EFFECTS OF REALITY THERAPY ON TEACHER ATTITUDES,

STUDENT ATTITUDES, STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT,

AND STUDENT BEHAVIOR

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

North Texas State University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

by

Bobby Donald Browning, B. S., M. Ed.

Denton, Texas

August, 1978

Browning, Bobby D., Effects of Reality Therapy on Teacher Attitudes, Student Attitudes, Student Achievement, and Student Behavior. Doctor of Education (Secondary Education), August, 1978, 130 pp., 31 tables, bibliography, 91 titles.

This study investigated whether Reality Therapy classroom management techniques could be used effectively to improve teacher attitudes, student attitudes, student achievement, and student classroom behavior.

The data for this study were obtained by the use of a Semantic Differential, Pupil Achievement record, student tardy report, and a student discipline report. The Semantic Differential consisted of seven key concepts related to the research problem. Bipolar adjectives were used to rate each concept. Concepts used in the study were rules, school, teacher, assistant principal, grades, discipline, and self. Teachers and students were administered the Semantic Differential prior to and following the treatment. Student grade point average was tabulated prior to and following Reality Therapy treatment, as was incidence of student discipline as measured by tardies, referrals to office, and suspensions.

1

Experimental and control group subjects were comprised of eighth grade teachers and students from two junior high schools.

The experimental and control group subjects had not had previous experience with the principles and techniques of Reality Therapy prior to the experiment. Experimental teachers and students were not acquainted with control group teachers and students. Building administrators at the experimental school monitored procedures employed in the experiment on a daily basis.

Experimental group teachers were exposed to twenty hours of Reality Therapy prior to the treatment period. Both the experimental and control teachers and student groups were administered a pre- and post- assessment with the instruments used to secure data for the study. Fourteen eighth grade teachers comprised the control group and fourteen eighth grade teachers comprised the experimental group. The experimental student group consisted of 345 students and the control group was comprised of 323 students. The study was conducted over a six-week period.

Chapter One concerns the background and significance of the study and the procedures involved in collecting and analyzing the data. Chapter Two deals with a review of selected

research. Chapter Three involves research methods and procedures, and the collected data are presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five presents the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

Experimental group teachers displayed a significantly positive attitude change after inservice education and implementation of Reality Therapy practices in their classrooms. Experimental group teachers also displayed a significantly positive change in attitude toward self after inservice education and implementation of Reality Therapy in their classrooms. Experimental group student attitude toward school environment, as measured by related concepts, showed a significant positive increase following Reality Therapy treatment. Student experimental grade point average increased significantly following Reality Therapy treatment. Student experimental groups did not significantly change their attitude toward self. Student experimental group incidence of discipline did not decrease as a result of Reality Therapy treatment, although student control group incidence of discipline did decrease.

The findings of the study support the following conclusions.

1. Reality Therapy inservice education and implementation of Reality Therapy Teaching techniques in classrooms produce

significant changes in the way teachers regard student discipline.

2. Implementation of Reality Therapy practices in junior high classrooms produces positive changes in attitude toward school environment.

3. Implementation of Reality Therapy techniques in junior high classrooms does not seem to be effective in producing changes in student attitude toward self.

4. Implementation of Reality Therapy techniques in junior high classrooms can be effective in producing higher student grade point averages.

5. Reality Therapy techniques in junior high classrooms are not effective in producing lower rates of student misbehavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Society has traditionally required educators to teach its youth. In the midst of our current technological society that demands skill in teacher methodology, many maintain that teaching methods are perpetuated which do not predictably teach (3). One salient reason given for failure to achieve an optimum level of teaching success is ineffective classroom management techniques (10). Ward (17, p. 41) stated that "there is a deep rooted and growing concern with the behavior of school children across this nation that cuts across race, wealth, school size, and experience of teachers." For the fourth straight year, the annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes toward Education indicated a growing concern on the part of the public for discipline, or the lack of it, in the nation's classrooms (17). Wilson (19, p. 11) maintained that "teachers, administrators, and concerned college personnel are not quite willing to admit that past efforts have been for many, unsuccessful--new techniques or solutions must be sought." Unfortunately, however, there is less than total agreement on the issues.

When the troubled educator seeks answers to the
complex questions concerning discipline in the
schools today, one of the first things he finds is
that a not-so-subtle war is being waged between two
camps with decidedly different answers to solving
the problem. The battle is between those who be-
lieve the answer lies in the return to some good old
fashion law and order in the classroom, and those
who contend that more, not less, student freedom is
the ultimate answer to better behavior (19, p. 38).

The classroom teacher is often caught in the middle.

One alternative classroom management technique that seeks

to establish a middle ground between these two approaches to

discipline is Reality Therapy. It is based on the premise

that student success and achievement are possible for all with-

out sacrificing reasonable rules and regulations that are

necessary when any group of people get together. The pro-

ponents of Reality Therapy further assert that its implemen-

tation and maintenance do not depend on punitive punishment

or unreasonable rules (6). An examination of Reality Therapy

established in an experimental setting at a suburban junior

high school and an examination of traditional classroom manage-

ment techniques at another suburban junior high school were

analyzed in this study.

Statement of the Problem

This study assessed teacher attitude and the social and

academic adjustment of eighth grade students through the use

of Reality Therapy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine whether Reality Therapy classroom management techniques could be used effectively to improve teacher attitude, student attitude, student achievement, and student classroom behavior.

Hypotheses

1. At the conclusion of the experimental period, there will be a significant difference in adjusted means of teacher attitude toward classroom management techniques, as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade teachers who utilize Reality Therapy in their classrooms and eighth grade teachers who do not.

2. At the conclusion of the experimental period, there will be a significant difference in adjusted means of teacher attitudes toward self, as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade teachers who utilize Reality Therapy in their classrooms and eighth grade teachers who do not.

3. At the conclusion of the experimental period, there will be a significant difference in adjusted means of student attitude toward the school environment, as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade students who receive Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who do not.

4. At the conclusion of the experimental period, there will be a significant difference in adjusted means of student attitude toward self, as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade students who receive Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who do not.

5. At the conclusion of the experimental period, there will be a significant difference in adjusted means of grades, as measured by student grade point average, assigned to eighth grade students who receive Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who do not.

6. At the conclusion of the experimental period, there will be a significant difference in incidence of discipline, as measured by weighted infractions, of eighth grade students who receive Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who do not.

Background and Significance of the Study

For several decades researchers have extensively examined the cognitive relationships that exist in a given learning environment. In many instances, educators viewed the development of the mind as a primary objective. Many, like Bestor, asserted that genuine education was intellectual training (1). Schools have generally been successful in the business of

transmitting facts and skills deemed essential to the maintenance of an enlightened citizenry. More subjects, more homework, more audio-visual aids are constantly being added to the curriculum; yet there are those who believe that educational change cannot occur without explicit attention given to the student. Combs, addressing this phenomenon, stated,

> Our failures are almost never failures of information. Rather they are human problems, breakdowns of personal meanings. Many of our current problems of alienation and depersonalization arise directly from our terrible absorption in the information half of the learning equation. We have turned our productive genius loose to devise a thousand new gadgets to gather and transmit information more efficiently and effectively than ever before. But we haven't learned to use them yet. In time, we shall learn to use our new hardware and I believe the machines will then increase our humanism. Meantime, we ought not to compete with the computers or make computers out of students. What is needed is to stress the qualities that make us unique, our humanity (4, p. 73).

There is a clearly established need for teachers to integrate intellectual content with feeling. Purkey feels that the wise teacher has already sensed the significant and positive relationship between a student's self-concept and his performance in school (11, p. 104). Smith, Krouse, and Atkinson (15, p. 459) have indicated that the "classroom is a social situation as well as a learning situation, and that the individual's status in a group affects his ability to function in a class."

One impediment to a universal recognition of "affective" educational experiences has been the difficulty of identifying genuinely novel factors of an emotional or volitional character (15). Another indication of the demise of behavior that could be termed affective is provided by Bloom, who postulated,

> It was evident to us that there is a characteristic type of erosion in which the original intent of a course or educational program becomes worn down to that which can be explicitly evaluated for grading purposes and that which can be explicitly taught easily through verbal methods. It may be true that it is easier to teach and evaluate cognitive objectives (2, p. 16).

Admittedly, the not-so-new emphasis on training for personal and social responsibility and for adjustment to social reality and discipline in human affairs has, in the minds of many, implied force and coercion in education and a corresponding lack of compassion and understanding. Despite this, scientific interest in the concepts of discipline, responsibility, social control, and self-concept has steadily increased. Glasser, with the publication in 1965 of Reality Therapy, has done much, at least theoretically, to link together the humanistic dimensions of love, self-awareness, and empathy with the concepts of responsibility, personal obligation, and discipline (6). The Reality Therapy concept, which emphasizes the legitimate use of power, discipline, and authority when necessary, has not

as yet undergone the transition from rhetoric to reality that
occurs as a result of objective scholarly investigation.

According to Glasser, Reality Therapy is a total approach
of dealing with individuals based on the premise that a person
must accept the reality of the world around him and become
involved with other people to satisfy his needs (6). His work
in this dimension is a significant addition to Rogerian think-
ing,with its focus on the acceptance and understanding of the
individual's reality (13). This theoretical postulate repre-
sents a shift from traditional Freudian psychology. In his
work with delinquent girls at the Ventura, California, Reform
Institute, Glasser found these Freudian techniques to be un-
realistic and unsuccessful (6). He discovered that an indivi-
dual will not succeed in general until he can in some way
experience success in one important part of his life. Glasser
hypothesized that

> Too much of our present educational system emphasizes
> failures and too many of our children are failing.
> Unless we can provide schools where children through
> a reasonable use of their capacities can succeed, we
> will do little to solve the major problems of the
> country (8, p. 8).

There is a significant potpourri of evidence available sup-
porting these contentions (9). Reality Therapy states that
teachers and students must become involved. When students

are involved with responsible teachers—people who themselves have a success identity and can fulfill their needs—the students are then in a position to fulfill their own needs (6). Glasser stated that when children cannot fulfill their needs at home, they must do so at school. He postulated,

> To begin to be successful, children must receive at school what they lack, a good relationship with other people. A child or adult cannot gain success if he is lonely. While we may call him by various euphemisms such as culturally deprived, disadvantaged, alienated, isolated or uninvolved, his basic problem is that within his family and his community, he has not found people to whom he can successfully relate. As a child, therefore, his only hope is to find these people in school (7, p. 108).

One factor contributing to the educational interest in Reality Therapy is that it does not require leniency. It does little to perpetuate the idea that humanism is "sissy stuff" (5). It does not force teachers to the ridiculous dichotomy of choosing education either for emotion or intellect. Fry (5, p. 93) states, "unfortunately many have viewed concepts such as social responsibility, discipline, control, and training for reality as almost 'Skinnerian' manipulation and deterministic management of behavior." Researchers are citing a need to re-examine humanistic techniques that may be extremely effective in the classroom (12, 14, 16).

Reality Therapy places major emphasis on such concepts as responsibility, self-control, and obligation. Techniques embodied in the process help children see that ultimately they are responsibile for fulfilling their needs. This is exemplified by Glasser's (6, p. 46) statement, "I do not wish to diminish the responsibility of each student to work hard for his education. Without hard work and personal discipline, students will fail no matter how much we improve the schools."

Reality Therapy outlines a step-by-step methodology that can lead the student from academic and social failure to personal success; yet the student has the responsibility to make the decisions that effectuate the change. No excuse is acceptable for failure to follow through on a commitment; however, no attempt is made to cause pain or to be punitive. The student suffers the reasonable consequence of his behavior, but accepting failure is not a reasonable consequence. Reality Therapy is a planned sequential program for making classroom involvement, relevance, and thinking realities in our schools (6, 7, 8). These steps are related to each other, and should be implemented as a whole. Separately, they have some merit, but combined into a total program they can provide a foundation upon which to structure our education system.

There is a need to obtain solid evidence as to the applicability of Reality Therapy to secondary teaching methodology. The study proposed herein attempts to determine the effects of a Reality Therapy program. The relative newness of Reality Therapy as a teaching concept may account for the notable lack of investigation in this area. On the basis of current interest and lack of documentary evidence, an experimental study of teachers and students engaged in Reality Therapy seems warranted and timely.

Definition of Terms

In this study certain terms were defined in the context of Glasser's Reality Therapy, as follows:

Reality Therapy.--Reality Therapy is a process of human involvement predicated on the belief that individuals care about each other, not only to the point of acceptance but beyond that to a willingness and desire to help others fulfill basic needs. These needs, as enunciated by Glasser in his books, Reality Therapy (1965), Schools Without Failure (1969), and The Identity Society (1971), are the need to feel worthwhile and to be loved. A satisfactory standard of behavior must be maintained to be worthwhile. If behavior is not evaluated or not improved upon when it falls below self-imposed

standards, we will not feel worthwhile or loved. Standards and values are intimately related to the fulfillment of our needs and are an inherent part of Reality Therapy.

Failure.--Failure is the inability to give or receive love and the inability to feel worthwhile as applied in Reality Therapy.

Self-concept.--Self-concept is an organized configuration of the perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities, goals, and ideas which are perceived as having positive or negative variances (13, p. 101).

Attitude.--Attitude is what predisposes a person to think, feel, perceive, and behave in specific manners toward a cognitive object.

Punishment.--Punishment is imposed excessive power of a personal authority. It is usually based on retribution or revenge.

Discipline.--Discipline relates to the techniques teachers use to secure degrees of order which they desire from their students based on the development of personal controls (12).

The <u>District</u>.--The District refers to a Gulf coast
school district, composed of approximately forty thousand
students.

<u>Disciplinary Infraction</u>.--Disciplinary infraction is a
general term used in the study to indicate overt student
actions that conflict with established disciplinary procedures.
Specifically, incidence of disciplinary infractions will be
recorded for student tardies, referrals to the office and
suspensions from school.

Limitations

This study was limited to the population of eighth grade
teachers and students at two suburban junior high schools,
during the spring of 1977.

Basic Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that the
eighth grade students who received Reality Therapy in this
investigation were not significantly different from eighth
grade students who did not receive Reality Therapy.

Procedures for Collection
of the Data

Data for this study were collected by the use of the
Semantic Differential, Pupil Achievement Record, District

Tardy Report, and District Discipline Report (see Appendix B, F). Consultation with the building principals was held concerning the nature of the study and its implications for each campus. Names of teachers and students participating in the study were procured. Six hundred and ninety-six subjects were used. Students not in attendance for both the pre and post-administration of the Semantic Differential were not included in the study.

An initial meeting was held with teachers participating in the study. Information relevant to both the experimental and control subjects was discussed. Meetings were conducted separately for the two schools involved. An explanation of the Semantic Differential was given. Written directions for administration of the survey were distributed (Appendix H). Forms for recording tardy and scholastic data were distributed and beginning and ending dates for the experiment were established. A meeting was held with the assistant principals of each building regarding the collection of discipline data and purposes of the study.

The survey was administered on the same day at both the schools.

Procedures for Analysis
of the Data

After the investigator tabulated respondent reactions, the computer was utilized and the results were placed in tables constructed for each question. Where appropriate, the tables were devised to show any differences on the Semantic Differential before and after the experiment. An indication of tardies, grade point average, and number of referrals to the office was also illustrated on a pre-and post-experimental basis.

Upon completion of tabulation of data, the tables were analyzed and comparisons made in view of the stated purposes of the study. From this analysis, conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made.

The experimental design employed for this study was a pretest-posttest control group design. This technique controls for such variables as maturation, instrumentation, selection biases, and experimental mortality. Statistical treatment for the first five hypotheses in the study utilized analysis of covariance. Hypothesis six was treated by chi square due to the nature of the data called for in the hypothesis.

Overview of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter I has dealt with the background and significance of the study and with the

procedures involved in collecting and analyzing the data.
Chapter II presents a survey of related studies and related
literature. Chapter III deals with the procedures and methods
followed. Chapter IV presents an analysis and treatment of
the data collected in this experimental study. Tables have
been constructed to facilitate explanation. Chapter V contains
the Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bestor, Arthur, _Educational Wastelands_, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1953.

2. Bloom, Benjamin S., D. Krathwohl and B. Masia, _Taxonomy of Educational Objectives_, New York, David McKay Company, 1965.

3. Buckley, Nancy K., _Modifying Classroom Behavior_, Champaign, Illinois, Research Press, 1973.

4. Combs, Arthur, "The Person in the Process," _Child Development_, XXV (1965), 73-84.

5. Fry, S. P., "Reality, Responsibility, and Determinism in Educational Development," _Journal of Educational Psychology_, X (1976), 93-101.

6. Glasser, William, _Reality Therapy_, New York, Harper and Row, 1965.

7. _____, _The Identity Society_, New York, Harper and Row, 1969.

8. _____, _Schools Without Failure_, New York, Harper and Row, 1975.

9. Holt, John, _How Children Learn_, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

10. Jones, William J., _Discipline Crisis in Schools_, Arlington, Virginia, National School Public Relations Press, 1971.

11. Purkey, William H., _Self-Concept and School Achievement_, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

12. Rice, Dale L., _Classroom Behavior from A to Z_, Belmont, California, Fearon Publishers, 1974.

13.   Rogers, Carl, <u>On</u> <u>Becoming</u> <u>a</u> <u>Person</u>, Boston, Massachusetts, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961, p. 13.

14.   Shaw, Belton L. and others, "A Scientific Interpretation of the Concept of Individual Responsibility," <u>The</u> <u>Canadian</u> <u>Psychologist</u>, II (1970), 146-151.

15.   Smith, E. S., Krouse and M. Atkinson, <u>The</u> <u>Educators</u> <u>Encyclopedia</u>, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

16.   Stern, George S., "Measuring Non-Cognitive Variables in Research on Teaching," <u>Handbook</u> <u>of</u> <u>Research</u> <u>on</u> <u>Teaching</u>, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1963, 398-450.

17.   Ward, John, "Gallup Poll on Educational Issues," <u>Phi</u> <u>Delta</u> <u>Kappan</u>, LV March (1974), 448-451.

18.   Webster, Staten W., <u>Discipline</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>Classroom</u>, San Francisco, Chandler Press, 1968.

19.   Wilson, P. S., <u>Interest</u> <u>and</u> <u>Discipline</u> in Education, London, Routledge and Kegan, 1971, pp. 11, 38.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED RELATED RESEARCH

In our present society it is important that the educator be concerned and committed to the transmission of informational data. Youth must gain cognitive skills and competencies. The most important task, however, may be the student's discovery of meaning and his growth as a human being. To this end, a whole new group of humanistic psychologies has come into being.

Teacher Attitude

The teacher in the school is classified as one significant person influencing the way a student perceives himself. Doll (17, p. 71) stated, "Teachers themselves will be the catalysts for productive changes that will ultimately establish methodologies and priorities commensurate to successful teaching." In a study by Hall, Lund, and Jackson (31) of thirty elementary students, the effects of teacher attention on student behavior were measured. The experimenters were able to increase positive student behavior by directing attention to positive behavior and ignoring negative behavior. During a reversal of contingencies, attention was given only

after periods of nonstudy behavior. This produced low rates of good behavior. Habler (30) examined the affective dimension of teacher pupil interaction by creating impressions regarding the teacher's interest in students and examining the effects of these impressions on student achievement. Results indicated a significant increase in student achievement as a result of increased interest in pupils. Hart (34) conducted a study based upon the opinions of 3,725 high school seniors concerning best-liked and least-liked teachers and found a total of forty-three reasons for liking teacher Z the least. Not surprisingly, over fifty-one per cent of the students said they liked best those teachers who were helpful and who exhibited feelings of support and concern to individual students. Teachers assessed negatively were those who had superior, aloof, overbearing attitudes. Students seemed willing to take for granted that a teacher "knows" his material. What seemed to make a difference was the teacher's personal style in conveying an attitude of helpfulness and concern to students. Witty (76) supports these conclusions at both the high school and college level.

Cogan (12) found that warm, considerate teachers got an unusual amount of original poetry and art from their high school students. Reed (54) found that teachers higher in a capacity for warmth favorably affected their pupils' interests

in science. Using scores from achievement tests as their

criterion measure, Heil, Powell, and Feifer (36) compared

various teacher-pupil personality combinations and found that

the well rounded flexible teachers were most effective with

all types of students. Combs in his book The Professional

Education of Teachers cites several studies which indicated

that teachers identified as highly competent typically see

themselves as follows:

1. Good teachers see themselves as identified with
    people rather than withdrawn, removed, apart from,
    or alienated from others.

2. Good teachers feel basically adequate rather than
    inadequate.

3. Good teachers feel worthwhile (13, p. 38).

Dollard and Mower (18) have conducted significant work

in teacher-student imitation practices. Their research indi-

cates that students often imitate the behavior of teachers

they admire. Glasser postulated that Reality Therapy, with

its emphasis on class discussions led by the teacher, has the

possibility of making an impact on student attitude (25, 26,

27). The individual, according to Glasser, strengthens his

self-concept by becoming more realistic in the sense of

accepting responsibility and being willing to make more sacri-

fices for long term gains and satisfactions. Such a position

on Reality Therapy is buttressed by the findings of Buhler (4),
Fromm (23), Goldstein (29) and Maslow (42). The observations
of these investigators illustrate how the losing or gaining
of a foothold on reality is ultimately linked with individual
self-concept. It is the responsibility of the teacher to
build a firm emotional relationship with the student who has
failed to establish such relationships in the past. Studies
by Jersild (38) indicate that only when the self is regarded
with a high degree of acceptance is it possible to relate to
and understand others as persons of worth.

Ryans (57) found that there are indeed differences be-
tween the self-related reports of teachers with high emotional
stability and those with low emotional stability. For ex-
ample, the more emotionally stable teachers (a) more frequent-
ly named self-confidence and cheerfulness as dominant traits
in themselves, (b) said they liked active contact with other
people, (c) expressed interests in hobbies and handicrafts,
and (d) reported their childhoods to be happy experiences.

Mitzel (44) found positive teacher attitude to be cor-
related to the teacher's classroom teaching process which in
turn effects changes in student behavior and achievement.

Hamachek stated,

> If it is true that good teachers have a positive
> view of themselves and others, then this may sug-
> gest that we provide more opportunities for teacher
> candidates to acquire more positive self-other
> perceptions. Self-concept research tells us that how
> one feels about himself is learned. If it is learned
> it is teachable. Rather than talk about group pro-
> cesses in the abstract why can't we first assist
> teachers to a deeper understanding of their own roles
> in groups in which they already participate? If one
> values the self-concept idea at all, then there are
> literally endless ways to encourage more positive
> self-other perceptions through teaching strategies
> aimed at personalizing what goes on in a class-
> room (32, p. 144).

Inservice education for teachers on the concepts of Reality

Therapy is one such way.

A study in the principles of Reality Therapy conducted

by Purl (52) with the Riverside Unified School District indi-

cated that "eighty-two per cent of the teachers felt they had

changed class-room management practices and forty-seven per

cent . . . stated they had altered traditional classroom

grouping practices." A study conducted in Palos Verdes,

California, showed no correlation between teachers' years of

experience and their ability to change attitudes in order to

implement Reality Therapy in the classroom. The District

reported in a _Schools Without Failure Questionnaire_, "The prin-

ciples of Reality Therapy enabled our teachers to make learning

more relevant to the student" (53, p. 32). Thaw (66)

used an instrument termed _Episode-Situation_

Questionnaire to determine information on teacher-role per-
ception. An experimental group consisting of two schools
and a control group of two schools were established. Teachers
of the control group perceived their role as exhibiting be-
havior, such as reinforcing group norms with high concern for
structure, rules, and organization. The teachers in the two
schools using Reality Therapy tended to perceive their role
as having behaviors which stressed the individuality and per-
sonality of people. Structure requiring many rules and
regulations was minimized in the Reality Therapy schools.

Lynch (40) conducted a study to determine whether math-
ematics teachers who had taken inservice training in some
principles of Reality Therapy behaved differently than they
had prior to inservice by being more personal, accepting
present behavior of students, and encouraging student commit-
ment. It was found that they did. This is compatible with
a similar study conducted among public school teachers in
Madison, Wisconsin (68).

Student Attitude

An individual's thinking, feeling, perceiving, and be-
having are shaped by a multiplicity of factors long before
he or she reaches school age. The importance of these traits,

compositely termed attitude, is cited by Pearson in the following manner:

> As one watches children through their years of growth, one is impressed by the fact that the motive of learning in order to be rewarded by the teacher's love is very important and powerful and continues not only through grade school but also into senior high school and college. . . . If, to the child, the teacher seems to be interested in learning, he, too, must become interested in learning, in order to be liked by the teacher and so be liked by him. . . . The reward which is most gratifying to the child is that of love from the adult whether this be the parent or a professional educator. When the child loves the teacher, he will do anything to please him, even to learning the most uninteresting subject, but he anticipates a real expression of love from the teacher in return, and as long as he gets it he will continue to learn (51, p. 149).

In a study of the relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance of others, by Omwake (48), it was indicated that only when one has a good attitude toward self is it possible to relate effectively to others, to understand them, and to regard them as persons of worth. Results of this study supported the hypothesis that a relationship exists between the way an individual sees himself and the way he sees others; those who accept themselves are accepting of others and those who are self-rejecting hold a correspondingly low opinion of others.

Tyron and Henry view student attitude and its influence on children in this manner:

Early in the child's development there enters a framework of the child's concept of himself and his methods and techniques of adjusting in problem situations. An important aspect of the generalizations drawn from experiences is the feeling of success or of failure that accompanies them. Each succeeding year adds substance and conviction to the individual's attitude toward self and thus serves as a framework guiding and setting limits for his social and personal adjustment (69, p. 167).

English presented a paper at the twenty-first annual conference of the California Association of School Psychologists, describing the results of Reality Therapy on student attitudes:

This research project sought to determine whether a Reality Therapy approach to working with small groups of youngsters was more or less effective in changing student attitudes than a performance/reward approach. Each of the above approaches was also compared to an instructional approach. The experimental group worked with the performance/reward method, and the control group with the instructional approach. Each group met for one hour once a week for fifteen weeks in the spring of 1968. When the Reality Therapy group was compared to the control group, the former displayed improvement in attitude significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. This improvement occurred during the fifteen weeks that the three groups were meeting; in other words, this information is a result of comparing post test data with pre test data.

English concludes,

If it can be assumed that the acquiring of a positive attitude toward self is a legitimate educational goal, then the findings of this research study possess ramifications which deserve further study. The findings do not permit us to state that one method of behavior modification was more effective than the other in effecting behavioral change. However, the significance of the Reality Therapy's group progress in comparison to that of the instructional group does merit

additional attention, since it appears that Reality
Therapy used as a method of behavior modification
could augment regular classroom instruction for the
purpose of attaining earlier improvement in attitude
change resulting in better classroom behavior (20,
pp. 73-74).

Thompson and Taylor (67) conducting research at the West

Virginia Industrial School for Boys found that Reality Thera-

py promoted significant gains in several vocational, develop-

mental, and educational areas. In addition, the experimental

subjects developed a better self-perception. In a related

study, Hawes (35) assessed the effect of Reality Therapy on

the self-concept, classroom behavior, and self-responsibility

of black elementary children and found the experimental group

significantly altered classroom behavior and self-

responsibility,but not self-concept. Matthews (43) postu-

lated that students who participated in Reality Therapy for

four months would score significantly higher on self-concept

on the California Test of Personality than similar classes

who did not use Reality Therapy. Results indicated that self-

concept scores increased in both the experimental and control

groups, although not at a significant level.

Student Achievement

In theory, Reality Therapy suggests that a successful

self-concept depends upon successful experiences and the

individual's ability to fulfill his need to be loved and to
feel worthwhile. In the classroom this can be done by the
student's active involvement and participation in daily
learning activities. Classroom practices supporting achieve-
ment, motivation, and ego development must be characteristic
of the learning environment. Schmuck observed,

> If a pupil experiences anxiety in his relations with
> peers and teachers we found that much of his attention
> and energy will be directed toward coping with fears
> and reducing tension. Such pupils often have negative
> feelings about themselves and perform more poorly in
> their school work than their intelligence levels in-
> dicate they are capable of (59, p. 324).

The indices used most widely to assess student achieve-
ment are grades, expressed by numbers or letters. Most
educators are conditioned to use a normal distribution.
Children learn early that they are either "A" students or "C"
students and teachers generally believe that only a few stu-
dents are able to learn what is taught. Bloom states,

> There is nothing sacred about the normal curve. It
> is the distinction most appropriate to chance and
> random activity. Education is a purposeful activity
> and we seek to have the student learn what we have
> to teach. If we are effective in our instruction,
> the distribution of achievement should be very dif-
> ferent than the normal curve (2, p. 76).

One salient criterion used to produce higher student
achievement has traditionally been the bestowing of teacher
praise or blame on students. Hurlock (37) conducted early

investigations in the subject as did Brenner (6) and

Schmidt (58). Results were often contradictory; however,

most seem to indicate that the originally poor performers

were stimulated more by praise than by blame. Later studies,

in most cases, indicate praise as having a more stimulating

effect than blame, and as contributing to better student per-

formance (47, 61). For example, in one study of 106 students

both sexes were divided into four groups matched on the basis

of intelligence and mathematical skill. A fifteen-minute

practice period in addition was given to the groups for five

consecutive days. One of the four groups served as the con-

trol group and received its tests separately without any

comment as to performance. Irrespective of the score obtained,

one of the three remaining groups received consistent praise;

one received reproof; and one was ignored. The children in

the praised group were called by name, told of their excel-

lent results, and encouraged to improve. The reproved group

was called out and criticized for poor work, careless mistakes,

and lack of improvement. The ignored group received no recog-

nition but merely heard what occurred to the other two groups.

Results showed that the praised group made the greater gains

and the reproved group made better gains than the ignored

group (64).

Boocock views school achievement from yet another source.

He states,

> In sum a student's intellectual accomplishments are
> affected by what goes on at his school, but what
> matters most is with whom he interacts while there.
> A relatively high status context and a climate
> favorable toward intellectual achievement both in-
> crease the probability that a student will interact
> with other students who value academic success and
> achieve it (5, p. 128).

Many studies have been conducted measuring the magnitude

of teacher effect upon pupil achievement. Ryan observed that

> The pupil's like or dislike for his teacher or his
> school must be considered. . . . It is not uncommon
> for dislike of the teacher to carry over to dislike
> for the material and consequently to conflict with
> the pupil's learning (57, p. 82).

Brush (9) illustrated a significant positive relationship be-

tween the amount of self-initiated and required work completed

by 987 junior high school pupils and their descriptions of

their teachers. In addition Parsons (50), Sears (60), and

Stern (65) have demonstrated the close correlation between a

student's attitude toward his teacher and achievement.

In summary, a considerable fund of research evidence re-

lating attitude to school achievement has been accumulating

in recent years. Among other things it was found that

1. In terms of their perception of self, indivi-
    duals have a definite commitment to perform as
    they do. (56)

2. There was a significant positive relationship between immature self-concept and reading disabilities in a third and sixth grade class (15).

3. There was a significant positive relationship between high self-concept and school achievement of 102 students researched (3).

4. There was a significant positive relationship between attitude perception of ability and school achievement over a six year period from grades six through twelve (7).

5. Measures of attitude and ego-strength made at the beginning of kindergarten were found to be more predictive of reading achievement than were measures of intelligence (72).

6. Underachieving academically capable high school boys were found to have more negative perceptions of self and of others and were less emotionally stable than achievers (13).

The literature does not contain numerous citations specifically dealing with the effect of Reality Therapy on student achievement. One secondary program in which Reality Therapy concepts were used to assess its effect upon achievement occurred in the San Juan, California, Unified School District (39). Eleven male students with essentially average or above average intelligence were scheduled for Reality Therapy classes as a result of low academic achievement. The program required that part of the time be spent in classes where Reality Therapy techniques were applied. At the beginning of the school year the students averaged nine D's or

F's per boy. By the end of the first semester they averaged one D or F per student.

A study by Palmer (49) demonstrates the correlation between self-concept and school achievement. A Q-Sort was devised to accompany a questionnaire to evaluate students' concepts of self. It was observed that changes in performance on intelligence tests occurred according to changes noted in self-concept.

Shea (63) tested for differences in assigned teacher grades between an experimental and control group. Findings indicated that the experimental Reality Therapy group achieved significantly higher grades than did the control group. These findings were in accord with similar research conducted by Chadburn (11), Bates (1), and Yannet (77). However, in similar studies Moates (45) and Duncan (19) found no significant difference.

Student Behavior

When an educator speaks of establishing effective classroom management techniques, it is usually regarded as a euphemism for what is commonly referred to as discipline. The word is commonly used in at least four different ways (10, p. 71). Two major definitions are the degree of order which

one observes in the behavior of a group or class and the form of punishment used to penalize a student for some undesirable behavior or violation of the general order prevailing. Fry (24, p. 92) states that the "term has come to be so permeated with the old-fashioned conception of punitive controls that it is necessary to start reinforcing it in the light of more contemporary formulations in humanistic education." Discipline, in this study, relates to the techniques teachers use to secure the kinds or degrees of order which they desire from their students based on the development of personal controls (75).

Research has indicated that discipline cannot be achieved if teachers focus their attention only on student misbehaviors (28). The teacher must assist students in the development of character, or, as Brown has stated, "to bring conduct under the dominion of morality" (8, p. 163).

The use of aversive consequences in eliminating behavior has involved considerable controversy. One major problem has been that responses designed to punish deviant behavior do not effectively reduce the frequency, and in many cases accelerate it. Studies have shown that there is often a suppression of the child's behavior at the time of punishment which leads the teacher to believe what he did or said

"worked." When the behavior returns later at a higher intensity, it is often blamed on the child rather than the teacher (62).

Foley and Wilson's (22, p. 184) work in the area of physical punishment demonstrates that in their opinion physical punishment is rarely the answer. They stated, "punishment following a disruptive act does nothing to anticipate or even to prevent future outbursts. Such punishment or power generally must be meted out in ever decreasing doses." Coopersmith, reporting on a recent study of discipline techniques, stated,

> A second and more surprising finding was that parents of high self-esteem children proved to be less permissive than those of children with lower self-esteem . . . they demanded high standards of behavior and were strict in enforcement of the rules. Yet their discipline was by no means harsh; indeed these parents were less punitive than the parents of boys whom we found to be lacking in self-esteem (16, p. 19).

It seems safe to say that all the factors--deep interest in the children, the guidance provided by well-defined rules of expected behavior, non-punitive treatment, and respect for the children's views--contributed greatly to the development of the boy's self-esteem.

Recently the issue of punishment has been re-examined (55, 53, 70, 71). This research indicates that

undesirable effects of punishment may occur in situations where the disciplinary agents are indiscriminate and very punitive. In child-training contexts where the agent rewards and encourages a large proportion of the child's behavior, even though selectively and occasionally punishing certain kinds of behaviors, these side effects are less likely to be found.

It is essentially the dichotomy of thought on the part of scholars concerning the management of aversive student classroom behavior that has traditionally confused many teachers. The values advocated by educators and by those favoring a psychiatric model often clash, and the clashing of values has led to a role conflict on the part of teachers. The divergence of values espoused by these two groups has been succinctly stated by White:

> It would be fair to say that the mental health movement has rewarded warmth of feeling; spontaneity; insight; a high interest in others; warm teachers and democratic classrooms. The same movement has been against competitive striving; intellectualism; emotional unresponsiveness; group tests; red tape; and vice principals in charge of discipline. Many of these are precisely the values revered by educators committed to the cognitive cause (74, p. 193).

Teachers have, in their view, asked for practical and concrete suggestions, says Morse (46), only to be given general platitudes. Teachers, therefore, have been forced to rely on their own common sense and ingenuity. They are forced to

focus on the reality problems as they exist in present situations. They have not been willing to option for theoretical assumptions at the expense of a controlled management environment. Reality Therapy does not advocate alternatives that constitute permissiveness and lack of organizational structure. Glasser believed that for most students who have not done well in school, permissiveness is destructive. He stated,

> None of the educational suggestions made in this book implies that students should be given responsibilities that they are not willing to assume. Responsibility is not a one way street. Teachers have the responsibility to make education relevant and interesting. Students have the responsibility to attend class, to study and to learn (27, p. 263).

In support of this, Fry stated,

> One thing which cannot be overlooked by the educator is that lawfulness, orderliness, responsibility, and restraint are important to the reality of the environment. While man in his reality is not seen as a hopeless organism, a creature who is a victim of his surroundings, he does live in a world in which a reality is determined for him and he is answerable and responsible to others (24, p. 14).

From the teacher's standpoint, the student must be trained to live his life within the confines of present reality. As the child matures in his conception of realistic behavior, emphasis is placed on cognitive ability, creativity, and subject material. One must acquire individual autonomy,

competence in essential learning skills, and a sense of respon-

sibility of who one is and where one wants to go. But before

the student can acquire the ability to let go and relinquish

environmental supports and substitute internal control, the

home, school, and community must provide generous amounts of

warmth, understanding and involvement. Equally important is

the disciplined environment, which requires the young indivi-

dual to assess behavior in terms of responsibility.

Recognizing student responsibility, however, does not

lead to punishment and reinforcement of excuses. Punishment

and excuses for behavior are of no value when working with a

student who has traditionally received punishment, usually

physical, on most occasions where wrong-doing occurred. As

Glasser states,

> Discipline is hard because we do not deal with ex-
> cuses, we ask for them. Discipline is poorly under-
> stood--it has nothing to do with hurting or harming
> children. It is teaching someone that the way he
> is going is not helping him and getting him to make
> better choices. It takes a long time for a child
> to fulfill his commitments. He will check you out.
> He will try to see if you will take excuses. If you
> accept excuses, it proves you don't really care and
> the old failure pattern recurs. If you accept ex-
> cuses, you are saying it's o.k. to not face the
> reality of one's behavior (26, p. 108).

To date, few studies have been conducted that attempt to

illustrate the correlation between Reality Therapy and class-

room discipline. Marple (41),in a dissertation titled

"Effective and Ineffective Procedures Used in Pupil Discipline," examined the question. Responses were sought from 499 teachers and thirty-seven administrators. After participants had completed a survey listing descriptions of incidents in which both effective and ineffective procedures had been used in connection with handling student misbehavior, three types of misbehavior were found to be most common. According to the teacher, the most effective techniques for all three problem areas were the positive reinforcement techniques of Glasser. Found to be far less effective than Reality Therapy, yet cited enough to be considered of importance, were corporal punishment and suspension.

Hawes (35) in a study to assess the effects of Reality Therapy on the self-concept, classroom behavior, and self responsibility of urban, black elementary school children found his Reality Therapy program significantly altering the classroom behavior and self-responsibility of the students, but not their self-concept.

Matthews (43) hypothesized that students who participated in Reality Therapy for four months would score significantly lower on the Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist than similar classes of students who did not participate. Experimentation from January to April indicated that scores

on the above inventory were significantly lower for experimental groups than for control groups. The researcher concluded that Reality Therapy appeared to be a better technique for decreasing discipline problems than did more traditional methods.

English (20) studied the effects of Reality Therapy on elementary-age children. One area examined was classroom behavior. Improvement was noted over a sixteen-week period at the .05 level of significance. English concluded that acquisition of a positive self-concept can effect behavior change.

Harrison (33) conducted a study to assess the effects of a Reality Therapy program on irresponsible students in a secondary school. It was hypothesized that a three-week experimental treatment would increase the rate of acceptable classroom behavior and decrease the rate of inappropriate classroom behavior. Collection of the data was continued past the proposed length of study for the purpose of determining the effects of Reality Therapy over an extended time period. Results indicated neither the appropriate nor inappropriate student behavior exhibited statistically significant changes as a result of the three-week experimental treatment. Shea (63), studying the effects of Reality Therapy techniques with delinquent behavior disordered youth, found no significant

decrease in discipline incidence as a result of Reality
Therapy.

There exists a need for an experimental study that ex-
poses eighth grade students to Reality Therapy classroom
management techniques. Information regarding possible
changes in teacher attitude as a result of Reality Therapy
inservice is also limited. The difficulty in the assessment
of affective outcomes and the relative newness of Reality
Therapy as a teaching concept may account for the notable
lack of investigation in this area.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bates, Mary M., "A Study of the Effectiveness of Group
    Counseling in Achieving the Goals of Guidance in
    Education Using Two Contrasting Formats," unpublished
    doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern
    California, Los Angeles, California, 1967.

2. Bloom, Benjamin S., Stability and Change in Human Char-
    acteristics, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1964.

3. Bodwin, Robert F., The Relationship Between Immature
    Self-Concept and Certain Educational Disabilities,
    Ann Arbor, Michigan, Michigan State University, 1959.

4. Buhler, Charles K., "The Reality Principle," American
    Journal of Psychotherapy, VIII (1954), 626-647.

5. Boocock, Sarane S., An Introduction to the Sociology of
    Learning, Boston, Massachusetts, Houghton Mifflin,
    1972.

6. Brenner, Robert B., "Effect of Immediate and Delayed
    Praise and Blame upon Learning and Recall," Teachers
    College Contribution to Education, John Edwards
    editor, Number 620, 1934.

7. Brookover, William B., Self-Concept of School Ability
    and School Achievement, Educational Research series,
    Number 36, U. S. Department of Health, Education and
    Welfare, Michigan State University, February, 1967.

8. Brown, Ronald L., Social Psychology, New York, The Free
    Press, 1965.

9. Brush, Fredrick R., Aversive Conditioning and Learning,
    New York, Academic Press, 1969.

10. Buckley, Nathan, Modifying Classroom Behavior, Champaign,
    Illinois, Research Press, 1973.

11.   Chadburn, Gerald L., "To Heal the Breach," The School
      Counselor, XIX (1971), 91-97.

12.   Cogan, M. L., "The Behavior of Teachers and the Produc-
      tive Behavior of their Pupils," Journal of Experimen-
      tal Education, XXVII (December, 1958), 124.

13.   Combs, Arthur W., The Professional Education of
      Teachers, Boston, Massachusetts, Allyn and Bacon,
      1965.

14.   Combs, Charles F., "The Perception and Self Scholastic
      Under Achievement in the Academically Capable,"
      Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIII (September,
      1969), 47-51.

15.   Coopersmith, S. A., "A Method of Determining Types of
      Self-Esteem," Journal of Educational Psychology, LIX
      (February, 1959), 87-94.

16.   _____, "Studies in Self-Esteem," Scientific
      American, 218 (1968), 19.

17.   Doll, Ronald F., Curriculum Improvement, Boston, Massa-
      chusetts, Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

18.   Dollard, B. and O. Mower, Learning Theory and the Sym-
      bolic Process, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1960.

19.   Duncan, James. L., "The Effects of Short Group Counseling
      on Selected Characteristics of Culturally Deprived
      Ninth Grade Students," unpublished doctoral disser-
      tation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee,
      1965.

20.   English, Dwane B., "Empirical Validation of a Reality
      Therapy Model in an Elementary Classroom," unpub-
      lished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia,
      Athens, Georgia, 1974.

21.   Fink, Martin B., "Self-Concept as it Relates to Academic
      Underachievement," California Journal of Educational
      Research, XIII (February, 1972), 62-70.

22. Foley, Ronald and Patrick Wilson, Classroom Discipline, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1973.

23. Fromm, Eric, The Sane Society, New York, Rinehart, 1955.

24. Fry, S. P., "Reality, Responsibility, and Determinism in Educational Development," Journal of Educational Psychology, X (1976), 93-101.

25. Glasser, William, Reality Therapy, New York, Harper and Row, 1965.

26. _____, The Identity Society, New York, Harper and Row, 1969.

27. _____, Schools Without Failure, New York, Harper and Row, 1975.

28. Gnagey, William R., The Psychology of Discipline in the Classroom, New York, MacMillan and Company, 1968.

29. Goldstein, Kenneth R., Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1940.

30. Habler, Larry N., Current Research in Motivation, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

31. Hall, Ralph, David Lund and Daniel Jackson, "Effects of Teacher Attention on Study Behavior," Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, XIV (1968, No. 5), 1-12.

32. Hamachek, Don E., "Characteristics of Good Teachers and Implications for Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXI (February, 1969), 341-344.

33. Harrison, James B., "Reality Therapy as an Approach to Discipline in the Classroom," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana, 1975.

34. Hart, Farron W., Teachers and Teaching, New York, MacMillan and Company, 1954.

35. Hawes, Richard M., "Reality Therapy in the Classroom," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970.

36. Heil, L. M., Martin Powell and Ernest Feifer, _Characteristics of Teacher Behavior Related to the Achievement of Different Kinds of Children in Several Elementary Grades_, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, New York, Brooklyn College, 1960.

37. Hurlock, Elizabeth, "An Evaluation of Certain Incentives Used in School Work," _Journal of Educational Psychology_, XV (Fall, 1925), 145-159.

38. Jersild, Arthur T., _Child Development and the Curriculum_, New York, Columbia University Press, 1946.

39. Johnson, Clarence J., "The Transfer Effect of Treatment Group Composition on Pupils' Classroom Participation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1964.

40. Lynch, Kay, "The Effects of Inservice Training on Teachers in the Use of Some Principals of Reality Therapy upon Student Achievement of Basic Mathematical Competencies," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, 1972.

41. Marple, Elizabeth M., "Effective and Ineffective Procedures Used in Elementary Pupil Discipline," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1975.

42. Maslow, Albert, "Self Actualizing People," _Personality Symposium_, New York, Grune and Stratton, 1950.

43. Matthews, Doris 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," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, 1972.

44. Mitzel, H. E., "Teacher Effectiveness," C. W. Harris
    (editor), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New
    York, Macmillan and Company, 1960.

45. Moates, Harold R., "The Effect of Activity Group Coun-
    seling on the Self-Concept, Peer Acceptance, and
    Grade Point Average of Disadvantaged Seventh Grade
    Negro Boys and Girls," unpublished doctoral dis-
    sertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, 1969.

46. Morse, Wayne L., "The Mental Hygiene Dilemma in Public
    Education," American School Orthopsychiatry, XXXI
    (1961), 332-338.

47. Murphy, Mark K., "Glasser on Discipline," Scholastic
    Teacher, LX (September, 1973), 26.

48. Omwake, Katerine R., "The Relation Between Acceptance
    of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three
    Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting
    Psychology, XVIII (December, 1964), 443-446.

49. Palmer, John R., "Role Concepts of Prospective Teachers
    of Young Children," unpublished doctoral dissertation,
    Columbia University, New York, 1954.

50. Parsons, Thomas L., "The School Class as a Social Sys-
    tem: Some of it's Functions in American Society,"
    Harvard Education Review, XXX (Fall, 1959), 296-318.

51. Pearson, George H., Psychoanalysis and the Education
    of the Child, New York, W. W. Norton, 1965.

52. Purl, Marilyn R., "An Analysis of Some of the Effects
    of Schools Without Failure Seminars on Participating
    Schools," (Riverside Unified School District),
    Riverside, California, August, 1971, 6 (mimeographed).

53. Redl, Frank R., When We Deal with Children, New York,
    The Free Press, 1966.

54. Reed, Hiram B., "Implications for Science Education of
    a Teacher Competence Research Program," Science
    Education, XXXXV (December, 1968), 473-486.

55.   Reeder, Thomas A., "A Study of Some Relationships Be-
      tween Levels of Self-Concept, Academic Achievement,
      and Classroom Adjustment," Dissertation Abstracts,
      XV (1965), 2472.

56.   Roth, Donald M., "Role of Self-Concept in Achievement,"
      Journal of Experimental Education, XXVII (June, 1969),
      265-281.

57.   Ryans, D. G., "Some Relationships Between Pupil Behavior
      and Certain Teacher Characteristics," Journal of Edu-
      cation Psychology, LV (May, 1961), 82-90.

58.   Schmidt, David B., "Effectiveness of Various Types of
      Classroom Incentives," Educational Method, XII
      (December, 1932), 297-334.

59.   Schmuck, Roland L., "Innovating Classroom Practices to
      Support Achievement Motivation and Ego-Development,"
      E. M. Bower (editor) Behavioral Science Frontiers
      in Education, New York, John Wiley, 1969.

60.   Sears, Pauline S., The Effect of Classroom Conditions
      on the Strength of Achievement Motive and Work Output
      on School Children, Cooperative Research Project,
      No. 873, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California,
      1963.

61.   Seligman, Melvin E., Samuel F. Maier, and R. L. Solomon,
      "Unpredictable and Uncontrollable Aversive Events,"
      F. R. Brush (editor) Aversive Conditions and Learning,
      New York, Academic Press,(1969), 128-142.

62.   Shaw, Belton W., and others, "A Scientific Interpre-
      tation of the Concept of Individual Responsibility,"
      The Canadian Psychologist, II (1970), 146-151.

63.   Shea, Gordon J., "The Effects of Reality Therapy
      Oriented Group Counseling with Delinquent Behavior
      Disoriented Students," unpublished doctoral disser-
      tation, Fordham University, New York, 1973.

64.   Solomon, D., L. Rosenberg and W. Bezdek, "Teacher
      Behavior and Student Learning," Journal of Educational
      Psychology, LV (1964), 23-30.

65. Stern, George S., "Measuring Non-Cognitive Variables in Research on Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago, Illinois, Rand McNally, 1963.

66. Thaw, T. S., "Combining a Behavioral Approach with Reality Therapy," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, V (December, 1970).

67. Thompson, David L. and James Taylor, Reality Therapy and Delinquents, Morgantown, West Virginia, Morgantown, West Virginia University, 1969.

68. "Training Cluster I Evaluation," Madison Public Schools, Madison, Wisconsin, (June, 1971), 10 (Mineographed).

69. Tyrow, Carolyn L. and William E. Henry, "How Children Learn Personal and Social Adjustment," The Forty-Ninth Yearbook, Part I, Learning and Instruction, the Study of Education, Chicago, Illinois, University of Chicago Press, (1950), 231-247.

70. Ulrich, Roland H., Control of Human Behavior, Glenview, Illinois, Scott Foresman and Company, 1966.

71. Walters, R. H., "Delay of Reinforcement Effects in Childrens' Learning," Science, 146 (Fall, 1964), 307-308.

72. Walters, R. H. and R. D. Parke, "The Influence of Punishment and Related Disciplinary Techniques on the Social Behavior of Children: Theory and Empirical Findings," Progress in Experimental Personality Research, IV (Fall, 1967), 179-228.

73. Wattenberg, William W., "Relationship of Self-Concept to Beginning Achievement in Reading," U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Series Number 377,

74. White, Martha L., "Little Red School House and Little White Clinic," TeachersCollege Record, 214 (1965), 193.

75. Wilson, Patrick R., Interest and Discipline in Education, London, Routhedge and Kegan, 1971.

76. Witty, Paul M., "An Analysis of the Personality Traits
     of the Effective Teacher," _Journal of Educational
     Research_, XXX (Fall, 1958), 661- 664.

77. Yannett, Wayne O., "The Effectiveness of Individual and
     Group Counseling Among High School Boys with School
     Behavior Problems," unpublished doctoral dissertation,
     St. John's University, New York, New York, 1964.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The primary function of the study was to explore the
effect of Reality Therapy on teacher attitude, student atti-
tude, student achievement, and student behavior. An
experimental group of eighth grade teachers received Reality
Therapy inservice education for five days and practiced
Reality Therapy classroom management techniques for a period
of six weeks. Students of these teachers comprised the experi-
mental subjects, while teachers and students from another
eighth grade junior high who had not been exposed to Reality
Therapy comprised the control group.

Sources of Data

The data which were included in this study were obtained
from the Semantic Differential given to teachers and students
of both the experimental and control groups, and information
relevant to student tardies, grades, and referrals to office.

Test Population

The subjects in this investigation were fourteen experi-
mental teachers, fourteen control group teachers, 323 control

group students and 345 experimental group students. All eighth

grade teachers and students were chosen from two junior high

schools. Both schools were essentially self-contained facili-

ties, and both were comprised of students from similar socio-

economic backgrounds.

Neither the experimental nor control teachers had a back-

ground in Reality Therapy, nor was Reality Therapy practiced

in classrooms prior to participation in the study. Teachers

serving as experimental models were unknown to control group

teachers.

Instruments

The Semantic Differential

The Semantic Differential was developed by Osgood as a

method of observing and measuring the connotative meaning of

concepts (4). It is based on the precept that any concept or

stimulus may be rated along a number of polar traits, and the

rating will operationally define the connotative meaning of

the concept for the individual doing the rating (Appendix G).

Osgood originated the Semantic Differential to measure conno-

tative meanings of concepts as points in what he called the

Semantic Space which "consists of a number of graphic seven

'unit' rating scales with opposing or bipolar adjectives at each end. These scales set up a semantic space, a region of some unknown dimension and Euclidean in character" (2, p. 450). Each scale measures one, sometimes two, of the basic dimensions or factors that Osgood and his colleagues have found to be behind the scales: evaluation, potency, and activity. These factors could be termed clusters of adjectives. The most important cluster seems to consist of adjectives that are evaluative such as good-bad and pleasant-unpleasant. The Semantic Differential is constructed by choosing the concepts or stimuli to be rated utilizing the bipolar adjectives. Concepts should be relevant to the research problem.

A test-retest correlation relative to reliability and validity has been reported by Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum (4). Buros' Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook states the Semantic Differential work of "Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum makes a definite contribution in showing that one can obtain consistent and stable results when investigating meaning by scaling methods" (4, p. 3,380). Remmer stated, " . . . in summary, the Semantic Differential in the light of the rigorous and extensive research it has undergone appears to be a widely useful research instrument" (4, p. 3,381). Relative to reliability, a test-retest correlation coefficient of .85 for the

Semantic Differential is reported (4, p.127). The authors
also report correlations of .994, .998, and .997 under their
validity section (4, p. 152).

Pupil Achievement Records

The standard pupil achievement report card was utilized
to obtain numerical grade averages of both the control and
experimental group at pre-and post-experimental levels. Six
weeks was the amount of time covered in each grading period.

District Tardy Report

The daily tardy record used by the district (Appendix F)
was utilized to record student tardies for both the control
and experimental group.

District Discipline Report

A detailed discipline report was utilized assessing
several forms of disciplinary infractions. This included the
number of referrals to assistant principals, number of
paddlings (control group only), and number of suspensions.

Teacher Inservice

Prior to formal inservice activities, experimental
teachers were asked to read the three books written by Glasser
specifically dealing with the concepts of Reality Therapy. A

series of five four-hour workshops was planned. Teachers were granted released time to participate in the seminars. The Director of Inservice Education for the district and a high school principal conducted the Reality Therapy workshops. Both have spent extensive time at the Institute of Reality Therapy in Los Angeles, California. Both conduct teacher training workshops and seminars on Reality Therapy on a regular basis.

The principal has, in addition, been a member of a Gulf Coast Reality Therapy workshop team for three years and studied first hand for one year a school using Reality Therapy. He has presented approximately forty Reality Therapy workshops for such diverse groups as schools, colleges, community organizations, psychological and sociological agencies, and Region Education Service Centers, and has successfully implemented and maintained a Reality Therapy Management System for four years in a large suburban high school.

The Director of Inservice Education for the district, in addition to attending workshops on three occasions, conducted by Glasser, is responsible for designing workshops, inservice training, professional growth, and values education activities

for the twenty-three hundred professional employees of the district. She has additional training in Taba teaching strategies process, IGE clinics, and workshops in Design Skills. She has conducted approximately thirty workshops in Texas and Louisiana specifically related to Reality Therapy.

The Reality Therapy inservice workshops conducted in the spring of 1977 with the experimental teachers adhered to the outline described below. The first workshop included distribution of a Reality Counseling outline accompanied by a brief explanation of Reality Therapy. The next step was the presentation of the film Schools Without Failure, followed by a discussion of the film. Participants received an outline of the goals of the program. Questions relating to the pre-assigned reading were answered.

The second workshop dealt with Reality Therapy techniques in the classroom. After receiving a guidebook for open-ended class meetings, teachers viewed Glasser's videotape on the subject and discussed the applicability of Glasser's techniques to the individual setting. The second phase of the session featured a simulated classroom meeting, with teachers playing both student and instructor roles.

The remaining sessions focused on the development of management techniques introduced in the first two workshops. Workshop three focused on Reality Therapy at Northbrook High School. The principal, teachers, counselors, and students presented a slide-tape program of their four-year effort in Reality Therapy. The fourth workshop consisted of a detailed step-by-step explanation of procedures to be followed in implementing Reality Therapy in individual classrooms, and the counseling procedure to be followed (Appendix A, B, C, E). Session five featured videotapes developed by Glasser on Reality Therapy. They are titled <u>School</u> <u>and</u> <u>Discipline</u> <u>and</u> <u>Rational</u> <u>Man</u> and <u>Reality</u> <u>Therapy</u>. Teachers chose to view one or both of the tapes that explained Reality Therapy procedures. The building principal and Reality Therapy counselor once again discussed procedures to follow to implement the program (Appendix B, C, D, E). A final question and answer period terminated the inservice activity.

Data Collection

Prior to inservice education, teachers of both the experimental and control groups were administered the Semantic Differential, measuring their attitude toward classroom management techniques and their attitude toward self. The Semantic

Differential concepts for this study were teacher, assistant principal, school, discipline, rules, grades, and self. The experimental teachers and the control group teachers were administered the survey on the same date at their respective schools.

Data were collected by May 30, and both control and experimental teachers were administered a posttest measuring their attitude toward self with the Semantic Differential. Teachers were posttested at their respective schools by the investigator.

On April 18, 1977, the researcher measured student attitude toward school environment and attitude toward self by use of the Semantic Differential. Experimental students received the survey during their first period class. Control group students were administered the Semantic Differential during their third-period class on the same date. Students were posttested on the same data May 31, 1977. Each student in the study completed a Semantic Differential on each of the concepts noted above. The bipolar adjectives for the Semantic Differential were selected from Osgood (4). They were pleasant-unpleasant, passive-active, ugly-beautiful, delicate-

rugged, fast-slow, bad-good, weak-strong, dull-sharp, deep-
shallow, heavy-light, worthless-valuable, and fair-unfair.
In both teacher and student concepts of "myself," the inves-
tigator used the biopolar adjectives developed by Ahlstrom
and Havinghurst (1). All students receiving the survey were
included in the study, with the exception of those leaving
school prior to the conclusion of the experiment. Students
in the experimental group were not advised as to the nature
of the program. The experimental group met class daily for
the six weeks of the experiment. Each teacher, administrator,
and counselor applied the principles of Reality Therapy daily.
Attendance and number of tardies were compiled prior to and
following exposure to Reality Therapy (Appendix F). A de-
tailed discipline report was compiled prior to and following
exposure to Reality Therapy (Appendix G).

Analysis of the Data

Statistical treatment for the first five hypotheses in
the study utilized analysis of covariance. F ratios were
determined to test significance of differences in mean scores
between the groups. Chi square analysis was used to test
Hypothesis six. Fourteen classroom mean scores for both the
experimental and control groups were compiled relative to
hypotheses one, two, three, four, and five. Even though three

separate scales--evaluation, potency, and activity--are found on a Semantic Differential instrument; the evaluative scores were combined to represent an overall score for each concept. Data collected for hypotheses one through four were combined into classroom mean scores for the following: pretest-posttest score on the Semantic Differential measuring teacher and student attitude toward concepts used in the study and measuring attitude toward self. A total score for each concept was derived by totaling the scores from each of the bipolar adjectives. Sequential digits were assigned to each of the five positions on the Semantic Differential scale. A person's score on an item was the digit corresponding to the scale position checked.

Data relevant to hypothesis five were obtained by pretest-posttest scores on grade point averages of experimental and control group students. Pre-and posttest assessment of three weighted disciplinary infractions were utilized to test hypothesis six. Tardies, referrals to office, and suspensions were weighted as follows: tardies--one, referrals to office--three, suspensions to office--nine.

The experimental design employed for this study was a pretest-posttest control group design, illustrated by Campbell and Stanley (3) as follows:

E

$$O_1 \qquad X \qquad O_2$$
$$\overline{\hspace{6cm}}$$
$$O_3 \qquad\qquad O_4$$

C

Scores O_1 and O_3 represent each of the four pretests. Observations O_2 and O_4 was the posttest score for each hypothesis. According to Campbell and Stanley, a pretest-posttest control group design is a true experimental design (3, p. 22). This technique controls for such variables as maturation, instrumentation, selection biases, and experimental mortality. This experimental design seemed reasonably well suited for the investigation.

Data from the instruments were keypunched on IBM computer cards for processing at the Region IV Educational Service Center, Houston, Texas.

Upon completion of tabulation of data, the tables were analyzed and comparisons made in view of the stated purposes of this study. Based on this analysis, conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ahlstrom,W., and R. Havinghurst, <u>400</u> <u>Losers</u>, San
    Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

2. Buros, O., <u>The</u> <u>Sixth</u> <u>Mental</u> <u>Measurements</u> <u>Yearbook</u>,
    Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon Press, 1965,
    3,380-3,381.

3. Campbell, D. and J. Stanley, <u>Experimental</u> <u>and</u> <u>Quasi-</u>
    <u>experimental</u> <u>Designs</u> <u>for</u> <u>Research</u>, Chicago, Rand
    McNally and Co., 1968.

4. Osgood, Charles G., Suci and P. Tannebaum, <u>The</u> <u>Measure-</u>
    <u>ment</u> <u>of</u> <u>Meaning</u>, Urbana, University of Illinois,
    1957.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present, analyze, and discuss the findings of this investigation. This study was designed to determine if inservice and implementation of Reality Therapy classroom management techniques could be used to improve teacher and student attitude toward self and toward some specific concepts related to school environment. The Analysis of Covariance and Chi Square statistical techniques were employed to determine whether statistically significant changes occurred as a result of the implementation of Reality Therapy in the classroom.

The data obtained in this study are based upon measures administered to twenty-eight eighth grade teachers and 668 eighth grade students. There were fourteen teacher representatives and 345 students in the experimental group. The control group consisted of fourteen teachers and 323 students. Neither teacher group had previous experience with the

theoretical postulates of Reality Therapy. Students from both schools lived in similar neighborhoods and shared a common background in educational experiences. The experimental teachers received twenty hours of Reality Therapy orientation as outlined in Chapter III.

The .05 level of significance was established as the basis upon which the hypotheses would be tested. Hypothesis I stated that at the conclusion of the experimental period, there would be a significant difference in adjusted means of teacher attitude toward classroom management techniques as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade teachers who utilized Reality Therapy in their classrooms and eighth grade teachers who did not. The six concepts used with the Semantic Differential to test Hypothesis I were rules, school, grades, teachers, assistant principal, and discipline. The means and standard deviations of the Semantic Differential used to rate teachers participating in this study and the analysis of covariance data can be seen in Tables I through XII.

A positive mean gain of 3.71 was achieved by the experimental group. The control group experienced a slight mean loss of .29. It can be seen in Table I that the standard

deviations in both groups decreased. The largest decrease occurred in the control group, the smallest in the experimental group.

TABLE I

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE TEACHER
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-RULES

Group	RULES				
	Means			Standard Deviations	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	16.9186	19.6364	20.5553	1.1412	0.9343
Control	19.3571	19.0714	18.1525	2.1344	1.9401

Table II presents the analysis of covariance data related to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of rules.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-RULES

Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Scores	F-values	P
Between	1	26.1279	26.1279	38.3714	0.0001
Within	25	17.0231	0.6809	..	..
Total	26	43.1510	..	..	..

Table II displays an F-value of 38.3714 which was significant beyond the .01 level of significance. The results indicated significant difference between the means of the

experimental and control group teachers' concept of the term

rules in favor of the experimental group.

A mean gain of 2.929 was achieved by the experimental

group. The control group experienced a slight mean loss of

.0328. It can be seen in Table III that the standard devi-

ations in both groups decreased.

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE TEACHER
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-SCHOOL

| Group | SCHOOL | | | | |
| | Mean | | | Standard Deviations | |
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	11.0714	20.0000	20.8893	1.6392	1.0377
Control	19.8571	19.7143	18.8249	2.1433	2.1279

Table IV presents the analysis of covariance data related

to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of schools.

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-SCHOOL

| Source of Variance | df | SCHOOL | | | |
		Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	18.9530	18.9530	13.8246	0.0010
Within	25	34.2741	1.3710	..	..
Totals	26	53.2270	..	..	..

Table IV displays an F-value of 13.8246 which was significant at the .0010 level of significance. The results indicated a significant difference between experimental and control teacher means when using the Semantic Differential to assess the concept of school in favor of the experimental group.

Table V presents means and standard deviations data relevant to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of grades.

TABLE V

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE TEACHER
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-GRADES

Group	GRADES				
	Means			Standard Deviations	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	18.2143	20.5714	20.9144	1.4711	1.3426
Control	19.1429	19.2857	18.9427	1.8753	1.8577

A mean gain of 2.357 was achieved by the experimental group. The control group achieved a mean gain of .1328. Table V indicates a decrease in standard deviations of .1285 for the experimental teachers and .176 for the control group teachers.

Table VI presents the analysis of covariance data related to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of grades.

Table VI displays an F-value of 22.5698 which was significant at the .0001 level of significance.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-GRADES

GRADES					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	25.1608	25.1608	22.5698	0.0001
Within	25	27.8699	1.1148	..	..
Totals	26	53.0308	..	..	..

Results indicated a significant difference in teacher attitude toward the concept of grades for the experimental group.

Table VI displays an F-value of 22.5698 which was significant at the .0001 level of significance. Results indicated a significant difference in teacher attitude toward the concept of grades for the experimental group.

Table VII presents means and standard deviations data relevant to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of Teacher.

A mean gain of 2.4285 was recorded by the experimental group,while the control group recorded a loss of .1428.

TABLE VII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE TEACHER
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-TEACHER

TEACHER					
Group	Means			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	17.9286	20.3571	21.0166	1.7745	1.2777
Control	19.8571	19.7143	19.0548	1.7034	1.6378

Standard deviations for the experimental group declined by

.4968,and a decline of .658 was registered by the control group.

Table VIII presents the analysis of covariance data re-

lated to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of

teacher.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE-TEACHER

TEACHER					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio	P
Between	1	20.2410	20.2410	26.2378	0.0001
Within	25	19.2861	0.7714	..	..
Totals	26	39.5271	..	..	..

Table VIII displays an F-value of 26.2378,which indicates

that a significant difference beyond the .01 level exists on

the part of experimental teachers toward the concept of

teacher following Reality Therapy treatment.

Table IX presents means and standard deviations data relevant to the concept of assistant principal.

TABLE IX

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE TEACHER
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE –
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio	P
Between	1	20.2410	20.2410	26.2378	0.0001
Within	25	19,2861	0.7714	..	..
Totals	26	39.5271	..	..	..

A mean gain of 2.0714 was recorded for the experimental group and a loss of .4285 in mean score was registered for the control group. Standard deviations for the experimental group decreased by .5971 and increased by .1610 for the control group.

Table X presents the analysis of covariance data related to the teacher Semantic Differential scale on the concept of assistant principal.

Table X reflects an F-value of 30.0087, which indicates a significant level of difference in favor of the experimental group beyond the .01 level of significance on teacher attitude toward the assistant principal.

TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	35.9235	35.9235	30.0087	0.0001
Within	25	29.9276	1.1971	..	..
Total	26	65.8511	..	..	..

Table XI presents means and standard deviations relevant
to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of discipline.

TABLE XI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE TEACHER
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - DISCIPLINE

DISCIPLINE					
Group	Means			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	14.6879	15.4471	15.3589	1.3007	0.8970
Control	14.5029	14.4550	14.5432	1.3140	1.3385

A mean gain was recorded for the experimental group of
.7592. A slight mean loss was evidenced by the control group.
Standard deviations increased slightly for both control and
experimental groups.

Table XII presents the analysis of covariance data re-
lated to the teacher Semantic Differential Scale on the concept of
discipline.

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPT - DISCIPLINE

DISCIPLINE					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	4.6283	4.6283	7.1252	0.0132
Within	25	16.2233	0.6489	..	..
Total	26	20.8470	..	..	..

Table XII reflects an F-value of 7.1252 which is significant at the .0132 level of confidence. There was a significant difference, after treatment, between the experimental and control group regarding teacher attitude toward discipline.

Hypothesis I stated that there would be a significant difference in the means of teacher attitude toward classroom management techniques as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade teachers who utilized Reality Therapy and eighth grade teachers who did not. Teacher attitude on the Semantic Differential was assessed by the concepts rules, school, grades, teachers, assistant principal, and discipline. Results indicated a significant difference on all six attitude concepts measured. Teacher concepts on school, rules, assistant principal, grades, teacher, and discipline changed significantly for the experimental group as a result of Reality

Therapy in-service and classroom implementation. Hypothesis I was accepted.

Hypothesis II stated that there would be a significant difference in means of teacher attitude toward self, as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade teachers who utilized Reality Therapy in their classrooms and eighth grade teachers who did not.

Tables XIII and XIV present data relevant to Hypothesis II.

TABLE XIII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE TEACHER
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - MYSELF

MYSELF					
Group	Means			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	15.0000	14.5000	16.2722	1.5191	1.2860
Control	20.5000	20.7857	19.0135	1.6984	2.0070

The posttest mean on the experimental group showed a decline of .5000, while the control group mean increased from 20.5000 to 20.7857. A decline in mean score represents a positive change in attitude toward self. Standard deviations for the experimental group decreased from 1.5191 to 1.2860, while the control group standard deviation increased by .4090.

Table XIV presents the analysis of covariance data related to the teacher Semantic Differential Scale on the concept of self. Table XIV reflected an F-value of 6.9370 which indicated positive significance for the experimental group at the .01 level of significance. Teacher attitude did change for the experimental group after treatment, on the concept of self. Hypothesis II was accepted.

Table XIV presents analysis of covariance data relevant to Hypothesis II.

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - MYSELF

MYSELF					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	12.7151	12.7151	6.9370	0.0143
Within	25	45.8238	1.8330	..	..
Total	26	58.5389	..	..	..

Hypothesis III stated that there would be a significant difference in adjusted means of student attitude toward the school environment, as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade students who received Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who did not. The six concepts used to assess attitude change on the Semantic Differential were

rules, school, grades, teachers, assistant principal, and discipline. Tables XV through XXVII reveal statistical findings relevant to Hypothesis III.

Table XV presents means and standard deviations data relevant to the teacher Semantic Differential on the concept of rules.

TABLE XV

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE STUDENT
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - RULES

Group	RULES				
	Means			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	14.4457	15.4379	15.4396	1.4169	1.6437
Control	14.4507	16.6750	14.6732	1.7044	1.1660

A mean gain of .9912 was recorded for the experimental group and a mean gain of .2243 was recorded for the control group. Standard deviations increased by .1268 for the experimental group and decreased by .5384 for the control group.

The analysis of covariance data for the student Semantic Differential are presented in Table XVI. Table XVI displayed an F-value of 4.7854, which was significant at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE STUDENT SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - RULES

RULES					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	4.1111	4.1111	4.7854	0.0383
Within	25	21.4773	0.8591	..	..
Totals	26	25.5884	..	..	..

There was, therefore, a significant difference in the ex-
perimental student group attitude toward rules following

Reality Therapy treatment.

Table XVII displays an experimental mean increase of .5564

and a control mean decrease of .2057. Standard deviations de-

creased slightly for both.

TABLE XVII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE STUDENT
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - SCHOOL

SCHOOL				Standard Deviations	
Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	16.1729	16.7293	16.5928	1.8554	1.7083
Control	15.8036	15.5979	15.7343	1.6173	1.5581

Table XVIII presents the analysis of covariance data related to the student Semantic Differential Scale of School.

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE STUDENT SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - SCHOOL

SCHOOL					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	5.0981	5.0981	4.8095	0.0378
Within	25	26.5000	1.0600	..	..
Total	26	31.5981	..	..	..

Table XVIII indicates an F-value of 4.8095, which was significant at the .05 level in favor of the experimental group.

Table XIX presents means and standard deviations data relevant to the student Semantic Differential on the concept of grades.

TABLE XIX

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION ON THE STUDENT
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - GRADES

GRADES					
Group	Means			Standard Deviations	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	15.3807	15.8686	16.1652	1.5398	1.6686
Control	16.1107	15.6586	15.3619	1.0981	0.8532

An increase in mean score of .4779 was registered for the experimental group,while the control group mean score declined by .4521. Standard deviations rose slightly from pretesting to posttesting for the experimental population and declined by .2449 over the same period for the control group.

Table XX presents the analysis of covariance data for the student Semantic Differential scale of grades.

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE STUDENT SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - GRADES

GRADES					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	4.1816	4.1816	6.9966	0.0139
Within	25	14.9416	6.5977	..	..
Total	26	19.1232	..	..	..

Table XX displays an F-value of 6.9966 which was significant at the .01 level of significance. Experimental student group attitude, when compared to control group attitude, did change positively after treatment, toward the concept of grades.

Table XXI presents means and standard deviations data related to the student Semantic Differential on the concept of teachers.

TABLE XXI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE STUDENT
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - TEACHERS

	TEACHERS				
Group	Means			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	16.4950	17.1000	16.9370	1.4731	1.6625
Control	16.1478	15.9664	16.1293	1.5495	1.4634

The experimental student group mean increased after treatment by .6050, while the control student group mean score declined over the same period by .1814. Standard deviations increased for the experimental group and declined for the control group.

Table XXII presents the analysis of covariance data for the student Semantic Differential Scale of teacher. Table XXII reflects an F-value of 9.8604, which was significant for the experimental group at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE STUDENT SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - TEACHER

	TEACHER				
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	4.5029	4.5029	9.8604	0.0043
Within	25	11.4165	0.4567	..	..
Total	26	15.9194	..	..	..

Table XXIII presents means and standard deviations data related to the student Semantic Differential on the concept of assistant principal.

TABLE XXIII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE STUDENT
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL					
Group	Means			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	16.3857	16.9928	16.1093	1.4716	1.3607
Control	13.8129	14.2764	15.1600	1.2789	1.2171

The experimental student mean increased after treatment by .6071 and the control group student mean increased over the same period by .4635. Standard deviations decreased slightly for both groups.

Table XXIV presents the analysis of covariance data for the student Semantic Differential Scale on the concept of assistant principal. Table XXIV indicates an F-value of 4.0658,which was not significant at the .05 level of significance. For the experimental group,student attitude did not change significantly when compared to control group student attitude, toward the concept assistant principal, following Reality Therapy treatment.

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE STUDENT SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	3.2550	3.2550	4.0658	0.0546
Within	25	20.0145	0.8006	..	..
Totals	26	23.2695	..	..	..

Table XXV presents means and standard deviations data
relevant to the student Semantic Differential on the concept of
discipline.

TABLE XXV

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE STUDENT
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - DISCIPLINE

DISCIPLINE					
Group	Means			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	14.6879	15.4471	15.3589	1.3007	1.3140
Control	14.5029	14.4550	14.5432	0.8970	1.3385

The experimental group mean increased after treatment by
.479. Standard deviations increased by .133 for the experi-
mental group and by .4415 for the control group students.

Table XXVI presents the analysis of covariance data re-
lated to the student Semantic Differential scale on the concept of
discipline.

TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE STUDENT SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - DISCIPLINE

| | | DISCIPLINE | | | |
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	4.6238	4.6238	7.1252	0.9132
Within	25	16.2233	0.6489	..	..
Total	26	20.8470	..	..	..

Table XXVI reflects an F-value of 7.1252, which was significant at the .01 level of significance. Experimental student attitude toward the concept discipline did change significantly when compared to control group student attitude, as a result of Reality Therapy treatment.

Hypothesis III stated that there would be a significant difference in adjusted means of student attitude toward the school environment, as measured by a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade students who received Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who did not. Student attitude on the Semantic Differential was measured by the concepts rules, school, grades, teacher, assistant principal, and discipline. Results indicated that a significant difference was achieved after treatment on rules, school, grades, teacher, and discipline.

Significance was not achieved on the concept assistant princi-
pal. Hypothesis III was not accepted.

Hypothesis IV stated that at the conclusion of the experi-
mental period there would be a significant difference in
adjusted means of student attitude toward self, as measured by
a Semantic Differential, between eighth grade students who
received Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who did not.

Tables XXVII and XXVIII present data relevant to
Hypothesis IV. A decrease in mean score indicates a gain in
student attitude toward self.

TABLE XXVII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE STUDENT
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - MYSELF

| Group | MYSELF | | | | |
| | Means | | | Standard Deviation | |
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	16.2057	16.0964	16.1519	1.4523	1.0728
Control	16.3714	16.3264	16.2709	1.2199	1.3824

The experimental group achieved a pretest mean of 16.2057
and a posttest mean of 16.0964. Pretest-posttest means for
the control group were 16.3714 and 16.3264. Standard devi-
ations decreased by .3795 for the experimental group and in-
creased by .1625 for the control group.

Table XXVIII presents the analysis of covariance data related to the student Semantic Differential scale.

TABLE XXVIII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE STUDENT SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL SCALE - SELF

SELF					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	0.0988	0.0988	0.1311	0.7203
Within	25	18.8270	0.7531	..	..
Total	26	18.9258	..	..	..

Table XXVIII indicated an F-value of 0.1311, which did not approach significance. Student attitude for the experimental group, when compared to student attitude for the control group, did not display a significant change after Reality Therapy treatment. Hypothesis IV was rejected.

Hypothesis V stated that, at the conclusion of the experimental period, there would be a significant difference in adjusted means of grades, as measured by student grade point average, assigned to eighth grade students who received Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who did not.

Table XXIX presents data relevant to Hypothesis V. The experimental student group mean grade point average for the

TABLE XXIX

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL
AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENT
GRADE POINT AVERAGE

	GRADE POINT AVERAGE				
Group	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted	Pretest	Posttest
Experimental	2.7021	2.7986	2.7510	0.4108	0.3714
Control	2.5907	2.5071	2.5547	0.2252	0.2447

six weeks prior to treatment was 2.70, as measured on a 4.0

scale. Following treatment, experimental student grade point

average was 2.80. The control group mean grade point average

for the six weeks period prior to pretesting was 2.59 as

measured on a 4.0 scale. Following posttesting, the control

group student grade point average was 2.50. This represented

an experimental group increase of .10 and a control group de-

crease of .09.

Table XXX presents the analysis of covariance data for

the student Semantic Differential scale of grade point average.

Table XXX reflects an F-value of 13.2132, which was significant

at the .01 level of significance. Hypothesis V was accepted.

Hypothesis VI stated that at the conclusion of the ex-

perimental period, there would be a significant difference in

incidence of discipline, as measured by weighted infractions

TABLE XXX

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE DATA FOR THE COMPARISON
OF STUDENT GRADE POINT AVERAGE

GRADE POINT AVERAGE					
Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	P
Between	1	0.2617	0.2617	13.2132	0.0013
Within	25	0.4951	0.2618	..	..
Total	26	0.7567	..	..	..

of eighth grade students who received Reality Therapy and
eighth grade students who did not. Tardies received a weight
of 0, referrals to office a weight of 3, and suspensions from
school a weight of 9. Chi square analysis was utilized to
test for significance.

Table XXXI presents analysis of chi square data related
to incidence of student discipline.

TABLE XXXI

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND
CONTROL GROUPS ON INCIDENCE OF DISCIPLINE

	CONTROL	EXPERIMENTAL	TOTAL
Pre	494	397	891
Post	371	408	779
Total	865	805	1670

Q   = 9.83
P   = .01
DF =   1

Hypothesis VI stated that a significant difference in incidence of student discipline, as measured by tardies, referrals to office, and suspensions, would occur after Reality Therapy treatment, between eighth grade students who received Reality Therapy and eighth grade students who did not. This did not occur. Incidence of discipline, as measured by these variables, increased following treatment, for the experimental group from 397 to 408. Incidence of discipline measured by the same criterion decreased from 494 to 371 for the control group. Significance was reached at the .01 level of significance for the control group. It was anticipated that significant change would occur with the treatment group, not the experimental group. Hypothesis VI was accepted; however, it is important to note that significance was not expected in the control group.

Findings of this research do not adequately explain the data revealed in the study relevant to Hypothesis VI. An examination of the discipline referral forms reveals that tardies and suspensions for the experimental group dropped sharply; however, referrals to office increased. The investigator's opinion is that experimental teachers were trying to establish personal relationships with experimental students, and they subsequently involved the assistant principal in their discussions with students to a much greater extent.

No suitable explanation exists for the significant decline in incidence of discipline for control group students. Control group teachers were administered a Semantic Differential. They were encouraged to keep complete incidence of discipline records. It is very possible that the "Hawthorne effect" was in operation with regard to control group teachers, on incidence of student discipline.

Discussion

An examination of the analysis of covariance and chi square tables related to the analysis of group scores reveals data which offers support to Hypotheses I, II, and V. Hypotheses III, IV, and VI were not supported sufficiently by the findings reported in Tables XXIII, XXIV, XXVII, XXVIII, and XXXI.

Hypothesis I stated that a significant difference would occur in attitude of experimental teachers toward classroom management techniques following Reality Therapy. Hypothesis I was accepted. The reported F-values on the concepts rules, school, grades, teacher, assistant principal and discipline were significant at the .05 level of significance.

The fact that the experimental teacher group's posttest mean scores showed the greater gains in the frequency of

attitude changes on the six scales used is consistent with the earlier research of Mitzel (7), Hamachek (3), and Purl (9). It appears that teachers who practice Reality Therapy in their classrooms may have strengthened their attitude toward concepts related to teaching. This important finding underscores Lynch's (5) experimental results and suggests the continued use of a Reality Therapy model as an effective classroom teaching strategy.

Hypothesis II stated that a significant difference would occur in teacher attitude toward self on the part of experimental teachers who practiced Reality Therapy in their classrooms. Results indicated that experimental teachers displayed a significant difference in attitude toward self.

Hypothesis III stated that after Reality Therapy treatment, students in the experimental group would display a significant difference in school environment as measured by the Semantic Differential. Findings indicated that Hypothesis III should be rejected. Significant differences on five of six variables used to assess attitude were significant at the .05 level or lower. Thompson and Taylor (13) and Matthews (6) tested for a similar effect with Reality Therapy models and the findings of this study are somewhat similar. The fact that significance was not reached in

student attitude toward the concept assistant principal is
important and perhaps should warrant further investigation.

Hypothesis IV stated that at the conclusion of the experi-
mental period there would be a significant difference in
attitude of self between students who received Reality Therapy
and students who did not. Interpretation of statistical analy-
sis used to assess attitude toward self on the Semantic
Differential did not yield significant results. This is in-
consistent with research conducted by Omweke (8), Hawes (4),
or English (2). Hypothesis IV was rejected.

Hypothesis V stated that the grade point average of stu-
dents exposed to Reality Therapy for a six weeks grading
period would be significantly different from students not ex-
posed to Reality Therapy. Experimental students' grade point
average rose from 2.70 prior to treatment to 2.80 following
treatment. Control group students' grade point average
dropped from 2.59 to 2.50 which was significant at the .05
level of significance. These findings support earlier studies
by Schmuck (11), Schmidt (10), and Brush (1), which support
the basic contention outlined in Hypothesis V. Hypothesis V
was accepted.

Hypothesis VI stated that at the conclusion of the experi-
mental period, there would be a significant difference in

incidence of discipline, as measured by weighted infractions, between students who received Reality Therapy and students who did not. Chi square analysis demonstrated the opposite to be true. Incidence of discipline increased slightly among students who received the treatment; however, as stated, it decreased significantly among control group students who did not receive any treatment. Hypothesis VI was rejected.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brush, Frederick R., _Aversive Conditioning and Learning_, New York, Academic Press, 1965.

2. English, Dwane B., "Empirical Validation of a Reality Therapy Model in an Elementary Classroom," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1974.

3. Hamachek, Don E., "Characteristics of Good Teachers and Implications for Teacher Education," _Phi Delta Kappan_, XXXXI (February, 1969), 341-344.

4. Hawes, Richard M., "Reality Therapy as an Approach to Discipline in the Classroom," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970.

5. Lynch, Kay, "The Efforts of Inservice Training on Teachers in the Use of Some Principals of Reality Therapy on Student Achievement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, 1972.

6. Mathews, Doris B., "The Effects of Reality Therapy on Reported Self-Concept," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, 1972.

7. Mitzel, H. E., "Teacher Effectiveness," C. W. Harris (editor), _Encyclopedia of Educational Research_, New York, MacMillan and Company, 1960.

8. Omwake, Katherine B., "The Relationship of Acceptance and Acceptance of Others," _Journal of Consulting Psychology_, XVIII (December, 1964), 443-446.

9.   Purl, Marilyn R., "An Analysis of Some of the Effects of
     Schools Without Failure Seminars on Participating
     Schools," (Riverside Unified School District), River-
     side, California, (August, 1971, 6 (mimeographed).

10.   Schmidt, David B., "Effectiveness of Various Types of
     Classroom Incentives," Educational Method, XXII
     (December, 1932), 297-334.

11.   Schmuck, Roland L., "Innovating Classroom Practices to
     Support Achievement, Motivation, and Ego-Development,"
     E. M. Bower (editor), Behavioral Science Frontiers in
     Education, New York, John Wiley, 1969.

12.   Thaw, T. S., "Combining A Behavioral Approach with Rea-
     lity Therapy," Elementary School Guidance and
     Counseling, V (December, 1970).

13.   Thompson, David L. and James Taylor, Reality Therapy and
     Delinquents, Morgantown, West Virginia University,
     1969.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the effects of Reality Therapy classroom management techniques upon eighth grade teachers and students. Reality Therapy is a counseling and teaching technique that outlines a step-by-step methodology that can lead the student from academic and social failure to personal success; yet the student has the responsibility to make the decisions that effectuate the change. Prior investigations of Reality Therapy concentrated on counselor aspects of the program. The experiments were conducted primarily with youngsters identified as delinquent or problem-oriented. Although Reality Therapy is becoming a widely used technique of classroom management, few studies have been conducted to determine the effects of Reality Therapy treatment on teachers and students in situations commonly referred to as a normal educational setting. A review of the literature found no study which specifically addressed itself to the implementation and use of Reality Therapy in a junior high setting.

Concepts employed to assess changes in teacher and student attitude on the Semantic Differential were rules, teacher, grades, assistant principal, school, and discipline. Teachers were administered the Semantic Differential prior to implementation of Reality Therapy into the classroom by the experimental teachers. After a period of six weeks, both the control and experimental teachers were posttested on the Semantic Differential. Mean classroom scores on all six hypotheses were tabulated by hand, and data were subjected to statistical analysis.

The subjects selected for participation in the present study were twenty-eight eighth grade classroom teachers and 668 eighth grade students. There were fourteen teachers in the experimental group and fourteen teachers in the control group. The experimental student group consisted of 345 students and the control group student population was comprised of 323 students.

In-service for experimental group teachers consisted of five four-hour workshops taught by experienced Reality Therapy consultants. Appendices A, B, C, D, and E, represent examples of Reality Therapy procedures covered by experimental teachers during inservice and during implementation of the experiment.

Data relevant to a comparison of student grade point averages between eighth grade control and experimental student groups were extracted from pupil achievement records. Incidence of discipline concerning tardies, referrals, and suspensions were recorded by the classroom teacher and assistant principal in both the control and experimental schools (Appendices D, F, and G).

The simple analysis of covariance statistical procedure was used to test Hypotheses I through V.

The .05 level of significance was established as the criterion level to test all hypotheses. Chi square analysis was used to test Hypothesis VI.

Findings

1. Experimental group teachers displayed a significantly positive attitude change after in-service and implementation of Reality Therapy practices in their classrooms toward the concepts rules, school, grades, assistant principal, teacher, and discipline.

2. Experimental group teachers displayed a significantly positive change in attitude toward self after in-service and implementation of Reality Therapy in their classrooms.

3. Experimental group student attitude toward school environment, as measured by the concepts, rules, school, grades, teacher, assistant principal, and discipline showed a significant positive increase following Reality Therapy treatment.

4. Student experimental groups did not significantly change their attitude toward self following Reality Therapy treatment.

5. Student experimental group grade point average increased significantly following Reality Therapy treatment.

6. Student experimental group incidence of discipline did not decrease as a result of Reality Therapy treatment. Student control group incidence of discipline did decrease.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are presented as a result of this investigation.

1. Reality Therapy in-service and implementation of Reality Therapy teaching techniques in classrooms produce significant changes in the way teachers view themselves and in the way they regard student discipline.

2. Implementation of Reality Therapy practices in junior high classrooms produces positive changes in student attitude toward school environment.

3. Implementation of Reality Therapy techniques in junior high classrooms does not seem to be effective in producing changes in student attitude toward self.

4. The implementation of Reality Therapy techniques in junior high classrooms can be effective in producing higher student grade point averages.

5. The implementation of Reality Therapy techniques in junior high classrooms is not effective in producing lower rates of student misbehavior as measured by tardies, referrals to office, and suspensions.

Recommendations for Future Research

In view of the results of this investigation, the following recommendations are made.

1. Future research in Reality Therapy should provide for the inclusion of a third placebo group to diminish the possibility of a Hawthorne type effect.

2. Future research in Reality Therapy should involve a longer time frame than the one existing in the present study.

3. Future research should focus more specifically on the role of Reality Therapy as a teacher discipline technique.

4. Future research is needed on Reality Therapy, preferrably on a school wide basis.

5.   Future research is needed to develop more sensitive instruments for the measurement of attitude toward self.

6.   Future research should focus on a systematic follow-up of teachers receiving Reality Therapy training. There exists a need to determine the long-range effectiveness of this type training.

7.   Future studies should focus on the role of the assistant principal in a Reality Therapy setting.

8.   Future research should explore the effect that different types of teachers have upon the development of internal pupil responsibility.

9.   Future research should include specific plans for experimental teacher control during the time Reality Therapy treatment is occurring.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

REALITY COUNSELING OVERVIEW

REALITY COUNSELING OVERVIEW

FUNCTION:

The Reality Therapy teacher's main function will be to provide a positive approach to working with students who find themselves out of the mainstream of education. Elements of the positive approach include developing self-reliance, developing an ability to set an objective or plan of action and see it through to completion, and developing a system of appropriately handling one's own behavior in an acceptable manner. Since each individual student will be held responsible for his own behavior, the students soon realize that Reality Counseling is not a soft approach.

PURPOSE:

This system provides an alternative whereby the students do not receive academic penalty for behavioral problems. The student decides for himself whether he will turn in the assignment for credit. It also allows the student to keep up with his work so he will be on track upon his return into the mainstream.

MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES:

(Dr. William Glasser's The Identity Society, "The Principles of Reality Therapy" contain these major responsibilities on pages 107-132.)

1. Involvement
2. Elicit present behavior
3. Value judgment avoided
4. Plan
5. Commitment
6. Reinforcement
7. Excuses eliminated
8. Consequences

Involvement: Involvement includes the processes of counseling, individualizing instruction, and coordinating communications between the students under his supervision and all other teachers, administrators, and other personnel who have a direct interest in the students. Involvement should also include making friends or taking a direct personal interest in each student's welfare, but not at the expense of fairness or consistency.

Elicit present behavior: Elicit present behavior
    or determine what the student is doing currently
    that is not acceptable behavior. The Reality Cen-
    ter counselor is not concerned here with dwelling
    on history or why a certain behavior is exhibited.
    He is concerned solely with establishing the actual
    factual behavior.

Value judgment avoided: Value judgments must be
    avoided at all costs. The student must realize that
    a particular behavior may be unacceptable at school
    even though it may be acceptable elsewhere. Regard-
    less of the behavior, it is not our prerogative or
    job to pass judgment on anyone.

Plan: Once a student realizes that his behavior is
    unacceptable, the Reality Therapy Center counselor
    should assist the student plan a course of action
    to correct the behavior. The key term for the
    counselor to keep in mind here is assist. The course
    of action must be the student's not the counselor's
    course of action.

Commitment: Once the student has developed or planned
    a course of corrective action, it should be put in
    writing and signed by the student who is truly
    committed to follow-up the stated course of action.

Reinforcement: On the successful accomplishment of
    each phase of the stated course of action, the
    counselor should provide positive reinforcement to
    the student involved. Every appropriate opportunity
    should be taken to provide positive reinforcement
    which encourages the student toward continued effort
    toward the accomplishment of the stated course of
    action.

Excuses eliminated: No excuses should be accepted by
    the counselor from the student for nonperformance of
    the student's stated course of action. The student
    will be unable to develop a sense of responsibility
    if he is able to substitute excuses for appropriate
    behavior.

Consequences: Consequences for failure to accomplish
    the stated course of action must be determined jointly
    by the student and the counselor prior to the stu-
    dent's commencement of action on the stated course.
    The consequences must be followed specifically if the
    appropriate action is not taken by the student.

APPENDIX B

<u>DISCIPLINE</u> <u>REFERRAL</u> <u>SHEET</u>

DISCIPLINE REFERRAL SHEET

_____   _____   _____
Student's Name   Date   Teacher's Name

_____   _____   _____
Class   Period   Student's Phone Number

Step I.   Have an individual conference with the student
(Teacher)   concerning his behavorial problem. After the
               conference, attach the student's commitment be-
               hind this referral sheet and file.

               Describe problem: _____

               _____

               _____

               _____   _____
               Date   Signature

Step II.   Should the commitment be broken, the teacher
(Teacher)   will make a phone call to either parent or
               guardian. The teacher will then refer the
               student to his counselor giving the counselor
               the discipline referral form and all commitments.

               Describe problem: _____

               _____

               _____

               _____   _____
               Date   Signature

(Teacher)   Telephone Conference: _____

               _____

               _____   _____
               Date and Time   Date referred to
               parents called   counselor

Step III.   Counselor's Remarks: _____
(Couunselor)

_____

_____

Date _____   Counselor's Signature _____

Step IV.   Teacher's Remarks: _____

_____

Date Referred to   Teacher's Signature _____
Principal

DISCIPLINE REFERRAL SHEET
Addendum

Student's Name _____ Grade _____ Teacher's Name _____

Class _____ Period _____ Home Phone _____

Step V.   Principal's Remarks: Date: _____

_____

_____

_____

Signature _____

Step VI.   Teacher's Remarks: Date: _____

_____

_____

_____

Signature _____

Step VII.   Principal's Remarks: Date: _____

_____

_____

_____

Signature _____

Step VIII.   Teacher's Remarks: Date: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____
Signature

_____
Signature

APPENDIX C

<u>LETTER</u> <u>TO</u> <u>PARENT</u> <u>OR</u> <u>GUARDIAN</u>

Dear Parent or Guardian:

_____ has been assigned to

the REALITY COUNSELING CENTER beginning _____

for a period of _____ days.

Please see that books and materials with which to work are

brought to the class so that the time may be spent profitably.

The class begins at 8:10 a.m.

This assignment is being made because _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A parent or guardian must accompany the referred student to the

Grade Level Principal's office on the morning he is to return

to his regular classes. We appreciate your cooperation.

        Sincerely,

        Grade Level Principal

APPENDIX D

<u>ADMINISTRATOR'S</u> <u>REPORT</u>

SPRING WOODS JUNIOR HIGH

DATE_____

STUDENT'S NAME_____

REASON FOR REFERRAL_____

ACTION TAKEN_____

Previously this referral would - would not have resulted in
suspension from school for a period of _____ days.

<u>Signature of Administrator</u>

APPENDIX E

REALITY COUNSELING CENTER ASSIGNMENTS

Teacher _____ Room_____

Date_____ Grade Level_____

REALITY COUNSELING CENTER ASSIGNMENTS

_____ has been assigned to the

R. C. Center for an indefinite period of time beginning

_____ on _____, 197____.
     (time)   (date)

If for some reason this student is not on your roll, please notify the office immediately. The student will receive 100% credit for work done on the attached assignments that you are to provide for the Reality Center Counselor. Student work completed will either be put in the teacher's mail box or hand carried by the student when returning to class. If any of the assignments listed on the attached sheet are not completed and returned on the date due, the student will receive a zero on that work.

Attendance in the R. C. Center is an excused absence. The student should be counted absent on your roles.

STUDENT_____   GRADE_____

TEACHER_____

REALITY COUNSELING CENTER ASSIGNMENTS

Please return these assignments to the Center at your earliest convenience, but not later than 8:00 a.m. on _____.
Please include due date. Work sheets may be attached to this sheet. Also, attach the test or note date of test if the test will be taken on another day when this assignment covers more than the time the student is in the R. C. Center.

1st Day

- -

2nd Day

- -

3rd Day

APPENDIX F

REPORT OF CLASS TARDINESS

REPORT OF TARDINESS

GRADE_____

NAME_____ DATE_____

TEACHER_____ SUBJECT_____

PERIOD_____ ROOM_____

REPORT OF TARDIES_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ACTION TAKEN_____

_____

PHONE NUMBER_____

ADDRESS_____

PARENTS NOTIFIED_____

_____
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

APPENDIX G

SPRING BRANCH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

DISCIPLINE AND DROP OUT REPORT

SPRING BRANCH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

DISCIPLINE AND DROP OUT REPORT

Date_____

Name_____ School_____

Grade_____ Sex_____ Racial/Ethnic Designation_____

Reason for Disciplinary Action

1. Truancy _____
2. Smoking or possession
   of tobacco _____
3. Excessive tardies _____
4. Illegal parking _____
5. Possession of drugs _____

6. Skipping part of
   school day _____
7. Leaving campus with-
   out permission _____
8. Other (describe _____
   below)

_____

Disciplinary Action Taken

1. Corporal punishment _____
2. Transfer within
   building _____
3. Inbuilding suspension _____
   Number of days_____
   Beginning____Ending____
4. Home suspension _____
   Number of days_____
   Beginning____Ending____

5. Expulsion _____
   Effective date_____
6. Other_____

_____

_____
Signature of person making
decision

Drop Out Report

Reason student dropped out:

1. Economic _____
2. Work _____
3. Leaving the district _____
4. Health_____

5. Other (describe below)

_____

_____

_____
Principal

APPENDIX H

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TEACHER DIRECTIONS

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL STUDENT DIRECTIONS

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE

117

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Administrative Directions: On each page of this booklet you will find a different idea to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. Here is how you are to use these scales: If you feel that the idea at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

Fair   x   :_____:_____:_____:_____ Unfair

<div align="center">OR</div>

Fair   _____:_____:_____:_____: x ___ Unfair

If you feel that the idea is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), then you should place your check mark as follows:

Strong   _____: x :_____:_____:_____ Weak

<div align="center">OR</div>

Strong   _____:_____:_____: x :_____ Weak

If you think the idea to be neutral on the scale, both sides of
the scale being unrelated to the idea, then you should place
your check mark in the middle space.

      Safe _____._____.___x__._____._____ Dangerous

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Student Directions: The purpose of this survey is to see how you feel about certain concepts and individuals that make up part of your school experiences. There are no right or wrong answers. Your individual judgments will not be made known to the teachers or administrators in your building.

<u>SEMANTIC</u> <u>DIFFERENTIAL</u>

SCHOOL

1.	Unpleasant	.	.	.	.	Pleasant
2.	Passive	.	.	.	.	Active
3.	Ugly	.	.	.	.	Beautiful
4.	Delicate	.	.	.	.	Rugged
5.	Fast	.	.	.	.	Slow
6.	Bad	.	.	.	.	Good
7.	Strong	.	.	.	.	Weak
8.	Sharp	.	.	.	.	Dull
9.	Deep	.	.	.	.	Shallow
10.	Heavy	.	.	.	.	Light
11.	Worthless	.	.	.	.	Valuable
12.	Unfair	.	.	.	.	Fair

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Ahlstrom, W., and R. Havinghurst, 400 Losers, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Bestor, Arthur, Educational Wastelands, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1953.

Bloom, Benjamin, D. Krathwohl and B. Masia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, New York, David McKay Company, 1965.

Bloom, Benjamin, Stability and Change in Human Charasteristics, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Bodwin, Robert F., The Relationship Between Immature Self-Concept and Certain Educational Disabilities, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Michigan State University, 1959.

Boocock, Sarane S., An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning, Boston, Massachusetts, Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Brookover, William B., Self-Concept of School Ability and School Achievement, Educational Research Series, Number 36, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Michigan State University, February, 1967.

Brown, Ronald L., Social Psychology, New York, The Free Press, 1965.

Brush, Fredrick R., Aversive Conditioning and Learning, New York, Academic Press, 1969.

Buckley, Nathan, Modifying Classroom Behavior, Champaign, Illinois, Research Press, 1973.

Buros, O., The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon Press, 1965, 3,380-3,381.

Campbell, D. and J. Stanley, _Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research_, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1968.

Combs, Arthur W., _The Professional Educational of Teachers_, Boston, Massachusetts, Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

Doll, Ronald F., _Curriculum Improvement_, Boston, Massachusetts, Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

Dollard, B. and O. Mower, _Learning Theory and the Symbolic Process_, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Foley, Ronald and Patrick Wilson, _Classroom Discipline_, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Fromm, Eric, _The Sane Society_, New York, Rinehart, 1955.

Glasser, William, _Reality Therapy_, New York, Harper and Row, 1965.

Glasser, William, _The Identity Society_, New York, Harper and Row, 1969.

_____, _Schools Without Failure_, New York, Harper and Row, 1975.

Gnagey, William R., _The Psychology of Discipline in the Classroom_, New York, MacMillan and Company, 1968.

Goldstein, Kenneth R., _Human Nature in the Light of Pschopathology_, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1940.

Habler, Larry N., _Current Research in Motivation_, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Hart, Farron W., _Teachers and Teaching_, New York, MacMillan and Company, 1954.

Heil, L. M., Martin Powell and Ernest Feifer, _Characteristics of Teacher Behavior Related to the Achievement of Different Kinds of Children in Several Elementary Grades_, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, New York, Brooklyn College, 1960.

Holt, John, _How Children Learn_, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Jersild, Arthur T., _Child Development and the Curriculum_, New York, Columbia University Press, 1946.

Jones, William J., _Discipline Crisis in Schools_, Arlington Virginia, National School Public Relations Press, 1971.

Osgood, Charles G., Suei and P. Tannebaum, _The Measurement of Meaning_, Urbana, University of Illinois, 1957.

Pearson, George H., _Psychoanalysis and the Education of the Child_, New York, W. W. Norton, 1965.

Purkey, William H., _Self-Concept and School Achievement_, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Redl, Frank R., _When We Deal with Children_, New York, The Free Press, 1966.

Rice, Dale L., _Classroom Behavior from A to Z_, Belmont, California, Fearon Publishers, 1974.

Rogers, Carl, _On Becoming a Person_, Boston, Massachusetts, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961.

Sears, Pauline S., _The Effect of Classroom Conditions on the Strength of Achievement Motive and Work Output on School Children_, Cooperative Research Project, No. 873, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1963.

Smith, E. S., Krouse and M. Atkinson, _The Educators Encyclopedia_, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Thompson, David L. and James Taylor, _Reality Therapy and Delinquents_, Morgantown, West Virginia, Morgantown, West Virginia University, 1969.

Ulrich, Roland H., _Control of Human Behavior_, Glenview, Illinois, Scott Foresman and Company, 1966.

Webster, Staten W., _Discipline in the Classroom_, San Francisco, Chandler Press, 1968.

Wilson, P. S., _Interest and Discipline in Education_, London, Routledge and Kegan, 1971.

Articles

Brenner, Robert B., "Effect of Immediate and Delayed Praise and Blame upon Learning and Recall," _Teachers College Contribution to Education_, John Edwards (Editor), Number 620, 1934.

Buhler, Charles K., "The Reality Principle," _American Journal of Psychotherapy_, VIII (1954), 626-647.

Chadburn, Gerald L., "To Heal the Breach," _The School Counselor_, XIX (1971), 91-97.

Cogan, M. L., "The Behavior of Teachers and the Productive Behavior of their Pupils," _Journal of Experimental Education_, XXVII (December, 1958), 124.

Combs, Arthur, "The Person in the Process," _Child Development_, XXV (1965), 73-84.

Combs, Charles F., "The Perception and Self Scholastic Under Achievement in the Academically Capable," _Personnel and Guidance Journal_, XXXIII (September, 1969), 47-51.

Coopersmith, S. A., "A Method of Determining Types of Self-Esteem," _Journal of Educational Psychology_, LIX (February, 1959), 87-94.

_____, "Studies in Self-Esteem," _Scientific American_, II (1968), 19.

Fink, Martin B., "Self-Concept as it Relates to Academic Underachievement," _California Journal of Educational Research_, XIII (February, 1972), 62.

Fry, S. P., "Reality, Responsibility, and Determinism in Educational Development," _Journal of Educational Psychology_, X (1976), 93-101.

Hall, Ralph, David Lund and Daniel Jackson, "Effects of Teacher Attention on Study Behavior," Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, XIV (1968, No. 5), 1-12.

Hamachek, Don E., "Characteristics of Good Teachers and Implications for Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXI (February, 1969), 341-344.

Hurlock, Elizabeth, "An Evaluation of Certain Incentives Used in School Work," Journal of Educational Psychology, XV (Fall, 1925), 145-159.

Maslow, Albert, "Self Actualizing People," Personality Symposium, New York, Grune and Stratton, 1950.

Mitzel, H. E., "Teacher Effectiveness," C. W. Harris (Editor), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York, Macmillan and Company, 1960.

Morse, Wayne L., "The Mental Hygiene Dilemma in Public Education," American School Orthopsychiatry, XXXI (1961), 332-338.

Murphy, Mark K., "Glasser on Discipline," Scholastic Teacher, LX (September, 1973), 26.

Omwake, Katerine R., "The Relation Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (December, 1964), 443-446.

Parsons, Thomas L., "The School Class as a Social System: Some of it's Functions in American Society," Harvard Education Review, XXX (Fall, 1959), 296-318.

Reed, Hiram B., "Implications for Science Education of a Teacher Competence Research Program," Science Education, XXXXV (December, 1968), 473-486.

Reeder, Thomas A., "A Study of Some Relationships Between Levels of Self-Concept, Academic Achievement, and Classroom Adjustment," Dissertation Abstracts, XV (1965), 2472.

Roth, Donald M., "Role of Self-Concept in Achievement,"
    Journal of Experimental Education, XXVII (June, 1969),
    265-281.

Ryans, D. G., "Some Relationships Between Pupil Behavior and
    Certain Teacher Characteristics," Journal of Education
    Psychology, LV (May, 1961), 82-90.

Schmidt, David B., "Effectiveness of Various Types of Class-
    room Incentives," Educational Method, XII (December,
    1932), 297-334.

Schmuck, Roland L., "Innovating Classroom Practices to Support
    Achievement Motivation and Ego-Development," E. M. Bower,
    (editor) Behavioral Science Frontiers in Education, New
    York, John Wiley, 1969.

Seligman, Melvin E., Samuel F. Maier, and R. L. Solomon,
    "Unpredictable and Uncontrollable Aversive Events,"
    F. R. Brush (editor) Aversive Conditions and Learning,
    New York, Academic Press, 1969.

Shaw, Belton W., and others, "A Scientific Interpretation of
    the Concept of Individual Responsibility," The Canadian
    Psychologist, II (1970), 146-151.

Solomon, D., L. Rosenberg and W. Bezdek, "Teacher Behavior
    and Student Learning," Journal of Educational Psychology,
    LV (1964), 23-30.

Stern, George S., "Measuring Non-Cognitive Variables in Re-
    search on Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching,
    Chicago, Illinois, Rand McNally, 1963.

Thaw, T. S., "Combining a Behavioral Approach with Reality
    Therapy," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, V
    (December, 1970).

Tyrow, Carolyn L. and William E. Henry, "How Children Learn
    Personal and Social Adjustment," The Forty-Ninth Year-
    book, Part I, Learning and Instruction, the Study of
    Education, Chicago, Illinois, University of Chicago
    Press, 1950.

Walters, R. H., "Delay of Reinforcement Effects in Childrens'
    Learning," Science, II (Fall, 1964), 307-308.

Walters, R. H. and R. D. Parke, "The Influence of Punishment and Related Disciplinary Techniques on the Social Behavior of Children: Theory and Empirical Findings," Progress in Experimental Personality Research, IV (Fall, 1967), 179-228.

Ward, John, "Gallup Poll on Educational Issues," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1974.

Wattenberg, William W., "Relationship of Self-Concept to Beginning Achievement in Reading," U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Series Number 377.

White, Martha L., "Little Red School House and Little White Clinic," Teacher College Record, (1965), 193.

Witty, Paul M., "An Analysis of the Personality Traits of the Effective Teacher," Journal of Educational Research, XXX (Fall, 1958), 661.

Unpublished Material

Bates, Mary M., "A Study of the Effectiveness of Group Counseling in Achieving the Goals of Guidance in Education Using Two Contrasting Formats," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1967.

Duncan, James L., "The Effects of Short Group Counseling on Selected Characteristics of Culturally Deprived Ninth Grade Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1965.

English, Dwane B., "Empirical Validation of a Reality Therapy Model in an Elementary Classroom," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1974.

Harrison, James B., "Reality Therapy as an Approach to Discipline in the Classroom," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970.

Johnson, Clarence J., "The Transfer Effect of Treatment Group Composition on Pupils' Classroom Participation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1964.

Lynch, Kay, "The Effects of Inservice Training on Teachers in the Use of Some Principals of Reality Therapy upon Student Achievement of Basic Mathematical Competencies," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, 1972.

Marple, Elizabeth M., "Effective and Ineffective Procedures Used in Elementary Pupil Discipline," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1975.

Matthews, Doris 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," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, 1972.

Moates, Harold R., "The Effect of Activity Group Counseling on the Self-Concept, Peer Acceptance, and Grade Point Average of Disadvantaged Seventh Grade Negro Boys and Girls," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, 1969.

Palmer, John R., "Role Concepts of Prospective Teachers of Young Children," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, 1954.

Purl, Marilyn R., "An Analysis of Some of the Effects of Schools Without Failure Seminars on Participating Schools," (Riverside Unified School District), Riverside, California, August, 1971, 6 (mineographed).

Shea, Gordon J., "The Effects of Reality Therapy Oriented Group Counseling with Delinquent Behavior Disoriented Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, New York, 1973.

"Training Cluster I Evaluation," Madison Publish Schools, Madison, Wisconsin, (June, 1971), 10 (mimeographed).

Yannett, Wayne O., "The Effectiveness of Individual and Group Counseling Among High School Boys with School Behavior Problems," unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, New York, New York, 1964.