

**ASSESSING THE EFFECTS OF REALITY THERAPY  
SMALL GROUP COUNSELING ON THE  
ACHIEVEMENT AND INTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL**

**BY**

**SUSAN M. W. RAMSEY**



ASSESSING THE EFFECTS OF REALITY THERAPY  
SMALL GROUP COUNSELING ON THE ACHIEVEMENT AND INTERNAL  
LOCUS OF CONTROL

---

A Research Paper  
Presented to  
the Graduate Council of  
Austin Peay State University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

---

by  
Susan M. W. Ramsey

July 1976

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Research Paper written by Susan M. W. Ramsey entitled "Assessing the Effects of Reality Therapy Small Group Counseling on the Achievement and Internal Locus of Control." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Guidance and Counseling.

Elizabeth H. Stokes  
Major Professor

Accepted for the Council:

Wayne E. Thompson  
Dean of the Graduate School

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Elizabeth Stokes, Professor of Psychology, Austin Peay State University, for her advice and assistance in the preparation of this paper.

The author also wishes to thank Miss Mary DeBow, Principal, and Mrs. Gloria Longstreet, fourth grade teacher, at Morningside Elementary School, for their cooperation and encouragement throughout the research program.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA.....	9
Method.....	9
Analysis of Data.....	15
Interpretation of Data.....	19
Subjective Verbal Evaluations.....	20
III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22
Summary.....	22
Conclusions.....	24
Recommendations.....	26
REFERENCES.....	28
APPENDICES.....	32
Appendix A.....	32
Appendix B.....	34
Appendix C.....	36

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Mean Pretest Locus of Control Scores.....	15
2. Mean Change Scores of Locus of Control.....	16
3. Pretest Mean Grade Point Averages.....	17
4. Mean Change Scores of Grade Point Averages.....	18

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The educative system continues to struggle toward greater efficiency in the light of ever increasing demands of the needs of our society. Moving from the traditional, basically authoritarian procedures in the schools, many educators are favoring the advent of an approach which emphasizes the responsibility of the child for his learning. Those favoring this view of education interpret the child's responsibility as participation in classroom decision making, exercising freedom of choice and accepting an active role in his own learning (Stephens, 1974). Concomitant with the development of this educational philosophy has been the nurturing of diversity and respect for individual differences (Fantini, 1975). The capability of the student to profit from the school experience is regarded as crucial to the support of our technological and industrialized nation. The goals of education continue to include the need to develop skills, attitudes and interests that enhance the quality of the individual's life and enrich the nation.

With the current emphasis on self-responsibility, as well as the development of cognitive qualities, the schools find their teaching domain considerably broadened. One of the problems is to devise appropriate and effective



methods for developing the responsibility for self. Group counseling in the school is one vehicle for the development of the skills of decision making, problem solving and acceptance of responsibility for learning.

Reality Therapy, a philosophy of counseling developed by William Glasser in 1969, stresses the development of individual responsibility and the patterns of constructive behavior which are beneficial to success in the total learning process. Thus, it is representative of the kind of counseling which should directly influence the child's locus of control, i. e., the degree to which one believes that he, rather than someone or something else, is primarily responsible for his successes and failures (Hawes, 1970a). The Coleman Report has found that school achievement was better predicted by this variable than by any other attitudinal, familial, school or teacher variables studied (Coleman Report, 1971).

Studies investigating the implications of locus of control have found significant correlations between intellectual-academic achievement and the positive, nurturing responses of parents, which is believed to increase the child's belief in internal control (Katkovsky, Crandall, & Good, 1967). Buck and Austrin (1972) assessed the locus of control variable of adequate achievers and underachievers and concluded that adequate achievers were significantly more internal, more positive and less deviant in classroom

behavior than were underachievers. The literature abounds with evidence documenting the relationship between academic achievement and locus of control (Battle & Rotter, 1963; Cellura, 1963; Chance, 1965; Crandall, 1968; Nowicki & Strictland, 1971; Roberts, 1971). These studies support the contention that the locus of control variable has a direct and significant impact on the learning process of the child (Chandler, 1975).

The primary purpose of this study is to assess the effects of small group counseling using the Reality Therapy approach emphasizing individual responsibility or internal locus of control with fourth grade students. One of the educational goals is to increase the child's acceptance of responsibility for his own behavior. There is a continuing need to investigate methods for increasing the acceptance of responsibility. This study will investigate the efficacy of small group counseling in this area. The research literature has also indicated that locus of control affects achievement. A secondary purpose of the study will be to investigate the effect of small group counseling on achievement.

Small group counseling has served as a vehicle for enrichment in the affective domain of the elementary student, and as a learning program for increased effectiveness in school. Support for the importance of the affective elements in the learning process comes from the studies of

Coopersmith (1959), showing a positive correlation between a positive self-concept and achievement, and Glick (1969), revealing a correlation between achievement and high acceptance among peers. By the use of group counseling, changes have been effected on numerous variables, such as attitudes toward school, learning, peers, teachers, attendance and self-concept (Lodato, Sokoloff, & Schwartz, 1964; Mann, 1968; Crow, 1971). Positive change also occurred in children in the area of adjustment as evidenced by the work of Anandam, Davis, and Poppen (1971). From the evidence presented by these research reports, the positive results seem promising with regard to the various aspects of adjustment.

The significance of group counseling techniques specifically directed toward increasing academic achievement has been examined extensively, with conflicting results reported. In an attempt to assess the effects of group counseling on self-concept and achievement in reading of educationally disadvantaged elementary children, Martin (1973) found no significant difference between the experimental and control groups. Ohlsen and Gazda (1965) found group counseling with bright underachieving fifth graders ineffective in improving the student's grade point average. Others have found group counseling effective in improving reading performance (Crider, 1966; Strickler, 1965). Overall grade point averages were significantly



increased after group counseling in the ambitious study of Winkler, Teigland, Munger, and Kranzler (1965). Most recently, in 1975, Harris and Trujillo found that utilizing group counseling and discussion to teach the principles of behavior self-control led to improvements in grade point averages of junior high students. Although the evidence of research regarding the benefit of counseling in promoting measurable achievement gain is not universally conclusive, it strongly suggests a trend in that direction, and deserves continued support.

To differentiate Reality Therapy from other counseling techniques, the guidelines developed by William Glasser (1965) and reviewed by Richard Hawes (1970a) will be presented as representative characteristics of Reality Therapy. The first step is to establish and maintain an authentic, personal involvement with the counseling subjects, one that fosters a sense of personal worth and self-esteem. The second guideline is to accentuate the present time by always looking at the behavior as it occurs. Past behavior is never emphasized. A third is to deal with behavior in the present by bringing the behavior to the most optimum conscious level. Emphasis is placed on "What are you doing? How is it helping?" and fourth, "What could you be doing?" The stage has thus been set for the most meaningful learning experience, which is reflecting upon and making a value judgment about one's own behavior. When

the child decides it is worthwhile to change his behavior, then steps five and six must follow, which are to encourage the making of a specific plan and committing oneself to it. The final steps, seven and eight, are to eliminate punishment and refuse to reinforce excuses. The atmosphere fostered by these guidelines becomes an added force toward responsible behavior, successful identity and the capacity to feel worthwhile (Hawes, 1970a).

Research assessing the effectiveness of the principles of Reality Therapy counseling is limited. The first reported research project (English, 1970) sought to determine if a Reality Therapy approach in working with small groups of elementary students functioning below grade level was more effective than a performance/reward approach. The statistical analysis revealed a significant improvement for the Reality Therapy group in the areas of reading achievement, self-concept and classroom behavior. It was concluded that increased self-concept can effect behavior change including improved achievement. Hawes (1970b) investigated the changes in the dependent variables of locus of control, self-concept and classroom behavior of third and sixth graders after a sixteen week program following the Reality Therapy principles of group counseling. Significant increases appeared in internal locus of control as measured by the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility questionnaire (IAR). The classroom meeting



concept of Reality Therapy was utilized by Matthews (1972) with fourth and fifth graders, for the purpose of assessing the changes in self-concept, social adjustment, reading achievement and discipline. The data suggested class meetings had a beneficial effect on the behavior of the students. Reality Therapy was shown to be a better technique for reducing the problem behavior of fourth graders than of fifth graders as measured by the Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist. None of the other areas investigated were shown to be significantly changed.

The majority of the studies reported in the literature indicate that a relationship exists between small group counseling of the elementary school students and positive change in the affective as well as cognitive domain. The reported evidence suggests that the multifactors of adjustment and academic achievement are susceptible to the positive forces of small group counseling. The investigations have consistently found a correlation between the internal locus of control and the degree of academic achievement. It would seem logical then, to investigate a small group counseling technique which emphasizes the development of the internal locus of control concept, or personal responsibility. There has been relatively little research which focuses on the assessment of the principles of Reality Therapy, which does emphasize the self-responsibility attribute necessary for internal control, and



increased achievement.

The primary focus of the study was to assess the effects of small group counseling using the Reality Therapy approach on internal locus of control and academic achievement. The following null hypotheses were postulated:

1. There is no significant difference in the post-counseling locus of control change scores of the experimental and control groups.
2. There is no significant difference in the post-counseling change grade point averages of the experimental and control groups.

## CHAPTER II

### PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

#### Method

##### Subjects

The experimental and control groups each consisted of ten fourth grade students attending a public elementary school in Hopkinsville, Kentucky. The participating fourth grade teacher was requested to submit names of all eligible students in her class as potential candidates for a Reality Therapy counseling program. The criteria for eligibility were: (a) written parental permission; (b) teacher recommendation for release from class (dependent on teacher judgment); and (c) student willingness to participate in the counseling program (determined by asking each student prior to selection procedure).

##### Instrument

Locus of control was assessed by administering the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility questionnaire (IAR). Developed by Crandall (1962), and reviewed by Crandall, Katkovsky, and Crandall (1965), the IAR is designed to measure the internal locus of control of elementary aged children. Written permission to use the IAR was obtained from Ms. Crandall, Fels Research Institute.

The children's IAR scale is composed of 34 forced-choice items. Each item stem describes either a positive

or a negative achievement experience which routinely occurs in children's daily lives. This stem is followed by one alternative stating that the event was caused by the child and another stating that the event occurred because of the behavior of someone else in the child's immediate environment. The items are presented in the test as representative of positive event items or negative event items. A child's I+ score (positive) is obtained by summing all the positive events for which he assumes credit, and his I- score (negative) is the total of all negative events for which he assumes blame. His total I score is the sum of his I+ and his I- subscores. The subscores represent the child's beliefs in internal responsibility for successes (I+) and failures (I-).

### Procedure

Permission was obtained from the school principal to conduct the research program. Letters requesting parental consent were given to all students of the participating fourth grade class. Written permission had to be obtained for the student to be eligible. Denied permission eliminated any student from consideration. (See Appendix A for form letter).

Student performance was measured by calculating grade point averages of all the subjects taught by the classroom teacher (English, science, mathematics, reading, social studies, spelling). The averages were based on a



4 point scale with 4=A, 3=B, 2=C, 1=D, and 0=F. The grades earned in the grading period immediately preceding and immediately following the counseling program were used for the comparative data in the study. The averages were calculated by the teacher at the conclusion of the study. The grades were those appearing on the students' report cards for the nine week grading periods.

The two administrations of the IAR proceeded according to the following guidelines: (a) it was given orally to the total group, and (b) individual responses were indicated on a typed test booklet with pencil. The IAR was given pre- and post-counseling program, with an eleven week interval between administrations. The specific administration procedures were as follows: The IAR was introduced and explained (See Appendix B for instructions). Each student was given an IAR test booklet at this time (See Appendix C). The questions on the IAR booklet were audio-taped and presented to the total group. Each student was requested to respond to the appropriate question by marking an X beside the a or b answer on the booklet following the taped presentation of each question. The students were given a 30 second interval between each oral presentation. The questions were duplicated on the test booklet and the students were encouraged to read the questions and answers as they were presented orally. Erasures were allowed. Each student wrote his/her name and the date of testing on the back

of the test booklet. The first administration of the IAR was given one week before the beginning of the counseling program.

Following the first administration of the IAR, ten students were assigned to the experimental group. Five of these ten were recommended for counseling by the classroom teacher as she felt they needed counseling. The other five were selected at random from the total list of eligible students which had an alternating sequence of boy-girl, boy-girl. The remaining ten students comprised the control group, not receiving the Reality Therapy counseling training.

The counseling program consisted of 18 sessions. Two sessions were held each week for nine weeks. Each session was approximately 40 minutes in length. The second administration of the IAR was given to the children in both the experimental and control group one week after the completion of the counseling sessions.

#### Training program design.

The overall design of the counseling program included: (a) teaching the basic seven concepts of Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1965), and (b) providing reinforcement by application of the concepts in home and school activities.

The content of the counseling program focused on three major phases: (a) cognitive teaching, (b) in-group experiences, and (c) out-group application. Essentially,

the philosophy of Reality Therapy, which encourages self-responsibility and commitment, was explored in group discussion. In addition, the students were required to make specific commitments to try to improve their behavior, using problem solving techniques. The final phase dealt with the direct transfer of learned self-responsibility to the classroom setting. The student chose the terms of his commitments, guided by the behavioral parameters judged by the counselor as appropriate for the circumstances of the individual situation.

Cognitive teaching. The emphasis of the group discussions was to teach the students the problem solving steps basic to Reality Therapy: Identify the problem. What are you doing? When will you start to change? Each student was encouraged to contribute to the problem solving process by providing suggestions for alternative behaviors once the problem had been presented for group discussion. As the counseling sessions progressed, the students would verbally outline the problem solving steps for the counselee with the problem under discussion. In addition, the students learned to consider the consequences of the alternative behaviors suggested by the members of the group.

In-group experiences. As the process of problem solving developed, the students practiced these steps of problem solving during the counseling periods. The students accepted progressively more responsibility for group



leadership and productive contributions. The counselor served as a guide for the learning process and became less active as spokesman. Problems were often presented which the students could solve for themselves within the counseling period using the techniques suggested by the group members.

Out-group application. The final phase of the training program was the transfer of problem solving skills to settings outside the group, thus increasing and reinforcing self-responsibility and personal commitment. The students were held accountable for their verbal commitments to the problem solving procedure by reporting to the group the results of the application in home and school experiences. Each session following the first two learning periods was begun by the students relating the results of their efforts to fulfill their commitments. The students were encouraged to utilize the problem solving skills independent of the group, and were invited to discuss the results of the out-group problem solving experience at each counseling session. The students were encouraged to renegotiate any verbal commitment which was not fulfilled. No overt expression of pressure or punishment was used as a controlling mechanism by the counselor or the students if commitments were not kept.

### Analysis of Data

All of the 20 subjects were present for the entire study. Thus, the analysis of data included pretest and posttest scores for every student originally selected to participate. There were ten subjects in the experimental group and ten subjects in the control group.

To analyze the pretest data, a  $t$  test for independent groups was run on the pretest data set for locus of control. Significance was set at the .05 level of confidence.

The pre-counseling locus of control scores of the experimental and control group were analyzed to determine that there was no significant difference in the scores of the two groups. The mean of the experimental locus of control scores was 23.4. The control group mean was 25.5. The analysis of the data yielded a  $t(18) = 1.06$ ,  $p > .05$ . It was accepted that there was no significant difference in the pretest locus of control scores of the two groups. Table 1 presents the pretest results.

Table 1  
Mean Pretest Locus of Control Scores

Subjects	N	Mean Scores	df	$t$ -value	$t$ -.05
Experimental	10	23.4			
Control	10	25.5	18	1.06	2.101*

\*.05 level of confidence

The posttest locus of control change scores of the experimental and control groups were analyzed using a t test for independent groups. The change scores represent the gain from pretest to posttest. Significance was set at the .05 level of confidence.

The analysis of the locus of control scores is as follows:  $t(18) = 1.77$ ,  $p > .05$ . The mean of the change scores for the experimental group was 2.6 and the control group was -.5. The change in gain of the locus of control scores of the two groups was not significantly different. Hypothesis 1, that there is no difference in the experimental and control group change scores following the counseling program was accepted. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2  
Mean Change Score of Locus of Control

Subjects	N	Mean Scores	df	<u>t</u> -value	<u>t</u> -.05
Experimental	10	2.6			
Control	10	-.5	18	1.77	2.101*

\*.05 level of confidence



To analyze the pretest data for grade point averages of the experimental and control groups, a  $t$  test for independent groups yielded the following results:  $t(18) = .16$ ,  $p > .05$ . The mean of the experimental group was 2.58 and the mean of the control group was 2.53. The pretest grade point averages were not significantly different for the two groups. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3  
Pretest Mean Grade Point Averages

Subjects	N	Mean Scores	df	$t$ -value	$t$ -.05
Experimental	10	2.58			
Control	10	2.53	18	0.16	2.101*

\*.05 level of confidence

The posttest data for grade point averages was analyzed by a  $t$  test for independent groups using the change scores of the experimental and control groups. Significance was set at the .05 level of confidence.

The results of the analysis are as follows:  $t(18) = .47$ ,  $p > .05$ . The mean of the change scores for the experimental group was .52. The mean for the control group was .36. The posttest grade point average changes were not significantly different for the two groups. Therefore, null Hypothesis 2 was accepted. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Mean Change Scores of Grade Point Averages

Subjects	N	Mean Scores	df	t-value	$t_{.05}$
Experimental	10	.52			
Control	10	.36	18	.47	2.101*

\*.05 level of confidence

### Interpretation of Data

The lack of significant difference on the pretest scores measuring locus of control for the experimental and control groups ( $t=1.06$ ,  $p>.05$ ) suggested that these groups of students did not significantly differ before the counseling training program began. Had a significant difference appeared on the posttest change scores of locus of control, it might have been concluded that the program affected internal locus of control of the students. However, a significant difference was not found on the posttest change scores, supporting the null hypothesis that there were no differences between the groups ( $t=1.77$ ,  $p>.05$ ) after the counseling program.

The pretest grade point average scores of the experimental and control groups were not found to be significantly different ( $t=.16$ ,  $p>.05$ ) which indicated that the groups did not differ significantly in this area prior to the counseling training program. If the posttest grade point average change scores of the experimental and control groups had been significantly different, it would have suggested the program affected a change in academic achievement. The posttest grade point average change scores were not significantly different ( $t=.47$ ,  $p>.05$ ) supporting the null hypothesis of no difference between the groups after the counseling training program.



### Subjective Verbal Evaluations

Although there were no statistically significant changes between the experimental and control groups on the measures utilized in the study, there were positive comments from the classroom teacher. Following the eleven week study, the teacher reported improvement in the experimental group's attitudes toward accepting responsibility within the classroom environment. The students were described as generally more cooperative and enthusiastic in their approach to classroom work. They appeared more willing to investigate alternatives of behavior and the consequences of their choices. The teacher also observed a change toward positive self-concepts and better interpersonal relationships in some of the students, particularly those students she had recommended for the program. These students had been regarded as lacking initiative and having negative self-concepts. The teacher reported she was encouraged by the potential of small group counseling, particularly for those students displaying a lack of internal locus of control or self-responsibility.

The school principal, who had observed the final counseling session, and the classroom teacher posed several explanations for the positive results observed. They contended the opportunity for the students to be singled out of the large classroom group and to be able to discuss

their problems made these students feel special. The second most beneficial aspect of the program appeared to be the effect of the atmosphere of the discussion sessions. The attempt to maintain an atmosphere of openness, responsiveness and no pressure appeared to have influenced the attitudes of the students about each other as well as themselves. The teacher reported that several of the more shy students began to initiate contact with peers and make more verbal contributions in the classroom.

Verbal student evaluations of the counseling training program were enthusiastic and positive. The group expressed regret at the termination of the program. Several reported that they enjoyed the privilege of being able to leave the classroom twice a week. Others commented on the fun of talking about themselves. Some reported they were using the problem solving steps at home and that their parents were interested. However, none of the students reported that their school work had improved or had become more enjoyable. The comments were made voluntarily at the last session of counseling after the group had finished the planned activities.

### CHAPTER III

#### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STUDY

##### Summary

This study was designed to assess the effects of small group counseling using the Reality Therapy approach on the achievement, measured by grade point averages, and individual responsibility, measured by internal locus of control scores, of fourth grade students. The study was conducted at Morningside Elementary School in Hopkinsville, Kentucky. The counseled group was compared on pretest and posttest measures of locus of control and grade point average to an equal group from the same classroom. The Intellectual Achievement Responsibility questionnaire by Crandall was used to measure internal locus of control. The instrument was administered one week before the counseling training program began and one week after the completion of the program. Grade point averages were calculated by the classroom teacher from the report card grades issued at the nine week grading periods immediately preceding and following the nine week counseling training program.

The subjects comprising the control and experimental groups were members of a single fourth grade classroom. Criteria for participation in the study were: (a) written parental permission; (b) teacher recommendation for release from class (dependent on teacher judgment); and (c) student



willingness to participate (determined by asking each student prior to the final selection procedure). From the 20 eligible students, five were specifically recommended for counseling. Of the remaining 15, ten were randomly placed in the control group, and five completed the experimental group which received counseling. These 15 students' names had been listed in boy-girl sequence, resulting in equal male-female distribution within the two groups.

Pretest data for locus of control and grade point averages indicated that the experimental and control groups did not differ significantly on their scores. Therefore, the two groups could be compared at the end of the counseling training program to determine if significant changes had occurred resulting from the program.

The experimental group participated in 18 counseling sessions twice a week for nine weeks for approximately 40 minutes. The sessions emphasized the problem solving steps developed by William Glasser (1969) based on the belief that frequent, self-directed experiences of individual responsibility encourages the student's belief in himself and enhances his motivation to achieve. The students were encouraged to practice these steps within the group and apply this knowledge in situations outside the group, particularly at school and at home. The students introduced areas of personal concern which served as the sources for problem solving practice. Each student was encouraged

to make a commitment of action, which was renegotiable if failure occurred. No pressure or punishment was used as a controlling mechanism within the group.

The analysis of the posttest data measuring the change scores of the two groups found no significant difference between the groups on locus of control or grade point averages, thus supporting the null hypotheses. The lack of significant difference between the two groups' posttest change scores suggests that the experimental group had not significantly changed their concepts of self-responsibility and academic achievement during the course of the eleven week period. Although the data revealed no significant differences in the two groups, there were positive comments about the program from the classroom teacher and the students involved in the counseling program. The classroom teacher supported the counseling training program, reporting improvement in the areas of attitude and initiative.

### Conclusions

The lack of a statistically significant difference between the two groups' posttest change scores of locus of control, measured by the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility questionnaire, suggests that the students had not changed their locus of control. Had a significant difference appeared, the conclusion might have suggested that developmental factors, the Reality Therapy counseling, and



the educative process provided impetus for the growth of self-responsibility and the increase of locus of control scores. Although no significant difference indicates counseling did not contribute significantly to the immediate and measurable increase of internalized feelings of self-responsibility, research reflects that the benefits of counseling are often subtle and emerge in varying degrees of residual impact as time progresses.

The data analysis utilizing the t test comparing the posttest change scores of the grade point averages of both groups showed no significant difference between the groups. The null hypothesis of no difference was supported. An increase of grade point averages of both groups might have suggested that factors within the educative process had contributed to better academic achievement. However, if those grade point averages of the experimental group had increased significantly over those of the control group, the benefits of counseling might have been regarded as a decidedly influential factor affecting change.

In conclusion, this researcher suggests that the Reality Therapy training program, like behavioral counseling, which emphasizes behavior changes, is a cognitive restructuring process which may be less receptive to precise measurement. The degree of internalization of the concepts of Reality Therapy initially may be too sensitive for effective measurement on an instrument such as the IAR.



Observation of the student's approach to problem solving and acceptance of responsibility for life's consequences may provide an alternative means of evaluating the student's internal frame of reference with regard to his locus of control. In this respect, the responsibility rests with the classroom teacher or school counselor to be sensitive observers.

Since the sessions were conducted for only nine weeks, it is also possible that a longer period of time may be necessary for the children to internalize the skills. The posttest measures were administered only one week after the conclusion of the program and the second grading period occurred one week later. The extension of the counseling sessions or the later administration of the post-measurement might have clearly reflected changes.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that further research extend the duration of the counseling program. The use of sociometric devices reflecting peer ratings in the classroom may be valuable sources of evaluating behavioral and affective change pre- and post-counseling. Behavior rating scales might be used by the teacher and the students in the classroom which could provide frequent and formal evaluations by those directly involved in the behavioral change process. Additional variables should be evaluated as sources of individual growth, such as academic achievement by subject,

self-esteem, and the relationship between self-responsibility and the multiple factors of the self-concept. Assessing a broader base of areas of growth may increase the measurability of counseling, particularly where cognitive, affective and behavioral change is sought. Further research is needed to determine how internal locus of control expectancies become generalized over various school and life situations. And finally, it appears pertinent to direct attention to the specific behaviors of teachers in the classroom and their influence on enhancing the development of internal responsibility of students.

## References

- Anandam, K., Davis, M., & Poppen, W. Feelings...to fear or to free? Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1971, 5, 181-189.
- Battle, E., & Rotter, J. B. Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic groups. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.
- Buck, M. R., & Austrin, H. R. Factors related to school achievement in an economically disadvantaged group. Child Development, 1972, 42, 1813-1826.
- Cellura, A. R. Internality as a determinant of academic achievement in low SES adolescents. Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester, 1963.
- Chance, J. Mother-child relations and children's achievement. Terminal report USPHS, Grant No. MHO 5268, 1965.
- Chandler, T. A. Locus of control: A proposal for change. Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 3, 334-339.
- Coopersmith, S. A. A method for determining types of self-esteem. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 87-94.
- Crandall, V. C. NIMH Progress Report, 1970.
- Crandall, V. C., Katkovsky, W., & Crandall, V. J. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.



- Crider, M. M. A study of the effectiveness of group guidance upon personality conflict and reading retardation. Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 26, 4438.
- Crow, M. L. A comparison of three group counseling techniques with sixth graders. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1971, 6, 37-42.
- Deighton, L. C. (Ed.). The Coleman Report. Encyclopedia of Education, 1971, 2, 482.
- English, J. The effects of Reality Therapy on elementary aged children. Paper read at the 21st Annual Conference of the California Association of School Psychologists and Psychometrists, Los Angeles, California, March 1970.
- Fantini, R. Back to basics. Teacher, 1975, 93, 33-37.
- Glasser, W. Reality therapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Glasser, W. Schools without failure. New York: Harper, 1969.
- Glick, O. Person-group relationships and the effect of group properties on academic achievement in the elementary classroom. Psychology in the Schools, 1969, 6, 197-203.
- Harris, M. B., & Trujillo, A. E. Improving study habits of junior high students through self-management versus group discussion. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 6.

- Hawes, R. Reality therapy: An approach to encourage individual and social responsibility in the elementary school. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1970a, 4, 2.
- Hawes, R. Reality therapy in the classroom. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970b, 71, 28083.
- Hume, K. E. Counseling and consulting: Complementary functions. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1970, 5, 3-11.
- Katkovsky, W., Crandall, V., & Good, S. Parental antecedents of children's belief in internal-external control of reinforcements in intellectual achievement situations. Child Development, 1967, 38, 765-766.
- Lodato, F., Sokoloff, M., & Schwartz, L. Group counseling as a method of modifying attitudes of slow learners. School Counselor, 1964, 12, 27-29.
- Mann, P. H. The effect of group counseling on educable mentally retarded boys' concepts of themselves in school. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28, 3467-A.
- Martin, P. J. The effects of group counseling on self-concept and achievement of selected educationally disadvantaged elementary school children. Dissertation Abstracts, 1973, 73, 1246.
- Matthews, D. B. The effects of reality therapy on reported self-concept, social adjustment, reading achievement and discipline of fourth and fifth graders in two

elementary schools. Dissertation Abstracts, 1972, 73, 3603.

Nowicki, S., & Strictland, B. R. A locus of control scale for children. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, 1971.

Ohlsen, M. M., & Gazda, G. M. Counseling underachieving bright pupils. Education, 1965, 86, 78-81.

Roberts, A. The self-esteem of disadvantaged third and seventh graders. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1971.

Stephens, L. S. The teacher's guide to open education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

Strickler, E. Educational group counseling within a remedial reading program. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 25, 5129-5130.

Winkler, R. C., Teigland, J. J., Munger, P. F., & Kranzler, G. D. The effects of selected counseling and remedial techniques on underachieving elementary school students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 384-387.



## APPENDIX A

### Parental Permission Letter

## Appendix A

Dear Parents,

I would like your permission to have your child join several of his/her classmates in a program of group counseling I am having at Morningside School. I hope you will consent to have \_\_\_\_\_ participate in this group experience.

I am enrolled at Austin Peay State University in the field of guidance and counseling. The program I wish your child to enter is a research project for a Master's degree.

For the program, half of the children selected will be in a counseling group for 30 minutes, twice a week for approximately nine weeks. The remaining half will stay with their teacher during that time. The proposed purpose of the counseling is to encourage the students to learn to solve their own problems better and to enjoy success in school.

Also, I must have your permission to obtain the nine week grade averages from your child's teacher to help me measure the benefits of counseling elementary children. A short attitude test will be given to each child before and after the nine week program to help me judge the effects of the counseling.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 886-9630.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Susan Ramsey

\_\_\_\_\_ has my permission to be part of the group counseling program described above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent signature

APPENDIX B  
IAR ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS



## Appendix B

## IAR ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS

Each of you has been selected to participate in a study that I am working on for these next nine weeks. Thank you for giving me your time and cooperation.

It is most important that the directions I will be giving you are followed exactly. Listen carefully.

You have been given a booklet of questions face down on your desk. Please put your name and today's date on the back with your pencil, leaving the booklet on your desk until I tell you to turn it over.

The questions in the booklet are about how you feel about certain experiences at school and at home. Each question has two choices, marked a and b. Neither one is right or wrong. You are to choose the one that most closely tells how you feel. Put an X beside either the a or b after you have decided which best describes the way you feel. Are there any questions?

I have tape recorded each question. Listen carefully, and read along from your booklet. Now please turn over your booklet, and we will begin. Put your finger on question number one. Are there any who have not found number one?

When all the questions have been read, you will be given time to look over your answers and complete any you may have missed. I will ask you to raise your hand to indicate you need more time at the end of the test. Look again at question one, and I will begin by turning on the tape recorder.

APPENDIX C  
IAR QUESTIONNAIRE BOOKLET

## Appendix C

## IAR Questionnaire Booklet

1. If a teacher passes you to the next grade, would it probably be...  
☐ a. Because she liked you, or  
☐ b. Because of the work you did?
2. When you do well on a test at school, is it more likely to be...  
☐ a. Because you studied for it, or  
☐ b. Because the test was especially easy?
3. When you have trouble understanding something in school, is it usually...  
☐ a. Because the teacher didn't explain it clearly, or  
☐ b. Because you didn't listen carefully?
4. When you read a story and can't remember much of it, is it usually...  
☐ a. Because the story wasn't well written, or  
☐ b. Because you weren't interested in the story?
5. Suppose your parents say you are doing well in school. Is it likely to happen...  
☐ a. Because your work is good, or  
☐ b. Because they are in a good mood?
6. Suppose you did better than usual in a subject at school. Would it probably happen...  
☐ a. Because you tried harder, or  
☐ b. Because someone helped you?



7. When you lose at a game of cards or checkers, does it usually happen...

- ☐ a. Because the other player is good at the game, or
- ☐ b. Because you didn't play well?

8. Suppose a person doesn't think you are very bright or clever...

- ☐ a. Can you make him change his mind if you try, or
- ☐ b. Are there some people who will think you are not very bright or clever no matter what you do?

9. If you solve a puzzle quickly, is it...

- ☐ a. Because it wasn't a very hard puzzle, or
- ☐ b. Because you worked on it carefully?

10. If a boy or girl tells you that you are dumb, is it more likely that they say that...

- ☐ a. Because they are mad at you, or
- ☐ b. Because what you did wasn't really very bright?

11. Suppose you study to become a teacher, scientist, or doctor and you fail. Do you think this would happen...

- ☐ a. Because you didn't work hard enough, or
- ☐ b. Because you needed some help and other people didn't give it to you?

12. When you learn something in school quickly, is it usually...

- ☐ a. Because you paid close attention, or
- ☐ b. Because the teacher explained it clearly?

13. If a teacher says to you, "Your work is fine," is it...

\_\_\_a. Something that teachers say usually to encourage pupils, or

\_\_\_b. Because you did a good job?

14. When you find it hard to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it...

\_\_\_a. Because you didn't study well enough before you tried them, or

\_\_\_b. Because the teacher gave problems that were too hard?

15. When you forget something you heard in class, is it...

\_\_\_a. Because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or

\_\_\_b. Because you didn't try very hard to remember?

16. Suppose you weren't sure about the answer to a question your teacher asked you, but your answer turned out to be right. Is it likely to happen...

\_\_\_a. Because she wasn't as particular as usual, or

\_\_\_b. Because you gave the best answer you could think of?

17. When you read a story and remember most of it, is it usually...

\_\_\_a. Because you were interested in the story, or

\_\_\_b. Because the story was well written?

18. If your parents tell you that you are acting silly, and not thinking clearly, is it more likely to be...

\_\_\_a. Because of something you did, or

\_\_\_b. Because they happen to be feeling cranky?

19. When you don't do well on a test at school, is it...  
\_\_\_a. Because the test was especially hard, or  
\_\_\_b. Because you didn't study for it?
20. When you win at a game of cards or checkers, does it happen...  
\_\_\_a. Because you play real well, or  
\_\_\_b. Because the other person doesn't play very well?
21. If people think you are bright or clever, is it...  
\_\_\_a. Because they happen to like you, or  
\_\_\_b. Because you usually act that way?
22. If a teacher didn't pass you to the next grade, would it probably be...  
\_\_\_a. Because she had it in for you, or  
\_\_\_a. Because your school work wasn't good enough?
23. Suppose you don't do as well as usual in a subject at school. Would this probably happen...  
\_\_\_a. Because you weren't as careful as usual, or  
\_\_\_b. Because somebody bothered you and kept you from working?
24. If a boy or girl tells you that you are bright, is it usually...  
\_\_\_a. Because you thought up a good idea, or  
\_\_\_b. Because they like you?



25. Suppose you became a famous teacher, scientist, or doctor. Do you think this would happen...
- ☐ a. Because other people helped you when you needed it, or
  - ☐ b. Because you worked very hard?
26. Suppose your parents say you aren't doing well in your school work. Is this more likely to happen...
- ☐ a. Because your work isn't very good, or
  - ☐ b. Because they are feeling cranky?
27. Suppose you are showing a friend how to play a game and he has trouble with it. Would that happen...
- ☐ a. Because he wasn't able to understand it, or
  - ☐ b. Because you couldn't explain it well?
28. When you find it easy to work arithmetic problems at school, is it usually...
- ☐ a. Because the teacher gave you especially easy problems, or
  - ☐ b. Because you studied your book well before you tried them?
29. When you remember something you heard in class, is it usually...
- ☐ a. Because you tried hard to remember, or
  - ☐ b. Because the teacher explained it well?

30. If you can't work a puzzle, is it more likely to happen...

\_\_\_a. Because you are not especially good at working puzzles, or

\_\_\_b. Because the instructions weren't written clearly enough?

31. If your parents tell you that you are bright or clever, is it more likely...

\_\_\_a. Because they are feeling good, or

\_\_\_b. Because of something you did?

32. Suppose you are explaining how to play a game to a friend and he learns quickly. Would that happen more often...

\_\_\_a. Because you explained it well, or

\_\_\_b. Because he was able to understand it?

33. Suppose you are not sure about an answer to a question your teacher asks you and the answer you give turns out to be wrong...

\_\_\_a. Because she was more particular than usual, or

\_\_\_b. Because you answered too quickly?

34. If a teacher says to you, "Try to do better," would it be...

\_\_\_a. Because this is something she might say to get pupils to try harder, or

\_\_\_b. Because your work wasn't as good as usual?