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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.
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.
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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 believe 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 without sacrificing reasonable rules and regulations that are necessary when any group of people get together. The proponents of Reality Therapy further assert that its implementation 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 management 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 thinking, with its focus on the acceptance and understanding of the individual's reality (13). This theoretical postulate represents 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 unrealistic and unsuccessful (6). He discovered that an individual 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 supporting 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 responsible 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 District.—The District refers to a Gulf coast school district, composed of approximately forty thousand students.

Disciplinary Infraction.—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


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 indicates 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 sacrifices 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 between the self-related reports of teachers with high emotional stability and those with low emotional stability. For example, the more emotionally stable teachers (a) more frequently 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 correlated 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 suggest 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 processes 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 classroom (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 indicated 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 principles 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 perception. 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 behavior, 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 personality of people. Structure requiring many rules and regulations was minimized in the Reality Therapy schools.

Lynch (40) conducted a study to determine whether mathematics 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 commitment. 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 behaving 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 Therapy promoted significant gains in several vocational, developmental, 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) postulated 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 achievement, 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 indicate they are capable of (59, p. 324).

The indices used most widely to assess student achievement 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 students 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 different 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 performance (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 control 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 excellent 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 recognition 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 increase 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 between 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 relating 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, individuals 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 responsibility 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 individual 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 excuses, we ask for them. Discipline is poorly understood—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 excuses, 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 classroom 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 exposes 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.
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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 attitude, 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 experimental 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 experimental 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 facilities, and both were comprised of students from similar socio-economic backgrounds.

Neither the experimental nor control teachers had a background 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 connotative 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.
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 distribu-
tion of a Reality Counseling outline accompanied by a brief
explanation of Reality Therapy. The next step was the pre-
sentation 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 School and Discipline and Rational Man and Reality Therapy. 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 date 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 investigator used the bipolar 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 detailed 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:
Scores \( E \) and \( C \) 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.
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>16.9186</td>
<td>19.3571</td>
<td>20.5553</td>
<td>1.1412</td>
<td>2.1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>19.3571</td>
<td>19.0714</td>
<td>18.1525</td>
<td>2.1344</td>
<td>1.9401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>F-values</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.1279</td>
<td>26.1279</td>
<td>38.3714</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.0231</td>
<td>0.6809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.1510</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 deviations in both groups decreased.

### TABLE III

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Pretest</th>
<th>Mean Posttest</th>
<th>Mean Adjusted</th>
<th>Standard Deviations Pretest</th>
<th>Standard Deviations Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>11.0714</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>20.8893</td>
<td>1.6392</td>
<td>1.0377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>19.8571</td>
<td>19.7143</td>
<td>18.8249</td>
<td>2.1433</td>
<td>2.1279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.9530</td>
<td>18.9530</td>
<td>13.8246</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.2741</td>
<td>1.3710</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.2270</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>18.2143</td>
<td>20.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>19.1429</td>
<td>19.2857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.1608</td>
<td>25.1608</td>
<td>22.5698</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.8699</td>
<td>1.1148</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.0308</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>17.9286</td>
<td>20.3571</td>
<td>21.0166</td>
<td>1.7745</td>
<td>1.7034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>19.8571</td>
<td>19.7143</td>
<td>19.0548</td>
<td>1.7034</td>
<td>1.6378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 related 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.2410</td>
<td>20.2410</td>
<td>26.2378</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.2861</td>
<td>0.7714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.5271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.2410</td>
<td>20.2410</td>
<td>26.2378</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19,2861</td>
<td>0.7714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.5271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.9235</td>
<td>35.9235</td>
<td>30.0087</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.9276</td>
<td>1.1971</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.8511</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>14.6879</td>
<td>15.4471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14.5029</td>
<td>14.4550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 related 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6283</td>
<td>4.6283</td>
<td>7.1252</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.2233</td>
<td>0.6489</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.8470</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>14.5000</td>
<td>16.2722</td>
<td>1.5191</td>
<td>1.2860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>20.5000</td>
<td>20.7857</td>
<td>19.0135</td>
<td>1.6984</td>
<td>2.0070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.7151</td>
<td>12.7151</td>
<td>6.9370</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45.8238</td>
<td>1.8330</td>
<td>9.4666</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58.5389</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>14.4457</td>
<td>15.4379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14.4507</td>
<td>16.6750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>4.7854</td>
<td>0.0383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.4773</td>
<td>0.8591</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.5884</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was, therefore, a significant difference in the experimental 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 decreased slightly for both.

TABLE XVII

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>16.1729</td>
<td>16.7293</td>
<td>16.5928</td>
<td>1.8554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15.8036</td>
<td>15.5979</td>
<td>15.7343</td>
<td>1.6173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XVIII presents the analysis of covariance data related to the student Semantic Differential Scale of School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1816</td>
<td>4.1816</td>
<td>6.9966</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.1232</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Means Pretest</th>
<th>Means Posttest</th>
<th>Means Adjusted</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Pretest</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>16.4950</td>
<td>17.1000</td>
<td>16.9370</td>
<td>1.4731</td>
<td>1.6625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>16.1478</td>
<td>15.9664</td>
<td>16.1293</td>
<td>1.5495</td>
<td>1.4634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5029</td>
<td>4.5029</td>
<td>9.8604</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.4165</td>
<td>0.4567</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.9194</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Means Pretest</th>
<th>Means Posttest</th>
<th>Means Adjusted</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Pretest</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>13.8129</td>
<td>14.2764</td>
<td>15.1600</td>
<td>1.2789</td>
<td>1.2171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2550</td>
<td>3.2550</td>
<td>4.0658</td>
<td>.0546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.0145</td>
<td>0.8006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.2695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Pretest</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>14.6879</td>
<td>15.4471</td>
<td>15.3589</td>
<td>1.3007</td>
<td>1.3140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14.5029</td>
<td>14.4550</td>
<td>14.5432</td>
<td>0.8970</td>
<td>1.3385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table XXVI presents the analysis of covariance data related to the student Semantic Differential scale on the concept of discipline.
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 principal. Hypothesis III was not accepted.

Hypothesis IV stated that at the conclusion of the experimental 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>16.2057</td>
<td>16.0964</td>
<td>16.1519</td>
<td>1.4523</td>
<td>1.0728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>16.3714</td>
<td>16.3264</td>
<td>16.2709</td>
<td>1.2199</td>
<td>1.3824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 deviations decreased by .3795 for the experimental group and increased 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0988</td>
<td>0.0988</td>
<td>0.1311</td>
<td>0.7203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8270</td>
<td>0.7531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.9258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Pretest</th>
<th>Mean Posttest</th>
<th>Mean Adjusted</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Pretest</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2.7021</td>
<td>2.7986</td>
<td>2.7510</td>
<td>0.4108</td>
<td>0.3714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.5907</td>
<td>2.5071</td>
<td>2.5547</td>
<td>0.2252</td>
<td>0.2447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 decrease 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 experimental period, there would be a significant difference in incidence of discipline, as measured by weighted infractions...
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[Q = 9.83\]
\[P = .01\]
\[DF = 1\]
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 atti-
tude 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 experi-
mental teachers who practiced Reality Therapy in their
classrooms. Results indicated that experimental teachers dis-
played a significant difference in attitude toward self.

Hypothesis III stated that after Reality Therapy treat-
ment, 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 signi-
ficant 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 experimental 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 analysis used to assess attitude toward self on the Semantic Differential did not yield significant results. This is inconsistent with research conducted by Omweke (8), Hawes (4), or English (2). Hypothesis IV was rejected.

Hypothesis V stated that the grade point average of students exposed to Reality Therapy for a six weeks grading period would be significantly different from students not exposed 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 experimental 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.
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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, preferably 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.
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 Center 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. Regardless 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 student'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

DISCIPLINE REFERRAL SHEET
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 concerning his behavioral problem. After the conference, attach the student's commitment behind this referral sheet and file.

Describe problem: ___________________________

______________________________
Date Signature

Step II. Should the commitment be broken, the 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 parents called Date referred to counselor
Step III. Counselor's Remarks:

________________________________________

________________________________________

Date                  Counselor's Signature

Step IV. Teacher's Remarks:

________________________________________

________________________________________

Date Referred to Principal  Teacher's Signature
**DISCIPLINE REFERRAL SHEET**  
**Addendum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step V. Principal's Remarks:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step VI. Teacher's Remarks:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step VII. Principal's Remarks:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature**
Step VIII. Teacher's Remarks: 

Date: 

Signature

Signature
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO PARENT OR GUARDIAN
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

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
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.

Signature of Administrator
APPENDIX E

REALITY COUNSELING CENTER ASSIGNMENTS
REality Counseling Center Assignments

Student ___________ has been assigned to the R. C. Center for an indefinite period of time beginning on __________, 197_.

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 mailbox 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.
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

NAME ___________________________  GRADE ___________________________

TEACHER ___________________________  DATE ___________________________

PERIOD ___________________________  SUBJECT ___________________________

REPORT OF TARDIES

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

ACTION TAKEN ___________________________

PHONE NUMBER ___________________________

ADDRESS ___________________________

PARENTS NOTIFIED ___________________________

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL ___________________________
SPRING BRANCH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

DISCIPLINE AND DROP OUT REPORT

Date ____________________________

Name ____________________________________________ School ____________________________

Grade _______ Sex _______ Racial/Ethnic Designation ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Disciplinary Action</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Truancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smoking or possession of tobacco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Excessive tardies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Illegal parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Possession of drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Skipping part of school day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leaving campus without permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (describe below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Action Taken</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Corporal punishment</td>
<td>5. Expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transfer within building</td>
<td>6. Effective date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inbuilding suspension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning:</td>
<td>Ending:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Home suspension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning:</td>
<td>Ending:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expulsion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Effective date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drop Out Report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason student dropped out:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Economic</td>
<td>5. Other (describe below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leaving the district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of person making decision ____________________________

Principal ____________________________
APPENDIX H

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TEACHER DIRECTIONS

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL STUDENT DIRECTIONS

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE
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 $\text{ x}$ $\text{ . . . .}$ Unfair

OR

Fair $\text{ . . . .}$ $\text{ x}$ 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 $\text{ x}$ $\text{ . . . .}$ Weak

OR

Strong $\text{ . . . .}$ $\text{ x}$ 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.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Deep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Unpleasant
2. Passive
3. Ugly
4. Delicate
5. Fast
6. Bad
7. Strong
8. Sharp
9. Deep
10. Heavy
11. Worthless
12. Unfair

Pleasant
Active
Beautiful
Rugged
Slow
Good
Weak
Dull
Shallow
Light
Valuable
Fair
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