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Abstract

THE USE AND EFFECT OF PUPPETRY AND BIBLIOTHERAPY IN GROUP COUNSELING WITH CHILDREN OF DIVORCED PARENTS

Kenneth P. Bunting, Ed.D.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia, August 1984

Chairman: Ruth K. Mulliken, Ph.D.

Primary school aged children who experienced the divorce of their parents posed a particularly challenging task to the counselor. They needed outlets to ventilate their frustrations, however, normal adult-like empathy was not a developmental reality.

For many years, the technique of puppetry has been successfully utilized within child counseling programs (Jenkins and Beckh, 1942) (Grant, 1950) (Koenig, 1951) (Dinkmeyer and Caldwell, 1970). Only recently the use of puppets was popularized by the introduction of the DUSO program (Dinkmeyer 1970, 1973). In fact, puppetry was cited as a potentially invaluable intervention strategy to facilitate affective educational programs to help stimulate young children to explore their feelings. However, little experimental evidence was gleaned from the literature to support the efficacy of the puppetry techniques (Strage, 1979) (Zingle, 1972) (Buffalo Public School System Project, 1975). Only testimonial and anecdotal statements supported the use of puppets as a counseling strategy (Liss, 1950) (Vidler, 1972) (Sang and Wickersham, 1975) (Burn, 1977). Puppets and structured story telling were described as a successful joint approach although without a controlled setting or measurable dependent variable.

Fifty second and third graders, of six Southeastern Virginia public schools, volunteered for divorce adjustment counseling. School officials from the local elementary schools allowed these volunteer S's to participate in groups led by different counselors at each school. These counseling groups ran for approximately one month with pre and post testing based on a specific experimental design cited in Campbell and Stanley (1963). The E explored the efficacy of specific child counseling techniques, puppetry and bibliotherapy. Standardized measures of attitude and behavior for this select cross section of elementary children were obtained. Frequency charting of affective words were derived from individual responses to a projective technique, sentence completion responses. The hypotheses were statistically analyzed
through the employment of ANOVA and T-Test procedures. Covariates were established and analyzed to control for the influence of the dependent variable test results and other potentially significant factors.

Unfortunately, the results of the post test data proved to be inconclusive. Some changes in the dependent variables were noted but these were not consistently manifested across the various experimental conditions.

Although the review of the literature supported and encouraged the utilization of these specific activities within the counseling setting, only anecdotal comment has been reported to document these practices. An attempt was made, through this research project, to develop quantitative results to measure the changes in the S's attitude, behavior and emotional expression based on their exposure to these strategies. However, the dependent variables did not exhibit the anticipated differences which were hypothesized.

Several extraneous variables influenced the experimental outcome. The most important of these were the observable counselor differences in style and group leadership. Future research should aim at controlling, through standardization, the impact of counselor ability and application of these techniques of puppetry and bibliotherapy.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

According to Harvill et al (1984) counseling in a historical sense, "began with two people talking to each other." They further reported that this generally has been the current trend. These authors encouraged counselors to use "props" as an alternative. This method was purported to enhance the counseling experience for all ages and types of client. For example, they stated that, "clients have offered positive reports of their use in counseling sessions and have indicated that they remember the prop more than they do the verbal exchange in many instances."

Muro and Dinkmeyer (1982) wrote,

Too often those who counsel approach children with a philosophy and technique derived from work with adults and then translated into approaches to children, almost as if the counselor considered the child a shorter version of a full grown adult. (p. 252)

These authors explained that an "innovative elementary
counselor" would be remiss if he/she did not attempt to capture the imagination through the use of techniques which embrace fantasy. This aforementioned goal has been achieved by the counselor with the use of puppetry and bibliotherapy.

Significant interest in the application of puppetry within the school setting was described in a resource manual developed by the Board of Education of the City of New York (1947-1948). This text presented alternatives which included puppet usage across the curriculum. They stated that "Puppetry has implications not only for unifying areas of experience but also for resolving pupil's personal-social problems." The manual listed various experiences offered through the practical application of puppetry which could help the student express him/herself imaginatively. Puppets allowed students to "develop individual security" through either tension release by dramatizing family problems or through audience participation and the practice of listening skills.

The 1950's ushered in the "T.V." era where puppetry assumed a broader audience and an at large interest from society in general. One only has to remember fondly children's programs like Howdy Doody and Kukla, Fran, and Ollie to be reminded of this happening. A student from the College of William and Mary attempted to research the efficacy of puppetry on pupil growth in personal adjustment. This experimental study proved to be inconclusive. The author explained that the dependent measure he used was "too gross" to
arrive at a significant shift in personal adjustment. (Haak, 1952)

Today in the 1980's, this author senses a rekindled interest in puppetry both in entertainment and therapeutic endeavors. We as a society identify with Miss Piggy of Muppet fame. Barbara Aiello, the creator of "Kids on the Block" uses puppets to "form a natural bridge between disabled and nondisabled children." These puppets are viewed by Aiello to be "nonthreatening" and a "safe environment to learn about the disabled." (Stark, 1983)

The purpose of the present study is to compare the differential effects that the use of puppetry, in the context of bibliotherapy, has on groups with children of divorced parents.

Statement of Problem

Only recently has the literature supported the notion of the long lasting influence a parent's divorce has on the child. Loss of the parent through divorce has been cited as one of the "causes of adolescent suicide" (Ray and Johnson, 1983). Kosky (1983) found a "high incidence of marital disintegration among the parents of the suicidal subjects" in hospitalized populations. Half the suicidal patients had divorced or separated parents while 82 percent of the nonsuicidal subjects came from intact families. It was reported that one-third of
the suicidal sample suffered "multiple losses."

According to Wallerstein (1982) the child of divorce endures readjustments as she observed "to stretch over years of childhood and adolescence." This author reported that even after five or ten years, the divorce remained for many of these children to be "the central event of their growing-up years and casts a long shadow over these years." A particularly vulnerable age was the young child, at or before the early latency age.

Wallerstein's research delineated an emerging pattern among young adults who during their childhood experienced the divorce of their parents. These interviewed subjects were "burdened by anxiety", fearful of rejection and cautious of long lasting, potential marital relationships. (Ruel, 1984)

Updyke and Nagle (1983) found that the divorce rate has increased over 125% during the past two decades. Twice as many children have been affected yearly by the dissolved marriages of their parents. Guidubaldi (1983) reported a higher incidence of "divorced-family" children were referred for psychological intervention. Thus, it would appear to be a need to investigate counseling options for the approximately 12.6 million youngsters who live in single parent homes. (Weers and Logee, 1983).

Therefore, the focus of this study has been to develop and test for effectiveness specific child counseling techniques (puppetry and bibliotherapy) which may facilitate group
counseling for the early latency aged child of divorced parents.

There currently exists a paucity in the research of pre-fourth grade divorce adjustment groups. Often cited were intervention strategies which appeared too complicated to facilitate positive interaction within groups of young children.

Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) found differences in the ability of different age groups to cope with divorce. They stated, "the younger latency group, seven and eight years old when their parents separated were more immobilized by their suffering." These children responded more favorably to a relationship between a therapist and a child which was empathic and nonthreatening, (Kelly and Wallerstein, 1977). The present study incorporated the use of puppets by the therapist and the reading of analogous divorce related stories to encourage the participation of this aged child within the group process.

Rucker, Thompson, and Dickerson (1978) reported that "puppets help create an aura of informality and anonymity that permits a candid and informative handling of such sensitive topics," in their research in death education. Bebensee (1979) explained the divorce process in relation to Kubler-Ross's stages of grief which allows one to draw comparisons between the loss of a loved one through death and marital breakup. Therefore, when Rucker, et al (1978) explains the potency of puppetry to "make it less difficult to understand the 'multiplicity of selves'..."
and stress that often occurs in the loss of a loved one. An added dimension of this technique appears worth exploring in light of the comparisons made between the stages of grief prompted by either the death or the divorce of a parent.

Bibliotherapy has long been employed as a device to enhance a child's adaptability to a specific problem situation. Reading related material has appeared to be a popular alternative incorporated into many forms of counseling (Nickerson, 1975) (Sclabasse, 1973).

Baruth and Phillips (1976) encouraged the use of bibliotherapy within the context of the divorce process. These authors assumed "that when people bring their own needs and problems to the reading experience, they interpret the author's words in light of their own experience." Kelly and Wallerstein (1980) found responses of children to divorce to be manifold as they reported "no simple guidelines for recognizing divorce-related emotional or behavioral change in children," (Kieffer 1982). By using the technique of bibliotherapy, latitude can be provided for the content of the counseling session. This technique would be dependent upon individual child reactions by controlling for the structure of the group session and it's therapeutic material to allow one to consider the impact of the use of puppets. Two of the more popular divorce group models for children employed each of these techniques, puppetry and bibliotherapy. For example, Wilkinson
and Bleck (1977) introduced puppet play during the sixth session of their developmental children's Divorce Group model. Green (1978) in his multimodal helping model included bibliotherapeutic activities in the first three of his eight sessions by having the children read and discuss "The Boys and Girls Book About Divorce" (Gardner, 1970). To control adequately the independent variable an attempt will be made to limit the use of reading material to a specific book and to arbitrarily define the use of puppets to be that which is solely used by the counselor.

Coupling the techniques of puppetry with bibliotherapy in the counseling setting allows this author to examine the effectiveness of puppet use in a controlled counseling environment. These techniques also serve these clients, the young child, with a vehicle for them to become more successfully involved within the group counseling process. Quint (1973) observed that puppets "served as an effective medium for retelling the popular stories." Reich (1968) claimed that "puppetry demands active speaking and listening participation" and therefore could be a language tool used by all teachers. Puppet play encourages original thinking in a minimally structured situation. When puppets are used as a role playing technique the child is afforded the opportunity to define and face his problems. These problems, as reported by the author may "be made reachable through the use of puppets."

According to Schroeder (1979) the counselor role-played
stories through puppetry as "a primary prevention-mental health education tool for kids in the early elementary school grades." The puppet shows in this study involved the children with audience participation. They noted a variety of "appropriate and creative responses" to realistic situations. This puppet company performed skits which included the topics of anger and divorce.

Sonnenshein-Schneider and Baird (1980) explained that using puppetry would allow children to "express deep feeling about a family situation." Puppets enable a child "to recreate the situation." Reading books about divorce, Two Homes to Live In: Child's Eye View of Divorce, by Barbara Shook and How Does It Feel When Your Parents Get Divorced by Terry Berger would serve as an appropriate vehicle to generate group discussion. Puppets may be added to help "act out feelings." They are best used "when the children have a definite issue or idea to express."

In conclusion, by measuring shifts in adjustment to a child's divorce related experiences, this examiner will attempt to measure the efficacy of puppetry in the context of group counseling. Bibliotherapy as an intervention strategy can also be used to minimize varied child counseling strategies and styles of the different individual group leaders. The present study combines these two techniques to measure their impact. To review objectively the results of these counseling strategies, use of puppets and therapeutic reading, the
dependent variables must be credible. To accomplish this, these intervention techniques will be directed toward improving the ability of children to experience positive shifts in behavior and attitude in their adjustment to the divorce of their parents.

Theoretical Rationale

When puppetry and bibliotherapy are employed as psychodynamic strategies then assumptions need to be considered with regard to a child's constructive use of fantasy. Rhodes and Tracy (1972) suspect important aspects of the unconscious contribute to the substance of this fantasy. These authors further reported that fantasy functions in several ways.

First, dreams and daytime fantasy provide a framework within which the child realizes some of the goals and motives which he is prevented from reaching in the real world ... or on the other hand the child can play out some of his more frightening motives in fantasy — (p. 266)

In these ways a child can symbolically project processes and conflicts within him or her.

With his exploration of a child's "make believe", Singer (1973) felt that the world of fantasy significantly interfaced between the processes of the unconscious inner world and the realities of the concrete environment.

Limitations present in all children due in part to their
lack of physical prowess, render them helpless in the face of real life obstacles. Adults around them seem much larger, adept, and, therefore, able to deal with such ease that identification to them is less meaningful. The struggling child may find it easier to relate more openly at an imaginary level, i.e. through the use of puppets.

According to Singer (1973) one would be hard pressed to explain imagery in play with primarily a drive reduction treatise, i.e. Freud. He cited the example of children playing at or around dinner time. It would not be an uncommon occurrence for youngsters to stall a parent's pleas to "come eat" until a game activity was completed. Instead Singer highlighted Piaget's assimilation process involved in play.

For Piaget, play derives from the child working out two fundamental characteristics of his mode of experience and development. These are accommodation, which represents the attempt to imitate and interact physically with the environment, and assimilation, which represents the attempt to integrate externally - deprived percepts or motor actions into a relatively limited number of schemata or differentiated motor or cognitive skills available at a particular age. (p. 13)

The child through symbolic play, as in fantasy, attempts to exert control over his/her surroundings.

To explain this process in terms of personality development, Alfred Adler's theory offers a viable alternative. Bischof (1964) reported that Adler's work could be abstracted into seven principles of human behavior. These principles
involve: "1) inferiority, 2) superiority, 3) styles of life, 4) creative self, 5) conscious self, 6) fictional goals, 7) social interest." He explained that Adler viewed the child as born into the world incomplete with a "deep sense of inferiority." Relevant to this, man then strives to become superior. Rather than a hierarchy of drives, there would be only one drive, that of a desire to achieve superiority which grows out of inferiority, the two inseparable. Adler, according to the author could not accept the purely environmentalistic viewpoint that man is solely a product of his environment. To Adler, there is too much material born and developed within man. This self-operated system he called the style of life. (p. 238)

Ansbacher and Ansbacher (1956) explained fantasy in relation to an individual's style of life. They stated that "Every attempt to solve a problem, since it involves the unknown of the future, sets fantasy to work." This process to these authors was guided by the style of life. The expression of fantasy provides a blueprint of one's style of life and "can be used as entrance gates to gain insight into the workshop of the mind." The direction taken by a child's fantasy serves to overcome a felt weakness with a goal for superiority as an end. According to the authors,

The process is somewhat similar to that which the child takes in creating his style of life. Where he feels the difficulty, fantasy helps to give him an illusory view of enhancement of his
19

self-esteem, usually spurring him on at the same time. (p. 218)

However, as the author's reported, fantasy can serve as a compensation for life without the socially approved goal of growth.

The explanation of Adler's theory offered by Maddi (1968) highlighted a person "striving for perfect completion."
According to this author the concept of "fictional finalism" is more a matter of achieving completion rather than one of reaching potentialities. He saw the person as striving for an ideal or a tendency to define oneself in relation to a goal state. Children can, through the employment of fantasy, arrive at a more substantial goal although it may not be realistic. If, however, it does not replace real life circumstances, then during the growth process a child can practice his/her style of life. As Maddi interprets Adler, the style of life is the "results of the superiority tendency." He stated that:

The style of life is a pattern of characteristics, determined both by the feelings of inferiority and the compensatory attempts engaged in by the person. (p. 93)

Constructive styles would be a reflection of the most socially approved form of living defined by cooperation and positive interaction with people while striving for superiority.

Adler (1927) emphasized that man's soul has purposiveness. He hypothesized a teleological approach to life in which "this striving for a goal, is innate in the concept of adaptation."
As he put it, "the psychic life of man is determined by his goal." According to Adler, a child similar to that of an adult, wants to surpass his rivals. The goal of superiority provides for security and adaptation which are synonymous with his expectation. Thus, man seeks to reduce and minimize the disadvantages of the human condition. Adler introduced the term "Gemeinschaftsgefühl" which suggests a sense of fellowship in the social context which allows for support from the community for the individual. Individual Psychology, as Adler envisioned, was borne from the context of society.

The world of imagination for Adler was the result of perception, impressions to stimuli. The author supposed that: "Nowhere does the uniqueness of an individual show more clearly than in the products of his fantasy and of his imagination." This process of imagination involved the reproduction of percepts. Adler described fantasy as a method of "prevision and prescience." He reiterated, "the fantasies of children and grownups, sometimes called daydreams, are always concerned with the future." Adler indicated that the striving for power was predominant in childhood fantasies.

Adler (1929) placed great importance on a person's striving when he stated, "Without the sense of a goal individual activity would cease to have any meaning." Fantasy serves to express the way we would like to behave. Similar to dreams, they are "an emotional rehearsal of plans and attitudes." Adler cited remarks made by, Gustav Frevertag, a
noted poet with poor vision.

Frertag said about himself: "Because my eyes were different from those of other people, it seems that I was compelled to use and train my fantasy. I do not know that this has helped me to be a great writer, but in any case as a result of my eyesight it has come about that I can see better in fantasy than others in reality." (p. 69)

The author would offer the conjecture that from an individual's weakness develops a strength.

Within the confines of a case study, Adler (1963) submitted that he identified the trait of "phantasy" in many children. He remarked,

They train themselves in a particular aptitude, and identify with a situation. They are filled with the feeling that they are what they want to be. Every human being is capable of doing that. It is manifested when reality becomes too limiting, when a person meets difficulties in his strivings for superiority. (p. 110)

Children have a tendency to take refuge in fantasy in order to obtain a semblance of that which is denied to us in reality. The loss of a parent created by the divorce fuels the child's need to marshall his/her fantasy to resolve the resulting inner conflict. Puppetry and bibliotherapy increases the opportunity to accomplish this in the counseling setting.

**Definition of Terms**

As an assurance against ambiguity, these terms for the purpose of this research were defined as follows:
Adjustment: Adjustment is defined as the adaptation the child has made to the divorce. He/she demonstrates a change in attitudes, behaviors and emotions to compensate for the differences which result from the parent's divorce.

Bibliotherapy: The use of literature which dynamically interacts with the personality of the reader. This specific reading material is content focused upon divorce related issues for the purpose of child adjustment. (McKinney, 1977)

Early Latency Age: A child at a seven to eight year old developmental age. This child would be at approximately a second to third grade level in primary school. (Kelly and Wallerstein, 1976)

Fear of Abandonment: A child reconciled to a life with one parent expresses concern that the remaining caretaker will leave. This causes underlying insecurity and anxiety. (Berg, 1978)

Hope of Reunification: The inability of the child to accept the finality of the parents' divorce. This condition may be manifested in a child's misbehavior, illness, and disappointment. It will inhibit acceptance of parent substitute figures. (Berg, 1978)

Maternal Blame: The child assigns responsibility of the divorce upon the mother and concommitantly negatively influences this parent-child relationship. (Berg, 1978)
Paternal Blame: The converse of maternal blame where the parental referent becomes the father. (Berg, 1978)

Peer Ridicule and Avoidance: The child perceives the divorce as a stigma and a reflection upon the self. This leads the child to hide these family experiences from the peer group which creates an atmosphere of fear and stress. (Berg, 1978)

Puppetry: A prop used by the counselor as a medium of expression and modeling. A hand puppet, animal like, which is to be used a minimum of one-third of the session time by the group leader.

Self Blame: The child focuses upon his/her guilt with regard to the dissolution of the marriage. One perceives misbehavior and status in the family as the responsible agent of the divorce. (Berg, 1978)

General Hypotheses

The present study assessed the results of group counseling for children of divorced parents by pre and post test measures. Data was obtained for the treatment (puppetry-bibliotherapy), treated control (bibliotherapy) and control groups. The following hypotheses were made.

1) Significant improvement in attitude as measured by the Children's Attitudes Toward Parental Separation Inventory (Berg, 1979) (CAPSI) resulted in the children of the treatment and treated control groups
2) Individual subscale scores on the Teachers Rating Scale (BRP-T), Student Rating Scale (BRP-S), Parent Rating Scale (BRP-P) of the Behavior Rating Profile (Hammill and Brown, 1978) showed significant positive changes between the treatment and treated control groups to the control group.

3) The combination of puppetry and bibliotherapy (treatment group) demonstrated the most positive adjustment to the divorce of their parents.

4) Significant differences in emotional adjustment (i.e. frequency of affective words) were depicted by the responses on the Sentence Completion task of the various subjects assigned to the different experimental conditions.
Chapter II

Survey of the Literature

In this chapter, the literature review will focus upon four major areas of consideration. The first area is a review of the research on the historical and theoretical overview for puppetry. This section is followed by a general review of the research on puppetry and its use in counseling. The third section examines the research on bibliotherapy especially as it pertains to children. The final area of this chapter addresses the notable differences of the specific population of this study, children of divorced parents.

Historical and Theoretical Overview of Puppetry Within the Counseling Setting

Historians suspect that the "first ancestor" of the puppet was a marionette like figure of human proportion used by ancient Egyptian priests. The word "puppet" is translated from the latin derivative pupa which means "girl" or "doll". In England during Shakespeare's day puppetry became immensely popular. Ultimately, puppets similar to the "Punch and Judy"
type sailed from Great Britain and arrived in America about 1928. (New York Board of Education, 1947-48)

According to Marcus (1948), Madelaine Rambert, a Swiss psychologist, found puppets to be a more effective toy in play therapy than the use of dolls. The puppet was more resilient and easier to handle for the child. Even without a "formal stage" the child quickly was able to "disappear behind Guignol's (puppet's) personality", allowing for a "variety of characterizations." At about the same time, Woltmann of Bellevue Hospital started a puppet theatre in his practice of child psychotherapy. Neither therapist was aware of the other's contribution.

The first noted application of puppetry in psychotherapy was reported by Jenkins and Beckh (1942) in their review of the work done by Dr. Lauretta Bender and Mr. Adolf J. Woltmann at Bellevue Hospital in 1935. They remarked "how vital and dynamic" were these puppet shows witnessed by them on the children's ward. This medium of puppetry, they conjectured, established a climate which facilitated the identification between the child and the puppet. The child audience could thus interact with the feelings of the puppet. The authors described these emotions by stating, "self-assertion, resentment, dependence, affection and remorse of the child Caspar of the puppet stage." Simple finger puppets were perceived as immediately and intensely attractive to children. The puppets in this study became more alive because they were
the hands of the child participant. It made, as pointed out by the authors, establishing rapport and maintaining high levels of interest an easier process. Puppets appeared also to reduce inhibitions. For example, authors commented:

Aggressive or other tabooed actions undertaken by these hands are therefore, for the purposes of the play, not the actions of the child manipulating the puppet but the actions of the puppet. (p.295)

The child is provided, through the use of this surrogate, a license to expression. Puppetry was viewed as a resource to "releasing the spontaneity of a child's life." It was most successfully introduced to children between the ages of five and eleven allowing for their limited level of language to dramatize their feelings when words alone could not accomplish this objective.

Grayson (1944) envisioned more mature content in play and recreation being introduced through puppetry. She remarked:

Quiet play of this kind may provide relief from the pressures of heavy school programs, some of the anxieties and uncertainties so common to adolescence. (p.236)

The "Kasperal Theatre", a product of Grant (1950) applied puppetry to play therapy. The puppet show became the means to create a tone of joy, excitement and anticipation. Grant also was impressed by the use of puppets in psychotherapy at Bellevue Hospital and therefore perceived the educational
potential of this approach. He described the opportunity allowed him for "calling forward a child who is known to have reading difficulties." The fact that the puppet and the youngster could share the same misfortune "brings relief for the child and offers the therapist welcome openings for reeducational work."

When children involve themselves in the plot of the story, Grant surmises that their reactions become extremely revealing. It was therefore assumed that this allowed for hidden conflicts to surface and also afforded a cathartic release through reenactment of emotionally conflictual situations. The child can laugh along with a puppet while sensing some of his own similar limitations. The child may reenact actual experiences in a more positive context. Spontaneous creations and scenarios allow a youngster to "either embellish the story or switch the planned course of events to meet the children's demands." Flexibility inherent in the use of puppets provides for such an alternative. By using puppets, Grant claimed children could share their feelings and master their own difficulties.

Koenig (1951) used puppetry as an intervention strategy with handicapped children. She introduced her puppet appealingly by stating:

"I don't know why everybody feels so sorry for me. I'm a good strong fellow. Look, "and here Jasper, the handpuppet with the big head and wobbly arms turns to the laughing, happy group of
children. "Well, what do you think, kids?". (p. 111)

With this exchange, the puppet enabled the therapist to join effectively with the children. According to Koenig, the ensuing relationship resembles the emotional tone and mood of a child engaged in free conversation with his peer group. She remarked, "often they do not have a feeling of security, comfort, and well being among adults." The author predicted that the use of puppets worked best with the seven to thirteen age group because they find "great release in dramatic play." She further elaborated that puppetry in the classroom allowed students the opportunity to talk about their problems without fear of censorship. In this way, children became more secure and self-confident by articulating their needs. Puppetry helped stimulate freedom of thought and expression to increase the level of intimacy and friendship amongst the teacher and her children. Koenig concluded, "Children bring to their puppets a feeling of love, understanding, enthusiasm, and a flair for fantasy." By channeling the make-believe, the adult could translate the experience of puppetry into a more realistic alternative.

According to Dinkmeyer and Caldwell (1970), the use of puppets can augment role-playing. They stated "Handpuppets of father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, etc., help reveal home situations." The authors remarked, if available, hand puppets will be put to good use by children in
any classroom. They claimed, for example, that "just one single prop may be all that is necessary in order to convert an activity into the world of the make-believe."

With the DUSO program, Developing Understanding of Self and Others, Dinkmeyer (1970) introduced a major developmental counseling strategy which used puppetry extensively throughout. He reported, "puppet activities comprise a significant aspect of the DUSO program." Dinkmeyer found hand puppets to be "both talkers and doers." He stressed that children needed time to become familiar with the puppets because "Initial plays invariably become rather violent Punch and Judy types." It was this author's belief that children, through spontaneous play with puppets, tend to be "quite revealing" allowing the teacher "more developmental theme material" than found elsewhere in this program. It was Dinkmeyer's opinion that, "because the puppets are obviously not real people, it is easier for the audience to project themselves and others into them." He remarked that using puppets stimulated creative responses as when "They find it easier to project life in an inanimate figure than to put themselves personally on display."

Mauer (1977) viewed an

Affective school program for young children focuses on facilitating personal and interpersonal growth, enhancing awareness of self and others, and increasing social interaction according to developmental needs. (p. 27)

This author cited Wittmer and Myrick (1974) as per the four
The major objectives of "feeling classes." These were,

1) to help children become aware that feelings exist; 2) to help children become aware that all people experience all types of feelings; 3) to help children become aware that feelings are not negative experiences to be avoided, and 4) to help children learn responsible and effective ways of expressing feelings. (p. 103)

As she reiterated, many children were unable to verbalize their emotional experiences, thus puppets became a medium of expression and modeling.

The use of puppetry has been discussed in this article as a means to facilitate the expression of feelings in young children. Such expressions tap the young child's world of fantasy and imagination and thereby allows learning to occur naturally and effectively. (p. 31)

Thus, the early research in puppetry was characterized by application of technique. It did, however, lack the rigors of experimental design. Jenkins and Beckh (1942) observed a positive climate for children to express their emotions at Bellevue Hospital in 1935. They saw children becoming less inhibited.

Grayson (1944) theorized that puppet play was more mature in content without elaborating as to specifically how puppets contribute to this phenomena.

Grant (1950) cited an example of a child with a reading problem being able to identify with a puppet of similar circumstance. This author suggested that the therapist was
provided with welcome options. Again, intrinsic qualities of the puppet appeared to "magically" improve upon the relationship between client and counselor. The anecdotal record supported the positive impact of puppet use in child therapy.

Koenig (1951) and Dinkmeyer and Caldwell (1970) both claimed transformations in the emotional climate when puppet characters were introduced into the classroom. The children were stimulated to express themselves differently when augmented by these devices to communicate more creatively. Puppets supposedly aided children when role-playing, however, controlled comparison did not substantiate this claim.

Dinkmeyer (1970) packaged the wholesale use of puppets into today's educational settings with the introduction of the DUSO program. He found it to be an effective cornerstone of his program; each of his thirty-three units has at least one puppet activity. He elaborated upon the theoretical implications in that puppets allowed children spontaneity of expression that can become "quite revealing."

Mauer (1977) cited the need for "affective" educational programs with puppetry as the facilitator. She explained puppets to be a modeling device which enabled young children to explore their feelings.

It was evident that the theoretical base which was being formulated by all the respective authors closely resembled the needs of the child as depicted by Adler's rationale. Puppets
seemed to enable the child to strive for superiority by modifying his style of life through simulation. Although changes apparently took place when puppets were introduced into a clinical setting, little empirical evidence existed to explain the more favorable emotional conditions said to exist. Puppets were seen as an accepted approach to therapy and instruction.

**Review of Research on Puppetry**

Marks (1944-45) reported on the "reactive medium" experienced when puppets are used in psychotherapy. School teachers who have employed puppetry have found their students reacting "spontaneously to puppet suggestions." It was speculated by this author that "children identify the puppeteers with the puppets and therefore as 'solvers of all problems'". This phenomena has allowed for the much needed opportunity for children "to work out the problems arising from unfavorable home or school situations."

According to Philpott (1977) there has been a "growing world wide interest in puppetry" and specifically cited was its use in child guidance. He reported two considerations which need to be "kept in mind" which are: "(1) the puppets mentioned have individual physical characteristics, and (2) the puppets have behavioral characteristics --- depending on the particular therapist's approach to puppets." (p. 9). Puppets have been
described by Philpott to have enormous therapeutic potential "in the hands of one who understands" their power to induce immediate reactions.

Hawkey (1948) found glove puppets to be of interest to some children, their popularity enhanced the child's "expression of fantasy." This author observed how natural preadolescent children expressed their problems when engaged in puppet play. Hawkey used puppet plays which were "determined by the reactions of the audience." He attempted to reveal the child's problems into his play.

Zingle (1972) stressed the importance of the classroom teacher as the central figure within an elementary school counseling program if it is to "become a hope!" for affective education. It was the teacher, according to the author, who spent the largest amount of time with the student allowing him/her opportunity to have known the child best. The counselor assumed the role as a consultant. Zingle contended that the DUSO program made a similar assumption. Therefore, it was implicit in this approach that the teacher was responsible for the counseling intervention. The author further stated that the DUSO program was a developmental approach concerned with "personalizing and humanizing the educational process for all students." In the "Leduc Project", Zingle observed a selected group of primary grade youngsters who participated in DUSO. The school principals, for this author, selected "twelve 'troubled' children and six 'well adjusted' children." These
eighteen students met for four months approximately one hour per week. The results obtained were teacher report and observation of global behavior. It was obvious to Zingle that although "no objective data were gathered" the majority of the participants benefitted from their group experiences. For example, he commented on anecdotal statements from the teachers indicated remarkable growth on the part of the children. It was stated that "the children began to become aware of their feelings, instead of attempting to ignore or deny them." As a result, these children invested more energy toward socially approved outlets.

Dinkmeyer (1970) (1973) when developing the theme for the DUSO puppets created three specific characters in particular. DUSO the Dolphin was the "empathic listener" who was the helper to the children who encouraged positive ways for them to solve their problems. On the other hand, Flopsie the Flounder began "rather indecisive and dependent" later to become more self-confident and Coho was initially insensitive while eventually learning to be more accepting and understanding. Dinkmeyer found that "The puppet can serve as a mode for self-expression." He qualified his impression by stating;

Puppetry offers many of the same benefits as role playing - an opportunity to take on different roles, to express ideas frankly, and to evaluate the behavior of self and others. However, puppetry has the unique value of permitting the child to objectify personality traits through manipulation of the puppets. This is in contrast to role playing in which the child transforms or
expresses himself through the role he assumes. Spontaneity, creativity and emotional release are stimulated through puppetry. (1973, pg. XXX)

Koenig and Peyton (1977) stressed the motivational properties of puppets when used within the educational setting. Their qualities included being "magical", "colorful", "manipulable", "expressive", "entertaining" and "fun to use." These properties allowed puppets to be attractive to children. For example,

Children confide in puppets and will very often do something to please a puppet which they would not do for another child or adult. (p. 58)

Puppets served as a vehicle to project oneself without inhibition. "Through puppets we can say and do things we would not otherwise feel comfortable doing." Puppets were versatile and could be used as partners to maintain and direct a child's attention. They could portray symbolically "real world" scenarios yet still encouraged cognitive and conative reactions. According to the authors, modeling through the expression of appropriate emotional reactions did provide examples to facilitate communication.

In his article "Structured Puppet Play Therapy" Vittner (1969) explained "Nonverbalizing children and also many verbalizers, can express themselves more easily through puppet play." (p. 68). Vittner felt young children had to act out whereas adults "achieve insight and integration by talking" to
reduce their level of stress. He found therapeutic results to be astounding when children were allowed to vent their hostilities in puppet play. The author reported that almost all the children were "helped considerably after one session." He went on to state that it normally would take "three or four 15 minute sessions" for the average child to return to "normal" while his most difficult client changed remarkably after "twelve visits." Vittner was successful in applying his puppet techniques with kindergarteners up and through the sixth grade pupils. He dealt effectively with clients who were "criers, daydreamers, disruptive behavior problems, fighters, the friendless, those with withdrawn and bizarre behavior." For Vittner, "Puppet play therapy really works."

Strage (1979) had children wear puppets to represent members of a family while role playing a variety of open ended stories. The parent figure, mother puppet, would then emit various verbal commands (indirect directives) to determine their influence upon the children manipulating their respective puppets. This author reported results confounded by the role playing technique. The older children would become so involved by creating unusual, "unpredictable" conclusions to dramatize their stories that they did not respond appropriately to the linguistic cues. Whereas the younger children, less complicated in their responses, performed more appropriately on the task at hand.

Liss (1950) cited a specific case study where puppets
enabled a therapist to constructively improve a child's self-control which ultimately led to the improvement of his social skills. The success "John" found in his play with puppets helped him to cope with his need for status. Liss found John, with the aid of puppets, to act out his resentment towards a sibling. According to the author, this child controlled his environment by this artificial process as he drew upon the puppets to reenact his struggle. He then became more objective in his perception of his problem.

An old approach similar to that, reported earlier in the review of Bellevue Hospital in 1935, resurfaced with comparable impact in Buffalo, New York in 1970. Vidler (1972) described a program introduced by a group of social workers aided by a "professional puppeteer." Children in the audience interacted with puppets to gain "new insights" and "to develop a sense of responsibility for their own actions." This puppet theatre allowed "youngsters to witness the whole gamut of emotions." This author felt that the approach provided opportunity for these children "to safely experience events and emotions."

Sang and Wickersham (1975) also cited the "Buffalo" program. They acknowledged the positive influence these techniques had on "emotionally disturbed preadolescent youngsters." By using "fairy-tale characters" they were able to help these children more effectively cope with their feelings in real life.

Sang and Wickersham reported the use of puppet plays for
ten sessions on a weekly basis, each lasted approximately an hour. Every performance provided "a particular structured experience." For example, in one of these sessions, children quizzed specific puppets regarding their feelings at the conclusion of the performance. "Doubling" was another technique employed during one of the puppet shows. The authors indicated that the therapist requested from each child a description of how a specific puppet might feel while concurrently being encouraged to share or "identify" his own emotions. It was concluded by these researchers that,

Puppet therapy isn't the grand cure-all for all emotional problems, but it has helped many youngsters toward dealing successfully with their environment. (Sang and Wickersham, 1975, p. 34)

They cited several examples of how particular children grew from this approach which enabled them to improve their self-confidence, i.e. one little girl entered and won a race at school. Parents, the children and involved professionals all recounted "noticeable behavior changes."

Concommitantly, within an unaauthored educational document entitled "Summary Evaluation of Career Education Project for Buffalo Public School System" (1975), various counseling strategies were examined. One involved elementary children presenting puppet shows to portray roles expected of certain occupations. The results of this study led to the conclusions that these children became, "more knowledgeable about vocations
and specific jobs." By employing Holland's Theory of Vocational Choice, the youngsters were described as changed in their level of interest in Artistic Occupations and ranked Investigative Occupations higher than Conventional Occupations.

Burns (1977) hypothesized that puppets instigated a "communication channel" to marshal feelings which could be acceptably expressed. She stated that the "onus" was on the puppet to promote two things to occur:

1) Feelings are flowing through the puppet (the sender).
2) The sender is becoming aware of the impact of these feelings on the perceiver (the audience).
(p. 4)

Puppets were defined as "nonperson" symbols, which facilitated "two-way communication" to improve the child's "feelings of self-worth." The consistency of the structure rested on the contrived personality of the puppet as the author felt that only spontaneous presentation as opposed to prerecorded dialogue made significant impact. Burns expanded this concept when he wrote,

It is possible to imagine a puppet solving mathematical problems at the blackboard; teaching historical concepts; enriching language arts with story telling; drilling students in skills; learning the alphabet - making mistakes and then being corrected by the class. Puppets can write on the board; measure things; put their arm around someone; shake hands; cry; laugh; have sensitive feelings; in short - an entire spectrum of feelings may flow through a puppet. (p. 8)
Burns cited Caplan (1973) as he articulated a rationale for puppetry:

Clinical evidence indicates that when children express in fantasy play the hostile emotions they feel, they siphon off their antipathy so it will not be buried to cause inner tension and possibly erupt in real-life situations. (pg. 50)

Thus, Burns felt that children were better able to express their feelings and thoughts through puppet play although "more realistic play material often cannot liberate" the same. Puppet use freed the student to contend symbolically with his problems. This process, Burns established, helped the student to "see themselves and others clearly, putting them in touch with their feelings."

Hamrin (1981) found many children unable to verbalize their "thoughts and feelings about handicaps." By using puppet plays, he was able to establish interaction between children and the puppet to expose them to dialogue concerning their perception of a handicapped child. The puppets asked for help, reached agreement or disagreement with the children and posed questions, comments and suggestions. The author found the enthusiasm of the youngsters to be an asset for the puppet shows since they seemed, "especially effective as a teaching strategy." Hamrin found puppets to work "because they are safe, the imagination can take over." Animals were more effective, observed the author, because of their neutral quality which made them "one step closer to fantasy." When the
skit was over, the teacher assumed the role as the facilitator in order "to discuss the show, clarify any misunderstandings, and reinforce the points brought out by the story." Although it was not a controlled setting with measurable dependent variables, the combination of puppet figures and specific story content opened the door for subsequent exploration on the impact of puppetry.

In conclusion, the present literature repeatedly established a rationale to support the introduction of puppetry into counseling strategies for children. In the majority of the articles cited, these conclusions were based on clinical evidence, i.e. testimonial. Only in rare instances did a semblance of experimental design surface.


Strage (1979) attempted to measure response effectiveness to indirect messages using puppetry and role-playing as a vehicle for communication. However, this author
reported the confounding influence of the role-playing strategy, complicated the reactions of the older children. Although puppetry was not the primary focus of this study, it appeared interesting that such an unexpected paradox in behavior occurred. The potency of this technique seemed unanticipated by this researcher.

In 1975 a Career Education project, Buffalo Public Schools, used puppetry in concert with other counseling techniques. They found significant experimental evidence in a youngster's ability to select vocational preference according to Holland's theory of Vocational Choice. However, the specific technique of puppetry was not isolated from other variables, nor was this the intent of the study. Something positive happened to change the student's perception of vocational preference, yet no qualification of the specific puppet strategies were included in the final report. It would have been of value to note the extent of puppet use and under what control conditions existed with the presentation of this technique.

Ultimately, the intent of the "Leduc Project", to study the impact of DUSO, stands as a benchmark without the benefit of "objective date." Anecdotal statements continue to be a primary reference to the effectiveness of puppetry in the counseling process.
Hamrin (1981) reintroduced the concept of puppetry as an important child counseling strategy. The author combined this approach with a script in order to sensitize youngsters to the plight of the handicapped. It would seem a logical alternative to define relevant dependent variables in which to study this process, of puppet use with children, in more definitive terms.

Review of the Research on Bibliotherapy

Sclabasse (1973) defined bibliotherapy as "a technique which involves the utilization of literature for therapeutic purposes." This author envisioned the relationship as a "dynamic interaction" between the reader's personality and the content of the story line. She listed the various objectives of bibliotherapy which intervene at the different levels of experience; i.e. intellectual, social, emotional, and behavioral. For example, at the emotional level the concern was "with developing emotional insight and growth." Bibliotherapy has dispelled one's notion of being different or has provided vicarious experiences which were safer than real life episodes. This has led a client to discuss problems without the embarrassment of actually revealing oneself. In conclusion, she cited the occasions when bibliotherapy was used successfully within individual as well as group psychotherapy; either for meeting the
personal needs of elementary school aged children or many other specific counseling situations. Schlabasse found this approach to psychodynamic intervention to be credible.

McKinney (1977) reiterated the popular definition of bibliotherapy to be,

\[ \text{defined as the dynamic interaction between the personality of the reader and literature, which can be used for personality adjustment or growth.} \]

(Russell and Schrodes, 1950) (p. 550)

He described this interaction in terms of surface or depth theory, the former conscious interpretation of the story by the reader while the latter unconscious reactions to the reader's experience. He believed the "combination of the reading of selected stories and the good counseling relationship" would intensify the effectiveness of short term intervention. He surmised that fiction helped clients recognize and accept their own needs as well as "heal intrapsychic tensions." The best results of this approach occurred for McKinney when reading was accompanied by "repeated contact with a counselor." He reported seven instances when clients identified with a story character, five notations where events in the story led to self-references and three occasions when "insight into his own behavior" was the result.
According to Schrank and Engels (1981), books have been used for centuries as "primary sources of entertainment, instruction, and healing." To them, bibliotherapy meant guided reading to help solve problems and learn more about oneself as well as others. The authors reported "three fundamental processes between readers and literature" which were: 1) identification, 2) catharsis and 3) insight. When the reader affiliated with "a character (or situation) in the story" he was perceived as identifying to literature. Catharsis happened when the "readers share and vicariously experience motivations and conflicts presented." Finally, insight occurred when the reader personalized the behaviors portrayed in the reading material. Schrank and Engels concluded that the effectiveness of bibliotherapy has been demonstrated in studies on academic achievement, assertiveness, attitude change, behavioral change, fear reduction, helper effectiveness, self-concept, self-development and therapeutic gain. Bibliotherapy was seen as a useful "adjunct to group counseling" because the verbal reaction by the group appeared to augment this process. It served as a "springboard for the discussion." However, the authors
reminded the researcher that "little has been substantiated about how, why or when it works", although bibliotherapy had seemingly powerful influence.

Cianciolo (1965) wrote that specific stories "might be a source of psychological relief." She surmised that the reaction a child had to literature might encourage him/her to solve "existing emotional problems" vicariously or be employed to prevent emerging emotional upsets. Children may have needed to clarify their own difficulties through identification to the specific story. The author cited (Heaton and Lewis 1955) as outlining a sequence of steps to follow when one used bibliotherapy. These were: 1) "a retelling of what occurred in the story itself", 2) simulation should occur "to identify similar incidents relative to the experience of the students", and 3) students be given ample "opportunity to arrive at a conclusion or generalization about the consequences of certain behaviors." (p. 899). Finally, Cianciolo cautioned teachers who use literature to change behavior to choose carefully the style and content of the story and prepare "follow-up activities if a significant amount of change is to occur."

Vantichelt (1978) found bibliotherapy to be "an illusive concept" to define. According to this author, the research generated has yet to establish it as a viable psychotherapeutic process. However, by his "classifying those reading variables" which related to variables inherent in therapy, it was hoped that he could provide a foundation for such research.
Vantichelt reported that imagery "emerged as a potentially critical variable." Chi Square scores with $p < .01$ for those subjects who visualized when reading "tend to have an emotional response more often." He also cited another significant Chi Square at $p < .01$ level for those who daydreamed while reading to be another "imagery visualization factor." Since imagery was "an integral part of a number" of therapeutic techniques and "it emerged as a significant variable in the reading process", he believed this process to be a worthy topic of behavioral science exploration.

Experimental validation of bibliotherapy was not always easy to demonstrate. Shearon (1976) attempted to compare the effects of psychodrama, reality therapy and bibliotherapy treatment techniques on measures of self-concept of selected fourth grade students. The author administered the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Florida Key to establish quantitative scores for self-concept on a pretest - posttest experimental design. Her results failed to differentiate between the effectiveness of the different treatment techniques. Neither did any of the aforementioned treatment conditions significantly differ from the control groups regarding the measure of self-concept or influence significant change in the pre and post test results.

Dixon (1975) compared five experimental groups; one received bibliotherapy and another counseling, while others only structured reading activities. He predicted that the
children assigned to the bibliotherapy or counseling groups would be superior in performance of criterion variables of reading, self-concept, anxiety and school personal-social behavior. Pre and post test measures on the Winnetker Scale for Rating School Behavior and Attitudes, Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Children's Form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale and Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory did not reveal significant differences between the experimental conditions. He stated,

An examination of the adjusted group means, however, did reveal that the group receiving bibliotherapy and reading exhibited a significantly higher reading achievement level when compared to the group receiving group counseling and reading. (p. 3512-A)

Stephens (1975) focused upon "the relationship between bibliotherapy and some developmental problems of adjustment and growth." By utilizing a multivariate analysis of covariance, the author reported that "the bibliotherapy group had higher mean adjusted post test scores than the other two groups, but the mean differences were not statistically reliable." Stephens compared bibliotherapy to recreational reading and a control group with pre and post test measures of self-reliance, i.e. The California Test of Personality and the Teacher Rating Scale.

Lickorish (1975) quoted instances where "patients could quote examples of personal insights which had been mediated by something they had read in literature." He remarked that most
human situations have been described by "some literary genius at one time or another." He claimed that careful selection from classic literature could "shed considerable light" on motives and behavior.

It was the opinion of Nickerson (1975) that therapeutic storytelling was "as old as the history of mankind." She added involvement to the other aspects of bibliotherapy; identification, catharsis and insight. She defined involvement as "an interest or a sense of being 'caught up in' and concerned with the tale." The author saw this approach to create a "nonthreatening environment" to probe and discuss a story in order to delve into feelings and relationships. She recommended alternatives when exploring consequential behavior and feelings by applying "nonverbal means of handling the story", i.e. dramatization or role playing. This writer underscored her comments by adding, "bibliotherapy is still a hit or miss procedure." She welcomed experimentation to determine the "efficacy and efficiency of these procedures."

To summarize, bibliotherapy was reported to be a practice "as old as the history of mankind" with still a dearth of experimentation to clarify the specific process which occurs (Nickerson, 1975).

A variety of definitions were offered by different researchers in an attempt to discern hypothetically the event between the reader and the literature (Sclabasse, 1973) (McKinney, 1977) (Schrank and Engels, 1981). Sclabasse saw
reading as a therapeutic process if it stimulates an intellectual, social, emotional, and/or behavioral reaction. McKinney reiterated the classic definition offered by Russell and Schroder (1950) perceiving it as a "dynamic interaction" which can be mediated by conscious and unconscious levels of response to the story. Schrank and Engels reported that identification, catharsis, and insight need to happen for bibliotherapy to be something more than just reading a passage.

Cianciolo explained the process of bibliotherapy to be more than an event which occurs when a client reads a carefully selected story. She cited Heaton and Lewis (1955) as originating a three step follow-up procedure to encourage the specific psychogenic reactions by the reader. Thus when defining the practice of bibliotherapy, one has had to account for the interaction between the reader and the literature. After the material has been read, then the counseling activities need to facilitate the responses after the reader concluded the specific story (Cianciolo, 1965).

Vantichelt investigated the variables involved with bibliotherapy which were similar to those found in other forms of therapy. He found visual imagery to be an important overlapping condition. He reported imagery to be a significant event present in both reading and therapy (Vantichelt, 1978).

Although Shrank and Engels (1981) reported widespread experimental efficacy concomitantly many studies did not result in overly significant findings (Shearon, 1976) (Dixon, 1975).
(Stephens, 1975). Pre and post test procedures which utilized standardized self-concept scales were unable to delineate improvements in the measured personality variables when one compared bibliotherapy to other counseling treatments and control groups. There were however, reported favorable trends in the direction of the subjects receiving bibliotherapy. Aecdotal statements of success were reported in the research by Lickorish (1975) and McKinney (1975).

Several articles reported on the group approach to bibliotherapy (Sclabasse, 1973) (Schrank and Engels, 1981) (Dixon, 1975) (Nickerson, 1975). Schrank and Engels claimed that bibliotherapy was an important adjunct to group counseling which could enhance a discussion. Nickerson hoped that nonverbal techniques could be paired with "handling the story." It would thus seem appropriate to consider puppetry as an alternate means of intensifying the reaction the reader has to a specific piece of literature.

**Review of the Research on Children of Divorced Parents**

Guidubaldi (1980) reported on the changing face of the American family and the "Declining Popularity of Marriage." He cited statistics which reveal that the divorce rate has nearly doubled between 1965 and 1978 and that only 60% of the current marriages of young adults can be expected to survive. It was projected that "50% of the children born in the past decade
will spend some time living in a single-parent family."

According to Drake and Shellenberger (1981) an exploration should be attempted into a child's reaction to a divorce. They thought it important to investigate:

1) understanding of the divorce and private ideas about the divorce;
2) affective responses to the separation and divorce including nature and intensity of feelings expressed;
3) methods of coping with the changes; and
4) manner of handling the feelings and reactions to the divorce (e.g. keeping them private or letting them emerge in school or at home); and unproductive behavioral responses, if any (e.g., truancy, delinquency or low achievement). (p. 56)

These authors reported an "example of direct involvement of groups of children in schools." Group goals were described as clarifying and sharing feelings about divorce, "gaining a realistic picture" of this situation and finding new coping strategies to relieve the pain (Wilkinson and Bleck, 1977).

Arnold (1978) believed that children experiencing the divorce of their parents increased their emotional risks but did not necessarily condemn them to a life of maladjustment. He described some children as having little overt reaction to the news of a divorce. However, the child's failure to manifest remorse was not due to a "lack of concern." The young child had to witness concrete evidence of a parent's separation in order to begin to accept the reality of a divorce. Some children got trapped by the defense mechanism of denial.

Arnold viewed the child, whose parents were divorcing,"not
only has reason to feel angry, but also has more reasons to
develop inhibitions in the expression of that anger." (p. 287)
This was in part brought on by his/her feelings of abandonment
and being unlovable. Other feelings experienced by children
when involved in parental separation and divorce closely
paralleled those described in the literature on death and
dying. Except for the finality of death, divorce was the
experiential loss of a parent which precipitated feelings of
depression, anger, guilt, and confusion.

According to Sonnenshein-Schneider and Baird (1980)
children of divorce manifested behaviors in school such as:
"poor concentration, outbursts, fighting, withdrawal, and
inferior school work." Due to what the author described as
"Piagetian egocentrism" (Piaget and Inhelder, 1969), it was
normally difficult to elicit a shared group experience because
spoken empathy did not usually exist. Rather there was, "a
felt empathy based on a commonality of experience since each
child impatiently waits to tell 'war stories', with children
trying to top one another." (p. 88) Peer validation and
support would carry "much more therapeutic impact than
conformation from an adult counselor alone." The authors
explained that using puppetry would allow children to "express
deep feeling about a family situation." Puppets enabled a
child "to recreate the situation." Reading books about
divorce, *Two Homes to Live In: Child's Eye View of Divorce*,
by Barbara Shook and *How Does It Feel When Your Parents Get*
Divorced by Terry Berger served as an appropriate vehicle to generate group discussion. Puppets might be added to help "act out feelings." They were best used "when the children have a definite issue or idea to express."

Haberl (1939) was successful with her introduction of marionettes (puppets on strings) to aid in speech therapy. Corrective work when transmitted through the puppet, met with less resistance since the child felt not as personally affronted. The timid child became more confident while the "show off" took a "backseat" to the puppet. The child's aggressiveness was curbed by the mere fact that the puppet became the player while the child remained backstage. This offered a child angry about his home deterioration a more effective channel of communication.

Baruth and Phillips (1976) encouraged the use of books for therapeutic rather than solely instructional purposes. They began their article with a story, "Mr. Page, I feel terrible about my parents getting a divorce. I wish we could stay together as a family..." (p. 191) This approach was noted to be more successful with children of average to above-average reading ability.

Olson (1975) stated that bibliotherapy can be employed when "Sam's parents are getting a divorce;". He found "the reading process may serve as a catalyst to free his emotions from their unconscious roots (Shrodes 1955)." He listed picture books and easy reading for primary grade children; one
example was *Tina and the Latchkey Child* by Jeanna Oterdahl.

In conclusion, the research indicates that the techniques of puppetry and bibliotherapy best served primary school aged children (age 6-8) who suffer the emotional upheaval experienced when their parents separated and divorced. Therefore, these aged children were used for this study, coming from both urban and rural public school districts in the southeastern sections of Virginia. These children were served within a small structured group setting.

**Summary of Research and Relationship to the Problem**

Primary school aged children who experienced the divorce of their parents posed a particularly challenging task to the counselor. They needed outlets to vent their frustrations, however, normal adult-like empathy was not a developmental reality (Sonnenshein-Schneider and Baird, 1980). These authors encouraged the use of a variety of techniques including puppetry and bibliotherapy although not applied concomitantly. Thus, this led to the justification for combining and focusing upon this tandem of counseling strategies to structure group activities on behalf of these children. Divorce for these children was an emotionally volatile experience which if they were provided an opportunity could cope with this situation (Arnold, 1978). Today, more than ever before, this problem has been commonplace in our society (Guidubaldi, 1980).
For many years, the technique of puppetry has been successfully utilized within child counseling programs (Jenkins and Beckh, 1942) (Grant, 1950) (Koenig, 1951) (Dinkmeyer and Caldwell, 1970). Only recently the use of puppets was popularized by the introduction of the DUSO program (Dinkmeyer 1970, 1973). In fact, puppetry was cited as a potentially invaluable intervention strategy to facilitate affective educational programs to help stimulate young children to explore their feelings. However, little experimental evidence was gleaned from the literature to support the efficacy of the puppetry techniques (Strage, 1979) (Zingle, 1972) (Buffalo Public School System Project, 1975). Only testimonial and anecdotal statements supported the use of puppets as a counseling strategy (Liss, 1950) (Vidler, 1972) (Sang and Wickersham, 1975) (Burn, 1977). Puppets and structured story telling were described as a successful joint approach although without a controlled setting or measurable dependent variable.

Neither has there been overwhelming experimental evidence to support bibliotherapy as a carefully controlled research area. Significant results to depict changes in dependent variables were difficult to demonstrate (Shearon, 1976) (Dixon, 1975) (Stephens, 1975). Anecdotal comment was however very favorable (Lickorish, 1975) (Gianciolo, 1965) (Shrank and Engels, 1981). Further research of this variable incorporating role-playing or dramatization as "nonverbal means of handling the story" was encouraged (Nickerson, 1975). Therefore,
bibliotherapy might be coupled with puppetry to add a nonverbal component to therapeutic literature. Coincidentally, bibliotherapy could be a controllable counseling strategy either a puppet or a counselor could introduce. An attempt was made to compare and separate the influence the puppet had on the emotional reactions of the aforementioned children.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this present study was to compare the differential effects that the use of puppetry and bibliotherapy had on counseling groups with children of divorced parents. The children's attitudes and behaviors were measured by observational and standardized techniques. This allowed the researcher to determine select changes in behavior of the participants in the study.

In this chapter the examiner will describe the subject population, their specific setting, the instrumentation which measured the variables in question, the treatment conditions, the procedures for data collection, the research design and the method of statistical analysis.

Subject Population and Procedure of Sample Selection

Six elementary schools from the southeast region of Virginia were selected to participate in this study. The schools were: B. C. Charles and Epes Elementary schools in Newport News, Lee-Jackson Elementary in Mathews County, Rappahannock Central in Middlesex County, and Botetourt and Abingdon Elementary schools in Gloucester County. The
principals of each of these elementary schools agreed to allow their staffs and children to participate in this research project.

After direct consultation with each of the third grade teachers in the selected elementary schools, a survey letter was sent to each (See Appendix A for sample). These teachers were asked to identify students whose parents had been divorced. When these lists of identified students were completed, then each custodial parent was contacted through phone conversation and descriptive letter to solicit their volunteer participation and that of their children (See Appendix B). Informed consent was obtained for each student in the subject pool (See Appendix C). A similar procedure to the aforementioned one was conducted with the respective second grade classrooms in order to complete the subject pool since only 82% of the sample of fifty-one (51) students were located in third grade settings.

Each counselor was requested to identify nine (9) students for the subject pool. Of these students, six (6) were randomly selected for participation within their respective group while three (3) students were designated as control subjects, and did not participate within the counseling group setting. Four of the counseling settings were able to enlist the appropriate number of volunteer participants. However, this was not accomplished at the other two settings. The counselor in Middlesex County was only able to identify seven (7) subjects
due to a lower incidence of children in the community meeting
the specified criteria for selection. Six (6) of these
students participated in the group sessions and the remaining
one (1) student was tested as a control subject.

The other deviation from the selection procedure took
place at the Abingdon school site in Gloucester County. The
counselor was only able to identify eight (8) student subjects,
therefore six (6) were assigned to the group and the remaining
two (2) students were identified and tested as control
subjects. It should also be noted that one (1) member of the
counseling group refused to return to the treatment setting and
thus was lost through attrition since he refused post testing.

In conclusion, of the fifty-one (51) students who volunteered,
fifty (50) completed the necessary pre and post testing
procedure. The final population in the sample amounted to
eighteen (18) in the treatment condition (puppetry and
bibliotherapy), seventeen (17) in the treated-control condition
(bibliotherapy), and fifteen (15) in the control condition.

When broken down according to sex, the sample was composed of
twenty-two (22) females and twenty-eight (28) males resulting
in a 56% male ratio. Taking this a step further, the treatment
group contained 56% boys, the treated-control group 59%, and
the control group 53% males.

The total subject population had an average age of nine
years and zero months. The oldest subject was ten years — nine
months of age and the youngest was seven years — six months.
The average age of the children within their respective group ranged between nine years to nine years and two months of age. Eighty-two percent of the subject population were enrolled in the third grade and the remaining eighteen percent were second graders. Ninety percent of the selected participants remained in the custody of their mother, eight percent lived with their father, and one child or two percent of the sample was under the care of guardians. The natural parents of these children were on the average divorced approximately four and one-half years ago, the most recent was three months proceeding the counseling intervention while the most remote divorce occurred ten years earlier. Each respective group had an average date of parent divorce between the range of 4.42 years and 4.56 years. Sixty-four percent of the sample had siblings with the respective average at two siblings per child identified as with siblings. The remaining 36 percent of the S's were only children. Finally, of this select sample, sixteen percent were reported by their caretakers as either having been or now currently involved with a counselor outside the resources of the local school setting.

**Treatment and Data Gathering Procedures**

Each custodial parent who agreed to allow their children to participate in the study was requested to complete pre - post test measures. Each parent, prior to and at the conclusion of the group activities, completed the Behavioral
Rating Profile - Parent Rating Scale (BRP-P) (Appendix D). Concomitant with the post testing, each parent filled out the Child Information Sheet (Appendix E) to allow the examiner (E) to more accurately describe the student population. The parents were also instructed that results of the research project would be made available to them if their interest was expressed. The parents, whose children were identified as control subjects, were informed that their children would receive counseling from the respective counselor at the conclusion of the data gathering interval.

Each counselor proceeded to obtain pre-post test data from each child's teacher. The respective teachers completed the Behavioral Rating Profile - Teacher Rating Scale (BRP-T) (Appendix F). The teachers were not instructed as to the specific group activities or those students who only participated as control subjects.

All subjects (S) were administered the Behavioral Rating Profile - Student Rating Scale (BRP-S) (Appendix G) and the Children's Attitudes Toward Parental Separation Inventory Form SD (CAPSI) (Appendix H). The S's who received group counseling were available for pre-post testing during the second and last group session by administering group testing. Due to the sensitive nature of the material requested from responses to the CAPSI, the control S's only responded to post testing of this instrument. However, the control S's did pre-post testing with the BRP-S. These students were each individually
tested.

All S's completed Incomplete Sentence Blanks, Grade 1-6, both at pre and post testing (Appendix I). Those S's who participated in treatment groups were requested to respond to informal content oriented questions at the conclusion of the third session (the first book session) and during the last group meeting (Appendix J). These responses were tape recorded and later transcribed.

All testing was administered by the respective group leaders. They were not provided with manuals and therefore remained unaware of the parameters for scoring the results. The raw test data was collected by each group leader and forwarded to the E for scoring, compilation, and analysis.

The treatment and treated-control groups met approximately twice a week during the month of May, 1984 for thirty (30) minutes per session. The initial session (rapport building) consisted of "warming up" activities, rule setting, and group goal development. During the second session, the S's were involved with pre testing. From the third to the seventh session (five sessions), structured group activities followed the content of the book, *Two Homes to Live In: A Child's Eye View of Divorce*. Each counselor was prescribed a select number of pages for each session and five discussion questions (Appendix K) for each session. There were six different counselors who followed the prescribed format, however, three counselors used a puppet (Bubba Bear) as a prop from the
initial session throughout the life of the group. The groups that received the puppetry treatment were exposed to their counselor verbally communicating through the puppet a minimum of thirty percent of the time. Only the counselor used the puppet and the puppet either functioned similar to the group leader (adult-like) or as a group member (childlike). Verification of the respective counselors puppet use was documented by a video recording of a select session and third party review.

All of the counselors employed in the study participated on a voluntary basis at no cost to the E. They were each experienced and certified as pupil personnel workers of whom five were School Psychologists and one, a Visiting Teacher. There were three male and three female group leaders, two from an urban school setting, two suburban, and two from a rural environment. All the counselors received specific training in the appropriate techniques (Appendix L). The primary training session involved an explanation of the child group process and video tapes of children in group counseling where the E previously employed bibliotherapy and formative group procedures.

The control group received no treatment during the month long period. They were tested for the purpose of providing a comparison research group.
Ethical Considerations

The ethical guidelines established by the American Psychological Association and the National Association of School Psychologists were followed. Confidentiality, appropriate informed consent and necessary therapeutic follow-up were the responsibility of the researcher.

All test scores remained confidential and results shared with the parents, if they requested access to their child's scores. These were interpreted by a qualified examiner and if the test results indicated the need for continued counseling then the parents were so advised.

Instrumentation

The Behavioral Rating Profile (BRP) (Brown and Hammill 1978) was constructed to yield a dependable measure of a child's overt behaviors to assess his/her personal and social adjustment. It has been designed to explore behavior within four district ecologies: i.e., child-teacher setting, child-parent setting, child-peer setting, and child-self setting. All but the child-peer setting will be assessed within this research proposal.

The BRP is comprised of six components which are the Student Rating Scales: Home, School, and Peer, the Teacher Rating Scale, the Parent Rating Scale and the Sociogram. All but the Sociogram were appropriate for the present study. Since the BRP was norm-referenced, the rated student's behavior was compared to the "normal" and/or within the "deviant" range.
The BRP is composed of five checklists to evaluate independent components. The Student Rating Scale was completed by the targeted students to obtain a self-report. Each scale (Home, School, and Peer) contains twenty items intermingled into a single sixty-item instrument. The children were asked to classify each item as either "True" or "False" by checking the appropriate box. Home Scale items include: "1. My parents bug me a lot." School Scale includes: "29. My teachers give me work that I cannot do.", and Peer Scale includes: "10. Other kids don't seem to like me very much.".

The Teacher Rating Scale is comprised of thirty items which are descriptive sentences to be classified along a semantic differential, i.e., "Very much like the student," "Like the student," "Not much like the student," and "Not at all like the student." An example of one item would be, "30. Doesn't follow class rules." The Parent Rating Scale is also a four-choice semantic differential similar to the Teacher Scale with thirty items for the parents' response. An example would be, "1. Is verbally aggressive to parents."

Item and content validity on the BRP have been supported by the selection process. The items to be included were chosen by "1) anecdotal input from parents and teachers of students already diagnosed as emotionally disturbed and/or learning disabled and 2) content reviews of currently popular behavior rating checklists and scales." The author stated that a acceptable validity coefficient adopted from Guilford (1956)
ranged between .30 and .80. All items would thus contribute "uniquely" to the sum total of the measured behavior. The "quality" of the specific item would be consistent to that which is assessed by the test as a whole. The experimental forms of the BRP scales were given to 154 children, 7 of their teachers, and 86 of their parents all associated with a private church related school in Austin, Texas. The number of items on the scales was reduced from 306 to 120. One hundred and fifty (150) protocols for each scale were randomly selected from the standardization population. Analysis, of fifty (50) protocols from second and third graders using Guilford's definition, determined all items on the final version of the BRP to be acceptable because medium coefficients were statistically significant and ranged from .43 to .83. The second/third grade norm group median coefficients were: Parent Scale .43, Teacher Scale .74, Student Home Scale .43, Student School Scale .47, and Student Peer Scale .48.

The demographic features of the sample indicates the BRP was "standardized on a large, unselected sample of 1,326 students, 645 teachers, and 847 parents." Eleven different states participated in the norm group including North Carolina, a southern state similar to the present experimental population. This sample did not contain any students known to be identified for Special Education services. For the Teacher Rating Scale, four to five students were randomly selected from each class roster for the respective teacher to observe and
complete a rating. Parents who completed their scale voluntarily participated after forms were sent home and/or passed out at school meetings such as the PTA.

Concurrent validity was obtained by comparing the scores on the BRP to those on the Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist (1970), Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist (1967), and Vineland Social Maturity Scale (1965). A total of seventy-two (72) coefficients were reported where 71% were determined significant at the .01 level of confidence and 12% at the .05 level. Only 11% of these comparisons failed to reach desired levels of significance. For most of these scores, the nonsignificant results were associated with the comparison between the BRP and the Walker Scale. Of these seventy-two (72) correlations, forty-six (46) of the coefficients were greater than .70. It should be noted that these comparisons were obtained by sampling four district groups: Normals, Institutionalized Emotionally Distrubed, Public School Emotionally Distrubed, and Public School Learning Disabled.

Construct validity was determined by inspecting intercorrelations among various subtests. Forty (40) coefficients were reported which ranged in size from .49 to .96. These were all significant at the .01 level of significance. This result suggested that particular subtests measured similar aspects or behaviors to that of "companion subtests." The intercorrelations among BRP scales" were all statistically significant.
The second instrument of choice for the aforementioned study was the Children's Attitudes Toward Parental Separation Inventory (CAPSI) (Berg 1979). According to Kieffer (1982), this inventory works best at describing attitude and cognitive restructuring. The instrument measures six factors of "subtle attitudinal and affective responses to separation and divorce." The CAPSI is composed of seventy (70) yes - no statements related to specific factors which are: 1. fear of abandonment (FA), 2. self-blame (SB), 3. parental blame (PB), 4. maternal blame (MB), 5. hopes for parental reunification (HR), and 6. peer ridicule and avoidance (PRA). Clinical utility of this inventory has been described as considerable, however, validity and standardization appear tenuous (Kieffer 1982).

Berg (1979) claimed that the CAPSI emphasized the "cognitive dimensions" of a child's attitude towards the parent's divorce. The author cited clinical case study as consistently agreeing upon "thirteen attitudinal problems" encountered by these children. Berg reported these dimensions to be face valid as stress inducers.

The author established content validity by presenting cards with the original 130 items to a panel of five Psychologists. These judges classified each item into one of the thirteen categories and ranked them by position of one to ten with the top six items in each of the thirteen categories retained. To avoid overlap, these six final items were then reduced to four with the statements varied for negative and
positive valence.

The CAPSI was developed as a "simple self-report" instrument with form SD revised to consist of six scales, ten items per scale. Children who were older than eight years of age were reported to have little difficulty "reading and understanding" the questions with an estimated administration time between twenty to thirty minutes. Answers are keyed appropriately with either a yes or no response and a point is given for nonappropriate responses. Scores therefore could range from a low of zero to a high of ten for each of the six scales.

Norms for the CAPSI were reported by Berg as mean and standard deviation scores on the sample of "children experiencing marital disruption" between the age range of five to seventeen with a mean age of the individual participant to be ten years - two months of age. These scores were reported by scale to be a mean score of: 3.15 for PRA, 4.04 for PB, 2.50 for FA, 4.06 for HR, 1.68 for MB, and 2.96 for SB. The standard deviations listed for these scales were: 2.53 for PRA, 4.58 for PB, 2.58 for FA, 4.74 for HR, 2.44 for MB, and 6.38 for SB. The total test score mean was 16.35 with a standard deviation of 7.22. This instrument was described by Berg to be "an objective measure of cognitive change following intervention with children of divorce." He suggested its use as a pre and post test comparison to evaluate the efficiency of intervention.
Berg stated, in his test manual for the CAPSI, that the reliability after a one-week test retest procedure was "relatively stable." He reported a total test score intercorrelational coefficient to be .83. Scale score coefficients were: PRA as .67, PB as .91, FA as .63, HR as .83, MB as .64, and SB as .71. He noted that these scores proved to be "larger than those coefficients representing the correlation of the scale to the other scales", therefore they appeared to have tapped "nonoverlapping information."

The author found it difficult to report the validity of the CAPSI because comparable instruments did not exist. He was unable to document concurrent validity between the CAPSI and the Behavior Problem Checklist (BPC) (Quay and Peterson, 1967). Two scores FA and the Total Test approached significant levels (p=.10) when compared to the Total Test score on the BPC. Construct validity was thought by the author to be evident since a relationship existed between age and test scores (problem attitudes). This relationship was explained by the view that the CAPSI was a "measure of irrationality" and "younger, less rational, children would do more poorly." PRA, HR, MB, SB, and Total Test scores all exceeded .001 level for significance.

Rotter and Rafferty (1950) viewed the Incomplete Sentence Blank (ISB) as a useful technique to study personality. It is a "semistructured projective technique" in which the subject is requested to finish a sentence from an initial "stem." It is a
device related to the word association test, yet it involves no pressure for an immediate response. The average time for administration was estimated as twenty minutes.

These authors listed general advantages of this method. These advantages include: response freedom, nonapparent appropriate responses, relatively efficient, group administered, and the flexibility in use. The major disadvantages listed were: susceptibility to nonobjective scoring, not as disguised as other projectives, and insufficient material obtained from less literate individuals.

Rotten and Rafferty reported split-half reliability coefficients to be .84 for male college students and .83 for female. The sample of eighty-two females and one hundred and twenty-four males was reported by the authors to have a correlational coefficient of .50 for females and .62 for males with regard to relationship of ISB and classification of S's as "either adjusted or maladjusted."

Sacks and Levy (1950) perceived the Sentence Completion Test as a nonstandardized technique which was designed to "elicit feelings and attitudes in various basic areas of interpersonal relationships." Sentences could be evaluated with respect to content and formal characteristics. Some characteristics included: number of words, modifiers, and precision of expression. These authors cited positive versus negative expressions. The present study analyzed the frequency of affective words and the valence of these cues.
Research Design

Campbell and Stanley (1963) provided the model for the experimental design employed in the present study. It was a pretest - post test Control Group Design with two treatment conditions. This design has been presented below:

\[ R_{01} X_1 O_2 (E_1) \text{ Puppetry-Bibliotherapy} \]
\[ R_{03} X_2 O_4 (E_2) \text{ Bibliotherapy} \]
\[ R_{05} O_6 (C) \text{ Control} \]

\( R = \) Random assignment of nonequivalent group
\( O = \) Observation or measurement
\( X = \) Treatment

A modification of this design was required with the administration of the CAPSI since the test items might have become stressful for the nontreated control group. To avoid this testing and \( X \) interaction, the design used was as follows:

\[ R_{01} X_1 O_2 (E_1) \]
\[ R_{03} X_2 O_4 (E_2) \]
\[ R_{05} (C) \]

The aforementioned experimental design used the process of randomization to make the groups equivalent (Randomized Block Design). It controlled for internal validity of History, Maturation, Testing, Instrumentation, Regression, Selection, and Mortality. The experimental effects of History,
Maturation, and Testing were regulated by the incorporation of the control group procedure. Instrumentation was controlled by the use of a printed test. Randomization of the subject pool controlled for Regression and Selection. Mortality or lost cases were at a minimum since the time involved in the present study only lasted approximately one month. This design did not control for interaction effects of testing since there were no comparison control groups only post tested to compare to the pretest - post test controls.

The external validity, the generalizability of this study, was limited by the age range of the population and restricted by volunteer S's of Southeastern Virginia Public School children. An attempt was made by E to broaden the sample by selecting sites in an Urban, Suburban and Rural setting. Three counselors assigned to each experimental condition helped to regulate the reactive arrangements of individual counselor skills. The counselors were "blind" to the procedures used by their colleagues in this investigation. The use of paper-pencil tests made the data collection less novel and therefore easier to assimilate by the S's. Selection bias was controlled by running groups from six different school sites with control S's tested from each of these settings.

The data obtained from the pre - post testing has been presented in the following diagram:
This procedure allowed for statistical analysis of the mean scores (X) for each group.

**Statistical Analysis**

An Analysis of Covariance was employed to determine changes made by the three different groups during the time of the intervention plan (0₁ = 0₂ ; 0₃ = 0₄ ; 0₅ = 0₆). This procedure served to control for the influence of the pretesting on the measurement of the dependent variable. The covariance was also analyzed in relation to specific counselor results. The mean scores X for each group were compared to the mean scores for other groups by the employment of the Paired T-Test (X₁ = X₂ = X₃ = X₄ = X₅). The variance between groups were evaluated for significant differences by an ANOVA procedure which included a one way analysis. Confidence levels were established at P< .05.

**Hypotheses**

The goal of this research project was to assess divorce adjustment counseling with children when the techniques of puppetry and bibliotherapy were employed. Pre and post test measures were obtained for the treatment, treated control, and control groups. The following hypotheses, stated in the null
form, were made:

1. There was no significant difference between the reported behavior of the treatment, treated control, and the control group as measured by the Behavioral Rating Profile.

2. There was no significant difference between attitude of the treatment, treated control, and control groups as measured by the Children's Attitude Toward Parental Separation Inventory.

3. There was no significant difference between frequency and valence of affective words between the treatment, treated control, and control groups as measured by the Incomplete Sentence Blank.

4. Individual subscales of the Children's Attitude Toward Parental Separation (Peer Ridicule, Avoidance, Paternal Blame, Maternal Blame, Self-Blame, Fear of Abandonment, and Hope of Reunification) indicated no significant difference between the treatment, treated control, and control groups.

5. Individual subscales of the Behavior Rating Profile (Student, Parent, and Teacher Scales) showed no significant difference between treatment, treated control, and control groups.

6. The treatment group demonstrated no significant difference from the treated control group.

7. The treatment group was not significantly different from the control group.

8. The treated control group showed no significant
9. The treatment and treated control group, together, indicated no significant difference from the control group.

Summary

This study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of specific child counseling strategies (puppetry techniques in the context of bibliotherapy). This aforementioned objective was achieved by sampling the differential effects of divorce adjustment counseling for early latency aged children who participated in groups where these experimental conditions were varied. Standardized measures of attitude and behavior for a select cross section of elementary children were obtained. Frequency charting of affective words were derived from individual responses to a projective technique, sentence completion responses. School officials from six local elementary schools allowed volunteer S's (second and third graders) to participate in groups led by different counselors at each school. These counseling groups ran for approximately one month with pre and post testing based on a specific experimental design cited in Campbell and Stanley (1963). The hypotheses were statistically analyzed through the employment of ANOVA and T-Test procedures. Covariates were established and analyzed to control for the influence of the dependent variable test results and other potentially significant factors.
Chapter IV

Analysis of Results

The results of this study, which investigated the effects that specific child counseling techniques (puppetry and bibliotherapy) had on divorce adjustment, shall be presented in this chapter. The select sample, second and third grade children, were tested for attitudinal shifts, emotional differences, and changes in behavior. The findings associated with each null hypothesis has been divided into the following order:

a. Children's Attitude Towards Parental Separation and Divorce Inventory and its specific subtests results

b. Incomplete Sentence Blank results

c. Behavior Rating Profile subscale post test results

These dependent measures have been compared by treatment and counselor. This comparison was accomplished through Paired T-Test, One-way Analysis of Variance, and Analysis of Covariance. The covariates of pretest results and individual counselor influence were decided upon. These results were described initially in the form of their means and standard deviations. Subsequently, Paired T-Tests, Analysis of Variance and Covariance highlighted the differences between varied treatment conditions.
To improve the readers' understanding of these results, the information found in this section (i.e. tables and text) used the following abbreviations:

**Children's Attitude Toward Parental Separation and Divorce**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>Total Test Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Peer Ridicule and Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Paternal Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Fear of Abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Hope for Reunification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Maternal Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Self-Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Defensiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Sentence Completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incomplete Sentence Blank**

**Behavioral Rating Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T</td>
<td>Teacher Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P</td>
<td>Parent Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH</td>
<td>Child-Home Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS</td>
<td>Child-School Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP</td>
<td>Child-Peer Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitude**

The CAPSI total test score showed a two point improvement in mean score for post test as compared to pretest results for both the treatment and treated-control conditions as presented
in Appendix M. However, the mean post test score for the control group was lower by one point to the scores of the two experimental conditions (Appendix M).

Although both experimental conditions demonstrated a consistent directional shift, neither post test mean was significantly different from the pretest scores. The T-values for the treatment condition (T=1.39) and the treated-control condition (T=1.23) for the Paired T-Test comparison of pre and post test results have been presented in Table 1. The F-values also proved to be inconclusive as presented in Table 2 for Analysis of Covariance and Table 3 the One-way Analysis of Variance for the CAPSI total test scores.

The mean scores for the individual CAPSI subtest scores for pre and post test results have also been presented in Appendix M. Of the fourteen comparisons, seven demonstrated a positive shift and an equal number a negative shift in attitude. The HR scores for both the treatment and treated-control conditions had the largest positive shift in mean test score. Paired T-Test results presented in Table 4 indicated that only the HR post test scores improved significantly from the pretest measures with T-values of 2.15 for the treatment group and 2.78 for the treated-control group. Each of these values represent a P<.05 level of significance. The D post test score for the treatment condition also significantly shifted in a positive direction with a P<.01 level (T=2.93).
TABLE 1

PAIRED T-TEST VALUES FOR COMPARISON OF PRETEST TO POST TEST MEAN SCORE BY TREATMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Counselor/ Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Post Test $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Approaching Significance; P<.10  
** Significant; P<.05  
*** Significant; P<.01
The F-values of the CAPSI subtest scores for both the One-way Analysis of Variance and the Analysis of Covariance proved to be insignificant with the exception of the D post test score between the treatment and control conditions. These results can be found in Table 2 and Table 3.

**Emotional Functioning**

The Incomplete Sentence Blank (SC) was used to measure emotional shifts as operationally defined by the frequency count of affective words in the responses by S's. The mean test scores are presented in Appendix N with a shift to a lower number of emotionally toned words in all experimental conditions for the post test results.

The Paired T-Test values for both the treatment and treated-control condition were significant at the P<.05 level. These results are included in Table 4 with a T=2.68 for the treatment condition and a T*=2.17 for the treated-control condition. No significant difference was demonstrated between the pre and post test results for the control group. All F-values for the Analysis of Covariance and the One-way Analysis of Variance were insignificant. These results are provided within Tables 2 and 3.

**Behavioral Functioning**

The Behavioral Rating Profile was employed to assess behavioral changes in the S's as observed by parents, teachers,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Covariate</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI Pretest</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI Counselor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Pretest</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Counselor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Counselor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Pretest</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Counselor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T Pretest</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T Counselor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P Pretest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH Pretest</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS Pretest</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP Pretest</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Approach Significance; P<.10
and the S's themselves. The higher subscale scores connote more positive perception of S's behaviors. The mean subscale scores presented in Appendix N show only random directional shifts. Eight out of the fifteen measures moved towards a positive shift in the perception of behaviors. No one scale was viewed to change uniformly in one direction or the other over the varied experimental conditions. Only the BRP-SH scaled score demonstrated a larger than one point improvement in the post test result and this was obtained from the S's in the control group. All other scores were less than a one point variation.

No Paired T-Test values met the criteria for significance. Only one score even approached a significant level \( P < .10 \) and that was for the BRP-T measure of the treated-control group. The teachers of these students perceived a decline in their student's behavior (Table 4).

F-values reported in Tables 2 and 3 also provided only marginal support for change in the BRP scales under the various experimental conditions. Again the BRP-T F-values approached significance \( P < .10 \) for the Analysis of Covariance of BRP-T with the pretest score as the covariate (\( F=2.42 \)).

Significant results were indicated in Table 3 for the BRP-CS score comparison between the treated-control group and the controls. An F-value of 4.57 with a \( P < .05 \) was reached with this comparison of post test scores. F-values approached significance for the BRP-CH scores between treatment and
### TABLE 3

**F-VALUES FOR ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF POST TEST DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY TREATMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>T vs C</th>
<th>T vs TC</th>
<th>TC vs C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>4.12*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.15**</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.96*</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

* Approaching Significance; $P < .10$
** Significant; $P < .05$
treated-control groups, treated-control and control groups. These values can be obtained in Table 3. The F-values of all the other comparisons proved to be inconclusive.

**Counselor Influence**

Each counselor, with the exception of one from the treated-control group, had a session video taped. Upon review of this tape, it was apparent to E and an impartial observer that differences in child clinical skills existed. Each treatment group (puppetry/bibliotherapy and bibliotherapy only) had a warm, empathic, skilled communicator leadership type and a structured, concrete, behaviorally oriented leadership type. The remaining counselor, who led a puppetry group, was less skilled and maintained a highly emotionally toned group setting. Based on these observed differences in counselor skills, the covariate of the individual counselor was examined. Also reviewed were the Paired T-Test results of pre and post testing for each counselor's group.

It should be noted that all counselors, but the least skilled, obtained improved post test scores for the CAPSI. However, counselor 1's mean CAPSI score on the post test increased by approximately four points (Appendix 0).

Paired T-Test comparisons of pre and post test results by specific counselors demonstrated significant improvements in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Post Test $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Pretest X</td>
<td>Post Test X</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>T-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP</td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
* Approaching Significance; P<.10  
** Significant; P<.05  
*** Significant; P<.01
CAPSI scores for two of the six groups. Counselor 3, puppetry/bibliotherapy group leader, had S post test scores change significantly to a $P < .01$ with a $T$-value $= 4.78$. Counselor 4 had his S post test scores improve significantly at a $P < .05$ with a $T=3.50$. Finally, Counselor 2, puppetry/bibliotherapy leader, S post test scores improved to the extent that these scores approached significance at a $P < .10$

These T-Test values are presented in Table 1 with the two most significant changes in post test scores found in the groups led by the structured, behaviorally oriented leaders. In Table 2, the F-values were determined to be insignificant when the covariate of the individual counselor was established.

**Summary**

The results have been summarized in relation to the specific null hypotheses which were previously formulated. Therefore, only the significant differences in the dependent variables have been cited.

The results as compared to the null hypotheses are as follows:

1. The F-ratio for the analysis of covariance indicated no significant differences in the reported behavior as measured by the Behavioral Rating Profile. Only the One-way Analysis of Variance between the BRP-CS scale demonstrated a $P < .05$ when the comparison was made between the treated-control and control groups.

2. Significant differences among treatment groups were not found in attitude as measured by the CAPSI results.
Although both counselor 3 and 4 did establish a positive shift in their group members attitude, this was not a consistent finding of the statistical analysis of these specific test results. Counselor 3, treatment group leader, had CAPSI post test results which were significant at a $P < .01$ level for the Paired T-Test comparison to the pretest. Counselor 4, treated control leader, achieved a $P < .05$ in the Paired T-Test comparison.

3. A tendency toward significant results were obtained through the Paired T-Test comparison of pre and post test results for affective word frequencies in the SC measurement. Both the treatment and treated-control group results exhibited shifts in affective word usage with the post test results having a reduced frequency of emotionally laden words. The control group did not achieve these significant differences. However, these results must be interpreted with caution since the One-way Analysis of Variance and the Analysis of Covariance did not support this finding.

4. The results of the Individual Subscales of the CAPSI did not show significant differences among treatment conditions. However, there were some potential trends established upon review of the outcome data. The HR post test scores differed significantly from the pretest results in both the treatment and treated-control groups. Each Paired T-Test had a $P < .05$. This finding was not substan-
tiated upon review of the Analysis of Covariance and the One-way Analysis of Variance results. The D subscale score showed significant improvement under the treatment condition. The Paired T-Test was significant at a $P < .01$ and the F-value for the One-way Analysis of Variance achieved a $P < .05$ between treatment groups versus control.

5. The Individual Subscale of the BRP failed to demonstrate significant differences amongst the varied experimental conditions.
Chapter V

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

In this final chapter, a general discussion and summary of this investigation are presented. Conclusions, drawn from the analysis of the results, will also highlight limitations of the present study and a direction for further research.

Discussion

The results of this study were inconsistent. Only marginal trends, if any, in the data were gleaned to support the differentiation in the effectiveness of the various experimental conditions. Although some differences in the research findings are to be mentioned, these have to be interjected with caution.

First and foremost, the treatment technique of puppetry did not, based on the test data, influence the outcome of the divorce adjustment counseling. In fact, the overriding influence upon the statistical analysis of the data was the pretest covariate. In all experimental conditions, pretest scores explained the resultant variance. Post test results for the control group was also contraindicated since all the dependent variable scores, with the exception of the SC task, were found to have group means to suggest better adjustment than those scores for both the treatment and treated-control conditions. Although the children who received group counseling responded interpersonally to the bibliotherapy and
puppetry techniques provided by the group leader, the results of the data analysis did not support their efficacy. Through both observation and anecdotal comment, child and counselor participants alike, supported the application of these techniques, regardless of the experimental outcome.

In the opinion of the E, two major influences made it difficult for significant experimental findings to occur. First and most importantly were the differences resulting from the individual counselor skills and their presentation of these specific techniques. The second consideration involved the duration of time for the intervention strategies and, whether or not, there was a long enough period between pre and post testing to allow for substantive change. Although these two factors were important and inhibitory, they are not necessarily all inclusive to explaining the experimental findings. These variables will be reviewed separately as to the potential influence each had on the product of this research.

Counselor skill differences became apparent upon review of the respective video taped sessions. The original purpose of the video taping was to document the extent of puppet use within each treatment group setting. However, the feedback that was provided to the group leader led E to believe that each counselor would benefit from this activity and the information recorded would assist E in the interpretation of the results of this investigation. Five out of the six group leaders consented to the taping of select sessions. Generally,
each counselor approached his/her counselor role differently. Counselor 1, who led a puppetry/bibliotherapy group, was regarded as the least skilled. The post test results, although not significant, did tend to support this notion. The mean post test score of the CAPSI was in the opposite direction of the results from all the other groups. The direction of these scores indicated a poorer adjustment in attitude toward their parent's divorce. Counselor 1's style was highly energized, almost emotionally excitable, with the children encouraged to be "off task" more than attuned to the structured content of the therapeutic story. In fact, more than one-third the time of the counseling session had elapsed before the structured activity was introduced. The children were spontaneously engaged in conversation by this group leader with the puppet prop used well in excess of 50% of the time for verbal exchanges. This counselor did not attempt to differentiate her voice to that of the puppets and her employment of this prop was awkward.

Counselor 2 displayed a "low key" more empathic style. He too led a puppetry/bibliotherapy group and did so in a more effective manner. This counselor utilized the puppet as a facilitator of communication through verbal exchanges with himself and his counselees. Counselor 2 was well-practiced with his puppet and projected into it a unique personality, voice differences, etc. He was more relaxed and moderate with his deployment of puppet responses. The children in his group
were well-behaved, sat on the floor around the counselor and quickly engaged in the counseling content. The specific session moved quickly, without interruption, as the clinical atmosphere was child oriented. Based on the taped observation, the E anticipated positive differences in the post test results of these selected participants. However, the results only approached significant levels $P<.10$ in the pre-post test comparison of the children's attitude change.

Counselor 5, bibliotherapy group leader, has a very similar counseling style to Counselor 2. She too conducted a relaxed session, strong on interpersonal communication. However, the Paired T-Test outcome for the participants in her group was nonsignificant for attitude change.

Finally, Counselors 3 and 4 had group outcomes which were supported by significant statistical differences between the pre and post test results. Each of these respective groups manifested improved attitudes as measured by the CAPSI. These group leaders, Counselor 3 puppetry/bibliotherapy and Counselor 4 bibliotherapy, had remarkably similar styles as evidenced in the taped group session. They tended to be structured, aloof and highly task oriented. Neither counselor encouraged extensive feedback from their child participants but were more concerned with imparting the content of the reading material. Counselor 3 used the puppet more sparingly and chose not to project a different voice or personality into the puppet. He cued its use by verbally giving notice that the puppet was in
action (i.e., Bubba Bear wants to say something). It should be noted that although not anticipated, the participants in these groups displayed the most positive results.

Skill of the counselor, although they were selected on the basis of experience and training, did make a difference. The training sessions helped to set treatment goals and mapped out the presentation of the structured activities. However, each counselor uniquely interpreted the task for their respective groups. In retrospect, the E should have insisted upon practice sessions with the puppet and a well-defined differentiation of puppet actions. The counselor, who altered his voice and gave personality to the puppet, appeared more relaxed and was able to increase the varied use of this prop. All the groups led by counselors who used puppets verbalized their affection and joined effectively with the puppet through their attention to it regardless of the way it was presented to them. Bubba Bear became an integral member of the group.

The second primary factor intruding upon significant results was the short duration of time, one month, that the treatment strategies were introduced to the respective groups. There was only a relatively brief period of time between the collection of pre and post test data. Although the quick experimental presentation guarded against attrition as well as history and maturation, it more than likely did not allow for S change to manifest itself through the checklists and written questionnaires. If in fact change did occur, it's questionable
if the instruments employed allowed for its accurate measurement. It was remarkable that some trends were in evidence, although, it was within certain treatment conditions rather than between experimental groups.

In view of the previous remarks, E will offer an interpretation of the significant research findings. Based on the nonsignificant results of the Analysis of Covariance with the pretest as the covariate, the major portion of the variance was explained by the pretest as opposed to the treatment conditions.

A One-way Analysis of Variance was employed to compare post test results among the various treatment conditions. On only two dependent variables were significant differences achieved. This finding occurred in only two instances, once where the D subscale of the CAPSI reached a P < .05 between the treatment condition (puppetry/bibliotherapy) and the control group and the other on the BRP-CS where P < .05 existed between the treated-control (bibliotherapy) and the control. The D variable, defensiveness, was significantly lower for the participants within the counseling group. Based on the post test analysis, the S's were less likely to try to suggest that relationships at home or with other family members, were "perfect". Their responses had a lower incidence of an unrealistically glowing report. A similar result was found in the data comparison of the BRP-CS subscale. Again, the
participants in the counseling group, although it be the bibliotherapy section, perceived school less favorably. The control S's ranked their behaviors in school to be above average as opposed to the treated-control group who perceived themselves as emitting below average behaviors. Potentially, the S's who received counseling were more realistic in their ratings and thus included a negative flavor to their responses.

Paired T-Tests were used to determine the change in the measurement of the dependent variables by the comparison of the pre and post test results within a specific treatment group. Two specific subscales of the CAPSI, HR and D, significantly differed and the frequency count of affective words on the SC task changed also from pre to post test measure. Children who participated in both the treatment and treated-control groups manifested significantly improved scores on the Hope for Reunification Scale. These S's tended to be less susceptible than the control group to false hopes that their families would reunite. The children in the treatment group also became less defensive in their post test responses since the D subscale score was significantly lower than the pretest measure.

Finally, for both the treatment and treated-control groups, the Paired T-Test results indicated that the post test sample for the frequency of affective words on the SC task was significantly less than the measured frequency of these words on the pretest sample. One explanation for this result might involve the S's moderated change in the expression of his/her
feelings. The intervention strategies could possibly facilitate an increased acceptance of real events and concomitantly a lessening of the emotional overlay.

It must be noted that these significant results and their interpretations are offered with caution since differences were not supported on a consistent basis across the various statistical operations. Multiple T-Tests can by their frequent use potentially render significance based on test use factors in probability.

Limitations

A number of limitations to the quality and generalizability of the findings stem from the procedures of this research. The more salient limitations will be reviewed below.

The subject population limits the applicability of the results. The population was comprised of second and third grade children of divorced parents. These children were drawn from a select geographic region, Southeastern Virginia, all of whom attended local public schools.

The samples of volunteer S's were located in four different local school systems: Gloucester, Mathews, Middlesex Counties, and the City of Newport News. Six separate schools participated within these respective educational agencies. A limitation can occur on the basis that both school personnel and custodial parents were willing to allow for the
participation of their children. The significant adults within the S's milieu encouraged the counseling help provided to their children. The cooperation from the adults within this particular environment might influence the experimental outcome.

It has been difficult to describe these results without considering that the experience of divorce can end with a variety of reactions by the participants. A divorce can be compatible or angry with the parents involving their children with an array of interpersonal consequences. The child's material surroundings could change drastically which would lead to different feelings of security. Each child travels a different path to reforming the relationship to the custodial and the absent parent. The idiosyncratic nature of the divorce process has made it difficult to generalize and categorize the various differences.

Most importantly, the most significant limitation of this research project has been related to the sampling procedure of the dependent variable. Although paper-pencil techniques are familiar to student populations, they do allow for intrasubject interpretation rather than direct observation of S differences. When informants, i.e. parents and teachers, are employed, then the E secures information which has been filtered by another's perceptions and biases. Concurrently, these dependent variables have been operationally defined as attitudes, behaviors, etc., however, they are verbal samples of suspected
changes in these domains without promise that these changes are long lasting and in evidence in the S's everyday actions.

Further Research Recommendations

The results of the present study were inconclusive, however, potential quantitative results emerged to support the use of these specific child therapy techniques. Puppetry has proven to be a popular device to bolster the counseling experience, yet seldom have empirical support documented its efficacy. For this select population, the puppet prop was observed to be facilitative even though measurement of its impact was difficult to achieve. E suspects that with varied preparatory activities and a longer duration of time for intervention, more favorable findings would occur. It would be important to standardize the use of puppets and rate counselor skills to meet with minimally equivalent standards.

The divorce adjustment counseling for the young child remains a congenial and practical concern. To limit the degree of S differences, it is recommended that E pretest with the CAPSI and establish selection criteria. Specific subscales appear worthy of further exploration. Certain ones need to be examined as developmentally more relevant than others. E would focus upon distinct attitudinal patterns associated to this aged child and plan an intervention strategy responsive to these particular needs.

Puppet use may need to be varied to not only involve the
counselor but also the child's active handling of this prop. When children of this age group are dynamically engaged with the puppet, it assumes a broader function. The child will not only react to the adult usage, he/she will project some part of their own personality. The increased flexibility of puppet use could potentially allow for more significant changes.

Finally, it would be important to pursue in more depth, emotional changes manifested by the S. The Incomplete Sentence Blank responses suggested an important area of further exploration. The manifestation of the child's feelings, through the frequency count of the affective words, seemed to be a measurable indication of change. Alternate techniques (i.e. TAT) need to be employed to delineate more thoroughly intervention outcomes.

Summary

In conclusion, 50 second and third graders, of six Southeastern Virginia public schools, volunteered for divorce adjustment counseling. The E explored the efficacy of specific child counseling techniques, puppetry and bibliotherapy. Unfortunately, the results of the post test data proved to be inconclusive. Some changes in the dependent variables were noted but these were not consistently manifested across the various experimental conditions.

Although the review of the literature supported and encouraged the utilization of these specific activities within
the counseling setting, only anecdotal comment has been reported to document these practices. An attempt was made, through this research project, to develop quantitative results to measure the changes in the S's attitude, behavior and emotional expression based on their exposure to these strategies. However, the dependent variables did not exhibit the anticipated differences which were hypothesized.

Several extraneous variables influenced the experimental outcome. The most important of these were the observable counselor differences in style and group leadership. Future research should aim at controlling, through standardization, the impact of counselor ability and application of these techniques of puppetry and bibliotherapy.
Dear Ms

With your principal's approval, I am forming divorce adjustment counseling groups for primary school aged children. The purpose of this counseling is twofold:

(1) to help this aged child adjust to his parents' divorce.

(2) to research the effectiveness of specific intervention techniques in partial fulfillment of my Doctoral Degree.

I need your help to invite volunteer participation from your class members. Please list appropriate student names on this form so that I may randomly select participants. Of course, I will send home a permission form to gain the parent's consent. Thank you again for the assistance you have provided me.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth P. Bunting
School Psychologist
Dear

In partial fulfillment of my Doctoral Degree from the College of William and Mary, I am forming Divorce Adjustment Groups for Primary School aged children. Your child was identified by his/her teacher as a potential participant. These arrangements will be made on a volunteer basis and would require your written permission for your youngster to have the opportunity to participate. Included is the appropriate permission slip for your signature if you choose to give your consent.

The counseling sessions will be led by a trained School Psychologist or School Social Worker. It will consist of eight small group sessions with six children and an adult. A minimum Pre and Post testing will be required and if your child is selected, you will be asked to fill out a "10 minute" checklist. Some of the children selected will not actually receive counseling but will be used as a comparison sample to determine the effectiveness of the counseling, after the post testing is completed these children will then be more directly involved in the group sessions. All results and participation by the children will be carefully protected by professional standards of confidentiality.

If you have any questions or comments please feel free to contact me at 693-5300.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth P. Bunting
School Psychologist
Appendix C

☐ I grant permission for my son/daughter __________________________
to participate in the Divorce Adjustment Counseling Groups. I understand selected tests will be administered for the purpose of statistical analysis of this dissertation research project.

☐ I do not grant permission for my son/daughter __________________________
to participate in the aforementioned group counseling sessions.

_________________________________________  __________________________
Signature                                      Relationship

_________________________________________  __________________________
Address                                        Phone Number

_________________________________________

_________________________________________
### PARENT RATING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My child</th>
<th>Very Much Like My Child</th>
<th>Like My Child</th>
<th>Not Much Like My Child</th>
<th>Not At All Like My Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is verbally aggressive to parents</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Doesn't follow rules set by parents</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overeats, is obese, fat</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Complains about doing assigned chores</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Doesn't follow directions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lies to avoid punishment or responsibility</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has associates of which parents don't approve</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is not a leader among his/her peers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is self-centered, egocentric</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is shy; clings to parents</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is lazy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has no regular, special activities with parents, e.g., shopping trips, ball games, etc.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is self-destructive; pulls out his/her own hair, scratches self to point of drawing blood, etc.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Seeks parental praise too eagerly

15. Is unconcerned about personal hygiene; brushing teeth, bathing, combing hair

16. Sleeps poorly; has nightmares, insomnia

17. Has too rich a fantasy life

18. Takes orders from parents unwilling

19. Is overly sensitive to teasing

20. Demands immediate gratification, e.g., must have the bicycle now, can't wait

21. Talks too little; is non-verbal

22. Is unreliable about money; buys compulsively; is not trusted with money

23. Tattles on others

24. Violates curfew

25. Doesn't seem to enjoy participating in family recreational activities

26. Makes "put-down" remarks about him/herself; self-effacing

27. Won't share belongings willingly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Not Much</th>
<th>Not At</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Doesn't listen when par-</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ents talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Demands excessive parental</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Cries excessively</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Marks in Each Column =

Multiply Sum by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X 0</th>
<th>X 1</th>
<th>X 2</th>
<th>X 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Add Products

Total Points = _____ Scored
CHILD INFORMATION SHEET

Child's Name ______________________________________________________
Birth Date _________________________________________________________
Grade in school ____________________________________________________
Number of months/years divorced ____________________________________
Parent living with:  Mother ______________ Father ______________
Extent of visitation rights __________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
Number of brothers _____________________________ Ages ____________
Number of sisters ______________________________ Ages ______________
Has the family as a whole been or now involved in counseling? ________
If so, briefly explain.

Has the child or is the child now involved in counseling? ____________
If so, briefly explain.

Since the divorce has there been a marked change in the child's
attitudes and/or behavior? _________
If so, what kind of change?

Briefly list some things your child has said concerning his/her
thoughts concerning any issue of the divorce situation.
## BEHAVIOR RATING PROFILE

**LINDA L. BROWN & DONALD D. HAMMILL**

**TEACHER RATING SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much Like The Student</th>
<th>Like The Student</th>
<th>Not Much Like The Student</th>
<th>Not At All Like The Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Is sent to the principal for discipline</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is verbally aggressive to teachers or peers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Is disrespectful of others' property rights</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tattles on classmates</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Is lazy</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lacks motivation and interest</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Disrupts the classroom</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Argues with teachers and classmates</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Doesn't follow directions</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Steals</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Has poor personal hygiene habits</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Is kept in from recess</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Says that other children don't like him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Can't seem to concentrate in class</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student</td>
<td>Very Much Like The Student</td>
<td>Like The Student</td>
<td>Not Much Like The Student</td>
<td>Not At All Like The Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pouts, whines, snivels</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is overactive and restless</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Is an academic under-achiever</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Bullies other children</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Is self-centered</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Does not do homework assignments</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is kept after school</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Is avoided by other students in the class</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Daydreams</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Has unacceptable personal habits</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Swears in class</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Has nervous habits</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Has no friends among classmates</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Cheats</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Lies to avoid punishment or responsibility</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Doesn't follow class rules</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sums of Marks in Each Column =
Multiply Sum by $X_0$ + $X_1$ + $X_2$ + $X_3$
Add Products

Total Points Scored = _______

Total Points Scored
Appendix G

BEHAVIOR RATING PROFILE

LINDA L. BROWN & DONALD D. HAMMILL

STUDENT RATING SCALES

TRUE   FALSE

☐  ☐  1. My parents "bug" me a lot.
☐  ☐  2. I don't have enough freedom at home.
☐  ☐  3. My parents treat me like a baby.
☐  ☐  4. I think about running away from home.
☐  ☐  5. My teacher often gets angry with me.
☐  ☐  6. Some of my friends think it is fun to cheat, skip school, etc.
☐  ☐  7. Other children don't like to play or work with me.
☐  ☐  8. Sometimes I get so angry at school that I yell at the teacher and want to stomp out of the room.
☐  ☐  9. I have some friends that I don't invite over to my house.
☐  ☐  10. Other kids don't seem to like me very much.
☐  ☐  11. I argue a lot with my family.
☐  ☐  12. My family doesn't do many things together, like going places or playing games.
☐  ☐  13. I get into too many arguments with people I know.
☐  ☐  14. I sometimes stammer or stutter when the teacher calls on me.
☐  ☐  15. When my parents don't let me do what I want, I get real quiet and don't talk.
☐  ☐  16. I am not interested in schoolwork.
☐  ☐  17. My parents don't spend enough time with me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>18. My parents say that I am awkward and clumsy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19. Other children don't like to share things with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20. My parents don't approve of some of my friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21. I spend too much time playing/working by myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22. My friends say that I am clumsy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. The teacher doesn't choose me to run errands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24. Other children don't listen to me when I have something important to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25. I don't have enough friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26. I can't seem to concentrate in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27. My teachers don't listen to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28. Usually, I am not interested in what my teachers have to say to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29. My teachers give me work that I cannot do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30. Other children say I act like a baby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31. I seem to get into a lot of fights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32. It is hard for me to make new friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33. I have lots of nightmares and bad dreams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34. I get real angry with the way children treat me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35. My parents expect too much of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36. I sometimes play &quot;hooky.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37. I have difficulty sitting still in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38. Often, I think about getting sick so I won't have to go to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39. My parents won't let me spend the night away from home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRUE  FALSE

☐  ☐  40. I don't like it when the teacher tells me what to do.

☐  ☐  41. Teachers are often unfair to me.

☐  ☐  42. I get teased a lot by other children.

☐  ☐  43. I rarely get to spend the night with my friends at their homes.

☐  ☐  44. People think I'm unattractive.

☐  ☐  45. I am dissatisfied with my progress in school.

☐  ☐  46. I don't like to do chores in the classroom, like erasing the board or running errands.

☐  ☐  47. I often break rules set by my parents.

☐  ☐  48. I never get my way at home.

☐  ☐  49. I am shy around my parents' friends.

☐  ☐  50. Occasionally, I get so upset at things that happen at school that I get sick.

☐  ☐  51. At home I'm always trying to get out of my chores.

☐  ☐  52. I do a lot of daydreaming in class.

☐  ☐  53. I don't tell any children how I feel.

☐  ☐  54. I am rarely invited to a friend's home to eat or play.

☐  ☐  55. I can't seem to stay in my desk at school.

☐  ☐  56. Other children are always picking on me.

☐  ☐  57. I don't listen when my parents are talking to me.

☐  ☐  58. When at home, I spend too much time daydreaming.

☐  ☐  59. The things I learn in school are not as important or helpful as the things I learn outside of school.

☐  ☐  60. Some children think I am dumb.
CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD
PARENTAL SEPARATION INVENTORY
Form SD
Berthold Berg, Ph. D.

Name ____________________________ Date ____________
Age ________________
Sex ________________

Family Background (circle one):
Living together
Separated
Divorced

Date of Separation ____________________________
Date of Divorce ____________________________

On the following pages are some statements. Some of them are true about how you think or feel so you will want to check yes. Some are not true about how you think or feel so you will want to check no. There are no right or wrong answers. Your answer will just tell us some of the things you are thinking and feeling now.

PRA _____ PB _____ FA _____ HR _____ MB _____ SB _____ DF _____ TOT _____

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON PRESS
300 College Park, Dayton, Ohio 45469
1. I LIKE TO BRING FRIENDS TO MY HOUSE .............................................. □ YES □ NO
2. MY FATHER CAUSED THE BREAKUP OF MY FAMILY ................................ □ YES □ NO
3. SOMETIMES I WORRY THAT SOON I MAY BE LEFT ALL ALONE WITH NO ONE TO TAKE CARE OF ME ........................................................ □ YES □ NO
4. SOME DAY THE WHOLE FAMILY WILL PROBABLY LIVE TOGETHER AGAIN ....................................................................................... □ YES □ NO
5. IT WAS USUALLY MY MOTHER'S FAULT WHEN MY PARENTS HAD A FIGHT ......................................................................................... □ YES □ NO
6. IT'S PROBABLY MY FAULT THAT MY PARENTS ARE UNHAPPY ............. □ YES □ NO
7. MY MOTHER NEVER GETS ANGRY WITH ME ........................................ □ YES □ NO
8. IT WOULD UPSET ME IF OTHER KIDS ASKED A LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT MY PARENTS ................................................................. □ YES □ NO
9. IT WAS USUALLY MY FATHER'S FAULT WHEN MY PARENTS HAD A FIGHT ......................................................................................... □ YES □ NO
10. I SOMETIMES WORRY ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO ME IF NO ONE IS LEFT TO TAKE CARE OF ME ................................................ □ YES □ NO
11. MY FATHER STILL LOVES MY MOTHER .................................................... □ YES □ NO
12. WHEN MY FAMILY WAS UNHAPPY IT WAS USUALLY BECAUSE OF MY MOTHER ...................................................................................... □ YES □ NO
13. WHEN MY PARENTS ARGUES WITH EACH OTHER IT WAS USUALLY MY FAULT ..................................................................................... □ YES □ NO
14. MY FATHER NEVER GETS ANGRY WITH ME ............................................ □ YES □ NO
15. I CAN TELL MY FRIENDS THAT MY PARENTS DON'T WANT TO LIVE TOGETHER ................................................................................... □ YES □ NO
16. MY FATHER IS USUALLY A NICE PERSON ............................................... □ YES □ NO
17. I SOMETIMES WORRY THAT BOTH MY PARENTS WILL WANT TO LIVE WITHOUT ME ........................................................................... □ YES □ NO
18. I SOMETIMES THINK THAT IF I TRY REAL HARD I CAN BRING MY FAMILY BACK TOGETHER AGAIN ......................................................... □ YES □ NO
19. MY MOTHER CAUSED THE BREAKUP IN MY FAMILY .............................. □ YES □ NO
20. MY PARENTS OFTEN ARGUE WITH EACH OTHER AFTER I MISBEHAVE. □ YES □ NO
21. EVERYONE WHO KNOWS ME LIKES ME ........................ □ YES □ NO

22. A LOT OF MY FRIENDS KNOW THAT MY PARENTS AREN'T LIVING TOGETHER ........................ □ YES □ NO

23. WHEN MY FAMILY WAS UNHAPPY IT WAS USUALLY BECAUSE OF SOMETHING MY FATHER SAID OR DID ........................ □ YES □ NO

24. IT'S POSSIBLE THAT BOTH MY PARENTS WILL NEVER WANT TO SEE ME AGAIN ........................ □ YES □ NO

25. MY MOTHER WILL ALWAYS LOVE MY FATHER ........................ □ YES □ NO

26. MY MOTHER IS USUALLY A NICE PERSON ........................ □ YES □ NO

27. MY PARENTS WOULD PROBABLY BE HAPPIER IF I WERE NEVER BORN ........................ □ YES □ NO

28. I AM ALWAYS WELL BEHAVED ........................ □ YES □ NO

29. I LIKE TALKING TO MY FRIENDS AS MUCH NOW AS I USED TO ........................ □ YES □ NO

30. MY FATHER CAUSED MOST OF THE TROUBLE IN MY FAMILY .... □ YES □ NO

31. I SOMETIMES WONDER WHO I WOULD LIVE WITH IF MY MOTHER AND FATHER LEFT ME ALL ALONE ........................ □ YES □ NO

32. IF I BEHAVED BETTER I MIGHT BE ABLE TO BRING MY FAMILY BACK TOGETHER ........................ □ YES □ NO

33. I USUALLY HAVE FUN WHEN I'M WITH MY MOTHER ........................ □ YES □ NO

34. IT'S EASY FOR ME TO START A FIGHT BETWEEN MY PARENTS ... □ YES □ NO

35. I ALWAYS DO THE RIGHT THING ........................ □ YES □ NO

36. I LIKE PLAYING AS MUCH WITH MY FRIENDS AS I USED TO .... □ YES □ NO

37. IF MY FATHER WERE A NICER PERSON MY PARENTS WOULD PROBABLY STILL BE LIVING TOGETHER ........................ □ YES □ NO

38. I FEEL THAT MY PARENTS STILL CARE ABOUT ME ........................ □ YES □ NO

39. MY FAMILY WILL PROBABLY DO THINGS TOGETHER JUST LIKE BEFORE ........................ □ YES □ NO

40. MY MOTHER CAUSED MOST OF THE TROUBLE IN MY FAMILY .... □ YES □ NO

41. MY PARENTS PROBABLY ARGUE MORE WHEN I'M WITH THEM THAN WHEN I'M GONE ........................ □ YES □ NO
42. MY MOTHER IS ALWAYS NICE TO ME ........................... □ YES □ NO
43. I SEEM TO HAVE LESS FRIENDS NOW THAN BEFORE MY PARENTS BROKE UP .................................................. □ YES □ NO
44. I HAVE FUN WHEN I'M WITH MY FATHER ..................... □ YES □ NO
45. I FEEL THAT MY PARENTS STILL LOVE ME ................ □ YES □ NO
46. MY PARENTS WILL PROBABLY SEE THAT THEY HAVE MADE A MISTAKE AND GET BACK TOGETHER AGAIN ................ □ YES □ NO
47. MY MOTHER CARES ABOUT ME ................................. □ YES □ NO
48. MY PARENTS ARE PROBABLY HAPPIER WHEN I'M NOT AROUND .. □ YES □ NO
49. MY FATHER IS ALWAYS NICE TO ME ........................... □ YES □ NO
50. USUALLY I'D RATHER PLAY WITH OTHER KIDS THAN BE ALONE □ YES □ NO
51. MY FATHER CARES ABOUT ME ................................. □ YES □ NO
52. I SOMETIMES THINK THAT ONE DAY I MAY HAVE TO GO LIVE WITH A FRIEND OR RELATIVE ......................... □ YES □ NO
53. I SOMETIMES THINK THAT MY PARENTS WILL ONE DAY LIVE TOGETHER AGAIN ........................................... □ YES □ NO
54. MY MOTHER IS MORE GOOD THAN BAD ........................ □ YES □ NO
55. MY PARENTS WOULD PROBABLY STILL BE LIVING TOGETHER IF IT WEREN'T FOR ME .......................... □ YES □ NO
56. MY MOTHER ALWAYS KNOWS WHAT IS BEST FOR ME ........... □ YES □ NO
57. MY FRIENDS AND I DO MANY THINGS TOGETHER ................ □ YES □ NO
58. THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS ABOUT MY FATHER I LIKE ..... □ YES □ NO
59. IF SOMETHING HAPPENED TO MY MOTHER I'D BE LEFT ALL ALONE WITH NO ONE TO TAKE CARE OF ME ................ □ YES □ NO
60. I SOMETIMES THINK THAT IF I GOT SICK OR IN TROUBLE THAT WOULD GET MY PARENTS BACK TOGETHER AGAIN ....... □ YES □ NO
61. IF MY MOTHER WERE A NICER PERSON MY PARENTS WOULD STILL BE LIVING TOGETHER .......................... □ YES □ NO
62. I CAN MAKE MY PARENTS UNHAPPY WITH EACH OTHER BY WHAT I SAY OR DO .......................... □ YES □ NO
63. MY FATHER ALWAYS KNOWS WHAT IS BEST FOR ME ............ □ YES □ NO
64. MY FRIENDS UNDERSTAND HOW I FEEL ABOUT MY PARENTS ... □ YES □ NO
65. MY FATHER IS MORE GOOD THAN BAD ......................... □ YES □ NO
66. I FEEL MY PARENTS STILL LIKE ME ........................ □ YES □ NO
67. I SOMETIMES THINK THAT ONCE MY PARENTS REALIZE HOW MUCH I WANT THEM TO THEY'LL LIVE TOGETHER AGAIN ......... □ YES □ NO
68. THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS ABOUT MY MOTHER I LIKE ..... □ YES □ NO
69. IT'S BECAUSE OF ME THAT MY PARENTS BROKE UP ........ □ YES □ NO
70. I LIKE EVERYONE I KNOW .................................... □ YES □ NO
SENTENCE COMPLETION - GRADES 1 - 6

Name ________________________________ Age _______ Sex _______

Complete these sentences to express your real feelings. Try to do every one. Be sure to make a complete sentence.

1. I like ________________________________________________________

2. The happiest time _______________________________________________

3. Boys _________________________________________________________

4. Girls __________________________________________________________

5. What annoys me ________________________________________________

6. My mother _____________________________________________________

7. I am afraid ____________________________________________________

8. In school _____________________________________________________

9. I can't _________________________________________________________

10. Reading ______________________________________________________

11. Sometimes _____________________________________________________

12. I hate _________________________________________________________

13. My teacher ____________________________________________________

14. My father _____________________________________________________

15. I worry about _________________________________________________

16. My secret wish ________________________________________________
SESSION 2

1. How do you feel about your parents' divorce?
2. How do you feel about your daddy not being home?

SESSION 3

1. Sometimes when you think, how do you feel about your parents' divorce?
2. How do you feel about your daddy not being home?
3. Did you learn anything by being in this group and reading this book?

Tape record replies to these statements asking individual students by name to respond.
SESSION 2

PAGES 1-11 TWO HOMES TO LIVE IN

1. What does divorce mean?

2. How did Niki's mommy and daddy feel about each other?

3. What happened to Niki's daddy?

*4. How do you feel about your parents' divorce?

*5. How do you feel about your daddy not being home?

*Tape record replies to these two statements asking individual students by name to respond.
1. Does Niki's mother and father love her?

2. What made Niki sad at dinner time?

3. What did Niki's father say divorce meant?

4. Did you ever visit your dad's house?

5. What do you miss most by not living with both of your parents?
1. What did Niki and her mommy think about divorce?

2. How does Niki feel about divorce?

3. What kind of scary thoughts did Niki have?

4. Do you ever have scary thoughts?

5. What do your parents' tell you about their divorce?
1. What did Niki wish her parents would do?

2. What made Niki mad at her mommy?

3. What special things did Niki do with her parents?

4. Have you ever wished that your mommy and daddy would get married again?

5. Do you do special things with your parents?
1. Where does Niki spend Christmas?

2. What birthday present did Niki get from her mom?

*3. Sometimes when you think, how do you feel about your parents' divorce?

*4. How do you feel about your daddy not being home?

*5. Did you learn anything by being in this group and reading this book?

*Tape record these replies as you ask each student individually by name.
TRAINING SESSION

GROUP TECHNIQUES WITH CHILDREN

A. Theory: Video Tape #1

I. Yalom's Curative factors:
   1. Cohesiveness
   2. Universality
   3. Social Learning
   4. Catharsis

II. Stages of Group process i.e., Tuckman
   1. Forming Leader Centered
   2. Storming
   3. Norming
   4. Performing Group Centered

III. Tasks of Counselor
   1. Creation and Maintenance of the group.
   2. Culture building.
   3. Activation and Illumination of the Here and Now.

B. Implementation: Video Tape #2

I. Formative Stage
   1. Rule setting
   2. Getting to know other members of the group
   3. Goal setting
   4. Pretesting
   5. Log and Attendance Sheets
   6. Tape recording select questions.

II. Group Structure
   1. Content - divorce related
   2. Technique - biblio counseling
   3. Planned questioning, i.e., Dinkmeyer and Muro.
   4. Video recording specific sessions.
   5. Describing the sample population.
III. Termination

1. Review of the major events within the life of the group.
2. Post testing
3. Feedback to the parents.
### Appendix M

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR CAPSI VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher scores indicate poorer performance on attitude scale.
### Appendix N

**Means and Standard Deviations for the Behavioral Rating Profile and Sentence Completion Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP</td>
<td>Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Sentence Completion scores indicate a simple frequency count of affective words.
2. Behavioral Rating Scores indicate a scaled score based on an average score of 10.
### Appendix 0

**Means and Standard Deviations for the CAPSI Variables**

**On Children in the Respective Treatment Groups by Counselor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSI</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher scores indicate poorer performance on attitude scale.
### Appendix P

**Means and Standard Deviations for the Sentence Completion and Behavioral Rating Variables by Counselor of Respective Treatment Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-T</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-P</td>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP-CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Puppetry &amp; Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Sentence Completion scores are simple frequency count of affective words.
2. Behavioral Rating scores are based on an average scaled score of 10.
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