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This study investigated whether students in an Alternative School differed significantly from students who remain on a regular high school campus on measures of goals of misbehavior which included the factors of attention, power, revenge, inadequacy, and on measures of social interest. This study also investigated whether the attitudes of parents of Alternative School students differed significantly from the attitudes of parents of regular campus students on the factors of confidence, causation, acceptance, understanding, and trust.

The Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale (STBRS) developed for this study was completed by 26 teachers of Alternative School students and 26 teachers of regular campus students. In each group, teachers rated 16 male and 10 female students. The Social Interest Scale (SIS) (Crandall, 1975) was administered to 20 Alternative School students and 20 regular campus students. Each group was composed of 13 male and 7 female students. The Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) (Hereford, 1963) was completed by 20 Alternative School parents and 20 regular campus parents.
Findings indicated that teachers rated Alternative School students significantly lower on social interest and significantly higher on all four goals of misbehavior, attention, power, revenge and inadequacy, with the goal of inadequacy having the greatest emphasis. These findings support the premise that the typical Alternative School student may be discouraged and resort to negative rather than positive ways of striving for significance.

No significant differences were found in the students' social interest as measured by the SIS or in parent attitudes. Related findings addressed possible effects of age, sex, birth order, or length of assignment in the Alternative School. No significant differences were found.

This study lends support to the teleological approach of Individual Psychology, emphasizing the goal-striving nature of the individual and the purposiveness of behavior.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent educational reforms have promoted an increased emphasis on academics and a concern for developing more effective learning environments. The task of providing a positive learning environment is often hindered by the dilemma of how to provide for the academic and disciplinary needs of those students who disrupt and impoverish the learning atmosphere without sacrificing the learning experience of others.

Alfred Adler (1930) was one of the first to point out that school failures are often life failures as well. He made important contributions to school personnel and other professionals by focusing on the goal directed or purposeful nature of behavior, the consistency of personality, and the necessity to develop social interest if the individual is to strive on the useful side of life. The framework of Adlerian theory offers the educator an opportunity to understand the psychological motivation of each student, thus facilitating the effectiveness of the disciplinary process (Dinkmeyer & Caldwell, 1970). For students to become involved in the learning process, learning must serve a purpose for them.
Users of Adlerian counseling techniques have offered methods and procedures that can be used to positively affect educational institutions (Kern, Matheny, & Patterson, 1978; Dinkmeyer & Caldwell, 1970; Dreikurs, Grunwald & Pepper, 1971; Mosak, 1979). Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1971), in particular, have emphasized that maintaining discipline and order are a necessary part of a positive educational process. The learning of cooperation and self-discipline is the foundation for social living. Although the young child leaves the home environment with a life style that is already well established, school experiences can affect the life style through adding some features of appropriate socialization that help cultivate the student's social interest (Rychlak, 1973).

Information concerning the motivation of behavior and parents' perceptions of that behavior is essential if school personnel are to be able to effectively discipline students who are difficult to teach and guide in their behavior. In spite of this crucial need, no studies were found which specifically addressed the psychological motivation or social interest of those students who so consistently disrupt the learning atmosphere of the classroom that they must be removed from the traditional school setting.
Statement of the Problem

Because of the lack of studies related to the motivation and social interest of Alternative School adolescents and the parents' perceptions of those behaviors, this study addressed the goals of behavior and social interest of adolescents assigned to a disciplinary program in an alternative school setting and the attitudes of their parents. The purposes of this study were: 1) to investigate whether goals of behavior, social interest, and parent attitudes are related to school adjustment, 2) to determine whether students in an Alternative School differ from students who remain in a traditional high school on measures of social interest, and goals of behavior and to lend empirical support to the basic tenets of Adlerian theory.

Related Literature

The review of literature focuses on the theoretical constructs of goals of behavior, social interest, and parent attitudes as proposed by Alfred Adler.

Goals of Behavior

The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler is teleological in its approach, emphasizing the goal-striving nature of the individual and the purposiveness of behavior. Adler (1958) declared that the way to understand an individual's
behavior is to know that person's goals. The basic goal of all human beings is that of belonging. In an effort to attain the goal of belonging, the individual may select useful, socially contributive goals, or the individual may select goals devoted to the useless side of life which involve concern with personal superiority and the protection of oneself from threats to one's sense of personal worth (Mosak, 1979). Dreikurs and Grey (1968) related that all behavior is the result of an individual's mistaken assumption about the way to establish significance and gain status.

Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) noted that adolescents strive to achieve significance in a variety of ways, both positive and negative. They maintained that some teens seek significance through mechanical skills, drama, athletics, music, schoolwork, or by joining clubs or getting part-time jobs. Other adolescents seek significance through delinquency or irresponsible behavior. Sexual promiscuity, alcohol or drug abuse, reckless driving, skipping school, cigarette smoking, shoplifting, and vandalism are among some of the negative ways adolescents strive for significance.

A major determining factor in whether an adolescent establishes negative or positive goals seems to be the level of encouragement or discouragement the adolescent experiences. Dinkmeyer and Caldwell (1970) maintained that the student who is discouraged actually goes into a different classroom environment than the one who feels adequate.
Because a lack of success is anticipated, the resulting behavior actually provokes responses from others which fulfill the student's expectations and perception of the life situation.

Although an adolescent's behavior may appear to be inappropriate, the behavior has meaning to the adolescent in terms of personal significance and self-esteem and reflects the conviction that this is the only way to gain significance. Dreikurs (1957) stressed that every action of a child has a purpose with the basic aim being to have a place in the group. He related that a well-behaved and well-adjusted child has found the way toward social acceptance by conforming to the requirements of the group and by making useful contributions. The child who misbehaves and defies the needs of the situation still believes that these actions will attain social status. Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) also noted that when a feeling of significance can be achieved through useful behavior, there is no need to misbehave.

Dreikurs (1948) classified the goals of misbehavior into four groups: attention getting, power seeking, revenge taking, and declaring deficiency or defeat. Dreikurs (1957) maintained that the correct identification of the goal of behavior requires careful observations. He related that each goal is identified by observing three factors: 1) behavior, 2) the reaction of the teacher, and 3) the
child's response to correction. Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) described the goals of misbehavior as they relate to adolescents. The goal of attention is characterized by behaviors that are disturbing and annoying. The adolescent's goal is to be noticed. The response by others is to feel annoyed. When corrected, the adolescent who has the goal of attention temporarily stops the behavior, but later repeats the behavior or does something else to attract attention. Adolescents whose goal of misbehavior is that of power believe that they are important when they challenge authority and take control. Behaviors associated with this goal include aggressiveness, defiance, disobedience, stubbornness, and resistance. Parents and teachers who encounter these behaviors feel angry and provoked. When corrected, the adolescent intensifies the behavior or submits with defiant compliance. The goal of revenge is characterized by behaviors which are hurtful, rude, violent, or destructive. Parents and teachers react with feelings of deep hurt or the desire to retaliate. Dreikurs (1957) reported that children with this goal of misbehavior know where they can hurt the most, take advantage of their opponents, and regard it as a triumph when they are considered vicious; since that is the only triumph they believe they can obtain, it is the one they seek. Dreikurs (1957) and Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) regard the adolescent who has the goal of inadequacy as the most discouraged of all. These adolescents
expect defeat and failure and stop trying. Their goal is to see that others expect nothing of them. Behaviors associated with this goal may include quitting easily, avoiding trying, truancy and dropping out of school. These adolescents believe they lack the ability and stamina to perform competently. Parents and teachers generally feel despair and may also want to give up or agree with the adolescent that nothing can be done.

No studies were found that investigated the theoretical construct of life style goals of behavior in adolescents. Because an understanding of psychological motivation and goals of behavior is an important component in establishing effective discipline management procedures in the classroom, it is important that these theoretical constructs be given more attention in research and in the field of education.

Social Interest

The concept of social interest is one of Adler's theoretical cornerstones. Adler (1956, 1958, 1959, 1964) viewed social interest as a necessary component of the healthy personality, contending that it is the criterion for mental health, the barometer of normality, and the difference between a useful life and a useless life. The concept of social interest embraces the idea that human well-being and progress are a function of cooperative behavior (Ansbacher, 1977). Adler's views are congruent
with those of a number of more recent theorists who have pointed out that characteristics such as concern for others, cooperation, and even altruism may be as important for the health of the individual as for the society in general (Bakan, 1966; Erikson, 1963; Hogan, 1975; Kanfer, 1979; Sampson, 1977).

Although social interest is a crucial factor in one's development, social interest must be taught and people can learn to improve their social interest. Orgler (1939) and Ansbacher (1968) viewed the adolescent's increased development of social interest as one task of the school. The school is placed between the family and life in society and has the opportunity to correct the mistaken styles of life and has the responsibility to aid the student in developing appropriate adjustment to social life.

Social interest influences a person's attention, perception, thinking about others, feelings such as empathy and sympathy, motives, and overt behavior relating to cooperation (Crandall, 1980). Thus, adolescents who have social interest adapt to the regulations of the social group in their environment. They come to respect the rules of society even though at times doing so may require a personal sacrifice (Dinkmeyer & Caldwell, 1970).

Increased interest in the investigation of Adler's construct of social interest has been evident during the past decade. Crandall's (1975) introduction of the Social
Interest Scale, Greever, Taeng, and Friedland's (1973) Social Interest Index, Altman's (1973) Early Recollections Rating Scale of Social Interest and Sulliman's (1973) Scale of Social Interest have enabled continuing study of social interest and furthered the ability to test and measure an individual's social feeling.

The basic tenet of Individual Psychology that social interest is a prerequisite for psychological adjustment and well-being has been empirically supported by several studies. Crandall (1978) studied the effects of stress on social interest. Twenty-one male and 27 female students from an introductory statistics course were asked to experience an intermittent schedule of high noise levels. Noise was utilized because of its well-documented effects as a stressor. The subjects' emotional reactions were assessed by four scales of the Mood Adjective Check List (Nowles, 1965). The four scales measured elation, surgency, anxiety, and sadness. Social interest was assessed by the Social Interest Scale (Crandall, 1975). Findings revealed that the effects of noise as a stressor resulted in significant increases in measures of anxiety and sadness, significant decreases in measures of elation and surgency, and lower scores on the social interest measure. Crandall concluded that these findings were consistent with Adler's view that social interest contributes to courage and psychological well-being.
Crandall and Putman (1980) designed a study to investigate the relation of social interest to different aspects of life satisfaction in a stratified sample of a wide variety of occupations including skilled, unskilled, clerical, administrative, and professional personnel. A questionnaire designed to provide a global measure of well-being, Life 3 (Andrew & Withey, 1976), a cognitive evaluation of well-being, Bradburn's (1969) measure of positive and negative affect, and the Social Interest Scale were administered to 225 non-teaching employees of the University of Idaho. The SIS was significantly related to all of the global measures of well-being. Crandall and Putman concluded that these results support the view that social interest facilitates a broader, less defensive interest in many activities and lend considerable evidence supporting Adler's belief in the importance of social interest.

The relationship between self-reports of happiness and satisfaction and social interest scores were studied by Crandall and Reimanis (1976). Scores of 60 volunteers from introductory psychology classes on the SIS correlated positively with both happiness and satisfaction reports. In a separate study, Crandall and Reimanis (1976) investigated the relationship of social interest to psychological maladjustment by administering the SIS to 30 male inmates at a state correctional center in New York State.
Criminal activity, as an indication of maladjustment, was found to be negatively related to social interest.

Students in grades nine through twelve attending a public high school in the state of Georgia participated in a study of social interest and cooperative behavior. The sample included 290 students, 131 males and 159 females. Students were administered the Social Interest Index (Greever, Tseng, & Friedland, 1973). The results indicated that pairs of high social interest subjects cooperated significantly more often than did pairs of low social interest subjects (Kaplan, 1978).

In spite of the potential importance of social interest for an adequate model of psychological adjustment, there has been a lack of concentrated research on the issue. Crandall (1982) designed a study to assess the relationship of social interest to indirect measures of adjustment. The SIS was used as a measure of social interest and Extreme Response Style (ERS), or the tendency to use extreme categories of rating scales, was selected because ERS has been found to be related to neurotic tendencies. The subjects were 183 students enrolled in introductory psychology classes. The results indicated significant evidence that individuals with greater interests in others are less inclined to make extreme responses in judging themselves, others and a wide variety of attitudinal issues. Since other research had found a positive relation between ERS
and measures of maladjustment, Crandall concluded that his data provided further evidence that positive relations between social interest and indices of adjustment are not limited to self-reports.

Adler (1956) believed there was no question that success in school also depends chiefly on the student's social interest. Although no studies were found that directly investigated this concept with school students, Mozdzierz and Semyck (1980) investigated the relationship between alcoholics' social interest and attitude toward success and failure. The subjects in this study were diagnosed alcoholics who had voluntarily participated in an inpatient alcohol treatment program. Subjects had a mean age of 40 and a mean educational level of eleventh grade. The Success-Failure Inventory (Guevera, 1965) was administered as a measure of subject's preference for failure avoidance as compared to success attainment. The Social Interest Index (SII) (Greever, Tseng, & Friedland, 1973) was used to measure social interest. The results suggested that the alcoholic with higher social interest tended to be motivated primarily towards the achievement of success, whereas the alcoholic with lower social interest tended to place greater emphasis on the avoidance of failure. These findings are consistent with the expectations based on Adler's (1956, 1964) description of social interest, namely that successful
fulfillment of life problems can only be realized if one possesses adequate social interest.

The relation of sex to social interest remains unclear. Kaplan (1978) investigated sex differences in social interest in a study involving 568 high school students in grades nine through twelve who were attending a public school in Georgia. The Social Interest Index (SII) (Greever, Tseng, & Friedland, 1973) and the Sullivan Scale of Social Interest (SSSI) (Sulliman, 1973) were used to measure social interest. The results of the study suggest higher social interest in female young adults than in male young adults. Greever, Tseng, and Friedland (1973) also investigated sex differences in social interest as measured by the SSI. The sample consisted of 344 junior college students, 189 males and 155 females. It was found that females scored significantly higher in social interest than males. Crandall (1980) in a review of studies utilizing the Social Interest Scale (SIS) reported that sex differences appeared only among college samples.

Among adolescents, no significant correlations with age or sex were found. Schneider and Reuterfors (1981) investigated the relationship between birth order, sex and social interest. The SIS was administered to a total of 167 males and 276 females enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a university. The results indicated
that only-borns obtained lower SIS scores than did either first-borns, second-borns, or middle-borns. Females showed evidence of greater social interest than did males.

Research studies present conflicting evidence relating to the significance of social interest in regard to the psychological well-being of the adolescent. Crandall and Kytonen (1980) investigated the relationship of social interest and psychological well-being in adolescents. Seventy-three high school students were given the Self-Focus Sentence Completion Test (Exner, 1973), a measure of egocentricity or self-centeredness, Life 3 (Andrew & Withey, 1976), a measure of general well-being, and the Social Interest Scale (Crandall, 1975). From their findings, they concluded that there was no significant relation in social interest and psychological well-being in most adolescents. However, in a study of adolescents whose parents had recently separated or divorced, Parks (1979) found significant correlations between measures of social interest, measures of self-esteem, self-reports of the subjects' difficulties of adjustment and parents' ratings of the subjects' difficulties of adjustment. Further research investigating the importance of social interest to the psychological well-being and adjustment of the adolescent is needed to help clarify this issue.
Parent Attitudes

Another construct of Adlerian theory is that behavior can be understood only in terms of the environment in which it occurs. Therefore, a person's life style development is best understood when considered as part of the family unit. The adolescent's attitudes toward living develop from the attitudes that characterize the family (Eckstein, Baruth, & Mahrer, 1982). These attitudes influence how the person perceives self, others, the world, and how to gain personal significance (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1983; Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1971; Dinkmeyer & Caldwell, 1970). The child's capacity for human responsiveness is developed early in life in relation to a nurturant figure. The child who is not welcomed by a nurturing parent fails to develop a normal capacity for sharing and caring about others and is most likely to be a selfish, hostile, problem child (Jenkins, Heideman & Caputo, 1985).

The family atmosphere is an expression of parental attitudes and values. It influences child-rearing practices which, in turn, influence the child's sense of belonging and competence. Parents are advised to relate to children in ways which encourage self-confidence and social interest. Children quite naturally experience a sense of inferiority in the world where, from the beginning, they are smaller and less self-sufficient and the parents may easily exacerbate these feelings to a point where they cripple self-confidence.
(Kern, Matheny, & Patterson, 1978). Windsor (1972) found that the mothers of 50 suicidal adolescents were described by their children as the more controlling and autocratic influence in the home, while their fathers were more passive and permissive in their child-rearing practices.

Gantman (1978) studied family interaction patterns among 30 families with adolescents ages 14 to 18 who were normal, emotionally disturbed or drug-abusing. Families were selected from volunteers from the community and schools, a drug and alcohol clinic, and a mental health/mental retardation center. The families were evaluated during a one hour interview while three observers behind a one-way mirror rated verbal behavior and the quality of interaction between father, mother, and adolescent. Assessed behaviors included the ability to reach a decision, decision time, scapegoating, and double bind messages. The power and potential of the family was underscored by the findings that families which produced a normal adolescent interacted in patterns clearly distinguishable from families with drug-abusing or emotionally disturbed adolescents. The normal families displayed clearer communication, more freedom of expression, more cooperation, and greater sensitivity among members.

Two variables of family characteristics, parental negligence and parental rejection, have received much
research support identifying their correlation with maladaptive behavior of adolescents. A study was undertaken to examine the intake application questionnaires of 42 inpatients and 258 outpatients of the Child Psychiatry Service at the University of Iowa. Tabulations indicated an actively critical, if not hostile, parental attitude toward the unsocialized aggressive child, and a detached and uninvolved parental attitude toward the socialized delinquents (Jenkins, Heideman, & Caputo, 1985). Silver (1958) conducted a study in which 56 male adolescents in grades seven through twelve of a rural school completed seven self-concept ratings from their own viewpoint and the points of view of parents and peers, a measure of defensiveness, and socio-metric acceptance-rejection scales. Results indicated that the level and stability of self-concept ratings is significantly associated with paternal acceptance and to a lesser degree with maternal acceptance. Reimanis (1974) investigated the relationship between crime and childhood memories. Subjects in this study were 103 youths at a state reception center pending transfer to a state penal institution. Childhood memories were assessed by a 74 item scale assessing relationships to one's community and family, one's mother, and one's father. Findings indicated that young male juvenile delinquents had an
unusually high number of memories of parents behaving in a cold and rejecting manner.

Adler (1958, 1964) attributed much importance to the mother's or the primary nurturant figure's influence in life style development. He asserted that proper primary nurturing demands two accomplishments: winning the child's trust through a show of love and then redirecting that trust to other persons. He contended that the contribution of bad primary nurturing can be seen in the lives of failures, the neurotics, the criminals, drunkards, and prostitutes.

Cofer (1973) investigated the relationship between the depressive personality and the perception of parental attitudes, feelings, and reactions. The subjects were 48 women who had previously been hospitalized in a psychiatric clinic because of depressive symptoms. A 154 item inventory consisting of statements reflecting the subject's self-perceptions, perceptions of paternal and maternal attitudes, feelings, and reactions to the subject, and the subject's perception of father and mother as individuals was administered. Cofer concluded that depressive prone women saw their mothers as markedly more critical and denigrating of them than did the comparison group of non-depressed women.

In another study investigating the relation of parent attitudes to juvenile delinquency, Jenkins and Boyer (1970)
undertook a study of the statistical data of 1500 cases provided by the Institute for Juvenile Research in Chicago. Twenty-nine descriptive entries considered likely to imply inadequate mothering were selected from a wide range of entries in the case records and then counted to get a total score. The selected entries reflected judgments of the mothers' attitudes toward children as recorded by a social worker or psychiatrist. Results indicated that inadequate mothering and maternal rejection produced a specific juvenile behavioral pattern characterized by overt or covert hostile disobedience, quarrelsomeness, physical and verbal aggressiveness, vengefulness and destructiveness.

Adler did not fix guilt by pointing to the nefarious role of bad mothering or poor primary nurturing. He was always careful to designate the individual child as the major source of the blame or credit for the eventual style of life. Adler consistently maintained that one cannot say that because a child is badly nourished, criminal tendencies develop. Rather, one must see what conclusions the individual has drawn and chosen to act upon (Adler, 1958). Nevertheless, due to the fact that parents do provide the atmosphere in which life style decisions are made and child-parent interactions effect the socialization of the adolescent, it is important that parental attitudes and the relationship between the adolescent and the parents be an integral part of research and preventative and remedial counseling.
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CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

This chapter includes descriptions of (1) hypotheses, (2) subjects, (3) instrumentation, and (4) data collection.

Hypotheses

1. Teachers will rate Alternative School students significantly higher than regular campus students on the goals of misbehavior, attention, power, revenge, and inadequacy and significantly lower than regular campus students on social interest on the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale.

2. Social interest scores as measured by the Social Interest Scale will be significantly lower for Alternative School students than for regular campus students.

3. The scores of parents of Alternative School students will be significantly different from the parents of regular campus students as measured by the factors of a) Confidence, b) Causation, c) Acceptance, d) Understanding, and e) Trust on the Parent Attitude Survey.

Subjects

Subjects in this study were derived from a pool of all ninth grade students who were enrolled in the Alternative School program during the second semester of the school
year, the parents of these students, and their teachers. Representative groups of students, parents, and teachers were formed from this pool of potential subjects. For instance, the parents who participated in the study are parents of students enrolled in the Alternative School during the spring semester, but may not be the parents of the students who completed the SIS. Teachers rated students enrolled in the Alternative School during the spring semester. The students rated by the teachers may not be the same students who completed the SIS or the same students whose parents completed the PAS. Participating in the study were 20 students, 20 parents, and 26 teachers who were identified as potential subjects and agreed to participate in the study. The Alternative School, which is located in a North Texas metropolitan area, is a program designed to provide a highly structured, controlled academic setting for junior high and senior high school students who disrupt the learning atmosphere on the regular campus. Assignments to the program are temporary, varying in length from five to thirty days, and usually result from an accumulation of referrals to the school principal for various infractions.

The comparison group was selected from a pool of students enrolled in ninth grade health classes in a traditional high school in the district. Representative
groups of students, parents, and teachers were formed from this pool of potential subjects. This group consisted of 20 students, 20 parents, and 26 teachers. Students in health classes were chosen to serve as a comparison group because health is a required course usually taken during the ninth grade year. Subjects were matched by sex and grade level. Students who had been assigned to an Alternative School setting in the past were not included with the comparison group.

Instrumentation

The Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale (STBRS) as developed by this investigator (Downing, 1986) was used to measure the goals of misbehavior and level of perceived social interest of the students in this study (see Appendix A). Items on the STBRS were suggested by literature defining behavioral descriptions of the goals of behavior as provided by several Adlerian theorists (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1983; Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1971; Dreikurs, 1967). The STBRS was designed to measure the goals of misbehavior (attention, power, revenge, inadequacy) and social interest.

The possible responses to the items on the STBRS are (1) Not at all like the student, (2) Not much like the student, (3) Like the student, (4) Very much like the student. Item scores can range from 1 to 4, 1 being behavior
least likely to be exhibited by the student, and 4 being the most likely. A dimension score for each of the six goals of behavior is obtained by totaling the item scores measuring each goal of behavior. Dimension scores are utilized to provide a profile of the goals of misbehavior. The total scores may range from 7 to 28 with a high score indicating that factor as a goal of behavior.

The STBRS is divided into three sections. Section I contains 25 items which can relate to specific student behaviors. Sections II and III each contain 5 items, with Section II relating to student reaction to correction of behavior and Section III relating to teacher reactions to student behavior. All items in each section were randomly assigned numbers for inclusion in the questionnaire.

To establish content validity and scale reliability of the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale, a pilot study was completed. Content validity for the scale was established by three members of a University Counselor Education faculty who are considered experts in the theory of Individual Psychology because they teach courses in counseling theories as well as courses related to theory applications. Each faculty member was asked to review the items for each of the goals of misbehavior and the social interest items on the scale and was asked to indicate their agreement that the items appear to measure what they purport
to measure. Items were categorized by goal of misbehavior and social interest (See Appendix A). Judges were asked to determine the accuracy of each item as a descriptor of that category. A statement of the approval of the items and suggestions for improvement of the instrument was returned to this author (see Appendix B). One judge suggested that item 17, truant, could also be a descriptor of the goal of power, but did not disagree with its placement as a descriptor of the goal of inadequacy. No item was adopted unless two out of the three judges agreed on its placement.

Scale reliability was established by asking teachers at the Alternative School at which this study was conducted in a metropolitan area in North Texas to complete the rating scale on two students each in their classroom. Eight teachers were asked to complete the rating scale on two students in their classroom. Within a two-week interval, each teacher was asked to complete the rating scale again on the same two students they had previously rated. The number of observations for each administration was 16. The Rank Difference Correlation was used to determine the ranking of the total score from the first administration of the scale. A reliability coefficient of .91 was obtained.

The Social Interest Scale (SIS) (Crandall, 1975) (see Appendix C), sometimes referred to as the Personal Trait Value Scale, was developed as a self-report/value oriented
approach designed to assess a person's interest in the interests or welfare of others. Twenty-four pairs of personal characteristics or traits are listed, and the respondent is asked to underline which characteristics from each pair they value most highly. The underlined items considered to reflect social interest are then totaled to render a social interest score. The scale includes nine buffer items. Item analysis yielded 15 key items related to social interest. The subject can score from zero to 15, with 15 representing the highest level of social interest (Crandall, 1975).

Basic validation for the scale consists of its significant relations to cooperative and altruistic behavior (Crandall & Harris 1976), peer ratings and measures of interpersonal attraction (Crandall, 1975, 1978), differences between criminal and non-criminal groups (Crandall & Reimanis, 1976), as well as relations to a number of self-report measures of attitudes and values. Validity of the scale was investigated by a correlation of peer ratings to social interest scores. Since an individual's ratings depended partly on the number of people available to that individual, it was necessary to form high and low criterion groups. The mean SIS scores were 10.22 for the high criterion group and 6.86 for the low criterion group. The results were significant ($t = 3.60$, $df = 43$, $p < .001$) (Crandall, 1975).
Test-retest reliability over a five week period was .82. Internal consistency measures included coefficient alpha, estimated K-R (Kuder-Richardson) 20, .73, and K-R 21, .71. Corrected odd-even reliabilities yielded similar estimates of .77 and .73 (Crandall, 1980).

The Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) (Hereford, 1963) (see Appendix D) was designed to measure five areas of parental attitude: 1) confidence in the parental role; 2) causation of the child's behavior; 3) acceptance of the child's behavior and feelings; 4) mutual understanding; 5) mutual trust.

The PAS is a 77 item survey that yields a score in five areas of parent attitude. To determine item selection in the development of the scales, five judges were asked to classify 200 items, approximately 40 for each scale, into each attitude area to which they felt it was most closely pertained. No item was adopted unless at least three of the judges agreed on its placement. Through this method 25 items for each area were selected. The 125 items became the preliminary form of the attitude scales. A product-moment correlation coefficient was obtained between each item and its total scale score, with a standardization group of 72 parents being used as subjects. The 15 items with the highest correlation coefficients in each of the five areas were used in the final version of the PAS. To reduce
the tendency of some subjects to consistently mark the undecided category, two additional items were included and designated as set breakers (Hereford, 1963).

The split-half reliability coefficients for the individual scales range from .68 for Acceptance to .86 for Understanding. An interscale correlation matrix was computed in which every scale was correlated with every other scale to investigate the possibility that all the scales might be measuring the same broad, undefined dimension of parent attitude. All intercorrelations were positive and range from .33 to .62. These correlations are high enough to indicate that all scales are measuring related parent attitude, but not so high as to suggest duplication (Hereford, 1963).

Each item on the PAS has five possible answers: Strongly Agree (A), Agree (a), Undecided (U), Disagree (d), or Strongly Disagree (D). Scores ranging from -30 to +30 are obtained for each of the five areas of parent attitudes. The Confidence Scale refers to the parent's concept of self. Low scores on this scale represent the parent who feels inadequate, dissatisfied, or unsure, and indicates the belief that the individual is lacking in ability to be a good parent. High scores would represent the parent who feels sure of himself, adequate to meet the demands of parenthood, and unconcerned about the difficulties of parent-child
relations. The Causation Scale is concerned with the interpretation a parent makes of his child's behavior, and the extent to which the parent is viewed as a causative factor. Low scores indicate a belief that behavior is inherited or predetermined. High scores reflect that the parent believes the child's behavior is determined by parent-child interaction, by environmental influences, and by parental behavior and attitudes. The Acceptance Scale measures the degree to which a parent is satisfied with the child and parental acceptance or rejection of the child's feelings and behavior, aggressiveness, need for affection, and self-expression. Low scores on the continuum indicate parent attitudes that overtly and completely reject the child. At the other end of the continuum is the completely permissive parent. The fourth scale, Understanding, is heavily weighted with items dealing with communication between parents and children—including freedom of expression, talking out problems, and joint participation in decision-making. The parent scoring high on this scale believes in the importance of sharing and communicating attitudes, feelings, and problems while parents scoring at the lower end believe children should be seen and not heard. The Trust Scale measures the amount of confidence that parents and children have in each other. Low scores reflect a parent-child relation marked by suspicion and
deceit. Conversely, parents who score high on this scale have enough respect for their children as individuals to feel that they can be trusted (Hereford, 1963).

Data Collection

Representative groups were formed from a pool of 47 students who were enrolled in the Alternative School during the spring semester and 52 students who were enrolled in health classes on the regular campus, the parents of these students, and the regular campus teachers of these students. The parents who participated in the study are parents of students enrolled in the Alternative School during the spring semester, but may not be the parents of the students who completed the SIS. Teachers rated students enrolled in the Alternative School during the spring semester. The students rated by the teachers may not be the same students who completed the SIS or the same students whose parents completed the PAS.

Informed parental consent was obtained for all students who participated in the study (see Appendix E). Twenty-four students were enrolled at the Alternative School during the week this study was conducted. Twenty parental consent forms were returned. Fifty-two students were enrolled in the two health classes that were randomly selected to serve as a comparison group. Twenty-four consent forms were
returned. Subjects were matched by sex and grade level creating two groups with 20 subjects, 13 male and seven female, in each group. A group administration of the Social Interest Scale (SIS) to the Alternative School students and to the comparison group was conducted during the same week. Testing situations and procedures were not identical because the structure of the regular school campus differs greatly from the structure of the alternative school campus. Effort was made to provide as much consistency as possible. The comparison group completed the SIS during their assigned health class period in their regular classroom. Alternative School students completed the instruments in an extra classroom at the Alternative School during the same class period of the day as the comparison group.

Students were asked to indicate sex, grade level, and whether or not they had ever been assigned to an Alternative school setting. A place to provide this information was included on the SIS. In addition, students were asked to fill out an information sheet giving parent's name, address, and phone number along with the information regarding sex, age, grade level, and birth order (see Appendix F).

The SIS was administered to both groups by the researcher, who is the coordinator of the Alternative School as well as a doctoral student in counseling with testing experience.
Instructions printed at the top of the scale were read to the students with an opportunity to ask questions before proceeding. No students in either group requested any further clarification. In addition, students were told that there are no right or wrong answers as the scale is concerned only with the attitudes and opinions that the students have. The scales were returned to the examiner upon completion before the end of the class period. To protect anonymity of the subjects, a coding system was utilized in which the subject received a numerical designation for the scale, ranging from A100 to A200 for the Alternative School group and C100-C200 for the comparison group. Subjects who desired an individual conference to discuss results were instructed to sign their instrument or make note of the numerical code so that could provide the information when requesting a conference.

The Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scales were sent to the teachers with a cover letter (see Appendix G) by inter-school mail during the same week that the SIS was administered to the students. In the comparison group, the STBRS was completed by the classroom teacher assigned to the student for the fifth period class. Fifty-two STBRS behavior rating scales were sent to the fifth period classroom teachers of students in the comparison group.
Twenty-nine were returned. Two of the instruments were discarded because they were incomplete. When a student is assigned to the Alternative School, membership in classes on the regular campus is maintained. The teachers of those classes send assignments to the student on a weekly basis. Forty-seven STBRS behavior rating scales were sent to the teacher on regular campus who had been assigned the Alternative School student for the fifth period class. Twenty-eight surveys were returned. The groups were matched by sex creating two groups composed of 26 students in each group, 16 male and 10 female.

The Parent Attitude Survey was mailed to the parents of the students in each group with a cover letter (see Appendix H). Forty-seven surveys were mailed to parents of ninth grade students who had enrolled during the spring semester. Only 12 surveys were returned within two weeks. The remaining eight surveys needed were obtained after phone contacts with parents requesting their assistance in completing the survey. For the comparison group, 52 surveys were mailed to parents of ninth grade students enrolled in the health classes on regular campus. Fourteen surveys were returned within two weeks. The remaining six were received following telephone contacts with parents. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included with the survey. Parents who wished to receive
information about the results of the study were given an opportunity to check a box on the back of the envelope. No information was obtained in regard to which parent, the mother or father, completed the survey.
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CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents, analyzes, and discusses the findings of this investigation. The data are examined as they relate to the hypotheses. The study was designed to compare the goals of behavior and social interest of adolescents assigned to an Alternative School with the goals of behavior and social interest of adolescents in a regular high school program, and to compare child rearing attitudes of parents of Alternative School adolescents with the parents of regular school adolescents.

Analysis of Data

The Hotellings $T^2$ multivariate test was used to make comparisons for Hypotheses 1 and 3. Hypothesis 2 was tested by a one-way analysis of variance.

Results

Hypothesis 1 states that teachers will rate Alternative School students significantly higher than regular campus students on the goals of misbehavior, attention, power, revenge, and inadequacy and significantly lower than regular campus students on social interest as measured by the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale.
Table I reports the means of the scores and the standard deviations on the five scales related to goals of behavior on the STBRS which was designed to measure the goals of attention, power, revenge, inadequacy, and social interest. The scores have a possible range of 7 to 28, with the higher scores indicating that factor as a goal of behavior.

### Table I

**MEANS OF SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH OF THE SCALES MEASURING GOALS OF BEHAVIOR ON THE STBRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th>Regular Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Int</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two-sample $T^2$ value is 39.51 with an $F$ of 7.27 with degrees of freedom 5 and 46. Under the hypothesis of equal mean vectors the probability of exceeding such an $F$ value would be less than .0001. Because a significant $F$ was obtained, univariate t-tests were used to determine which factors influenced the overall significance.

Table II reports the univariate t-test data on the scales measuring goals of behavior, attention, power, revenge, inadequacy, and social interest on the STBRS.
TABLE II

UNIVARIATE t-test DATA ON THE GOALS OF BEHAVIOR ON THE STBRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>t *</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-4.81</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>-3.85</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interest</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* df = 50

The t values on all five scales, attention, power, revenge, inadequacy, and social interest are significant at the .01 level of significance. These findings further support Hypothesis 1 that teachers will rate Alternative School students significantly higher on the goals of misbehavior and lower on social interest as measured by the STBRS.

Hypothesis 2 states that social interest scores as measured by the Social Interest Scale (SIS) will be significantly lower for Alternative School students than for regular campus students.

To test Hypothesis 2, a one-way analysis of variance was applied to determine whether there were significant differences in the social interest measure.

Table III reports the sum of squares, mean squares, F value and P value of the social interest factor as measured by the SIS.
TABLE III

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA OF THE SOCIAL INTEREST FACTOR AS MEASURED BY THE SIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Interest</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 1, 50

Since the F value did not attain significance at the .05 level, these results do not lend support to Hypothesis 2. Alternative School students did not score significantly lower than regular campus students on social interest as measured by the SIS.

Hypothesis 3 states that the parents of Alternative School students will score significantly different from the parents of regular campus students on parent attitudes as measured by the factors of a) Confidence, b) Causation, c) Acceptance, d) Understanding, and e) Trust on the Parent Attitude Survey (PAS).

Table IV reports the means of the scores and the standard deviations for each of the five parent attitudes, confidence, causation, acceptance, understanding, and trust measured by the PAS. The scores have a possible range of -30 to +30. High scores reflect positive parent attitudes regarding child-rearing practices.
TABLE IV
MEANS OF SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE PARENT ATTITUDE SCALES OF THE PAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Campus</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two-sample $T^2$ statistic has the value 6.28; the associated F value is 1.12 with degrees of freedom 5 and 34. The P value is .37 which does not indicate significance at the .05 level. These results do not lend support to Hypothesis 3.

Related Findings

In addition to the instruments completed, the effects of sex, birth order, age, and length of assignment on measures of social interest and goals of misbehavior were also investigated by this study. Data about sex, birth order, and age were collected from the student information sheet (See Appendix G). Information regarding length of assignment was obtained from Alternative School records.

Students are assigned to the Alternative School program for varying lengths of time. The lengths of assignments for students participating in this study ranged from 14 to
97 days. In order to investigate whether there are significant differences in goals of misbehavior and social interest of students according to the length of assignment, Alternative School students were divided into two groups. Students are typically assigned to the Alternative School for 10 to 20 days. Students receiving assignments for longer than twenty days are usually considered more severe discipline problems. Group assignment was based on this rationale. Group 1 was composed of 12 students who were assigned to the Alternative School for 20 days or less. Group 2 consisted of 14 students whose assignments were 21 days or longer. A series of univariate t-tests were applied to determine any significant differences between the two groups on measures of goals of misbehavior and social interest on the STBRS.

Table V reports the means of the scores and standard deviations on the five scales on the STBRS.

**TABLE V**

MEANS OF SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE SCALES MEASURING GOALS OF MISBEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL INTEREST ON THE STBRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Short Assign. N = 12</th>
<th>Long Assign. N = 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Int</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI reports the univariate t-test data comparing the two groups based on length of assignment on the scales measuring goals of misbehavior and social interest on the STBRS.

**TABLE VI**

**UNIVARIATE t-test DATA COMPARING LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT GROUPS ON GOALS OF MISBEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL INTEREST AS MEASURED BY THE STBRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interest</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* df = 24

The t values on each of the five scales attention, power, revenge, inadequacy, and social interest were not significant. These findings indicate that there is no relationship between the length of assignment and the goals of misbehavior and social interest as measured by the STBRS.

Other factors considered included the possible effects of the students' ages, sex, and birth order on the goals of misbehavior and social interest as measured by the STBRS. These questions were tested by a multivariate analysis of variance, MANOVA, to accommodate more than two levels of a single independent variable in determining any overall effects for the total sample.
A one-way MANOVA test was used to determine any overall age effects. Students participating in this study ranged in age from 14 to 17. The total sample was divided into two groups. Group 1 was composed of students age 14 and 15. These ages are considered typical for ninth grade students who have not been retained in any grade during their school years. Thirty-seven students were assigned to this group. Group 2 was composed of students age 16 or older as these students may have experienced retention during their school years. Fifteen students were assigned to this group.

Table VII shows the significance of the probability of no overall age effect on the goals of misbehavior and social interest as measured by the STBRS for the total sample which includes the Alternative School group and the regular campus group.

<p>| TABLE VII |
| ONEWAY MANOVA TEST FOR THE HYPOTHESIS OF NO OVERALL AGE EFFECT |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilks' Criterion</th>
<th>F (5,46)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MANOVA F is not significant at the .05 level. These findings indicate no overall age effects on the goals of misbehavior and social interest as measured by the STBRS.
Table VIII shows the significance of the probability of no overall sex effect for the total sample.

**TABLE VIII**

ONEWAY MANOVA TEST FOR THE HYPOTHESIS OF NO OVERALL SEX EFFECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilks' Criterion</th>
<th>F (5,46)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MANOVA F is not significant at the .05 level indicating no overall sex effects on the goals of misbehavior and social interest as measured by the STBRS.

Table IX shows the significance of the probability of no overall birth order effects for the total sample. The 52 observations were divided into four groups: oldest, middle, youngest, and only. Group 1, oldest, was composed of 22 observations. Groups 2 and 4, middle and only children, contained 5 observations each. Group 3, the category for youngest children contained 20 observations.

**TABLE IX**

ONEWAY MANOVA TEST FOR THE HYPOTHESIS OF NO OVERALL BIRTH ORDER EFFECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANOVA</th>
<th>F (15,121.87)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Criterion</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MANOVA F is not significant at the .05 level indicating no overall effects of birth order on the goals of misbehavior and social interest as measured by the STBRS.

Table X shows the correlation matrix for the five variables measured by the STBRS.

**TABLE X**

**CORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE FIVE VARIABLES ON THE STBRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Atten</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Revenge</th>
<th>Inadeq</th>
<th>Soc Int</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atten</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.75869</td>
<td>0.68041</td>
<td>0.45133</td>
<td>-0.50929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.75869</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.87096</td>
<td>0.77272</td>
<td>-0.74214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>0.68041</td>
<td>0.87096</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.65898</td>
<td>-0.61137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadeq</td>
<td>0.45133</td>
<td>0.77272</td>
<td>0.65898</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-0.72024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Int</td>
<td>-0.50929</td>
<td>-0.74214</td>
<td>-0.61137</td>
<td>-0.72024</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High correlations were evident between power and all other scales. The correlations indicated a positive relationship with attention, revenge, and inadequacy and a negative relationship with social interest. A high negative correlation was also found between social interest and the goal of inadequacy.

**Discussion**

Students who disrupt and impoverish the learning environment of the classroom often demonstrate academic and disciplinary needs which are difficult to accommodate in
the traditional classroom setting. A better understanding of the motivation of behavior and the development of the social interest of these students is essential to the development of effective discipline management plans and programs. The purpose of this study was to identify the goal of students' behavior as defined by teacher observation and the level of social interest of disruptive students as well as identify parent attitudes of these students which might differ from those of the parents of nondisruptive students.

Two major limitations of this study were the small sample size and the need for further validation of the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale. The small sample size may have limited the statistical power to find significant differences. Further validation of the STBRS is needed to enhance the validity of the findings of this study. Both of these factors must be considered for all the dependent measures in viewing the results of this study.

The major findings of this study were that teachers rated Alternative School students significantly higher on all four of the goals of misbehavior and significantly lower on social interest as measured by the STBRS with the t statistic suggesting greater emphasis on the goal of inadequacy. These findings indicate that teachers perceive Alternative School students as more likely to display patterns of behavior representative of the four goals of
misbehavior than students who remain on regular campus. These findings are congruent with and seem to support the theoretical construct of life style goals of misbehavior in adolescents as proposed by Adlerian theorists (Adler, 1958; Dinkmeyer & Caldwell, 1970; Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1983; Dreikurs, 1948; Dreikurs & Grey, 1968; and Mosak, 1979). The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler is teleological in its approach, emphasizing the goal-striving nature of the individual and the purposiveness of behavior. Dreikurs and Grey (1968) related that all misbehavior is the result of an individual's mistaken assumption about the way to establish significance and gain significance. Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) noted that adolescents strive to achieve significance in a variety of ways, both positive and negative. The establishment of negative instead of positive goals is indicative of the level of encouragement or discouragement the adolescent experiences. The results of this study suggest that the typical Alternative School student may be discouraged and resort to socially useless ways of gaining significance.

Dreikurs (1948) and Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) classified the goals of misbehavior into four groups and provided descriptions of behavior, teacher reactions, and student responses to correction for each group. The four groups were identified as: attention getting, power
seeking, revenge taking, and declaring deficiency or defeat. The fifth group, social interest, is considered a positive goal of behavior. Adlerian theorists purport that the goal of behavior can be identified through observations of behavior, teacher reaction to that behavior, and student responses to correction. (Dinkmeyer & Caldwell, 1970; Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1983; Dreikurs 1948, 1957; Sweeney, 1981). The Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale which was used to measure goals of behavior in this study was designed to categorize teacher observations into each of the five groups in order to identify the goal of behavior.

Teacher observations of Alternative School students yielded significantly higher scores on the goal of attention indicating that teachers perceive Alternative School students as striving for attention in disturbing or annoying ways. Dinkmeyer and McKay's (1983) behavioral descriptions, identifications of parents' and teachers' feelings and reactions, and the adolescent's responses to correction provide a means of understanding adolescents who pursue the goal of attention. Their descriptions suggest that Alternative School students would exhibit behaviors such as clowning, minor mischief, and unique dress. Teachers typically feel annoyed and react by reminding, coaxing, and expressing irritation about the behavior. The Alternative School student with this goal of behavior reacts to correction
by temporarily stopping the behavior, but later repeating the behavior or doing something else to attract attention.

According to these findings, Alternative School students are perceived by teachers as more likely to display the goal of power. Dinkmeyer and McKay's (1983) descriptions of this goal indicate that Alternative School students are more likely to exhibit behavior such as aggressiveness, defiance, hostility, disobedience, stubbornness, and resistance. Teachers typically feel angry or provoked when working with these adolescents and may react by fighting power with power or giving in. The adolescent displaying the goal of power responds to correction by intensifying the behavior or with defiant compliance.

The goal of revenge was also identified as a significant factor in this study. According to these findings and Dinkmeyer and McKay's (1983) discussion of this goal of misbehavior, Alternative School students are perceived by their teachers as more likely to try to attain significance by being cruel and hurting others. They are more likely to display behaviors of rudeness, violence and destruction. Teachers may feel hurt and react with retaliation. The adolescent reacts by seeking further revenge by intensifying the attack or by choosing another weapon.

Alternative School students were rated significantly higher on the goal of inadequacy as well. The t statistic
for this factor suggests an even stronger relationship between this goal and whether or not a student is assigned to the Alternative School. Dinkmeyer and McKay's (1983) descriptions of this goal indicate that Alternative School students are more likely to exhibit behaviors such as quitting easily, avoiding trying, truancy, dropping out of school, and escaping through alcohol or drugs. Their goal is to see that others expect nothing from them. Parents and teachers of these students generally feel despair and may also want to give up. This finding is particularly relevant to the field of education where much concern is currently being expressed in regard to drop-out prevention. These results confirm the need to diligently evaluate factors in the educational process which may be contributing to that sense of discouragement.

In this study, high scores on the goal of inadequacy for Alternative School students were correlated with low social interest scores on the STBRS. This correlation supports Crandall's (1978) conclusion that social interest contributes to courage and psychological well-being and Crandall and Putnam's (1980) findings that social interest facilitates a broader, less defensive interest in many activities. These findings also seem to be related to Crandall and Reimanis's (1976) investigation of the relationship between social interest and psychological maladjustment.
Their findings indicated that criminal activity, as an indication of maladjustment, was negatively related to social interest. This study's findings of the correlation between high scores on the goals of misbehavior and low scores on social interest indicates a lack of adjustment by Alternative School students to their social environment in that they reflect striving in negative ways rather than positive ways involving social contribution, thus this research supports the findings by Crandall and Reimanis as well as Crandall's (1982) conclusion in a separate study that positive relations between social interest and indices of adjustment are not limited to self-reports. The findings of this study also agree with a study by Mozdzierk and Semyck (1980) in which it was concluded that persons with higher social interest tended to be motivated primarily towards the achievement of success, whereas those with lower social interest tended to place greater emphasis on the avoidance of failure. Teachers rated Alternative School students significantly higher on the goal of misbehavior, inadequacy. Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) described adolescents who display this goal as the most discouraged of all adolescents because their goal is to see that others expect nothing of them. These adolescents believe they lack the ability and stamina to perform competently. When they do not think they can be the best, they give up. Thus much of their energy is focused on the avoidance of failure.
The finding that teachers perceive Alternative School students as more likely to display goals of misbehavior and less likely to exhibit social interest provides further support to the premise that Alternative School students strive to gain significance in negative rather than positive ways. The teacher ratings of regular campus students on the social interest scale of the STBRS indicate that teachers perceive these students as more likely to exhibit overt behavior relating to cooperation and contribution to the social group in their environment, striving in positive ways. Students with positive goals of behavior and social interest are described in literature as being resourceful and able to make responsible decisions, cooperating with others, treating others with respect, and able to ignore provocation and work without being prodded (Adler, 1956; Dinkmeyer & Caldwell, 1970; Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1983; Dreikurs & Grey, 1968; Sulliman, 1973). Dinkmeyer and McKay (1983) suggest that teachers who work with adolescents who demonstrate social interest enjoy and respect the student's willingness to cooperate. These adolescents respond to correction by accepting responsibility for their actions and attempting to resolve the conflict. The findings of this study indicate that Alternative School students are perceived by their teachers as less likely to exhibit these behaviors and responses to correction than their peers who
remain on regular campus. Orgler (1939) and Ansbacher (1968) viewed the adolescent's increased development of social interest as one task of the school. The school is placed between the family and life in society and has the opportunity to correct the mistaken styles of life as well as a responsibility to aid the student in developing appropriate adjustment to social life.

The results of this study point to the need to include information about the purpose of the goals of behavior in teacher training. Adler (1930) emphasized that the demand for reducing the difficulty of the subject matter is not a sufficient remedy for maladjustment among school children and stressed that an attitude of fellowship on the part of the teacher, well prepared and followed with deliberation, will surely do more than any administrative relaxation. An awareness of the purpose of behavior will enhance discipline management techniques and facilitate teacher responses which can have an impact on the ways the adolescent seeks a sense of belonging or strives for significance.

The construct of social interest is very complex involving a person's attention, perception, thinking about others, feelings such as empathy and sympathy, motives, and overt behavior relating to cooperation (Crandall, 1980). Because the social interest scale on the STBRS incorporates only the teacher perception of social interest and does
not include the students' cognitive or feeling components of the construct, the findings must be approached with caution. However, it would be remiss to ignore the potential contribution of these findings to the field of research relating to social interest because the findings indicate that Alternative School students are less likely to be perceived by teachers as having social interest. Information is needed to determine the correlation between social interest as measured by the STBRS and social interest as measured by the SIS because they are measuring different aspects of the construct.

There were no significant differences in the scores of Alternative School students and regular campus students on the SIS. The conflicting results between significant social interest scores on the STBRS and the lack of significant social interest scores on the SIS may be attributed to the complexity of issues in the measurement of social interest. The SIS was developed as a self-report/value oriented approach designed to assess a person's interest in the welfare of others while the STBRS focuses on teacher's perceptions of the students' social interest. Although a series of studies attest to the validity of the SIS (Crandall 1975, 1978; Crandall S. Harris, 1976; Crandall & Reimanis, 1976), other studies have questioned its validity. Mozdzierz, Greenblatt, and Murphy (1986) found that the SIS failed to
relate inversely with measures of maladjustment. Crandall (1980) has suggested that better measures of social interest could be developed. Mozdzierz, Greenblatt, and Murphy (1986) suggested the possibility that social interest is a multidimensional concept, and further studies are needed to identify the nature of these dimensions. Specifically, they recommend a multitrait-multimethod study of social interest accounting for sex, psychopathology, social desirability, and behavioral components to determine the construct validity of social interest. The conflicting results found in this study support this recommendation.

No significant differences were found regarding parent attitudes, length of assignment, sex, age, or birth order. These findings must be viewed with caution because the small sample size may have hindered the detection of significant differences. The finding that attitudes of parents of students in the Alternative School do not differ from the attitudes of parents of students who remain in the traditional school could be related to sampling difficulties. Because the number of responses were limited in both groups, the possibility that a representative sample of each group was not obtained must be considered. Specifically, the procedures may have solicited responses from parents who typically demonstrate attitudes related to a high degree of cooperation and a higher level of confidence in their parenting skills.
No significant differences were found in regard to the length of assignment and goals of misbehavior and social interest. This finding may imply that the Alternative School program involved in this study does not raise the social interest level or redirect the goals of misbehavior of the students involved in the program. Further investigation is indicated by these findings to determine the effectiveness of this program and similar programs designed to meet the disciplinary needs of disruptive students.

No significant sex or age differences between the two groups of students were found by this study. These findings support Crandall's (1980) findings that, among adolescents, no significant correlations with age or sex and social interest were found. The results disagree, however, with the findings of Schneider and Reuterfors (1981) and Kaplan (1978) which identified higher social interest for female adolescents than male adolescents. The small sample size for this study may have been a limiting factor in determining significance in this study. Further research is needed to clarify this issue.

The findings indicating no significant differences between birth order and social interest do not support Schneider and Reuterfors' (1981) findings which indicated a significant relationship between birth order and social interest. A critical factor in the incongruency between
the findings of these two studies is the small sample size of this study. Schneider and Reuterfors' results indicated that only-borns obtained lower SIS scores than did either first-borns, second-borns, or middle-borns, however, their study involved a large sample of 443 college students.

The findings of this study are important to the field of counseling because they can enhance the understanding of counselors who work with adolescents who are misbehaving. The instrument developed for the purpose of this study has the potential to be a valuable tool for counselors to utilize in their consultation with teachers. The instrument developed for this study has potential for utilization in future research as well as in the field of counseling. More research is needed to provide further validation and/or to refine the instrument.

On the basis of these findings, it is recommended that teachers receive training in understanding and responding to the goals of misbehavior. Teachers, would benefit from training sessions which focus on helping them to understand the purpose and goals of misbehavior and enhance their skills in responding with disciplinary techniques which encourage cooperation, concern for the welfare of others, and enable adolescents to maintain a belief in themselves that promotes positive ways of contributing to their social environment. Dreikurs (1957) pointed out that teachers
who are trained in understanding the goals of misbehavior and in specific methods of correction related to those goals will no longer use the term "problem" as an admission of defeat, but rather as an indication that the adolescent poses an interesting challenge.

This study is significant in that it lends support to the teleological approach of Individual Psychology, emphasizing the goal-striving nature of the individual and the purposiveness of behavior. Research investigating the goals of behavior in adolescents is lacking. Because an understanding of the purpose of behavior is an important component in establishing effective discipline management procedures in the home and in the classroom, it is important that these theoretical constructs be given more attention in research.

Summary

The major findings of this study were as follows: 1) that teachers rated Alternative School students significantly higher on all four goals of misbehavior (attention, power, revenge, and inadequacy) and significantly lower on social interest on the STBRS with the t statistic for the goal of inadequacy suggesting a strong relationship between that goal and whether a student is assigned to the Alternative School; 2) that social interest scores as
measured by the SIS were not significantly different for Alternative School students than for regular campus students; and 3) that parents of Alternative School students did not score significantly different from parents of regular campus students on the factors of confidence, causation, acceptance, understanding, and trust on the PAS.

In related findings, no significant differences were found in length of assignment, sex, age, or birth order.

These findings indicate that teachers perceive Alternative School students as more likely to display patterns of behavior representative of the four goals of misbehavior than students who remain on regular campus. The results of this study suggest that the typical Alternative School student may be discouraged and resort to socially useless ways of gaining significance.

On the basis of these findings, it is recommended that teachers receive training in understanding and responding to the goals of misbehavior to enhance their skills in responding with disciplinary techniques which encourage cooperation and concern for the welfare of others.

The need for further research is indicated in the following areas: 1) validation and/or refinement of the STBRS, 2) investigation of the correlation of the social interest measures on the STBRS and the SIS, 3) investigation to determine the effectiveness of Alternative School
programs in raising the social interest level or redirecting the goals of misbehavior, 4) further studies to identify the multidimensional nature of social interest and to determine the construct validity of social interest, 5) further studies to clarify sex and age differences on measures of social interest, especially as related to adolescents, and 6) investigation of the theoretical construct of life style goals of behavior in adolescents.

This study is significant in that it lends support to the teleological approach of Individual Psychology, emphasizing the goal-striving nature of the individual and the purposiveness of behavior.
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SECTION I

On the following pages are a number of statements regarding student behavior. Please indicate your perception of this student's behavior by using the following scoring system:

1 = Not at all like the student  
2 = Not much like the student  
3 = Like the student  
4 = Very much like the student

Circle the number that best describes the degree to which the student demonstrates that behavior.

1. Makes noises, talks excessively 1 2 3 4
2. Ignores provocation by others 1 2 3 4
3. Works without being prodded 1 2 3 4
4. Is resourceful, makes own decisions 1 2 3 4
5. Frequently disturbs class or annoys others 1 2 3 4
6. Refuses to do work or follow the rules of the classroom 1 2 3 4
7. Lashes out at others in hurtful ways 1 2 3 4
8. Quits easily, avoids trying 1 2 3 4
9. Seeks attention from the teacher 1 2 3 4
10. Destructive 1 2 3 4
11. Vindictive 1 2 3 4
12. Wants to be noticed 1 2 3 4
13. Cooperates with others 1 2 3 4
14. Seems to have given up 1 2 3 4
15. Stubborn, complies only enough to get by, but not to teacher satisfaction 1 2 3 4
16. Aggressive, argues with teachers and classmates 1 2 3 4
17. Truant 1 2 3 4
18. Does not complete assignments 1 2 3 4
19. Antagonistic 1 2 3 4
20. Lacks motivation and interest/exhibits minimal participation 1 2 3 4
21. Disobedient, wants to be in control  
22. Rude, disrespectful to others  
23. Clowns, instigates minor mischief  
24. Defiant, resists correction  
25. Treats others with respect  

SECTION II

When corrected, this student will most probably respond in the following way:

1. Temporarily stops behavior/later repeats behavior or does something else to attract attention  
2. Some resistance to correction/persists with behavior or intensifies actions/marginally complies  
3. Strong resistance to correction/intensifies attack or attempts to retaliate or get even  
4. Passive endurance/Attempts to motivate this student are usually met with little or no attempt toward action or task completion  
5. Accepts responsibility for actions/Attempts positive resolution of conflict/demonstrates willingness to cooperate  

SECTION III

Teachers working with this student might typically respond in the following ways(s):

1. Feel annoyed/frequently remind the student of rules and responsibilities/lose instructional time in monitoring student behavior  
2. Feel angry, provoked, or challenged/easily become engaged in a power struggle/feel that the leadership of the class is threatened  
3. Feel angry, hurt, alienated, or antagonistic in return/find it difficult to like the student or establish rapport  
4. Feel defeated in effort to motivate the student/feel ineffective in combating the student's expression of total inability  
5. Enjoy and respect the student's willingness to cooperate/realize conflicts can be resolved in a respectful manner/easily rely on the student's resourcefulness and ability to make responsible decisions
SOCIO-TELEOLOGICAL BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

The following includes a break-down of items on the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale according to the factor it is intended to measure.

Factor I: Social Interest

2. Ignores provocation
3. Works without being prodded
4. Is resourceful, makes own decisions
13. Cooperates with others
25. Treats others with respect

Student response to correction:

5. Accepts responsibility for actions/attempts positive resolution of conflict/demonstrates willingness to cooperate

Teacher response to student:

5. Enjoy and respect the student's willingness to cooperate/realize conflicts can be resolved in a respectful manner/easily rely on the student's resourcefulness and ability to make responsible decisions
Factor II: Attention

1. Makes noises, talks excessively
5. Frequently disturbs class or annoys others
9. Seeks attention from teacher
12. Frequently disturbs class or annoys others
23. Clowns, instigates minor mischief

Student response to correction:

1. Temporarily stops behavior/later repeats behavior or does something else to attract attention

Teacher response to student:

1. Feels annoyed/frequently reminds the student of rules and responsibilities/loses instructional time in monitoring student behavior

Factor III: Power

6. Refuses to work or follow the rules of the classroom
15. Stubborn, complies only enough to get by, but not to teacher satisfaction
16. Aggressive, argues with teachers and classmates
21. Disobedient, wants to be in control
24. Defiant, resists correction

Student response to correction:

2. Some resistance to correction/persists with behavior or intensifies actions/marginally complies

Teacher response to student:

2. Feels angry, hurt, provoked, or challenged/easily becomes engaged in a power struggle/feels that the leadership of the class is threatened
Factor IV: Revenge

7. Lashes out at others in hurtful ways
10. Destructive
11. Vindictive
19. Antagonistic
22. Rude, disrespectful to others

Student response to correction:

3. Strong resistance to correction/intensifies attack or attempts to retaliate or get even

Teacher response to student:

3. Feels angry, hurt, alienated, or antagonistic in return/find it difficult to like the student or establish rapport

Factor V: Inadequacy

8. Quits easily, avoids trying
20. Lacks motivation and interest/exhibits minimal participation
14. Seems to have given up
17. Truant
18. Does not complete assignments

Student response to correction:

4. Passive endurance/attempts to motivate this student are usually met with little effort or attempt toward action or task completion

Teacher response to student:

4. Feels defeated in effort to motivate the student/feel ineffective in combating the student's expression of total inability
APPENDIX B
April 15, 1986

Mrs. Rebecca Downing
1613 Fair Ct.
Irving, Texas 75060

Re: Validity of the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale

To Whom It May Concern:

Rebecca Downing has submitted for my opinion a copy of a questionnaire authored by her, and adapted from literature describing the goals of misbehavior and social interest. I was asked to determine the content validity of the items used and to indicate if they are appropriately assigned to the correct factor describing the goals of misbehavior or social interest. This questionnaire, in my opinion, should be considered to have content validity.

Sincerely,

Dr. Bobbie Wilborn
Professor of Counselor Education
North Texas State University
April 15, 1986

Mrs. Rebecca Downing  
1613 Fair Ct.  
Irving, Texas 75060  

Re: Validation of the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale  

To Whom It May Concern:  

Rebecca Downing has submitted for my opinion a copy of a questionnaire authored by her, and adapted from literature describing the goals of misbehavior and social interest. I was asked to determine the content validity of the items used and to indicate if they are appropriately assigned to the correct factor describing the goals of misbehavior or social interest. This questionnaire, in my opinion, should be considered to have content validity.

Sincerely,  

Dr. Byron Medler  
Professor of Counselor Education  
North Texas State University
April 15, 1986

Mrs. Rebecca Downing
1613 Fair Ct.
Irving, Texas 75060

Re: Validity of the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale

To Whom It May Concern:

Rebecca Downing has submitted for my opinion a copy of a questionnaire authored by her, and adapted from literature describing the goals of misbehavior and social interest. I was asked to determine the content validity of the items used and to indicate if they are appropriately assigned to the correct factor describing the goals of misbehavior or social interest. This questionnaire, in my opinion, should be considered to have content validity.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joanna Strother
Assistant Professor of Counselor Education
North Texas State University
Have you ever been assigned to an Alternative School? ________ Sex ________ Age ________

Below are a number of pairs of personal characteristics or traits. For each pair, choose the trait which you value more highly. In making each choice, ask yourself which of the traits in that pair you would rather possess as one of your own characteristics. For example, the first pair is 'imaginative - rational'. If you had to make a choice, which would you rather be? Write 1 or 2 on the line in front of the pair to indicate your choice.

Some of the traits will appear twice, but always in combination with a different other trait. No pairs will be repeated.

Be sure to choose one trait in each pair.

'I would rather be....'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. imaginative</th>
<th>1. neat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. rational</td>
<td>2. logical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. helpful</th>
<th>1. forgiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. quick-witted</td>
<td>2. gentle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. neat</th>
<th>1. efficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. sympathetic</td>
<td>2. respectful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. level-headed</th>
<th>1. practical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. efficient</td>
<td>2. self-confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. intelligent</th>
<th>1. alert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. considerate</td>
<td>2. cooperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. self-reliant</th>
<th>1. imaginative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. ambitious</td>
<td>2. helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. respectful</th>
<th>1. realistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. original</td>
<td>2. moral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. creative</th>
<th>1. popular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. sensible</td>
<td>2. conscientious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. generous</th>
<th>1. considerate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. individualistic</td>
<td>2. wise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. responsible</th>
<th>1. reasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. likable</td>
<td>2. quick-witted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. capable</th>
<th>1. sympathetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. tolerant</td>
<td>2. individualistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. trustworthy</th>
<th>1. ambitious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. wise</td>
<td>2. patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions

On the following pages are a number of statements regarding parents and children. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement in the following manner:

- Strongly Agree — cross out letter 'A'
- Agree — cross out letter 'a'
- Undecided -- cross out letter 'u'
- Disagree — cross out letter 'd'
- Strongly Disagree -- cross out letter 'D'

For example: if you strongly agree with the following statement, you would mark it this way:

Boys are more active than girls  A a u d D

This survey is concerned only with the attitudes and opinions that parents have; there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. Work just as rapidly as you can -- it is your first impression that we are interested in. There is no time limit.

REMEMBER.............................. A = Strongly Agree
amy = Agree
u = Undecided
D = Disagree
D = Strongly Disagree

1. Parents have to sacrifice everything for their children  A a u d D

2. Parents should help children feel they belong and are needed  A a u d D

3. Taking care of a small baby is something that no woman should be expected to do all by herself.  A a u d D

4. When you come right down to it, a child is either good or bad, and there is not much you can do about it.  A a u d D

5. The earlier a child is weaned from its emotional ties to its parents, the better it will handle its own problems.  A a u d D

6. Most of the time, giving advice to children is a waste of time because they either don't take it or don't need it.  A a u d D

7. It is hard to let children go and visit people because they might misbehave when parents are not around.  A a u d D

8. Fewer people are doing a good job of child-rearing now than 30 years ago.  A a u d D

9. With all a child hears at school and from friends, there is little a parent can do to influence him.  A a u d D
10. If a little girl is a tomboy, her mother should try to get her interested in dolls and playing house.

11. A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it, just as parents express theirs.

12. If children are quiet for a while, you should immediately find out why.

13. It is a rare parent who can be even-tempered with the children all day.

14. Psychologists now know that what a child is born with determines the kind of person he will become.

15. One reason that it is sad to see children grow up is because they need you more when they are babies.

16. The trouble with trying to understand children's problems is that they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested.

17. A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life, because her child is part of her.

18. Most parents are not sure what is the best way to bring up children.

19. A child may learn to be a juvenile delinquent from playing games like cops and robbers and war too much.

20. There is no reason why a child should not learn to keep his clothes clean very early in life.

21. If a parent sees that a child is right and the parent is wrong, they should admit it and try to do something about it.

22. A child should be allowed to try out what it can do at times without the parents watching.

23. It is hard to know what to do when a child is afraid of something that will not hurt him.

24. Most all children are just the same at birth; it is what happens to them afterwards that is important.

25. Playing with a baby too much should be avoided since it excites them and they will not sleep.

26. Children should not be asked to do all the compromising without a chance to express their side of things.

27. Parents should make it their business to know everything their children are thinking.
28. Raising children is not as hard as most parents let on.

29. There are many things that influence a young child that parents do not understand and cannot do anything about.

30. A child who wants too much affection may become a "softie" if it is given to him.

31. Family life would be happier if parents made children feel they were free to say what they think about anything.

32. Children must be told exactly what to do and how to do it or they will make mistakes.

33. Parents sacrifice most of their fun for their children.

34. Many times parents are punished for their own sins through the bad behavior of their children.

35. If you put too many restrictions on a child, you will stunt his personality.

36. Most children's fears are so unreasonable, it only makes things worse to let the child talk about them.

37. It is hard to know when to let boys and girls play together when they cannot be seen.

38. I feel I am faced with more problems than most parents.

39. Most of the bad traits children have (like nervousness or bad temper) are inherited.

40. A child who misbehaves should be made to feel guilty and ashamed of himself.

41. Family conferences which include the children do not usually accomplish much.

42. It is a parent's duty to make sure he knows a child's innermost thoughts.

43. It is hard to know whether to be playful rather than dignified with children.

44. A child that comes from bad stock does not have much of chance of amounting to anything.

45. A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible.

46. There is a lot of truth in the saying "Children should be seen and not heard".
47. If rules are not closely enforced, children will misbehave and get into trouble.

48. Children do not realize that it mainly takes suffering to be a good parent.

49. Some children are so naturally headstrong that a parent cannot really do much about them.

50. One thing I cannot stand is a child's constantly wanting to be held.

51. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.

52. More parents should make it their job to know everything their child is doing.

53. Few parents have to face the problems I find with my children.

54. Why children behave the way they do is too much for anyone to figure out.

55. When a boy is cowardly, he should be forced to try things he is afraid of.

56. If you let children talk about their troubles, they end up complaining even more.

57. An alert parent should try to learn all his child's thoughts.

58. It is hard to know when to make a rule and stick by it.

59. Not even psychologists understand exactly why children act the way they do.

60. Children should be toilet-trained at the earliest possible time.

61. A child should always accept the decision of his parents.

62. Children have a right to activities which do not include their parents.

63. A parent has to suffer much and say little.

64. If a child is born bad, there is not much you can do about it.

65. There is no acceptable excuse for a child hitting another child.
66. Children should have a share in making family decisions just as the grown-ups do.  
67. Children who are not watched will get into trouble.  
68. It is hard to know what healthy sex ideas are.  
69. A child is destined to be a certain kind of person no matter what the parents do.  
70. It is a parents' right to refuse to put up with a child's annoyances.  
71. Talking with a child about his fears most often makes the fear look more important than it is.  
72. Children have no right to keep anything from their parents.  
73. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job.  
74. Some children are just naturally bad.  
75. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.  
76. Children do not try to understand their parents.  
77. A child should never keep a secret from his parents.
APPENDIX E
Dear Parent:

As part of my doctoral studies at North Texas State University, a study is being conducted investigating adolescents in regard to their goals of behavior and social interest and parental opinions about child-rearing practices.

The study will consist of administering a questionnaire to selected adolescents in the Irving Independent School District. Parents and teachers will also be asked to fill out a questionnaire.

If you agree, your child will be given a questionnaire by the researcher who has experience in testing and is a licensed professional counselor. The questionnaire consists of fifteen questions for which there are no right or wrong answers. In addition, a questionnaire will be mailed to you seeking your opinions in regard to effective discipline and child-rearing practices. The parent questionnaire consists of 77 items in which you will be asked to rate your agreement. Your child's classroom teacher will also be asked to complete a behavior rating scale consisting of 30 questions designed to help determine the adolescent's purpose of behavior.

There are no risks to your child. Participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time. All of the procedures are confidential.

The benefits of this study could add to the effectiveness of discipline management techniques by providing needed data related to the goals of behavior of adolescents and their level of cooperativeness. An understanding of parent opinions regarding child-rearing practices could assist in developing a better working relationship between the home and schools which is crucial to effective discipline management. Adolescents who experience disciplinary problems are hindered in their academic progress. The results of this study could be valuable in assisting this kind of student. The results of this study could also benefit the counseling profession by helping counselors to better understand the psychological motivation and needs of adolescents.

Please feel free to call me or talk to me at the Alternative School (790-8204) if you have any questions. I appreciate your willingness to allow your child to participate.

Yours truly,

Rebecca Downing
Doctoral candidate
North Texas State University
INFORMED CONSENT

Name of Subject: ________________________________

1. I hereby give my consent to Rebecca Downing to administer the Social Interest Scale to my child as part of a study being conducted through North Texas State University. I understand that, as a parent, I will be asked to complete the Parent Attitude Survey and the classroom teacher will complete the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale rating my child's behavior and I give consent to these investigational procedures as well.

2. I understand that the information is confidential and voluntary. I may withdraw my child at any time. I have read a clear explanation of the procedures and the purpose of the study. I voluntarily consent to the procedure.

____________________________
Date

____________________________
Parent
APPENDIX F
STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

Student Name ____________________________________________________________
Address _________________________________________________________________
Grade _______ Sex ________

Parent Name ____________________________________________________________
Address _________________________________________________________________
Home Phone ________________________________
Business Phone _____________________________

Have you ever been assigned to an Alternative School? __________

In your family, are you the

_______ oldest child?

_______ middle child?

_______ youngest child?

_______ only child?

(Please check the one that applies to you)
May 1, 1986

Dear ________________,

I am asking for your help.

Your assistance is needed in a study conducted through North Texas State University. This study is investigating behavior and attitudes of students assigned to an Alternative School setting. In order to obtain this valuable information, we are asking for your perceptions on the following behavior rating scale. The student whose name appears at the top of the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale has been enrolled in your class this semester. We are interested in your perceptions of this student's behavior.

The first section of this scale deals with behaviors which may be exhibited by the student. Section II is included to find out how the student typically responds to correction. Section III attempts to determine how most teachers would typically respond to the student in a regular classroom setting.

Your answers to the statements on this scale will be confidential, and we are not asking for your name on the scale; therefore, your answers will be totally anonymous.

If you would like to know the results of this study, please indicate below and sign this form. Please return the Socio-Teleological Behavior Rating Scale through inter-school mail to Rebecca Downing at the Alternative School within one week.

Your help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Downing
Doctoral candidate
North Texas State University
May 10, 1986

Dear Parent,

I am asking for your help.

As part of my doctoral studies at North Texas State University, a study is being conducted to explore adolescent behavior, attitudes, and beliefs. We are especially interested in finding out what primary caretaker parents believe about children and the process of parenting. In order to obtain this information, we are asking for your opinions on the following questionnaire in order to help the schools plan more effective discipline management as well as to help school counselors plan more effective counseling.

Your answers to the statements in the questionnaire will be confidential, and we are not asking for your name on the questionnaire; therefore, your answers will be totally anonymous.

Enclosed you will find a self-addressed envelope. Please return this questionnaire within one week. If you would like to know the results of this study, please check the box on the front of the envelope.

Your help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Downing
Doctoral Candidate
North Texas State University
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