure counselling. This information will strengthen the program because it will allow for alterations of program aspects that the department

21 of/de 2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NE S 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION^{SM} RESOLUTION TARGETS

PIONEERS IN METHYLENE BLUE TESTING SINCE 1974

METED

1000 COUNTY ROAD 6, BURNING WOOD, OH 44027 USA
TEL: 414 485 7807 FAX: 414 485 7807 TLA 848585485

deems necessary, as well as maintaining aspects of the program that are functioning effectively. The information provided by the evaluation was necessary to further develop the program.

First, the evaluation allowed the counsellors to assess their views about the program goals. Based on the information concerning the questionnaire and actual goal statements, the counsellors' views differed from their actual goal statements for reasons that require further investigation. These differences have ramifications for the program's functioning in terms of what can be expected from the counsellors. The program goals list, designed by the Recreation Department, represented important issues people with physical challenges experience, which are the responsibility of Leisure Counselling. The counsellors need to understand these differences so that they can assess whether or not the content of their leisure counselling sessions should be modified in order to accommodate the program goals.

A second beneficial aspect the evaluation allows is the ability of the Recreation Department to reassess their program goals. The evaluation provided feedback to the department about the discussions of the goals during each counsellor's sessions. Based on each counsellor's perceptions of the goals, and their knowledge of each goals' feasibility in relation to client needs, the goals list may require modifications. Any modifications the counsellors and department can agree on will strengthen the program because the counsellors may be more inclined to follow the goals counselling sessions. Counsellor agreement with program goals is necessary in order for them to maintain a willingness to discuss program goals

with clients. Counsellor agreement with goals will facilitate cohesion to the program as determined by the Recreation Department. In conjunction with the findings of the evaluation, the counsellors' perceptions of the goals are somewhat different and warrant further investigation.

Overall, the usefulness of the process evaluation is with the feedback provided to the counsellors and to the Recreation Department. The feedback described the frequencies with which the program goals were addressed by each counsellor; the manner with which the counsellors respond to their clients; their perceptions of the appropriateness of the goals; and their beliefs about the appropriateness of their verbal responses to clients. The information provides the Recreation Department with the impetus for change in terms of being able to determine what differences and similarities between the counsellors are acceptable and not acceptable. Similarly, adjustments can be made to the program goals list. Another useful aspect the evaluation provides is that it enables the counsellors to determine for themselves which aspects of their counselling verbal behaviors they deem acceptable and which aspects they find necessary to change. Increased awareness into one's behavior is the first step for change.

Limitations of the Study

There are aspects of the study which limit the conclusions. First, utilizing more than four counsellors in the evaluation would have provided more viable conclusions. It may be argued that four was the maximum number of counsellors available, which for this study was true. Perhaps incorporating counsellors from other

programs, for example, would have increased the total sample size. However, this evaluation has led to the development of a methodology that can be used for analyzing the content of leisure counselling sessions. Future studies may be conducted in other settings which may follow the present procedure.

Second, the present investigation contained female counsellors only. An Honors thesis conducted in conjunction with the present evaluation, examined whether or not the sex of a client had an impact on counselling styles. Sex of client was found to be a nonsignificant factor, at least with female counsellors. Nevertheless, the inclusion of male subjects would have provided alternative ways of dealing with the data. For example, one would be able to determine if any sex differences existed in terms of counsellors' goal and verbal response statements. There may have been more options for examining and providing feedback to the Recreation Department if male counsellors were utilized.

The final limitation involves the counsellors' use of the Medical Model. The orientation to the Medical Model is apparent due to the counsellors' domination of the discussions during the counselling sessions. The lack of two way interaction during each counsellors' sessions revealed their adherence to this model. Prior to any evaluation efforts aimed at outcome research, the efficacy of the Medical Model as an approach for leisure counsellors, should be demonstrated.

Suggestions For Future Research

The present investigation was the first study among many possible evaluations. This process evaluation provided the basis for

future research because it is now understood how each leisure counsellor functions within the confines of the program. The knowledge provided by the process evaluation was considered the first step to the complete evaluation of the leisure counselling program within the Recreation Department at the Royal Ottawa Hospital. There are several suggestions for future research.

First, a content analysis is currently being conducted to further understand the nature of the leisure counselling process. A content analysis will enable one to determine not only how counsellors respond to their clients, as with the present investigation, but would also determine what the counsellors are saying to their clients and what the clients are saying to their counsellor. A content analysis would help provide possible explanations for the varying frequencies of goal statements; or an explanation for why a counsellor responds to her client in terms of Direct Guidance rather than simply providing Information. A content analysis would contribute to the information provided by the present investigation.

Similarly, the second suggestion for future research involves examining other variables that are part of the counselling process. Additional variables may include counsellor intentions, personality, and nonverbal behaviors which all need to be examined in conjunction with counsellor verbal behaviors to fully appreciate the role and style of counsellors' behavior.

A third suggestion for future research involves conducting process evaluations that examine counsellors' behavior during counselling sessions with different disability groups. There is the issue concerning whether or not counsellors' behavior changes in

relation to the particular type of disability a client exhibits. It would be interesting and beneficial for counsellors to understand any behavioral changes they experience depending on the disability of their client. Increased awareness would lead counsellors to determine the appropriateness of treating people with certain disabilities differently. Perhaps, it is appropriate to deal with disability groups differently; however, it is necessary to know whether or not counsellors are behaving differently during counselling sessions in relation to their client's disability.

A fourth suggestion for future research includes evaluating the impact leisure counsellors have on clients way of life. It is important to know that the counsellors are counselling within the confines of the program, which the present investigation conveys. However, one cannot assume that just because the counsellor are following program goals, that clients are affected by leisure counselling. Impact studies are important to determine any client lifestyle changes as a result of their participation in the leisure counselling program. Perhaps, the next study may involve a phone call to clients to assess any behavioral leisure changes. Client impact evaluations would logically follow the process evaluation that was conducted in the present study to fully understand and evaluate the leisure counselling program.

Other aspects of client behavior that may be measured in conjunction with the counsellor variables in relation to the counselling process include client verbal and nonverbal behaviors, personality variables, and as stated previously, type of disability. Because the present investigation's focus was counsellor verbal

behavior, the incorporation of client variables to assess the impact of leisure counselling would promote more viable conclusions to be drawn about the services provided by leisure counsellors. Examining possible interactions between counsellor and client behaviors and variables, would enable investigators to understand what types of counsellors working with what types of clients effect what types of outcomes. This information would be clearly beneficial for understanding the dynamics associated with the leisure counselling process and perhaps promote the ultimate leisure resources for people with physical challenges.

References

- Acuff, S. H. (1966). Recreational Counselling as an Aspect of Programming for the Short Term Psychiatric Patient. Recreation in Treatment Centers (Vol. 5). Washington, DC: A.P.R.S.
- Adams, R. C., Daniel, A. N., McCubbin, J. A., & Rullman, L. (1982). Games, Sports and Exercises for the Physically Handicapped (3rd ed.). Philadelphia, USA: Lea & Febiger.
- Amoroso, K., Fisher, R., Kent, A., Pasquine, L., & Rubin, C. (1977). Leisure Education: A Rehabilitation Necessity. In G. S. Fain & G. L. Hitzhusen (Eds.), Therapeutic Recreation: State of the Art. The National Recreation and Park Association.
- Appleford, B. & Ryan, T. J. (1977). An Examination of Social Processes in the preschool. The Journal of Early Childhood Education, 2(1), 1-9.
- Berven, N. L., & Scofield, M. E. (1980). Evaluation of Professional Competence Through Standardized Simulations: A Review. Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin, 24, 178-202.
- Bolton, B. (1974a). Three Verbal Interaction Styles of Rehabilitation Counsellors. Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin, 18, 34-40.
- Bolton, B., & Rubin, S. E. (1974b). A Research Model for Rehabilitation Counsellor Performance. Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin, 18, 141-148.
- Brannan, S. A., Chinn, K. B., & Verhoven, P. J. (1981). What is Leisure Education?... A Primer for Persons Working With Handicapped Children and Youth. Washington, DC: Hawkins & Associates.

- Chelimsky, E. (1985). Comparing and Contrasting, Auditing and Evaluation. Evaluation Review, 9(4), 483-503.
- Curtis, J. E. (1979). Recreation: Theory and Practice. London, England: C. V. Mosby.
- DiLorenzo, T. M., Prue, D. M., & Scott, R. R. (1987). A Conceptual Critique of Leisure Assessment and Therapy: An Added Dimension to Behavioral Medicine and Substance Abuse Treatment. Clinical Psychology Review, 7(6), 597-609.
- Dixon, J. T. (1980). The Role of Evaluation in Therapeutic Recreation Service. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 51(8), 48-49.
- Durkin, R. P., & Durkin, A. B. (1975). Evaluating Residential Treatment Programs for Disturbed Children. In M. Guttentag & E. L. Struening (Eds.) Handbook of Evaluation Research (Vol.2). London: Sage Publications.
- Edwards, W., Guttentag, M., & Snapper, K. (1975). A Decision-Theoretic Approach to Evaluation Research. In M. Guttentag & E. L. Struening (Eds.) Handbook of Evaluation Research (Vol.1). London: Sage Publications.
- Epperson, A., Witt, P. A., & Hitzhusen, G. (1977). Leisure Counselling: An Aspect of Leisure Education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Ezrin, S. A. (1977). The Goals-Guide-Behaviors Evaluation Strategy: A Formative Evaluation Plan for Teachers of Early Childhood Education Programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University. Ottawa.

- Gibbons, J. D. (1985). Nonparametric Methods for Quantitative Analysis. (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: American Sciences Press.
- Grant, J., & Grant, D. J. (1975). Evaluation of New Careers Programs. In M. Guttentag & E. L. Struening (Eds.) Handbook of Evaluation Research (Vol. 2). London: Sage Publications.
- Gunn, S. L., & Peterson, C. A. (1978). Therapeutic Recreation Design: Principles and Procedures. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in Research and Evaluation (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Edits Publishers.
- Johnson, G. H. (1970). The Purpose of Evaluation and the Role of the Evaluator. Evaluative Research: Strategies and Methods. American Institutes for Research.
- Kaplan, M. (1975). Leisure Theory and Policy. New York: Wiley.
- Keene, K., & Stewart, N. R. (1989). Evaluation: Rx for Counselling Program Growth. The School Counsellor, 37, 62-66.
- Kraus, R. (1978). Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society (2nd ed.). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
- Kraus, R. (1977). Recreation Today: Program Planning and Leadership (2nd ed.). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
- Kunce, J. T., & Derrieux, G. A. (1984). Evaluating Rehabilitation Counsellor Effectiveness. In W. G. Emener, A. Patrick & D. K. Hollingsworth (Eds.). Critical Issues in Rehabilitation Counselling. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Lee, L. J., & Sampson, J. F. (1990). A Practical Approach To Program Evaluation. Evaluation and Program Planning, 13, 157-164.

- Moffitt, A. R. & Ryan, T. J. (1975). Schools Without Curricula: Evaluation of Some Early Childhood Programs. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 7(4), 429-445.
- Nesbitt, J. A. (1977). The Benefits of Leisure Service and Participation to People Who Are Handicapped. In G. S. Fain & G. L. Hitzhusen (Eds.), Therapeutic Recreation: State of the Art. National Recreation and Park Association.
- Neulinger, J. (1974). The Psychology of Leisure: Research Approaches to the Study of Leisure. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1975). The Study of Change in Evaluation Research. In M. Guttentag & E. L. Struening (Eds.) Handbook of Evaluation Research (Vol. 1). London: Sage Publications.
- O'Morrow, G. S. (1970). Recreation Counseling- A Challenge to Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation Literature, 31, 226-233.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. London: Sage Publications.
- Rossi, P. H., & Freeman, H. E. (1989). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (4th ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Rutman, L. (1980). Planning Useful Evaluations: Evaluability Assessment (Vol. 96). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ryan, T. J. & Moffitt, A. R. (1974).. Evaluation of Preschool Programs. Canadian Psychologist, 15, 205-219.
- Scofield, M. E., & Yoxtheimer, L. L. (1983). Psychometric Issues in the Assessment of Clinical Competencies. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 30(3), 413-420.

- Shivers, J. S. (1963). Leadership in Recreational Service. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Simpson, R. H. (1966). Teacher Self-Evaluation. New York: Macmillan.
- Sjoberg, G. (1975). Politics, Ethics and Evaluation Research. In M. Guttentag & E. L. Struening (Eds.) Handbook of Evaluation Research (Vol. 2). London: Sage Publications.
- Smith, M. E. (1987). A Guide to the Use of Simple Process Measures. Evaluation and Program Planning, 10, 219-225.
- Struening, E. L. (1975). Social Area Analysis as a Method of Evaluation. In M. Guttentag & E. L. Struening (Eds.) Handbook of Evaluation Research (Vol. 1). London: Sage Publications.
- Tinsley, E. A., & Tinsley, D. J. (1982). A Holistic Model of Leisure Counselling. Journal of Leisure Research, 2nd Quarter, 100-116.
- Twain, D. (1975). Developing and Implementing a Research Strategy. In M. Guttentag & E. L. Struening (Eds.) Handbook of Evaluation Research (Vol. 1). London: Sage Publications.
- Witt, P. A., Ellis, G., & Niles, S. H. (1984). Leisure Counselling with Special Populations. In D. Thomas (Ed.), Leisure Counselling: Concepts and Applications. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Zigler, E. F., & Finn-Stevenson, M. (1988). Applied Developmental Psychology. In M. H. Bornstein & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), Developmental Psychology: An Advanced Textbook (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Zoerink, D. A. (1988). Effects of a Short-Term Leisure Education Program Upon the Leisure Functioning of Young People with Spina Bifida. Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 3rd Quarter, 44-52.

Appendix A

Counsellor Verbal Response Category System

The following is a counsellor verbal response category system, as adopted from Hill (1978), which classifies the verbal statements of counsellors into particular verbal response categories. For the purposes of this evaluation, the investigators added the categories of Minimal Encourager Type A and B, and a Listen category. Acronyms that were used for the verbal responses throughout the evaluation appear in brackets. Examples of various verbal responses, as decided by the investigators, are given where appropriate.

Counsellor Response System

- 1. Minimal Encourager Type A (ME-A):** This consists of a short phrase that indicates simple agreement, acknowledgement, and/or understanding. It encourages but does not request the client to continue talking; it does not imply approval or disapproval. It may be a repetition of key word(s) and does not include responses to questions (see Information). The Type A response occurs when the counsellor is looking directly at the client and maintaining eye contact. Examples include such remarks as: "Exactly", "Oh really!", "Okay", "Yes", "That's nice", "It's true", "That's right", and the like.
- 2. Minimal Encourager Type B (ME-B):** This category is the same as the above category, except that the counsellor is not looking at the client and eye contact is not being maintained.

- 3. Approval/Reinforcement:** This provides emotional support, approval, or reinforcement. It may imply sympathy or tend to alleviate anxiety by minimizing client's problems.
- 4. Information:** This supplies information in the form of data, facts, resources, theory, and the like. It may be information specifically related to the counselling process, counsellor's behavior or arrangement (time, place, fee, etc.). It may answer direct questions but does not include directions for what the client should do (see Direct Guidance).
- 5. Direct Guidance:** This consists of directions or advice that the counsellor suggests for the client, or for the client and counsellor together, either within or outside the counselling session. It is not aimed at soliciting verbal material from the client (see Closed or Open Questions).
- 6. Closed Question:** This is a data-gathering inquiry that request a one or two word answer, a yes or no, or a confirmation of the counsellor's previous statement. The possible client responses to this type of inquiry are typically limited and specific. If statements are phrased in the form of a closed question but meet the criteria for another category, they should be put in the other category.
- 7. Open Question:** A probe requests a clarification of feelings or an exploration of the situation without purposely limiting the nature of the response to a yes or no, or a one or two word response. If statements are phrased in the form of an open question but meet the criteria for another category, they should be put in the other category.

8. Restatements: this is a simple repeating or rephrasing of the client's statement(s) (not necessarily just the immediately preceding statements). It typically contains fewer but similar words and is more concrete and clear than the client's message. It may be phrased either tentatively or as a statement.

9. Reflection: This is a repeating or rephrasing of the client's statement(s) (not necessarily just the immediately preceding statements). It must contain references to stated or implied feelings. It may be based on previous statements, nonverbal behavior, or knowledge of the total situation. It may be phrased either tentatively or as a statement.

10. Nonverbal Referent: This points out or inquires about aspects of the client's nonverbal behavior, for example, body posture, voice tone or level, facial expressions, gestures, and so on. It does not interpret the meaning of these behaviors.

11. Interpretation: This goes beyond what the client has overtly recognized. It might take one of several forms: It might establish connections between seemingly isolated events or statements; it interprets defenses, feelings, resistance, transference (the interpersonal relationship between the counsellor and the client); it might indicate themes, patterns, or causal relationships in the client's behavior or personality. It usually gives alternative meanings for old behavior or issues. If a statement also meets the criteria for a confrontation, it should be put in confrontation.

12. Confrontation: This contains two parts: The first may be implied rather than stated and refers to some aspect of the client's message or behavior; the second part usually begins with a "but" and

presents a discrepancy. This contradiction or discrepancy may be between words and behavior, between two things the client has stated, between behavior and action, between real and ideal self, between verbal and nonverbal behavior, between fantasy and reality, or between the counsellor's and the client's perceptions.

13. Self-Disclosure: This usually begins with an "I"; the counsellor shares his or her own personal experiences and feelings with the client. Note that not all statements that begin with an "I" are self-disclosure; it must have a quality of sharing or disclosing.

14. Silence: A pause of five seconds is considered the counsellor's pause if it occurs between a client's statement and a counsellor's statement or within the client's statement (except after a simple acceptance of the counsellor's statement, e.g., "yes", pause).

15. Listen: During a 15 second interval, the counsellor is not talking, but simply listening to the client talk.

16. Other: These include statements that are unrelated to the client's problems, such as small talk or salutations, comments about the weather or events; disapproval or criticism of the client; or statements that do not fit into any other category or are unclassifiable due to difficulties in transcription, comprehension, or incompleteness.

Note. From "Development of a Counsellor Verbal Response Category System" by C. E. Hill, 1978, Journal of Counselling Psychology, 25, p. 467.

As adapted from Hill (1978).

END

2/7 05 193

FIN