PEER COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS
IN A STUDY SKILLS COURSE

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Steven Michael Till, B. A.
Denton, Texas
May, 1980
Till, Steven Michael, *Peer Counselor Effectiveness in a Study Skills Course*. Master of Arts (Experimental Psychology), May 1980, 35 pp., 5 tables, references, 24 titles.

Research has demonstrated the efficacy of attitudinal-motivational counseling in conjunction with study skills training. However, it has not been clear whether group or individual counseling was most beneficial.

This research attempted to evaluate the usefulness of peer counselors in group and individual counseling sessions. Using students voluntarily enrolled in a study skills program, it was demonstrated that all students improved in study habit scores. However, only individual-peer counseling was effective in changing academic attitudes (*p* < .05), as compared to group-peer counseling, no-counseling, and no-treatment conditions. Grade-point-average change scores were not differentially effected by the treatment conditions.
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Many institutions of higher education have experienced a drop in enrollment, reduced tuition income, and less government support. Due to these factors, many students have been admitted who fell below previous admission standards. In an attempt to retain their scholastic image, many institutions have developed study skills programs for these students (Garfield & McHugh, 1978). In reviewing the literature on study skills training, it becomes apparent that a diversity of methods and techniques falls under the rubric of study skills. Two general study skill areas which have been explored are: (a) training in the mechanics of studying, and (b) counseling in the area of attitudinal-motivational difficulties.

Some of the study skills programs have involved training in only the mechanics of study behavior. Most of the research has demonstrated that these programs were effective in improving the study habits of the subjects, but have not been shown to be effective in improving their scholastic attitudes. In an early review of the literature on such programs, Entwistle (1960) found that (a) a study skills course was usually followed by scholastic improvement, (b) a course was most helpful to the students desiring to take it,
(c) students wishing to take a study skills course but prevented from doing so, and therefore of comparable motivation to those who enrolled, failed to show significant improvement, and (d) any gains noted were not necessarily related to either the duration or content of the study skills course. More recently, Garfield and McHugh (1978) implemented a skills course which emphasized selective reading, note-taking, note kneading, overviewing, note questioning, answer rehearsing, and answer evaluating. The authors found that skills training alone resulted in improved learning behavior and lower levels of fear. Unlike others, these researchers also found that skills training alone improved scholastic attitudes. This research suffered from two major shortcomings. First, no control groups were utilized. It is, therefore, not clear whether the results were due to time, motivation, attention, or treatment effects. Secondly, the sample of experimental subjects were involved in the research for a diversity of reasons. Some members were recruited, some were self-referred, some were part of a special program for the disadvantaged, and still others were faculty referred. Research has shown that scholastic attitudes and the learning of study mechanics were related to whether the subjects were self-referred or required to take part in the course (Entwistle, 1960). It was not clear whether these attitudinal results were due to treatment effects or subject variables. Tyron and Sy (1977) found that skills training alone improved the
study skills ability, but not scholastic attitudes of older students (23-66 years old). The authors attributed the lack of improvement in attitude scores to the fact that older students had high attitudes concerning school before study skill training, thus creating a ceiling effect. While research has demonstrated these courses to be effective in improving knowledge of study habits, they have not been shown beneficial in improving scholastic attitudes.

Other study skills programs involved training in the mechanics of study behavior accompanied by some type of attitudinal-motivational counseling. Shaw (1955) was one of the earliest researchers to recognize the need for counseling along with study skills training. He pointed out that students often failed because of social and emotional disturbances, therefore necessitating counseling in these areas. Weigel and Weigel (1967) demonstrated that most college students already knew how to study correctly, but did not do so. Subjects were instructed to fill out a study habits and attitudes survey first as an "ideal" student and then later were asked to fill it out as they really were. They found significant differences between the real and ideal conditions. The subjects received higher scores when filling out the survey as ideal students. The lack of use of good study skills must, therefore, be attributed to attitudinal and motivational factors, rather than lack of knowledge of effective study skills.
Bednar and Weingberg (1970) reviewed the literature on study skills programs for underachievers, and concluded that treatment programs associated with improved academic performance were characterized as (a) structured rather than unstructured, (b) lengthy rather than short, (c) having high levels of therapeutic conditions, (d) appropriate to the needs of the students, and (e) having included counseling aimed at the dynamics of underachievement as well as skills training. In another review, Mitchell and Piatkowska (1974) cited three shortcomings in the Bednar and Weinberg review. The earlier review omitted specific treatment targets (other than improved academic performance), included both group and individual programs, and did not differentiate between bright, failing underachievers from low-ability, low-achieving students. In this review, it was concluded that (a) lengthy treatments were superior for failing underachievers, (b) treatment of non-volunteer students was seldom successful, (c) grade gains did not consistently accompany improvements in any of the behaviors established as treatment targets, and (d) unstructured treatment might be superior to structured treatment. Thus, there was disagreement in the literature as to whether a structured or unstructured group approach was more beneficial for underachievers. In a study of average volunteer students, Jones, Trimble, and Altman (1970) found no difference between unstructured and structured groups; however, both were superior to a no-counseling control group.
In a required counseling-study skills program, Kaye (1972) found that failing college freshman given a combination of group and individual counseling, along with study skills training, showed significant improvement in grade point averages over a no-treatment control group. However, no attempt was made to partial out the differential effects of group and individual counseling. Light and Alexakos (1970) found no significant differences between subjects receiving group or individual counseling in conjunction with study skills training on indices of study habits, grades, or teacher ratings. However, there were significant differences between the counseled and noncounseled control subjects on these three variables.

Counseling has also been demonstrated to be a useful adjunct to behavioral approaches to study skill deficits. Mitchell and Ng (1972) investigated the effects of desensitization, counseling, and combinations of both in the treatment of test anxious students. They found significant changes in academic performance for those subjects receiving a combination of both treatments, but not by subjects receiving only one of the treatments.

It has been demonstrated that counseling is a useful and important component of study skills courses. However, the method of counseling most beneficial has been in doubt. Another area which has been important was that of who should conduct counseling with study skills students,
According to most economic forecasts, the chances of increased government funding for future new academic programs or positions has become more and more doubtful. This places institutions which have been dependent upon government funding in the position of either stagnating or looking for new and innovative uses for those assets which they already possess. One asset every college or university possesses is a plethora of qualified undergraduates capable of acting as paraprofessionals when under proper supervision.

In a series of research articles Brown and his associates (Brown, 1974, 1965; Brown, Wehe, & Zunker, 1971; Brown & Zunker, 1966) found that paraprofessional counseling was an effective and financially practical counseling procedure when used in academic counseling which included both study skills training and attitudinal-motivational counseling. These researchers also found that freshmen counseled by paraprofessionals made greater use of the information than those counseled by professionals. Mitchell and Piatkowska (1974) also found that underachievers were resistant to change by experienced counselors. Fremouw and Feindler (1978) compared a peer model with professional model for teaching study skills. Using volunteer subjects, these investigators found no difference in the effectiveness of trained peer instructors and professional instructors. Furthermore, it was discovered that the tutors as well as tutees made significant gains in their study techniques. This was consistent with the findings of
Jackson and VanZoost (1974) who instructed experimental subjects enrolled in study skills courses to tutor a friend in study skills as they progressed in the course. The control subjects did not tutor friends. It was found that the experimental group scored significantly higher on measures of study habits and attitudes than the control subjects. Thus, research is available demonstrating the positive gains achieved by both tutors and tutees in these programs.

In summary, research has demonstrated the efficacy of attitudinal-motivational counseling in conjunction with study skills training. However, it has not been clear whether group or individual counseling was most beneficial. Furthermore, paraprofessionals have been shown to be effective in programs in which they were conducting both skills training and attitudinal-motivational counseling, but no research has been done separating the skills training from the counseling functions of the paraprofessionals.

The purposes of the present study were (a) to assess the usefulness of paraprofessionals as attitudinal-motivational counselors in a study skills program, and (b) to discover whether group or individual paraprofessional counseling was more efficient in changing study skills and attitudes. The following hypotheses were tested.

1. There would be significant differences in postcourse study skills scores between students receiving skills training and the no-treatment group.
2. There would be significant differences in postcourse academic attitude scores between group or individually counseled and noncounseled subjects.

3. There would be no significant differences in postcourse study habit scores between group or individually counseled and noncounseled subjects.

4. There would be no significant differences in postcourse study habit scores between individually and group peer counseled subjects.

5. There would be no significant differences in postcourse academic attitude scores between individually and group peer counseled subjects.

6. There would be no significant differences in postcourse academic attitude scores between noncounseled and no-treatment subjects.

7. There would be significant differences in grade point average change scores between group or individually counseled subjects and noncounseled subjects.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 44 students who had voluntarily enrolled in the Study Skills classes during the 1978-1979 school year and 19 volunteers from general psychology classes for a total of 63. The mean age of the students was 21.06 years, with a standard deviation of 3.26 years. There were 24 freshmen, 7 sophomores, 15 juniors, 12 seniors, and 5 others
involved. The 44 Study Skills students were randomly assigned to one of three treatment conditions. The individual-peer-counseling condition consisted of 18 students (8 males, 10 females). The group-peer-counseling condition contained 15 students (7 males, 8 females). The no-counseling group comprised 11 students (5 males, 6 females). The no-treatment group included 19 students (6 males, 13 females).

Materials

Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Form C. The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Form C (Brown & Holtzman, 1966) was developed for use in screening, diagnosing, teaching, and research. This instrument has been used as a dependent measure in most published study skills research and has been shown effective in retesting subjects as many as three times within one semester (Gadzella, Goldston, & Zimmerman, 1977). Factor analysis of the survey has yielded four primary scales: Delay Avoidance, Work Methods, Educational Acceptance, and Teacher Approval. Delay Avoidance and Work Methods scores have been combined to form a Study Habits scale. Teacher Approval and Educational Acceptance scores have been combined to form a Study Attitudes scale. Study Habits and Study Attitudes scores have been combined to form the full scale Study Orientation. The test consisted of 100 items graded on a 5-point scale which ranges from "rarely" to "almost always."

The internal consistency measures of reliability, as found by the Kuder-Richardson Formula Eight, were reported
in the .87-.89 range for the four basic subscales. Test
retest reliabilities after 4 and 14 week intervals varied
from .83 to .94.

In a sample of 1,772 freshman from six colleges and
universities, the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes was
shown to correlate .36 with first semester grade point average.
Goldfried and D'Zurilla (1973) found that the predictive
validity of the Study Habits, Study Attitudes, and Study
Orientation scales ranged from .52-.55 when peer ratings
(rather than grade point averages) were utilized. Wen and Liu
(1976) found moderate to high correlations between each survey
subscale and course examination scores for black females but
failed to show the same effect for black males. Subscale
intercorrelations ranged from .49-.71, with the higher
correlations between scales which were combined to make up the
subtotal scales Study Habits and Study Attitudes.

The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes thus appeared
to have sufficient reliability and predictive validity to
be used as a dependent measure in this study. Scales Delay
Avoidance, Work Methods, and Study Habits were used as the
measures of study skill habits. Scales Teacher Approval,
Educational Acceptance and Study Attitudes were used to
measure academic attitudes. A list of the items in Form C
of the survey may be obtained from Appendix A.

Grade point averages. Grade point averages of the
students were obtained from the Registrar of the University
for the semester prior to the research and for the semester
during which the subjects participated in the study. All
grade information was kept strictly confidential, and
researchers and instructors were blind to the grade point
averages of individual students until all treatments were
completed.

Procedure

All 44 students who originally volunteered for the Study
Skills course received training in the mechanics of study
behavior. A 12-lesson study skills program was conducted
at the Reading and Study Skills Laboratory in the University
Counseling and Testing Center. The courses were taught by
two graduate students (one male and one female) and covered
the areas of (a) time scheduling, (b) note-taking, (c) opti-
mizing environmental conditions for studying, (d) scheduling
of reinforcement contingent upon study time and behavior,
(d) improving memory and concentration through the use of
mnemonics and other aids, (f) test and study anxiety manage-
ment training, and (g) general test-taking strategies. Each
of the instructors taught five sections of the class, with
the subjects randomly assigned to one instructor or the other.
Each section contained 5-10 subjects and met for 2 hours per
week. The instructors were coordinated to assure that all
sections received instruction in all seven areas mentioned.

In addition to the skills training, the subjects were
randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions.
In the individual-peer-counseling condition, one peer counselor met with the study skills student, on a one-to-one basis, for 1 hour per week for 5 consecutive weeks. The peer counselors were instructed to cover attitudinal, motivational, and university adjustment problems with the subjects. The exact areas and depth of coverage were directed and chosen by the subjects. In the group-peer-counseling condition, two peer counselors and five study skills students met for 1 hour per week for 5 consecutive weeks. The counselors were instructed to cover the same areas as those covered with the individual-peer-counseling subjects. In the no-counseling conditions, subjects attended the two weekly study skills training sessions but received no attitudinal/motivational counseling. The no-treatment group received neither study skills training nor counseling.

The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes was administered during the first hourly study skills session. It was given again 5 weeks later during the last meeting of the study skills class. The no-treatment group was given the survey and then retested 5 weeks later with no researcher intervention in the interim. Grade point averages for the students, prior to taking the course and for the semester in which the course was completed, were available to the researcher.

The peer counselors were six seniors (three males and three females) majoring in psychology at North Texas State University. They each received 2 hours credit for their
participation. Training of the peer counselors was conducted by one of the staff psychologists and two graduate students at the Counseling and Testing Center. Training consisted of four 1-hour sessions prior to the beginning of any counseling activities, and then continued in 1-hour weekly sessions for the remainder of the academic school year. The counselors received instructions in basic communication skills and problem-solving strategies. All counselors conducted both individual and group counseling sessions.

Results

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) using pretest scores as the covariate is utilized in order to account for possible pretreatment subject differences on the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes (Winer, 1962). The results of ANCOVA's for all seven scales of the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes are presented in Table 1. The pre- and postcourse means and standard deviations as well as the postcourse adjusted means for each scale of the survey are presented in Table 2.

As seen in Table 1, all scales on the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes have significant F's at or beyond the .01 level with the exception of the Teacher Approval scale which is significant at or beyond the .05 level. All of these ANCOVA's are therefore followed by Tukey's test for comparisons between adjusted means (Winer, 1962). The
Table 1
Summary of ANCOVA's for the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Methods</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Avoidance</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Habits</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Approval</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Acceptance</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Attitudes</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Orientation</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*df = (3, 55)

results of these tests are presented in Table 3. On the Delay Avoidance and Study Habits scales, subjects who received skills training achieved significantly higher postcourse scores (p < .05) than those not receiving such training. On the Work Methods scale this effect is found only in differences between the individual-peer-counseling and no-treatment groups. The Tukey test reveals that on the academic attitude scales (Educational Acceptance, Teacher Approval, and Study Attitudes) the individual-peer-counseling subjects score significantly higher (p < .05) than the non-counseled subjects on the Educational Acceptance and Study Attitude scales but fail to score significantly higher on the Teacher Approval scale. However, the group-peer-counseling
Table 2--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group Counseled</th>
<th>Individually Counseled</th>
<th>No Counseling</th>
<th>No-Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.53</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>55.39</td>
<td>71.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. M</td>
<td>56.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>14.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>88.53</td>
<td>113.60</td>
<td>91.50</td>
<td>133.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. M</td>
<td></td>
<td>114.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>131.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Group Counseled</td>
<td>Individually Counseled</td>
<td>No Counseling</td>
<td>No-Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>31.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. M</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>29.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>36.22</td>
<td>60.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. M</td>
<td>57.49</td>
<td>61.66</td>
<td>58.72</td>
<td>41.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Habits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>36.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. M</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>28.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>34.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. M</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>27.09</td>
<td>25.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Individually Counseled</td>
<td>No-Counseling</td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Avoidance</td>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>(6.42^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individually Counseled</td>
<td>(6.20^#)</td>
<td>(4.56^*)</td>
<td>(5.09^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-Counseling</td>
<td>(3.08)</td>
<td>(2.78)</td>
<td>(5.48^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
<td>(1.78)</td>
<td>(1.78)</td>
<td>(3.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Methods</td>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>(-3.32)</td>
<td>(2.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individually Counseled</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-Counseling</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Habits</td>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individually Counseled</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-Counseling</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Approval</td>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individually Counseled</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-Counseling</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
<td>(\text{---})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Group Counseled</td>
<td>Individually Counseled</td>
<td>No-counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Acceptance</td>
<td>Group-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-3.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Attitudes</td>
<td>Group-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-4.34*</td>
<td>- .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Orientation</td>
<td>Group-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-3.28</td>
<td>- .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-counseling</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-treatment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F (3, 55) significant p < .05  
**F (3, 55) significant p < .01
subjects fail to score significantly higher than the non-counseled subjects on any of the academic attitude scales. No significantly different postcourse scores between group or individually counseled and noncounseled students are found for any of the three study habit scales (Work Methods, Delay Avoidance, and Study Habits). On the scales which measure study skills (Work Methods, Delay Avoidance, and Study Habits) the Tukey test demonstrates no statistically significant differences between the group and individually counseled subjects. On the Study Attitudes scale (which is an overall combined score for study attitudes) individual-peer-counseling subjects score significantly higher than group-peer-counseling subjects, $F(3, 55) = 4.34, p < .05$, on study attitudes. Finally, no significant postcourse differences on study attitude scores are demonstrated between no-counseling and no-treatment subjects on any of the three study attitude scales (Educational Acceptance, Teacher Approval, and Study Attitudes).

An analysis of variance on precourse grade point averages for the four experimental conditions revealed no significant differences between groups. As seen in Table 4, an analysis of variance on grade point average change scores was tabulated with no significant differences obtained between experimental conditions. It is worth noting, however, as seen in Table 5, that the mean grade point average change
Table 4

Summary of ANOVA on Grade Point Averages for Treatment Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Mean Grade Point Average Change Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>No Counseling</th>
<th>No-treatment Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseled</td>
<td>Counseled</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change scores based on 35 subjects due to first semester status of some subjects.

**T = 35

scores for the subjects in the two counseled treatment conditions are greater than those in the no-counseling and no-treatment conditions.

Discussion

The results of the study support all of the hypotheses except the second, fifth, and seventh. All students receiving study skills training achieve significantly greater improvement in their study-habit scores than students not receiving
this training. This indicates that the study skills training program used is successful in imparting skills knowledge to the students. Presumably, attitudinal-motivational factors will determine which students will utilize these newly acquired skills to improve their academic performance.

It was hypothesized that students receiving either group or individual counseling would show significant improvement in academic attitude scores compared to those students receiving no counseling. This effect was found only for the students receiving individual counseling, but not for the students receiving group counseling. Two probable reasons for the lack of significant improvement by the group-peer-counseling subjects are the emphasis of the peer counselor training and the heterogeneous composition of the group participants. The peer counselors received extensive systematic training in individual counseling skills but received no formal training in group intervention skills. It appears they were unable to utilize adequately these individual counseling skills to conduct successfully group counseling sessions. This is consistent with comments made by the peer counselors who expressed difficulty in running the groups. All the counselors stated a need for more formal training in group processes. Had the counselors been better trained in group counseling techniques, they might have been better prepared to conduct the extremely heterogeneous groups to which they were assigned.
In group counseling situations, it is believed that participants learn from other group members' experiences. In conventional group counseling, however, the group is usually choreographed in such a way that the members have similar problems or life experiences which, would enhance the possibility of vicarious learning. In this study, the group members were randomly assigned from a heterogeneous subject pool. It is due to this extreme heterogeneity that subjects and counselors complained that they felt much time spent in the group did not concern the problems they were currently experiencing. These reasons probably contribute greatly to the finding that the group counseling was not successful in improving study attitude scores.

No significant improvement in grade point averages were noted between treatment conditions. This failure to show significant improvement is consistent with Mitchell and Piatkowska (1974), who found no grade point average improvement in 41 of 49 programs reviewed. Several factors are seen as responsible for this lack of significant improvement. First, within each group there was great variability, with some students improving and others declining in grade point average. Second, the grade point average change scores are not available for all subjects. Of the 63 subjects, 28 were either first-semester freshmen or transfer students for whom no previous semester's grade point averages were available. Third, a plot of grades over a student's entire undergraduate career
indicates that for a variety of reasons their grades rise (Ofman, 1964). The no-treatment group grades were, therefore, showing a positive increase, along with those of the treatment subjects. Fourth, it has been demonstrated that improvement in grade point average following study skills training takes some time to take effect (Ofman, 1964). Finally, recent research (Fremouw & Feindler, 1978) indicates that while 16% of the variance in grade point averages can be accounted for by skill level, 84% is related to other unidentified factors, such as intelligence, academic background, or course difficulty. No research is available at this time which indicates what portion of this 84% is accounted for by attitudinal-motivational factors. Thus, the lack of significant findings with the grade point average dependent variable is probably due to factors inherent in the grade point average score and the grade improvement measurement method utilized in this study.

Even with all of the shortcomings of the grade point average change score, it is one of the most accessible measures of academic functioning available. It is for this reason that researchers continue to use it, regardless of consistently negligible results.

There are several limitations when generalizing from the findings obtained in this study. First, it is not implied that peer counselors are unable to run groups successfully. The failure of the group-peer-counseling treatment condition appears to be at least partially due to unforeseen training
deficiencies and group makeup in this study. Future research in this area should spend more time with concentrated training in group dynamics for the peer counselors. Assignment of subjects to more homogeneous groups and experimentation with group size to find the optimum number of effective peer counseling would also be beneficial.

A second limitation of this research is the finding that the study skills course and the peer counseling do not improve the academic performance of the subjects. Due to the problems inherent in grade point average change scores, the conclusion that there is no change in academic performance is unwarranted. Future research should use long-range grade point average measures to allow for the demonstrated lag effect of these training programs. Furthermore, other measures of scholastic success (such as the percent of students graduating, or grades in the major area of study) may prove useful as dependent measures.

The major implication of this research is that university study skills programs can initiate peer counseling programs for the attitudinal-motivational aspects of academic achievement. It has been adequately demonstrated that on a one-to-one basis peer counselors do effectively increase the academic attitudes of the people enrolled in these courses. It is believed that over the long run, these improved academic attitudes will allow the students to excel in both their scholastic and interpersonal endeavors. Furthermore, being
economically beneficial for the professional in charge of the study skills program, this is a valuable training and learning experience for the undergraduate paraprofessionals.

The implications for group peer counseling for the attitudinal-motivational aspects of academic achievement are not clear at this time. It is believed that the lack of positive findings in this study may have been due to the group counseling program which was utilized. However, it may be that the level of counseling effectiveness required to conduct a group successfully is beyond the ability level of paraprofessionals. If this is the case, then ameliorating the counselor training and subject assignment problems in this study would not significantly improve the performance of the group peer counselors. Further research in this area will be necessary before the full implications of group peer counseling are understood.

In summary, the findings of this research project are: (a) study skills training improves the study skills knowledge of the subjects, (b) individual peer counseling improves the academic attitudes of the subjects, and (c) group peer counseling does not improve the academic attitudes of the subjects. It is believed that in the long run the individually counseled students will be more likely to utilize the newly acquired study skills knowledge than those students no showing improvement in academic attitudes.
Appendix A

Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes
(Brown & Holtzman, 1966)

1. When my assigned homework is extra long or unusually difficult, I either quit in disgust or study only the easier parts of the lesson.

2. In preparing reports, themes, term papers, etc., I make certain that I clearly understand what is wanted before I begin work.

3. I feel that teachers lack understanding of the needs and interests of students.

4. My dislike for certain teachers causes me to neglect my school work.

5. When I get behind in my school work for some unavoidable reason, I make up back assignments without prompting from the teacher.

6. Difficulty in expressing myself in writing slows me down on reports, themes, examinations, and other work to be turned in.

7. My teachers succeed in making their subjects interesting and meaningful to me.

8. I feel that I would study harder if I were given more freedom to choose courses that I like.

9. Daydreaming about dates, future plans, etc., distracts my attention from my lessons while I am studying.

10. My teachers criticize my written reports as being hastily written or poorly organized.

11. I feel that teachers allow their personal like or dislike for a student to influence their grading unduly.

12. Even though I don't like a subject, I still work hard to make a good grade.

13. Even though an assignment is dull and boring, I stick to it until it is completed.

14. I give special attention to neatness on themes, reports, and other work to be turned in.
15. I believe that the easiest way to get good grades is to agree with everything your teachers say.

16. I lose interest in my studies after the first few days of a new semester.

17. I keep all the notes for each subject together, carefully arranging them in some logical order.

18. I memorize grammatical rules, definitions of technical terms, formulas, etc., without really understanding them.

19. I think that teachers like to exercise their authority too much.

20. I believe that teachers truly want their students to like them.

21. When I am having difficulty with my school work, I try to talk over the trouble with the teacher.

22. I hesitate to ask a teacher for further explanation of an assignment that is not clear to me.

23. I feel that teachers are too rigid and narrowminded.

24. I feel that students are not given enough freedom in selecting their own topics for themes and reports.

25. I lay aside returned examinations, reports, and homework assignments without bothering to correct errors noted by the instructor.

26. I get nervous and confused when taking an examination and fail to answer questions to the best of my ability.

27. I think that teachers expect students to do too much studying outside of class.

28. Lack of interest in my school work makes it difficult for me to keep my attention focused on assigned reading.

29. I keep my place of study business-like and cleared of unnecessary or distracting items such as pictures, letters, momentos, etc.

30. I have trouble with the mechanics of English composition.

31. When explaining a lesson or answering questions, my teachers use words that I do not understand.
32. Unless I really like a course, I believe in doing only enough to get a passing grade.

33. Telephone calls, people coming in and out of my room, "bull-sessions" with my friends, etc., interfere with my studying.

34. In taking notes, I tend to take down material which later turns out to be unimportant.

35. My teachers fail to give sufficient explanation of the materials they are trying to teach.

36. I feel confused and undecided as to what my educational and vocational goals should be.

37. It takes a long time for me to get warmed up to the task of studying.

38. I do poorly on tests because I find it hard to think clearly and plan my work within a short period of time.

39. I feel that teachers are overbearing and conceited in their relations with students.

40. Some of my courses are so uninteresting that I have to "force" myself to do the assignments.

41. I am unable to concentrate well because of periods of restlessness, moodiness, or "having the blues."

42. I skip over the figures, graphs, and tables in a reading assignment.

43. I believe that teachers secretly enjoy giving their students a "hard time."

44. I believe that having a good time and getting one's full share of fun out of life is more important than studying.

45. I put off writing themes, reports, term papers, etc., until the last minute.

46. After reading several pages of an assignment, I am unable to recall what I have just read.

47. I think that teachers tend to talk too much.

48. I believe that teachers tend to avoid discussing present-day issues and events with their classes.
49. When I sit down to study I find myself too tired, bored, or sleepy to study efficiently.

50. I have difficulty in picking out the important points of a reading assignment--points that later appear on examinations.

51. I feel that teachers try to distribute their attention and assistance equally among all their students.

52. I feel that my grades are a fairly accurate reflection of my ability.

53. I waste too much time talking, reading magazines, listening to the radio, watching TV, going to the movies, etc., for the good of my studies.

54. When in doubt about the proper form for a written report, I refer to an approved model to provide a guide to follow.

55. The illustrations, examples, and explanations given by my teachers are too dry and technical.

56. I feel that it is not worth the time, money, and effort that one must spend to get a college education.

57. My studying is done in a random, unplanned manner--is impelled mostly by the demands of approaching classes.

58. When reading a long textbook assignment, I stop periodically and mentally review the main points that have been presented.

59. I feel that teachers tend to be sarcastic towards their poorer students and to ridicule their mistakes excessively.

60. Some of my classes are so boring that I spend the class period drawing pictures, writing letters, or daydreaming instead of listening to the teacher.

61. "Extracurricular activities"--dating, clubs, athletics, fraternity and sorority activities, etc.--cause me to get behind in my school work.

62. I seem to accomplish very little in relation to the amount of time I spend studying.

63. I feel that teachers make their courses too difficult for the average student.
64. I feel that I am taking courses that are of little practical value to me.

65. I utilize the vacant hours between classes for studying so as to reduce the evening's work.

66. I can concentrate on a reading assignment for only a short while before the words become a meaningless jumble.

67. I think that football coaches contribute more to school life than do the teachers.

68. I believe that the sole purpose of education should be to equip students to make a living.

69. Problems outside of school--financial difficulties, being in love, conflict with parents, etc.--cause me to neglect my school work.

70. I copy the diagrams, drawings, tables, and other illustrations that the instructor puts on the blackboard.

71. I feel that teachers think too much about grades and lose sight of the real objectives of education.

72. I strive to develop a sincere interest in every course I take.

73. I complete my homework assignments on time.

74. I lose points on true-false or multiple-choice examinations because I change my original answer only to discover late that I was right the first time.

75. I think that students who ask questions and offer comments in class are only trying to impress the teacher.

76. The prestige of having a college education provides my main motive for going to college.

77. I like to have a radio, record player, or television set turned on while I'm studying.

78. When preparing for an examination, I arrange facts to be learned in some logical order--order of importance, order of presentation in class or textbook order of time in history.

79. I believe that teachers intentionally schedule tests on the days following important athletic or social activities.
80. I believe that a college's football reputation is just as important as its academic standing.

81. With me, studying is a hit-or-miss proposition depending on the mood I'm in.

82. I am careless of spelling and the mechanics of English composition when answering examination questions.

83. I believe that one way to get good grades is by using flattery on your teachers.

84. I think that it might be best for me to drop out of school and get a job.

85. I study three or more hours per day outside of class.

86. Although I work until the last possible minute, I am unable to finish examinations within the allotted time.

87. I feel that it is almost impossible for the average student to do all of his assigned homework.

88. I feel that the things taught in school do not prepare one to meet adult problems.

89. I keep my assignments up to date by doing my work regularly from day to day.

90. If time is available, I take a few minutes to check over my answers before turning in my examination paper.

91. I feel that the ridiculous assignments made by teachers are the main reason for student cheating.

92. Prolonged reading or study gives me a headache.

93. I prefer to study my lessons alone rather than with others.

94. When tests are returned, I find that my grade has been lowered by careless mistakes.

95. I feel that students cannot be expected to like most teachers.

96. I feel like cutting classes whenever there is something I'd rather do or whenever I need to cram for a test.

97. At the beginning of a study period I organize my work so that I will utilize the time most efficiently.
98. During examinations I forget names, dates, formulas, and other details that I really do know.

99. I believe that teachers enter their profession mainly because they enjoy teaching.

100. I believe that grades are based upon a student's ability to memorize facts rather than upon the ability to "think" things through.
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