Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

5-1971

Continuance vs. Discontinuance in Family Counseling

Katherine Anderson
Portland State University

Alice Dudley
Portland State University

Mayetta Rocks
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Counseling Psychology Commons](#), [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Katherine; Dudley, Alice; and Rocks, Mayetta, "Continuance vs. Discontinuance in Family Counseling" (1971). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1455.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1454>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

CONTINUANCE VS. DISCONTINUANCE
IN FAMILY COUNSELING

by

Katherine Anderson

Alice Dudley

Mayetta Rocks

Consultant Committee:

Dr. A. Emlen

Mrs. C. McKinney

Dr. G. Pinamonti

Portland State University

School of Social Work

May, 1971

CONTINUANCE VS. DISCONTINUANCE IN FAMILY COUNSELING

Objectives

The study was designed to examine the socialworkers' and clients' perceptions of change in the treatment process; specifically, to examine the question of why clients discontinue service prior to planful termination. Also, the authors attempted to assess the client's perception of gain and the worker's assessment of gain.

Significant Findings

1. Seventy-two per cent of the clients who responded to the questionnaire felt they had been helped. In those cases where the client indicated he had received no help or that his situation became worse, the authors found that the client often indicated that his spouse was unable or unwilling to participate in treatment. These clients also often indicated that they had divorced.
2. The client tended to rate the gains he made from treatment slightly higher than the worker rated them.
3. The inability or unwillingness of the spouse to participate in the treatment process was seen as an important reason for discontinuance before six interviews were completed.
4. The client seemed more likely to indicate fee as a reason for termination of service after six interviews.
5. Clients who paid no fee were more likely to terminate in an unplanned manner before six interviews. If the client paid any fee, his termination was more likely to be planful.

Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Research

1. The authors recommend that workers indicate clearly on the statistical cards which members of the family were seen in order to facilitate and expedite data gathering.
2. The statistical cards ;give assessment of service in terms of gain only. The authors recommend that because service is not always gainful, that there be a place on the statistical card to so indicate this. The situation may be so deteriorated that in the worker's assessment there is no ability on the part of the client for motivation, capacity and opportunity for change.
3. On the basis of the data derived from the questionnaire, the authors recommend that further exploratory study be done in the following areas:
 - a. In the cases where the spouse is unable or unwilling to participate in the treatment process.
 - b. In the cases where the clients who paid no fee were more likely to terminate unplanned and before six interviews.
4. The authors recommend, as in the study done by Dr. Dan Jennings, that any questionnaire mailed out by the agency in the future be a more immediate follow-up to treatment, that is, there is a need for further exploration of the optimum time for follow-up study. A future questionnaire might be returned to the individual practitioner so that he could evaluate the service. Also a planned follow-up of this sort might result in the practitioner reaching out to the client to re-involve him in the treatment process if the client so indicated the need on the returned questionnaire.

5. Findings in this study showed that the critical period for clients continuance seems to be within the first five interviews. The authors recommend that further exploratory study be done on this critical period of treatment.

INTRODUCTION

In a period of management by objectives, financial retrenchments, concern for greater efficiency in use of staff and evaluation of efficacy of social work services, agency boards, executives and staff are asking many questions such as: are our agency services meeting the needs of our clients; do the families we attempt to help actually change; to what extent; in what ways? Further, is there congruence between the workers' assessment of change and the clients' perception of the help they receive?

Corresponding inquiries are coming from other segments of the community, planning councils, findings bodies and governmental sources responsible for allocating and distributing the community resources. Therefore, accountability becomes an important factor. The main question becomes, are the needs of the community being met in the best possible manner? Again, this relates directly to the desire of the social work profession to upgrade practice in accordance with the changing times. Consequently, there is a pressing need for evaluation of service from the standpoint of those who serve and those who receive service.

Research in social work has frequently been focused upon an examination of the efficacy of social work help. For example, in "Continuance in Casework and Other Helping Relationships: A Review of Current Research," (Levinger, 1960) the authors found that continuance seems to be a function of numerous variables having to do with the clients' attributes and environment and the workers' attributes and environment. A corollary interest has been in the question of why the clients

discontinue service. For example, factors in discontinuancy of service in "Some Theoretical and Practical Problems in Evaluating Effectiveness of Counseling," (Ballard and Mudd, 1957) the authors found that there were discrepancies between the client's view and the worker's view of change in the counseling process.

In Portland, The Family Counseling Service Agency has had a continuing interest in the effectiveness of treatment. In 1970, the agency employed Dr. Jennings of the Portland State University School of Social Work to conduct a limited study in this subject.

As students placed in Family Counseling Service for field work, the authors were interested in fulfilling their research requirement in their field agency. The executive director and field instructors were queried regarding possible research topics and once again the subject of discontinuance was introduced.

METHODOLOGY

In the Family Counseling Service Agency of Portland the problem most often presented by the client is categorized as marital (as opposed to total family or parent-child problems). Consequently, the authors decided to limit the study of continuance vs. discontinuance to this category. Uniformly, a worker evaluated a case at termination. The statistical card is the tool by which this task is accomplished. The nature of the study called for the use of completed records and as this study was undertaken in 1970, the authors used the completed statistical cards on marital cases from the year 1969 representing the total tri-county area (Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah counties). The total population consisted of 283 completed cases.

The statistical cards (see appendix) are an important source for collection of data. The statistical card gives factual data about family members (age, sex, income, etc.), factual information about service, and also documents an evaluation of service as seen by the worker. The evaluation of service actually consists of (1) the worker's judgment as to whether or not service was terminated by casework plan or whether the family withdrew or terminated service in an unplanned manner, and (2) the worker's assessment of client gain.

In this study, therefore, continuance is defined as a planned completion of service, that is, termination of service is made by mutual decision between worker and client regardless of the number of interviews. Conversely, discontinuance is defined as unplanned termination of service, that is, the client, by his own decision, withdrew from

service (often for reasons unknown to the worker).

The worker in assessing client change is allowed to indicate on the statistical card the following choices:

1. substantial gain
2. moderate gain
3. slight gain
4. no change
5. unable to determine

Thus the worker has two judgmental decisions to make: 1) regarding planfulness, and 2) regarding client gain. The authors attempt in this study to relate these two judgmental decisions to factual information about the number of in-person interviews the worker has had with the client. The attempt was to explore the interrelationships between the three factors: planfulness, gain, and number of interviews.

In analyzing the cards, the authors accepted the worker's statements that the client's identified problem was marital as well as the number of in-person interviews indicated on the card by the worker in the categories such as: one interview, two to five interviews, six or more interviews. The authors eliminated any contacts that were by telephone or correspondence only and/or collateral contacts; because the study was focused on the relationship between planfulness, gain, and the number of in-person interviews between client and worker.

After presenting the findings derived from the initial investigation of the statistical cards to the Family Counseling Agency, the authors thought that a further study should be made which would compare the data showing the worker's assessment of client change in relation to the three selected variables, number of interviews, planfulness and gain, and the

client's assessment of change. More specifically, the authors wanted to know whether or not the client saw termination as a joint decision between himself and the worker or did he withdraw on his own, and if so, for what reason? Also, they wished to know whether or not the client perceived change in terms of gain, and whether or not there was a relationship between the number of interviews and the client's perception of planfulness and gain? Finally, did the client's assessment agree or disagree with the worker's assessment?

In devising an effective instrument for gathering the necessary data several factors became important - namely, time, cost, and procedure involved in contacting clients. The study had to be originated and completed within a six week time period and costs had to be kept to a bare minimum. Consequently, this ruled out any in-person interviews.

In the prior study done for the agency in 1970, "Planned Short Term Treatment Project Follow-up Study" by Dr. Dan Jennings (1970), it was shown that the population under consideration was highly mobile and transient. The authors decided to use the entire population of 283 marital cases for the collection of data so that they could gather a fuller return in each category than could be anticipated by random sampling procedures. Therefore, a simple mail-out questionnaire seemed the most appropriate instrument to use. It was immediately realized because of the time and the minimal financial resources that any consideration of a follow-up procedure of those questionnaires not returned within the time limit was an impossibility.

In designing the questionnaire, the first step was to examine the pertinent literature and extant questionnaires pertaining to prior en-

deavors concerned with client-agency change in evaluation of counseling. This included the Family Forum Questionnaire of Family Counseling Service as well as the current FSAA pilot "Census Study of Families Served."

The authors devised a seven question form which allowed for collection of data pertinent to the variables of planfulness, gain and number of interviews. This form was presented to the research consultants of Portland State University and the final form was then submitted to the Director of the Family Counseling Service for approval. The questionnaire (see appendix) was mailed on February 5, 1971. The final date for acceptance of completed questionnaires into the study was February 26, 1971. A total of 72 completed questionnaires were returned, a twenty-five per cent return.

It may be noted that this is a poor response rate, however, in Dr. Jennings' study done after only six months, the response rate was slightly less than fifty per cent. Thus both studies seem to emphasize the highly mobile and transient character of clients served by this agency.

FINDINGS

In examining the total population derived from the statistical card the authors found that there were a total of 93 one-interview cases. There were 79 cases in the two-to-five interview category, and 111 in the six-or-more interview category.

In the one interview cases, the workers assessed 69, a majority, of these as unplanned termination and 24 as planned. In the two-to-five category, the workers indicated 47 unplanned terminations and 32 planned ones. In the category of six-or-more interviews, only 30 were unplanned

terminations and 81 were planned.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS RELATED TO PLANFULNESS OF TERMINATION

A.			
Number of Interviews	One	Two to Five	Six or More
Termination unplanned	69	47	30
Termination planned	24	32	81
B.			
Number of Interviews	Six to Ten	Eleven to Twenty	Twenty-one or more
Termination unplanned	23	6	1
Termination planned	43	23	15

As the data in Table I indicates, when the case is terminated after one interview, the worker tends to show it as unplanned. According to the worker's interpretations, following this the greater the number of interviews the more tendency to show the termination as being planned. Irving Fowler, in "Family Agency Characteristics and Client Continuance" reported rates of non-return to second interviews tend to cluster around thirty-three per cent. About thirty-three per cent are lost after two to three interviews and thirty-three per cent continue into four or more interviews.

Table II indicates the worker's assessment of gain as related to the number of interviews. This information is further broken down in Table III. The type of termination as determined by the worker seems to be related to whether or not he saw gain. Therefore, it appears that planned termination is closely related to measurable gain on the part of the client. Stated another way, the greater the number of interviews the more the worker tended to see them as planned termination. The data shows that in all cases seen by the workers as showing no change, the number of interviews is always in the one-to-five interview category and termination is seen as unplanned. In the six-or-more interview category the worker always saw some gain. Therefore, the material leaves us with at least two conclusions: 1) the worker tends to perceive termination as unplanned where they did not see gain, 2) the worker does not seem to indicate gain when a client stopped coming for unknown reasons.

TABLE II
EVALUATION OF SERVICE

A.

Interviews	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	No Change	Unable to Determine	Totals
One						
<u>Planned</u>	4	7	11	0	2	24
<u>Unplanned</u>	3	1	20	11	34	69
Two to Five						
<u>Planned</u>	7	14	11	0	0	32
<u>Unplanned</u>	6	4	20	10	7	47
Six Plus						
<u>Planned</u>	31	37	13	0	0	81
<u>Unplanned</u>	4	9	16	0	1	30
B.						
Six to ten						
<u>Planned</u>	15	20	8	0	0	43
<u>Unplanned</u>	1	8	13	0	1	23
Eleven to Twenty						
<u>Planned</u>	9	9	5	0	0	23
<u>Unplanned</u>	2	1	3	0	0	6
Twenty-One+						
<u>Planned</u>	7	8	0	0	0	15
<u>Unplanned</u>	1	0	0	0	0	1

TABLE III

GAIN RELATED TO PLANFULNESS OF TERMINATION

A.		
Degree of Gain	Planned	Unplanned
Substantial	42	13
Moderate	58	14
Slight	34	56
No Change	0	21
TOTAL	134	104
B.		
Termination	Planned	Unplanned
Moderate to Substantial	100	27
No change to slight gain	34	77
TOTAL	134	104

TABLE IV

FEE RELATED TO NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS AND CONTINUANCE

A. Dollars per Week						
Interviews	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25
<u>One</u>						
Planned	7	6	4	6	0	1
Unplanned	20	17	9	17	3	3
<u>Two to Five</u>						
Planned	1	13	5	10	1	2
Unplanned	16	11	8	10	1	1
<u>Six or More</u>						
Planned	16	22	14	25	2	2
Unplanned	10	7	6	5	1	1
B. Total Number of Terminations Disregarding Number of Interviews						
Dollars per week	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25
Planned	24	41	23	41	3	5
Unplanned	46	35	23	32	5	5
Total	70	76	46	73	8	10

Table IV indicates that the majority of clients pay fees in the zero to five dollar category. Those clients who pay no fee are less likely to planfully terminate service especially before six interviews. If the client pays any fee, he is more likely to terminate by plan.

INTERPRETATIONS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of 283 questionnaires were mailed out. Forty-nine were returned by the post office because they were unable to locate the client. Of this number there were only 18 cases where new addresses could not be found. Seventy-two completed questionnaires (see appendix) were returned to the agency - twenty-five per cent (25%) of the total.

Returns were as follows:

Number of Questionnaires	Mailed	Returned
One interview:	93	21
Two to five interviews:	79	18
Six or more interviews:	111	33

The following is an examination of the client's assessment of service received:

I. Assessment of the Problem

The first and second questions required the client to describe the problem which brought him to the agency. Of the seventy-two (72) returns, sixty-eight (68) clients saw their problem as a husband-wife problem, three (3) indicated a personal problem only, one (1) did not indicate a problem.

Although there was a basic agreement between worker and client perception of the problem as being of a "marital nature," that is, conflict between the spouses, the clients clarified the outstanding symptoms of the marital conflict in their written statements as follows:

lack of communication	12
alcoholism	8
personal problem	7
parent-child difficulties	5
financial problems	5
sexual problems	4
physical problems	2
problems with in-laws	2
housekeeping difficulties	1

II. Assessment of help received and gains made

In questions 3 and 4, the client was asked for his perception of the help he received at the agency. Of the seventy-two responses to the questionnaire, fifty-two (52) clients felt they had received some help (72%), nine (9) felt they had not been helped at all (12%), and eleven (11) felt that things got worse (15%). (See Table V.)

In comparing the client's perceptions and the worker's perceptions of the gains made, the authors found that the client has a tendency to rate his gains slightly higher than his worker. There also tends to be more agreement between the worker and the client where there is substantial or moderate gains.

TABLE V

ASSESSMENT OF HELP RECEIVED AND GAINS MADE

A. Worker Assessment Compared to Client Assessment of Gain						
WORKER ASSESSMENT	GAINS					
	CLIENT ASSESSMENT					
	A great deal	Some	A little	Not at all	Things got worse	Totals
Substantial	9	8	2	1	0	20
Moderate	6	5	4	2	4	21
Slight	6	6	3	2	4	21
No change	0	0	1	1	0	2
Unable to determine	1	1	0	3	3	8
Totals	22	20	10	9	11	72
B. Combined Categories of gain						
Worker Rating	Client Rating					
	+	-				
+	49	13				
-	3	7				

An important finding was that as the number of interviews increases both the client and worker tend to perceive more gains as shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS COMPARED TO WORKER AND CLIENT VIEW OF GAIN

Interviews		Gain	No Gain
One	Worker	14	7
	Client	11	10
Two to five	Worker	15	3
	Client	14	4
Six or more	Worker	33	0
	Client	27	6
Total		114	30

Gain = substantial, moderate, slight
 No gain = no change, unable to determine

In those eleven cases where the client indicated that "things got worse," the authors found from other data on the questionnaire that seven of these clients indicated that they got a divorce, seven of these clients also indicated that their spouses were unable or unwilling to participate in counseling. In six instances the client had only one interview, the other five clients were interviewed more than six times. As in the findings of the Jennings' study, where he found that thirty-one

per cent (31%) of the responses indicated that service would have been more helpful had more members of the family been able to participate, the authors feel that possibly more effective ways need to be explored to involve all significant family members in the treatment process.

In those nine cases where the client indicated he had not been helped at all, five indicated that they were dissatisfied with their worker, two gave no information, two said spouse unable to participate. In four instances the client was interviewed once, four clients were seen two to five times, and one client was seen more than six times.

III. Terminations

In questions 5 and 6 which deal with the clients' perception of termination of service, the authors found that the client tends to agree with the worker's perception of whether termination was planned or unplanned, especially after six interviews as shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII
CLIENT AND WORKER PERCEPTIONS OF TERMINATION
OF SERVICE

A. Comparison of Worker and Client Perceptions of Termination of Service			
Number Interviews		Client Planned	Unplanned
One	Worker Planned	0	8
	Unplanned	3	10
Two to five	Worker Planned	6	4
	Unplanned	4	4
Six or more	Worker Planned	18	6
	Unplanned	4	5
B. Further Breakdown of Table 7-A Disregarding Number of Interviews			
	Worker Planned	24	18
	Unplanned	11	19

IV. OTHER IMPORTANT REASONS FOR TERMINATION WITH THE AGENCY

In question 7, the client was asked if other reasons made it necessary for him to terminate. The client's responses sometimes showed more than one reason per client for termination.

TABLE VIII
OTHER IMPORTANT REASONS FOR TERMINATION

REASON	One Inter- view	Two to Five Interviews	Six or More Interviews
Fee	3	2	10
Spouse unable to participate	6	8	7
Transportation or distance	1	1	2
Agency hours	0	0	3
Moved	0	0	3
Child care	1	0	1
Found help elsewhere	3	4	7
Other	2	0	1

In Table VIII, the fact that the spouse is unable to participate appears to have no relationship to the number of interviews. Inability of the spouse to participate accounts for about one half of the client reasons for discontinuance before six interviews, according to our data. After six interviews, this reason accounts for less than one-fifth.

When the client indicated that the amount of the fee influenced his termination with the agency, it appears that he was more likely to see the fee as a reason for termination after six interviews.

In investigating these fifteen cases which saw the fee as a reason for termination, six of the clients had been paying less than \$6.00 per week, three had been paying from \$6.00 to \$10.00 per week, four clients had been paying from \$11.00 to \$15.00 per week, and two had been paying from \$21.00 to \$25.00 per week. As pointed out in Table IX, the amount of the fee does not seem especially relevant.

TABLE IX

FEE AS A FACTOR IN TERMINATION COMPARED TO NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS

Number Interviews	\$0-5	\$6-10	\$11-15	\$16-20	\$21-25	Total
One	2	1	0	0	0	3
Two to five	1	0	0	0	1	2
Six or more	3	2	4	0	1	10
Total	6	3	4	0	2	15

Of this same group of clients, eight regarded termination as their decision alone, seven saw the decision as a joint decision between themselves and their worker.

V. SUMMARY IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has touched on the dual perspective of socialworkers and clients in an attempt to identify their perceptions of change in the treatment process. It was done in an effort to explore some of the factors that relate to the question why clients discontinue service

before planful termination.

To accomplish this objective, all marital cases with in-person interviews closed in the year 1969, a total of 283 cases, were reviewed in terms of three factors: the number of interviews, planfulness of termination, and gains made during the process. From this, data was obtained that indicated the caseworker's viewpoint. Secondly, to assess the client's view of these same variables a questionnaire was employed. From a twenty-five per cent return, seventy-two responses, comparable data was derived which allowed for a comparative study.

Because of the limited size of the return of the questionnaire, deductions are tentative and guarded. Nonetheless, the authors feel the following considerations are in order:

1. Both worker and client tend to see the identified problem as the same, that is, marital, as opposed to parent-child, total family or environmental.
2. Clients as a whole tend to see slightly more gain in the treatment process than the worker. An exception was in the area where the client indicated on the questionnaire that things got worse, i. e., in his view there was deterioration rather than gain. These differences in perception might be related to the following factors:
 - a. The socialworker assesses gain in relation to the actual treatment process while in fact gain in functioning depends for support and confirmation on influences entirely outside of the social casework process.
 - b. The client's response to the questionnaire may be

influenced by the intervening time between termination and the filling out of the questionnaire.

- c. In those cases where the client indicated that he had not been helped at all, i. e., the situational aspects of the problem may not have changed (e.g., the alcoholic spouse), the worker may have indicated gain because the client evidenced progress in coping with the particular problem or situation.
3. The data indicates that when the spouse is unable to participate early in the counseling process, continuance is less likely. Approximately thirty per cent (30%) of the total returned questionnaires indicated that "spouse being unable to participate" was a factor relating to termination. Of the thirty per cent, two thirds terminated before six interviews.
 - a. The authors speculate that if the workers can be encouraged to identify and help the client cope with this fact early in the treatment process and focus on the immediate pressure of the spouse being unable to participate, the agency might lose fewer clients prematurely.
 - b. The authors also speculate that where the spouse is unable or unwilling to participate in individual counseling, an effort might be made to involve this spouse, perhaps by using more marital group counseling.
 4. Clients who gave fee costs as a reason for termination were usually those who had been interviewed more than five times. It seems that as the fee accumulates over a period of time and

becomes a more significant amount, the client, consequently, begins to see the fee as a drain on his resources.

5. Yet, from the investigation of the statistical cards, it was found that clients who pay no fee are more likely to terminate unplanned and before six interviews. This might be related to the following factors.

- a. Clients who pay a fee may place more value on counseling since it "costs something," and therefore may have more of a commitment.
- b. Clients who pay no fee may have problems of a financial nature which may be one symptom of more basic dysfunction in their lives. If they are somewhat irresponsible financially, this irresponsibility probably appears in other areas of functioning. (Some writers see problems as coming in clusters.)
- c. Clients who pay no fee may be those who have more difficulty in meeting the necessary costs of keeping appointments at the agency such as transportation, child care, etc.

In looking critically at the instrument used in this study to gather data on client assessment, the authors believe that the following additional observations are justified:

1. The clients seemed to be well able to make the judgments called for, which reinforces the idea that the clients are the best source of information concerning gains made in the treatment process as pointed out in Sacks, Bradley and Beck, Clients

Progress within Five Interviews; An Exploratory Study Comparing Worker and Clients Views.

2. As pointed out in Dr. Jennings' study, "Planned Short Term Treatment Project Follow-up Study," the population under consideration was of a highly mobile and transient nature. His study pointed out that it was difficult to contact the clients all of whom had been seen at the agency very recently. The current study utilized cases closed as long as two years prior to mailing the follow-up questionnaire. The authors realized that this compounded the difficulty in obtaining data.
3. The data received from the questionnaire was that which the the authors intended to obtain. The only exception was in Question #6 which related to the decision to terminate. The client had been asked whether or not it was his decision alone to stop coming. Several clients indicated that they perceived this question to mean that it was only one spouse's decision rather than the partners' decision. Further misunderstanding was indicated from their responses when asked if it were a joint decision between "you and your worker," the client several times responded that one spouse and the counselor made a joint decision, but the other partner was not in agreement. Therefore, the authors realize that any comparison between client and worker assessment of termination is difficult because of the different meaning of the question to the client as opposed to the author's intent. Consequently, the authors believe that the findings derived from Table VII tend to be invalid.

In looking critically at the instrument which was the source of data for the worker's assessment (the statistical cards), the authors recognized that it was difficult to assess deterioration or negative changes within the treatment process as the statistical card is limited to a rating of positive change categories.

On the basis of this study, it was concluded that much further exploration and evaluation of service in relation to termination needs to be done. Specifically, further study needs to be conducted in the area where the spouse is unable to participate in treatment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Wesley T., "Clients, Counselors and Fees," The Family Coordinator, Vol. 17, #4, October, 1964.
- Ballard, Robert G. and Mudd, Emily H., "Some Sources of Differences between Client and Agency Evaluation of Effectiveness of Counseling," Social Casework, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, January, 1958.
- Ballard, Robert G. and Mudd, Emily H., "Some Theoretical and Practical Problems in Evaluating Effectiveness of Counseling," Social Casework, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 10, December, 1957.
- Beck, Dorothy Fahs, Patterns in Use of the Family Agency, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1962.
- Bitterman, Catherine M., "Serving Applicants When there is a Waiting List," Social Casework, Vol. 34, No. 6, June, 1958.
- Bleukner, M., Hunt, J. M., Kogan, L. S., "A Study of Interrelated Factors in the Initial Interviews with Clients," Social Casework, Vol. XXXII, January, 1951.
- Briar, Scott, "The Casework Predicament," Social Work, Vol. XIII, No. 1, January, 1968.
- Brigg, Elvira H., "The Application Problem: A Study of Why People Fail To Keep First Appointments," Social Work, Vol. 10, No. 2, April, 1965.
- Brown, Selma, "Time Content and Worker as Factors in Discontinuity," Smith College Studies in Social Work, June 1966, Vol. XXXVI, #3.
- Chilman, Catherine S. (Ed.), Approaches to the Measurement of Family Change, Welfare Research Report 4, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., 1966.

- Fanshed, David, "A Study of Caseworkers' Perceptions of Their Clients," Social Casework, Vol. XXXIX, December, 1958.
- Freeman, J. J., et.al., "Factors Associated with Success or Failure in Marital Counseling," Family Coordinator, Vol. 8, April, 1969.
- Fowler, Irving A., "Family Agency Characteristics and Client Continuances," Social Casework, Vol. XLVIII, No. 5, May 1967.
- Garcia, Ralph A., and Irwin, Olive, "A Family Agency Deals with Problems of Dropouts," Social Casework, Vol. 43, No. 2, February 1962.
- Geisman, L. L. and Ayers, Beverly, "A Method for Evaluating the Social Functioning of Families Under Treatment," Social Work, Vol. IX, No. 1, January, 1959.
- Graham, Henry L. and Blumenthal, David L., "Why We Failed - As Clients See It," Family Service Highlights, Vol. XVI, June, 1955.
- Gundlach, Ralph, "The Problem of Early Termination: Is It Really The Terminatee?" Journal Consulting Psychology, Vol. XXII, December, 1958.
- Hunt, J. M. and Kogan, L., "Measuring Results in Social Casework," Family Service Association of America, New York, 1950.
- Hunt, J. M., "On the Judgment of Social Workers as a Source of Information in Social Work Research," in Use of Judgments as Data in Social Work, Ann W. Shyne, editor, National Association of Social Workers, 1959.
- Jennings, D. E., "Planned Short Term Treatment Project Follow Up Study," (unpublished manuscript), May, 1970.
- Kogan, Leonard S., "The Short Term Case in Family Agency," Social Casework, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 5, 6, and 7 (May, June, and July, 1957).

Kogan, Leonard S., Hunt, J. M. and Bartelme, Phyllis, A Follow-up Study of the Results of Social Casework, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1953.

Krause, Merton S., "Predicting Client Discontinuance at Intake," Social Casework, Vol. 43, No. 6, June 1962.

Levinger, George, "Continuance in Casework and Other Helping Relationships: A Review of Current Research," Social Work, Vol. 5, No. 3, July 1960, pp. 40-51.

Mayer, John E. and Rosenblatt, Aaron, "The Clients Social Context: Its Effect on Continuance in Treatment," Social Casework, Vol. XLV, November, 1964.

Mayer, John E. and Timms, Noel, "Clash in Perspective Between Workers and Client," Social Casework, Vol. L., No. 1, January, 1969.

Mayer, Henry J., Borgatta, Edgar F. and Jones, Wyatt C., Girls at Vocational High: AN Experiment in Social Work Intervention, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1965.

Most, Elizabeth, "Measuring Change in Marital Satisfaction," Social Work, Vol. IX, No. 3, July, 1964.

Parad, Howard J. (Ed.), Crisis Intervention: Selected Readings, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1965.

Perlman, Helen Harris, "Can Casework Work?" Social Service Review, Vol. XLII, No. 4, December, 1968.

Perlman, Helen H., "Some Notes on the Waiting List," Social Casework, Vol. 44, No. 4, April, 1963.

Polansky, Norman and Koumin, Jacob, "Clients Reaction to Initial Interviews, a Field Study," Human Relations, Vol. IX, August, 1956.

Reid, William J. and Shyne, Ann W., Brief and Extended Casework, Columbia University Press, New York, 1969.

Reid, William J., "Client and Practioner Variables Affecting Treatment," Social Casework, Vol. XLV, No. 10, December, 1964.

Ripple, Lillian, "Factors Associated with Casework Service," Social Work, Vol. 2, No. 1, January, 1957.

Ripple, Lillian, Alexander, Ernestina, and Polemis, Bernice W., Motivation, Capacity and Opportunity, Social Service Monographs, Second Series, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1964.

Rosenblatt, Aaron and Mayer, John, "Client Disengagement and Alternative Treatment Resources," Social Casework, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1, January, 1966.

Sacks, Joel G., Bradley, Panke M., Beck, Dorothy F., "Clients Progress Within Five Interviews: AN Exploratory Study Comparing Workers' and Clients' Views," Family Service Association of America, New York, 1970.

Shyne, Ann W., "What Research Tells Us About Short Term Cases in Family Agencies," Social Casework, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 5, May, 1957.

Siegal, Natalie, "A Follow-up Study of Former Clients: An Example of Practioner-Directed Research," Social Casework, Vol. XLVI, No. 6, June, 1965.

Stark, Frances B., "Barriers to Client-Worker Communication at Intake," Social Casework, Vol. XL, April, 1959.

Thomas, Edwin, Polansky, Norman and Kounin, Jacob, "The Expected Behavior of a Potentially Helpful Person," Human Relations, Vol. VIII, May, 1955.

SURNAME		FIRST NAMES		WOMAN'S MAIDEN NAME		ALIAS—PREVIOUS MARRIAGE		RECORD NO.			
ADDRESS		TEL. NO.		AREA		DISTRICT		INCOMING DATE			
SOURCE OF APPLICATION						TEL. NO.		MARITAL STATUS MC UC W DES DIV SEP S OTHER		INCOMING STATUS	
										_____ NEW TO AGENCY _____ SERVICE LAST TERMINATED—PRIOR YEAR _____ SERVICE LAST TERMINATED—THIS YEAR	
FAMILY		BIRTH DATE		OCCUPATION OR SCHOOL OR WHEREABOUTS IF AWAY		BIRTHPLACE		RACE		RELIGION	
MAN										CITIZEN YES NO	
WOMAN										RESIDENT YES NO	
NAMES OF SINGLE CHILDREN		SEX				FAMILY		EDUCATION		MARRIAGE DATE	
						MAN				CROSS REFERENCES	
						WOMAN					
						EMPLOYER				FAMILY MEMBER	
OTHERS IN HOUSEHOLD				RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD		INCOME		FEE		CASEWORKER	
						ADJ.					

STATISTICAL CARD

FSAA FORM NO. 41

PRINTED IN U.S.A. 1963

FAM. SIZE

PRIMARY FOCUS OF SERVICE	REASON FOR TERMINATION	DATE TERMINATED
I FAMILY AND INDIVIDUAL RELATIONSHIPS 1. ☐ MARITAL RELATIONSHIPS 2. ☐ PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP OR RELATIONSHIP OF INDIVIDUAL CHILD UNDER 18 3. ☐ OTHER FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS OR RELATIONSHIPS OF INDIVIDUAL ADULTS 4. ☐ TOTAL FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS II ENVIRONMENTAL OR SITUATIONAL CONDITIONS 5. ☐ FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY 6. ☐ PHYSICAL ILLNESS OR HANDICAP 7. ☐ MENTAL ILLNESS 8. ☐ INTELLECTUAL RETARDATION 9. ☐ ARRANGEMENTS FOR PHYSICAL CARE OF FAMILY MEMBER 10. ☐ OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL OR SITUATIONAL CONDITION III OTHER 11. ☐ REPORT GIVEN ON TERMINATED SERVICE 12. ☐ INQUIRY MADE FOR OUT-OF-TOWN AGENCY	I TEL. OR CORR. ONLY WITH FAMILY OR CONTACT ON BEHALF OF FAMILY 1. ☐ FAMILY DID NOT FOLLOW THRU 2. ☐ REFERRED ELSEWHERE 3. ☐ PRESENTING REQUEST OR NEED MET BY AGENCY 4. ☐ REPORT GIVEN ON TERMINATED SERVICE 5. ☐ INQUIRY MADE FOR OUT-OF-TOWN AGENCY 6. ☐ SERVICE NOT AVAILABLE II IN-PERSON INTERVIEW(S) WITH FAMILY 7. ☐ REFERRED ELSEWHERE 8. ☐ SERVICE TERMINATED BY CASEWORK PLAN 9. ☐ FAMILY WITHDREW OR TERMINATED SERVICE 10. ☐ FURTHER SERVICE NOT POSSIBLE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE GIVEN _____ YES _____ NO	CATEGORY OF SERVICE AT TERMINATION <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="flex: 1;"> ☐ TEL. OR CORR. ONLY WITH FAM. ☐ ONE IN-PERS. INTERVIEW WITH FAM. ☐ 2-3 IN-PERS. INT. WITH FAM. ☐ 6 OR MORE IN-PERS. INT. WITH FAM. ☐ THRU CONTACT ON BEHALF OF FAMILY </div> <div style="font-size: 4em; margin: 0 10px;">}</div> <div style="text-align: center; flex: 0.5;"> THRU CONTACT WITH FAMILY </div> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Number of Group Sessions _____ IN-PERSON INTERVIEWS WITH CLIENTS (CHECK ONE OR MORE) </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> A. <u>Office interviews</u> _____ B. <u>Home visits</u> _____ physical incapacity _____ other reasons _____ C. Family Group Interviews _____ </div>

EVALUATION OF SERVICE	FAMILY AND INDIVID- UAL RELATIONSHIPS	ENVIRONMENTAL SITUATIONAL COND
SUBSTANTIAL GAIN	_____	_____
MODERATE GAIN	_____	_____
SLIGHT GAIN	_____	_____
NO CHANGE	_____	_____
UNABLE TO DETERMINE	_____	_____

FAMILY COUNSELING SERVICE

2281 N. W. EVERETT ST. • PORTLAND, OREGON 97210 • 228-7238

ACCREDITED AGENCY
FAMILY SERVICE ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA

February 5, 1971

Dear

In 1969 you came to Family Counseling Service for help with a problem. We are eager to know whether or not you received the help you needed. Your opinion really counts to us so that we can help serve others in the future in a better way.

Will you help us? Please answer these few questions now, and put them in the mail right away.

This questionnaire is strictly confidential and for agency use only. This material will not be made public.

Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Katherine Clark
Executive Director

sp

encl: questionnaire

OFFICERS

R. J. NOVOTNY
President
PAUL G. COOK
Vice-President
BARNES H. ELLIS
Vice-President
MRS. DONALD J. STERLING, JR.
Secretary
WILLIAM G. CONLEY
Treasurer

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LOWELL C. ASHBAUGH
MRS. JOHN P. BLEDSOE
MRS. JAMES E. BRYSON
CLIFFORD J. CAMPBELL
ROBERT P. DEKONING
STUART KERR
PETER H. KOEHLER
MRS. DAVID J. LEWIS
JOE T. LIENERT

IRVIN H. LUITEN
ROSCOE C. NELSON
DENNIS J. O'TOOLE
MRS. HAROLD M. PHILLIPS
MRS. FORREST E. RIEKE
BEATRICE K. ROSE, M.D.
MRS. VERA SHEPHERD
MRS. HUGH STITES
FREDERIC G. WESSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to be of maximum help to us, please complete all questions.

1. Describe briefly the problem that brought you to us for help.

2. Would you say the problem was mostly:
☐ a personal problem
☐ a husband-wife problem
☐ a parent-child problem
☐ other

3. Can you tell us in a sentence or two to what extent you were helped?

4. Would you say that you were helped:
(Please check only one)
☐ a great deal
☐ some
☐ a little
☐ not at all
☐ things got worse

5. What were the reasons you stopped coming to the agency?

6. Was it your decision alone to stop coming? ☐
Was it the worker's decision? ☐
Was it a joint decision between you and your worker? ☐

7. Were there other important reasons than the above that made you decide to stop coming, such as:
☐ Transportation, distance from the agency
☐ Babysitting problems
☐ Agency hours not convenient
☐ Fee
☐ Moved away
☐ Spouse unable to participate
☐ Other (describe)

☐ Found help elsewhere (describe)

Please return the completed questionnaire to Family Counseling Service,
2281 N.W. Everett Street, Portland, Oregon 97210, by February 12, 1971.
Thank you for your help.