

chapter two - counsellors as teachers*

An examination of the arguments for and against the role combination of teaching and counselling leads to a view of counselling as being, in some senses, an ingression into the traditional practices of teaching; and, in other senses, an egression from them. The traditional practices of teaching are, therefore, analysed in such a way as to generate items for an inventory to measure 'teacher identification'. The inventory also includes items which invite respondents to reject the ingression of non-teaching principles and practices. En route to the development of the inventory, some observations are made concerning the kinds of role combination with teaching which counsellors tend most to resist.

This article follows an earlier attempt (Law, 1977^{c**}) to explore and identify the nature of what has been termed 'system orientation'. The present purpose is to explore and identify the nature of what is to be termed 'teacher identification'. Both system orientation and teacher identification are argued to be important and measurable components in the minds of people doing counselling and interviewing work in secondary schools.

The first task is to give some appreciation of the complexities implicit in asking the question 'Should the counsellor also teach?' In the past, this question has been examined mostly in the setting of attempts to show the practical benefits which the employment of a teacher-counsellor as opposed to a full-time counsellor would bring (see for example Schools Council, 1967; Bradshaw, 1973). Thompson (1970) came across arguments of this kind in his intensive study of the work of 25 counsellors. 20 of them had some teaching commitment to combine with their counselling role. Of these, 14 mentioned advantages and 14 disadvantages, some mentioning both. The main advantages were felt to be the improved chances of gaining staff acceptance (6 mentions), and the improvement of contacts with children (13 mentions). The disadvantages were said to be the creation of conflicts for the children (12 mentions), and the overstraining of the available time for counselling (8 mentions).

Arguments about the tenability and practicality of different counselling roles recur in the literature. What has not so far been attempted is fitting the arguments into a more general theoretical system which would help us to comprehend the general shape of the alleged conflicts between teaching and

the arguments

* There has always been some tension between teachers and guidance people. Both offer help; and offering help can make a person feel vulnerable: 'suppose my help is not accepted', '... understood', '...valued'; or 'suppose it is rejected', '...discredited', '...superseded'. Aspects of such frisson also occur between teachers and social workers, between almost any helper and parents, and – maybe - between social workers and IAG people. It hinders the notion that what is learned in one helping role can flow across into another (ingression). It favours a predisposition to see what we now do as rooted in what we have always done (egression). All of this seriously complicates the question 'is personal advisory work a new profession?'. The ideas in this chapter help to explain why, on any long perspective, the question cannot be answered 'yes' or 'no'.

** chapter one in this volume.

counselling, where those conflicts occur, and where the two ideas of teaching and counselling are closely allied. Dunlop (1968, p. xi) provides us with what might be a fruitful starting point when he observes that 'counselling is either an evolving profession with the school applications as a speciality, or it is a speciality within the profession of education'. Dunlop is not primarily concerned with the pragmatic problems of workability but with broader issues which require that the key elements in the two roles be identified, that the professional ideologies of counselling and teaching be examined, and that some attention be paid to how, historically, the two roles have evolved together or apart.

Implicit in Dunlop's formulation are two sorts of explanations for the occurrence of counselling in schools. One explanation is 'ingressive', in the sense that it sees counselling as substantially having its origins outside teaching, and as being brought to education as a fertilising but essentially intrusive and perhaps even subversive activity which can be practised in schools alongside the practice of teaching. In such a view, the school application is -but one of many possible specialities for the professional counsellor. The other explanation is 'egressive', in the sense that counselling is thought of as substantially having its origins in teaching, as part of every complete teaching role, as a specialism which can facilitate the objectives of teaching, and as sharing in the ideology of teaching. In such a view counselling is a specialism of education. A colleague and I have reported elsewhere that ingression and egression also provide useful concepts for the more general comprehension of developing guidance programmes in secondary schools (Law and Watts, 1977). In discussions of whether or not counselling and teaching involve conflict and of whether that conflict is acceptable, it is possible to find traces of both ingressive and egressive assumptions concerning the relationship between the two activities.

the ingressive relationship

The ingressive explanation of the relationship between counselling and teaching is usually accompanied by perceptions of conflict between the two roles (see Jones, 1970; Holden, 1971; Milner, 1974), although in some cases (e.g. Holden) there is an acknowledgement that such conflicts are an inevitable and even desirable part of modern living. Holden sees counselling as an ingression into the school, but not as one that leads to unacceptable inter-role conflicts. His view, in summary, appears to be that although not all teachers can be counsellors, all counsellors can and should be teachers.

Traces of the ingressive explanation are also to be found in a report by the National Association for Mental Health (1970), which argues that social workers of various kinds, with no previous experience as teachers, might be recruited into the school counselling service. Again, Hughes (1971) dichotomises what he calls 'teaching' and 'clinical' roles in unequivocal terms. He argues that the role of the school should be conceived of in much broader terms than hitherto and that there is a wide area of need not being met by present educational provisions. Hughes is referring particularly to the enrichment of the school which might be provided by more sustained contact with organisations like the

careers guidance, school health, educational welfare, children's, probation and youth services.

Each of the views referred to here seems to employ a picture of counselling as a distinctive and new contribution to the practice of education, drawing in only a limited way upon what has traditionally happened in schools in terms of care, guidance and support, and drawing much more substantially from the clinical practices and orientations of the voluntary and professional agencies of care, guidance and support outside the school. The counselling service in schools may, in such a view, be staffed by teachers or non-teachers, but in the practice of their work counsellors are thought of as experiencing some inter-role conflict with any teaching role they may be assigned, even though that conflict may occur at acceptable levels.

One feature of this elaboration of the ingressive model is the generic conception of counselling as a set of practices, roles and ideas which are shared by a number of different sorts of professional people and volunteers. Such a conception of counselling has been elaborated at some length by Halmos (1965). For him the term refers to a sociological category which can be used in much the same way - although, of course, not in the same sense - as the category 'white-collar workers'. The common ancestor of all counsellors is, according to Halmos, 'the giver of spiritual solace'. He paints a view of society in which the more primitive priestly roles have diversified into medical and paramedical areas, in which the emergent roles have been overlaid with scientifically-based theory and technique, but in which they continue to share in some fundamental dynamic of the priest which Halmos calls 'the faith of the counsellors'. What Halmos has described, in short, is the secularisation of primary religious drives.

Halmos acknowledges that there are others, apart from the medical and paramedical professions, who share the counselling role. But he might, for example, have paid more attention to social workers whose work can readily be seen as the secularisation of a former religious activity. As Younghusband (1964, p.23) observes: 'Historically, social work, like much other voluntary effort on behalf of one's neighbour, sprang from the religious motive. It had two parts, the giving of alms and the giving of service'. What we have here, therefore, is a global conception of counselling as a matrix of principles, practices and objectives which have their origins deep in the history of man's attempts to help his fellow man, which are reflected in a wide range of medical, paramedical and social work professions as well as in a range of voluntary and informal services, and which appear to have been ingressively taken up by at least some school counsellors for the development of their professional identity.

That educational practice is due for such a fertilising ingression of such influences has been extensively argued outside the literature of counselling. Herford (1965), for example, argues for a more unified approach to teaching and social work. In much the same vein, Mays (1962) has argued that the role of the teacher ought to be conceived of in much more diffuse terms than it usually is, and that particularly in the underprivileged areas of large cities the teacher should regard himself as, in some sense, a social worker.

The role of the counsellor can, then, be set in a broad context not only of teaching but also of social work and other professional and voluntary helping roles. Some of the more imaginative contributions to the literature of counselling acknowledge the possibilities. Lytton (1969), for example, in looking to the future, visualises the training of what he calls 'pupil personnel workers' alongside nurses, social workers and school psychologists. The task of the pupil personnel workers will be to help normal children with emotional difficulties - a task not notably different, Lytton observes, from that of the social case-worker. But it will be offered from a base in the school.

the egressive relationship

Inevitably not everyone accepts the reality of such perceptions nor the wisdom of such ambitions. Thus Baker (1971), looking at counselling in schools from an exterior vantage point, strongly denies that it has anything much to do with the casework relationship. His central argument is that school counselling lacks a mature system of methods, theories, principles and skills like those of casework, and he is unwilling to concede that school counselling represents the introduction into schools of such a system.

Hamblin (1971), by contrast, rejects the dichotomy between teaching and counselling because it denies the importance of creative teaching skills in counselling. He seeks further support for conceiving of teaching and counselling as a unified enterprise, pointing out that counselling need not be tied to conventional casework methods, and that group counselling and group guidance are available as alternatives to such methods. Barnett (1971, p. 13), like Hamblin, opposes any notion that counselling and teaching might be seen as separate professions. He draws an analogy with medicine, arguing that counsellors and teachers are members of a single profession in the same sense that a surgeon and a psychiatrist are. Williams (1973) employs essentially pragmatic arguments to support the case that teaching and counselling are essentially unified activities. Indeed he sees serious consequences in trying to split school staff 'into bad punishing figures (teachers) and warm sympathetic counsellors'.

Hughes has already been quoted at length in elaboration of the idea that counselling is an ingression into teaching, drawing upon 'traditions and organisations' outside the schools. But Hughes is quite capable of comprehending and representing the apparently self-contradictory elements in a situation. Contrary to Dunlop's formulation of the issue, there is nothing necessarily mutually exclusive about thinking of the relationship between counselling and teaching in both ingressive and egressive terms. And Hughes, with better historical sense than many, does both. He sees, for example, a strong historical continuity between the selection function and the guidance function in education. Guidance is conceived of by Hughes as a historical refinement of more primitive methods: one which sees achievement in its motivational context and in which, therefore, there is a place for the co-operation of the child.

Each of the writers quoted in this section takes the view, in one sense or another, that counselling is 'like' more traditional educational practices. Baker does it by dichotomising counselling and casework relationships, but others do it by pointing to the similarities between teaching and counselling. Halmos might well indeed have paid more attention than he did to the teaching profession when he was considering the variety of professions which somehow embody the secularisation of the faith of the counsellors. Much of Wilson's (1962) analysis of the role of the teacher, for example, points to the possibility of seeing teaching as a close modern parallel to an earlier priestly role, and Tropp's (1957) study of the emergence of the teaching profession in this country identifies, among its multifarious origins, religious roots. All generalisations are over-simplifications. But it is possible, without too much difficulty, to see the development of the medical, teaching and social work professions in this country as a diversification and secularisation of what were once more unified religious roles, and ultimately of a primitive priestly role. Each of these elements in our society has, in modern history, diversified further: medicine into physiological and psychiatric medicine, teaching into curricular and extra-curricular specialisms, social work into what might be called the 'listening' and the 'providing' roles.

Of course, the argument that teaching and other helping relationships are unified by common religious origins is a spurious one in the sense that almost everything that happens in modern life can be seen to be so unified, if a long enough historical perspective is taken. Go back far enough - and in some cases one does not have to go back too far - and one can find religious inspiration for art, music, literature, war, politics, science, and capital investment. No statement of the relationship between professional roles in psychiatry, social work, teaching and counselling can therefore be a simple one. There are many recent accretions to all such roles, and many losses of earlier elements. No doubt the seeds of counselling have lain deep in the traditions of teaching: in that sense the emergence of counselling in its specialist sense is an egression that flowers naturally in the role of the teacher. No doubt too the seeds that fall from psychology and social casework upon the soil of educational practices, find that soil fertile: in that sense the emergence of counselling in its specialised sense is a welcome ingression of compatible seed to compatible soil. Simple propositions that teaching and counselling are, or are not, in essential conflict, are probably therefore over-simple. Both are complex undertakings, with complex origins, complex accretions and complex relationships. More sophisticated statements may well find elements in teaching which share at various levels the orientations of counselling, and elements which do not. A next step is, therefore, a more thorough analysis of the contemporary role of the teacher.

As Wilson (1962, p.22) observes: 'The business of socialising children - of motivating, inspiring and encouraging them, of transmitting values to them, awakening in them a respect for the facts and a sense of critical appreciation - all of this is unspecific. It implies "what a man is" as much as "what a man does". The role obligation. is diffuse and difficult to delimit, and the role activities are

**the
contemporary
role of the
teacher**

highly diverse.' Illich's (1971) criticism of the teaching profession is indeed that it takes too much upon itself. The teacher is, he claims, concurrently custodian, moralist and therapist.

Many other lists of teacher roles have been offered by various writers, representing formidable, extensive and even self-contradictory commitments. The lists often employ metaphorical language: for example, teacher as 'father', 'grandfather', 'elder brother', etc. (see Hoyle, 1969, pp. 65ff). Thus Floud (1962) argues that in the 'affluent society' the teacher's outdated 'missionary' role should be developed more in the direction of the 'crusader'* (whose objective is to communicate standards of excellence in a cultural desert of mediocrity) and of the 'social worker' (whose objective is to comprehend the 'social dimensions' of work in contemporary schools). Hoyle's (1969, pp. 14-15) formal analysis of the role of the teacher sets out three broadly distinguishable roles: 'instruction' - transmitting a body of knowledge; 'socialisation' - preparing the child for participation in society by communicating to him the values and norms of society; and 'evaluation' - differentiating the children on the basis of their intellectual and social skills**.

A study by Musgrove and Taylor (1969a) illustrates the importance which is attached by British teachers to their specifically instructional tasks. The teachers were asked to rank four roles in order of importance from various points of view including that of their 'ideal selves' - i.e. 'the teacher I would like to be' - and in terms of their actual performance. The four roles were those associated with discipline (e.g. he is 'firm and keeps children quiet'), teaching (e.g. he 'explains work clearly'), personality (e.g. he is 'patient, understanding, etc.'), and organisation (e.g. he has 'everything ready for a lesson'). There was a high degree of unanimity about the high importance attached to the specifically teaching task both in 'real' and 'ideal' terms. These teachers wanted to teach, and saw themselves primarily as exponents of a curriculum.

But the evidence of Hargreaves (1967), Grace (1972) and King (1973) is that teachers also see themselves as transmitters of values. The agglomeration of values, sentiments and standards so transmitted is sometimes characterised as the 'tone' of the school, sometimes as its 'hidden curriculum'. The implication in the latter term is that the school operates at a split-level of open and hidden curriculum. Hargreaves (1972), indeed, develops the notion of split-level communication. He characterises the two basic and inescapable sub-roles of the teacher as those of 'instructor' and 'disciplinarian', and describes the disciplinary role as being closely related to the hidden-curricular role: both are concerned with learning outside the formal curriculum of the school, and with the modification of behaviour and attitudes in socially functional directions. Musgrove and Taylor's (1969a) study provides, in passing, some evidence of the importance which is attached by teachers to their disciplinary role: those who did not ascribe first or second importance to teaching did so either to discipline or (to a lesser extent) to personality.

* sic!

** This is not evaluation ('how are the helpers doing?'), it is assessment ('how are the learners doing?').

In another study, Musgrove and Taylor (1969b) asked 131 teachers and pupils to rank in importance statements representing three role-areas: teaching, discipline, and personality. Roles associated with 'personality' were expressed in such terms as 'a good teacher is patient, understanding, kind and sympathetic', and 'a good teacher is cheerful, friendly, good-tempered and has a sense of humour'. As it happens, the teachers were in conflict with pupils on this issue, pupils giving perceptibly more weight to teaching skills than to the exercise of personality which, in this study, the teachers favoured. Musgrove and Taylor conclude: 'There is probably a "curvilinear" relationship between teachers' friendliness to pupils and their effectiveness. When "expressive" relationships are emphasised unduly, whether in school or factory, "instrumental" relationships may be impaired. Insistence on getting a job done might put at risk friendliness between subordinates and those in authority. Too little friendliness between teachers and taught may well provoke resistance to learning; too much concern with friendliness may mean that more difficult tasks are never seriously attempted' (ibid, p.27). Musgrove and Taylor may or may not be right about this. The evidence of their study, which contained no measure of effectiveness, supports no such conclusion. The extrapolation to industrial situations is speculative and contradicts at least some of the evidence derived from industrial settings (e.g. Mayo, 1945). And that is to say nothing about the philosophical problems implicit in the suggestion that the teaching situation can in some sense be 'dosed' with the optimum quantity of an expressive quality like 'friendliness' in order to bring about an instrumental result like 'learning'.

Terms like 'curriculum', 'hidden curriculum' and 'extra curriculum' are familiar to teachers. The term 'inner curriculum' is not so familiar. It represents the idea that one of the purposes of teaching is that the child should discover himself. The process of self-discovery occurs, willy nilly, in all parts of the life of the school (and, of course, outside the school). It is difficult to imagine, for example, how an intelligent child can study any well-written piece of literature without finding there some new insight into his own feelings. Thus curriculum content will have inner-curricular consequences, and so will extra-curricular content. Indeed, much of this kind of learning about the self has traditionally occurred informally. But there are some formal exceptions to this: certain aspects of the school's punishment system, the grade-marking system, the examination and selection systems, the careers guidance system (where such a system exists), and the pastoral-care system all have, at least in part, the objectives of teaching children about themselves. The curriculum, in such situations, is often the child: he is studying himself.

This element in the educational process is called 'internalism' by Byrne (1955). Internalism is that element in the school's programme which helps a child to know himself*1. It is not concerned with information-giving but with comprehending the child in the sense of knowing about his view of himself in the world, recognising that the school's climate - although suitable for many - may or may not be suitable for him. Byrne thinks of this process as occurring principally in an interview situation. Hughes (1971) indeed argues that the introduction of counselling techniques into careers guidance in schools is

** Oh dear!

desirable precisely because 'if the help given is to be of lasting value for the individual's occupational future, it must include attention to those issues of personal development summarised by many writers as the "search for identity"'.

But to see this element in the teacher's role as exclusively practised in interview situations is unnecessarily limited. The school curriculum can be modified in such a way as to leave room for the formal study of the inner curriculum. Hayes and Hopson (1971) and Hopson and Hough (1973), for example, have assembled a number of approaches to the task of constructive and sensible introspection in classroom-based exercises. Some of my own work (Law, 1977a) is directed towards the development of what I have called 'an inner curriculum'. A recent survey of guidance provisions in a small sample of secondary schools (Law and Watts, 1977) showed that self-awareness represented a secondary but significant component of their objectives.

The foregoing represent attempts to analyse the elements in the role of the teacher. What follows are attempts to distinguish between different types of teachers. Musgrave (1972, pp. 226ff) has pointed out that not all teachers can carry out all of the teaching roles that have been outlined here. He accordingly sets out three 'ideal' types of teacher, each of whom will emphasise different aspects of the teaching role: the 'academic' teacher will see his role as centring on knowledge; the 'child-centred' teacher will emphasise the skills of teaching rather than the subject matter; and the 'missionary' teacher will see himself as rescuing the child from his environment or, in more sophisticated terms, as a compensator for cultural deprivation.

Further elaboration of two of Musgrave's types is offered by Kob (1961). The professional identity of Kob's 'type B' is based on his academic qualifications and on his specialised knowledge of a particular subject. He is more likely than his colleagues to be a graduate and less likely to accept assignments in the school outside the confines of his academic interests. He may be critical of his colleagues who 'substitute pedagogical methods for knowledge'. He sees teaching not as a primary and basic part of his role but as a possible field of application for his specialised knowledge. Perry's (1965) philosophical analysis of what he calls the 'traditional' model for teaching is closely parallel to Kob's empirical observation of 'type B', placing the same emphasis upon the teacher as a source of knowledge and upon the child's dependence on the teacher. Perry sees the traditional model as being static in the sense that there is little appreciation of how the child's attitude changes and grows. Within this model the teacher conceives of himself as already educated, and it follows that the only person who can profit from the process is the child. No account is taken of the child's history and his other environments; there is no theory of learning, and no appreciation of psychological development. The situation is conceived of as a preparatory one in the sense that the pupil is seen as getting ready to live and as therefore being in no position to question the validity of what he is being taught.

Kob also offers an elaboration of what he calls the 'type A' teacher, who derives his sense of professional identity not so much from his academic background as

from his pedagogic skill. He is therefore likely to emphasise the importance of teaching skills, although he may regard them primarily as a matter of personal disposition rather than the product of training. Scholarship is afforded a secondary place to the possession of teaching skills. Perry's analysis of what he calls the 'child-centred' model for teaching again provides a parallel philosophical interpretation. He sees the child-centred teacher as interested in the child's capacity to learn and as a facilitator of learning 'rather than as a source of knowledge. Subject matter is not primary, and the teacher's academic qualification is not sufficient. No standard pattern of behaviour is sought, Perry contends, by such teachers; the emphasis instead is upon individual and personal development. Underlying this orientation is an assumption that the child will be reasonable, thoughtful, critical and finally accepting. It is a psychological model for teaching in the sense that the teacher observes, relates, and guides by means of diagnosis and treatment rather than by means of disapproval and punishment. Child-centred teacher satisfactions are derived, according to Perry, from the initiations of his pupils, and great reliance is placed upon the child's capacity to initiate. The teacher too is therefore a kind of pupil.

What emerges from this selection of inventories of teaching roles and types is the possibility of analysing teaching role-concepts according to at least two analytical structures. One pays attention to different kinds of teaching tasks. The other pays attention to the variety of approaches which teachers might take to those tasks. For example, Hoyle's reference to 'instruction' identifies a task; Musgrave's references to 'academic' and 'child-centred' teachers identify alternative approaches.

For the purposes of the present study, four major teacher tasks are identified:

- 1. The curricular task** - enabling pupils to learn the material set out in the school curriculum. This corresponds with what Hoyle has called the 'instructional' role and with what Musgrove and Taylor call the 'teaching' role.
- 2. The hidden curricular task** - concerned with the communication of a moral sense to the pupils. This corresponds with what Hoyle calls 'socialisation', with what Illich calls the 'moralist' role, and with what Hargreaves refers to as the 'disciplinarian' role.
- 3. The extra-curricular task** - to do with the custody and care of the child and with the personal and social enrichment of his school experience. This is related to, but broader than, what Illich calls the 'custodial' role, and is also related to Musgrove and Taylor's exploration of the importance of 'personality' in teaching.
- 4. The inner-curricular task** - responsibility for facilitating self-knowledge and self-development on the part of the child. This corresponds in some degree with what Illich calls the 'therapeutic' role, with what Hoyle calls 'evaluation', with Byrne's 'internalism', with Hughes' 'self-identity', and with what Law and Watts have called 'self-awareness'.

There is a temptation to identify each of these major task areas with specific activities. The teacher in the classroom, for example, can be seen to be concerned at that moment with the curriculum; in assembly with the communication of a moral sense; in grade marking with the child's discovery of his own abilities (or lack of them); in checking the register with the care and custody of the child. But closer examination of these activities shows that generally each has more than one objective, and that, for example, communication of curricular information in the classroom is usually accompanied by communications of other sorts. Moreover, there are other activities, such as administrative duties or the operation of the punishment system, which have a very broad range of objectives indeed. Almost all of the teacher's tasks need to be serviced with administrative chores, and the punishment system in the school is characteristically used for a wide range of curricular and other purposes.

So far as the approaches which a teacher might take are concerned, these can be identified as a continuum ranging from extreme nomothetic to extreme idiographic approaches:

- 1. Nomothetic approaches** are authoritarian in the sense that the child is thought of as being subjected to objective and legitimate curricular content, standards of behaviour, provisions and evaluations, to which disciplines the child is expected to submit himself and by which he is to be judged. The authority of such an approach may be legitimised by society-at-large, by the school, by the will of the teacher, by the requirements of an examination system, or by other means. The essential feature of the nomothetic approach is that the legitimisation of the task is founded entirely externally to the child. It corresponds in some measure to what Musgrave calls 'academic', to what Floud calls 'crusading' roles, to Kob's 'type B', and to Perry's 'traditional' teacher.
- 2. Idiographic approaches** are democratic in the sense that they begin with an attempt to comprehend the child and his individual differences, difficulties and strengths. The child is invited to participate in the learning, socialising, enriching or evaluative experience. The legitimisation of the task is internal to the child. As an approach it corresponds to some extent with what Musgrave calls 'child-centred' and what Floud calls 'social work' roles. It also corresponds with elements in Kob's characterisation of 'type A' and in Perry's 'child-centred' teacher.

A matrix of four broadly distinguishable tasks and two broadly distinguishable types of approach yields an analysis of possible contemporary teaching roles in eight cells. The cells are set out in table 1, together with operational descriptions of some of the typical duties of a British school teacher.

Table 1 – chapter two. Analysis of teaching operations by task and approach

Tasks	Nomothetic	Idiographic
Curricular	a. Designing curriculum	a. Facilitating project work
	b. Lecturing	b. Manning* resource centre
Extra-curricular	a. Punishment	a. Attending pupil council
	b. Communicating moral values	b. Discussion of moral issues
Hidden-curricular	a. Running school club	a. Befriending pupils
	b. Custodial duties	b. Supporting rejected or deviant pupils
Inner-curricular	a. Grade marking	a. Discussing test results
	b. Testing	b. Counselling

The relationship between teaching and counselling - based upon both an ingressive and an egressive conceptualisation - is expressed in the items in table 2. Some of the items are rooted in comparisons between teaching and outside sources of practice and ideology (e.g. items 31, 33, 35). Some are rooted in linking counselling to various combinations of task and approach in the role of the teacher (e.g. items 32, 34, 37).

counsellors' acceptance of teaching and non-teaching roles

The items were incorporated at random into a questionnaire also incorporating 30 System Orientation Inventory items which was administered or mailed to a main-sample of 398 respondents mentioned in a previous article** (Law, 1977c). A seven-point scale of agreement and disagreement was attached to each of the items, a score of 1 representing absolute acceptance of the statement, and a score of 7, absolute rejection. Table 2 sets out the means and standard deviations of the raw scores obtained from the main sample for these items. A low mean indicates a high degree of general acceptance of that item. A low standard deviation indicates a high degree of agreement between members of the sample.

Five of the six most readily acceptable statements refer to the acceptability of combining the teaching and counselling role. All four teaching tasks identified in the earlier analysis - extra-curricular (item 48), inner-curricular (item 41), hidden-curricular (item 45) and curricular (items 40 and 44) - appear in those items. But each is written in what was earlier identified as idiographic terms. The approach to teaching represented is student-centred, easy and relaxed, based

* Oh dear, Oh dear!

** chapter one

on the student's perceptions of himself, directed towards self- rather than legislative discipline, using informal methods, and offering opportunity for autonomy and participation to the student. In these circumstances the counsellors seem to experience little difficulty in reconciling the teaching and the counselling roles. Where similar kinds of tasks are worded in more nomothetic terms, they are more likely to be rejected: formal teaching from a set curriculum (item 38) and the custodial care of the child (item 39) both have means which fall in the rejection part of the response scale.

A suggestion which emerges from this evidence is that the problems connected with reconciling teaching and counselling are much more critically attached to teaching approaches than to teaching tasks. All of the tasks designated here have been accepted, at least in some form, by the counsellors in this study. It is when those tasks are set about by nomothetic methods that they are more likely to be rejected (see e.g. items 32, 38, 39).

There is a great deal, then, in the idiographic role of the teacher which is seen by counsellors acceptably to egress into the role of the counsellor. What of their perception of the ingression into a counselling role of skills and ideologies from outside the school? There was a general acceptance of the view that counselling work should be seen by the children as different from the work of the teachers (item 47), and that the work of the counsellor should be supervised by a specialist in guidance rather than the headteacher or a senior teaching colleague (item 36). But there was no general acceptance of the suggestion that the work of the counsellor is more like that of a social worker (item 43), child psychotherapist (item 33), or educational psychologist (item 35) than it is like that of a teacher, although there was no general rejection either.

The conclusion must be that while people doing counselling work in school see little problem in accepting compatible 'idiographic' elements in the teaching role, there is no similar general agreement concerning the ingression into that role of elements taken from outside the school. To the latter part of the issue the only possible generalisation is: 'some do, and some do not'.

the construction of a Teacher Identification Inventory

The main purpose for assembling the items, however, was to arrive at a measure of teacher identification on the part of people involved in interviewing and counselling work in secondary schools. The 18 items listed in table 2 were retained from a 22-item pilot version of the inventory because they offered higher item-total correlations. The method was identical with that used for the development of the System Orientation Inventory, described in detail elsewhere (see Law, 1977b; 1977c14). Item-total correlations for the pilot sample are given in table 2. The selected items yield an inventory with a reliability coefficient-alpha of 0.90 (see Cronbach, 1951; McKennell, 1968). After reversal of scores for asterisked items, the inventory represents a measure of identification with teachers as a group. It has been employed in further investigations into the role conceptions of secondary school counsellors, which will be reported later.

- Baker, R.: 'Caseworker and Counsellor: Some Points for Discussion'. *The Counsellor*, No. 8, 1971.
- Barnett, B.R.: 'The Role of the British School Counsellor'. *The Counsellor*, No. 6, 1971.
- Bradshaw, K.D.: *Counselling in Schools*. London: Headmasters Association/ National Association of Counsellors in Education, 1973.
- Byrne, R.H.: 'Educational Counselling'. In Hall, R.K., and Lawreys, J.A. (eds.): *The Year Book of Education*. London: Evans, 1955.
- Cronbach, L.H.: 'Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests'. *Psychometrika*, No. 16, 1951, pp. 297-334.
- Dunlop, R.S.: *Professional Problems in School Counselling Practice*. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Text Book Company, 1968.
- Floud, J.: 'Teaching in the Affluent Society'. *British Journal of Sociology*, Volume XIII No. 4, 1962, pp. 299-308.
- Grace, G.R.: *Role Conflict and the Teacher*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Halmos, P.: *The Faith of the Counsellors*. London: Constable, 1965.
- Hamblin, D.: 'The Work of the School Counsellor'. *The Counsellor*, No. 7, 1971.
- Hargreaves, D.H.: *Social Relations in a Secondary School*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Hargreaves, D.H.: *Interpersonal Relations and Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Hayes, J., and Hopson, B.: *Careers Guidance*. London: Heinemann, 1971.
- Herford, M.E.M.: 'Comprehensive Counselling'. *Education*, No. 3263, 1965, pp. 277-278.
- Hoiden, A.: *Counselling in Secondary Schools*. London: Constable, 1971.
- Hopson, B., and Hough, P.: *Exercises in Personal and Career Development*. Cambridge: Careers Research and Advisory Centre, 1973.
- Hoyle, E.: *The Role of the Teacher*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Hughes, P.M.: *Guidance and Counselling in Schools: a Response to Change*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1971.
- Illich, L: *Deschooling Society*. London: Calder & Boyars, 1971.
- Jones, A.: *School Counselling in Practice*. London: Ward Lock, 1970.
- King, R.: *School Organisation and Pupil Involvement*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Kob, J.: 'Definition of the Teacher's Role'. In Halsey, A.H., Floud, J., and Anderson, C.A.: *Education, Economy and Society*, pp. 558-576. Glencoe: Free Press, 1961.
- Law, B.: *Decide for Yourself* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Careers Research and Advisory Centre, 1977(a).
- Law, B.: *Role Conceptions of Secondary School Counsellors*. PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London, 1977(b).
- Law, B.: 'System Orientation: a Dilemma for Secondary School Counsellors'. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, Volume 5 No.2, 1977(c).
- Law, B., and Watts, A.G : *Schools, Careers and Community*. London: Church Information Office, 1977.
- Lytton, H.: 'An Integrated Approach to Counselling and Social Work'. In Lytton, H., and Craft, M. (eds.): *Guidance and Counselling in British Schools*. London: Arnold, 1969.

Table 2 – chapter two: Means, standard deviation and item-total correlations of raw scores for 18 items concerning the relationship between counselling and teaching

Rank order of agreement	Item no.	Item content	Mean	Main sample N=398 Standard deviation	Pilot sample N=50 Item-total correlation
1	31	The professional ethic I want to work to is different from the professional ethic of the teaching profession.	3.5	1.6	0.60
11	32*	I want to combine my role with a teaching role where I am also communicating to the child the disciplines and values of society.	3.5	1.9	0.30
14	33	I want to do work which is more like that of a child-psychotherapist than it is like that of a teacher.	3.8	1.8	0.69
18	34*	I want to have a teaching programme so that I can demonstrate to my colleagues my effectiveness as a teacher.	4.6	1.8	0.47
14	35	The work I want to do is more like that of an educational psychologist than it is like that of a teacher.	3.8	1.7	0.64
7	36	I want my counselling and interviewing work to be supervised by a specialist in guidance and counselling rather than by the headteacher or a senior teaching colleague.	2.8	1.4	0.36
10	37*	I want my counselling and interviewing work to be combined with a timetabled teaching programme so that I can understand what is happening in the daily life of the school.	3.4	2.0	0.81
16	38*	I want to combine my counselling and interviewing role with a role where I am doing formal teaching from a set curriculum.	4.4	2.0	0.65
18	39*	I want to combine my counselling and interviewing role with a role where I am responsible for 'shepherding' or 'looking after' the children in a custodial sense.	4.6	1.9	0.40
5	40*	I want to combine my counselling and interviewing role with a role where I am also working with timetabled groups in an informal way and where the children can choose the topics for study and discussion.	2.7	1.4	0.42

Rank order of agreement	Item no.	Item content	Mean	Main sample N=398 Standard deviation	Pilot sample N=50 Item-total correlation
3	41*	I want to combine my counselling and interviewing role with a teaching role where I can help children gain a sense of themselves as individual persons.	2.6	1.5	0.57
9	42	The skills I want to develop are different from the skills of most teachers.	3.1	1.7	0.63
13	43	The work I want to do is more like that of a social worker than it is like that of a teacher.	3.6	1.6	0.63
3	44*	I want to have a timetabled teaching programme so that I can keep in touch with the day-to-day problems of the classroom.	2.6	1.9	0.76
2	45*	I want to combine my counselling and interviewing role with a teaching role where I can help the children develop self-discipline and a sense of their own values.	2.6	1.6	0.41
9	46	The work I want to do is different even from the work of a child-centred teacher.	3.3	1.5	0.52
5	47	I want my counselling and interviewing work to be seen by the children as something different from the work of the teachers.	2.7	1.6	0.56
1	48*	I want to combine my counselling and interviewing role with a role where I am also having 'extra-curricular' responsibilities in which I can engage with the children in an easy and relaxed manner.	2.4	1.3	0.30

Notes

1. The raw scores of items marked above with an asterisk were reversed so that, for the purposes of the item-total correlations, agreement with these items was equivalent to disagreement with the other items. Scoring procedure is explained in detail in Law (1977c).
2. The item-total correlation is the correlation between the distribution of scores on each item and the aggregated total for the remaining 22 items in the pilot version of the questionnaire.
3. Items are numbered 31-48 to avoid confusion in later articles where System Orientation items (numbered 1-30) and Teacher Identification items will be compared.

- McKinnell, A.C.: 'Use of Coefficient-Alpha in Constructing Attitude and Similar Scales'. Government Social Survey Report, SS 353/11, 1968.
- Mayo, B.: *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilisation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1945.
- Mays, J.B.: *Education and the Urban Child*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1962.
- Milner, P.: *Counselling in Education*. London: Dent, 1974.
- Musgrave, P.W.: *The Sociology of Education* (2nd edition). London: Methuen, 1972.
- Musgrove, F., and Taylor, P.H.: 'Teachers' Role Conflicts'. In Musgrove, F., and Taylor, P.H.: *Society and the Teacher's Role*, pp. 43-57. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969(a).
- Musgrove, F., and Taylor, P.H.: 'The Expectations of Pupils'. In Musgrove, F., and Taylor, P.H.: *Society and the Teacher's Role*, pp. 17-27. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969(b).
- National Association for Mental Health: *School Counselling*. London: NAMH, 1970.
- Perry, L.R.: 'What is an Educational Situation?' In Archambault, R.D. (ed.): *Philosophical Analysis and Education*, pp. 59-86. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Schools Council: *Counselling in Schools*. Working Paper 15. London: HMSO, 1967.
- Thompson, A.J.M.: *An Investigation into the Work Performed by Some Trained Counsellors in English Secondary Schools*. University of Keele, 1970 (mimeo).
- Tropp, A.: *The School Teachers*. London: Heinemann, 1957.
- Williams, K.: *The School Counsellor*. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Wilson, B.R.: 'The Teacher's Role - a Sociological Analysis'. *British Journal of Sociology*, Volume XIII No.1, 1962, pp. 15-32.
- Younghusband, E.: *Social Work and Social Change*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1964.