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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

I. INTRODUCTION

In the more highly developed and industrialized nations throughout the world, education is not only becoming the major vehicle of status and economic opportunity, but a necessity for these societies and their citizens. Without a high school diploma, the individual finds it almost impossible to gain successful entry into the occupational system and society as a whole.¹ Based on the fact that there was ample opportunity in the economy for unskilled workers with a minimum of education, school systems traditionally have been selective. This has changed. Large sprawling urban industrial complexes are requiring its citizens to be literate, responsive to rapid change, and able to learn new ideas and skills quickly and repeatedly. These same citizens are raising their levels of aspiration, asking for a larger share in the affluence of the society, demanding the education that will fulfill these aspirations, and pressuring the

governments to be more responsive to their demands and desires.²

At the same time, various technological advances urging individuals and societies to change ever more rapidly cause the rate of change to become as great a problem as change itself. Additionally, the electronic age and the techniques of the mass media may be having a greater influence on shaping the thinking, attitudes, and behavior of man and his institutions than most people realize.³

Interwoven and underlying these sociological and technological changes is an insistence on personal integrity and freedom, a nagging need for individual identity, and a search for values which will make life more meaningful.⁴

The combination of these technological, sociological, and psychological forces is tearing at the very fabric of our society causing emotional upheaval in individuals, breakdown in communication among people, and placing great pressures and demands on our educational system.⁵


While it is difficult to predict specifically how the educational institutions will be shaped during the next decade, it is likely that almost all the students in the more highly developed countries will need to complete secondary education. Educational institutions will probably shift from status giving and selective systems to systems designed to help each individual develop to his highest potential. Gardner states, "What we must reach for is a conception of perceptual self-discovery, perceptual reshaping to realize one's best self, to be the person one could be." It seems a greater emphasis will be placed on the higher thinking processes of problem-solving rather than memorization and on the basic ideas, structures, and methods of inquiry—an emphasis on how to learn rather than

---

6 Bloom, Davis and Hess, op. cit.
8 Gardner, op. cit.
9 Glasser, 1969, op. cit.
what to learn.\textsuperscript{11} The development of these teaching methods should not only facilitate the learning experiences of students, but they should be done in a way which respects the learner's personal integrity and his capacity to form independent judgments.\textsuperscript{12}

One of the most difficult and complex problems facing educators today is that of enhancing the learning potential of children who live in the poverty ridden, central areas of our large metropolitan cities.\textsuperscript{13}

Among the several school programs attempting to solve the educational problems in the inner city is one called Schools Without Failure.\textsuperscript{14}

One of the basic objectives of this program is to encourage the development of individual or internal responsibility i.e. the degree to which one believes that he rather than someone or something else is primarily responsible for his successes and failures. The Coleman Report\textsuperscript{15} found

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13}Glasser, 1969, \textit{op. cit.}
  \item \textsuperscript{14}Glasser, 1969, \textit{op. cit.}
\end{itemize}
that school achievement among minority children was better predicted by this variable than by any other attitudinal, familial, school and teacher variable studied.

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the effects of a Schools Without Failure program\textsuperscript{16} on the culturally deprived Black child's belief of internal-external control or the child's belief in self-responsibility versus powerlessness.\textsuperscript{17}

The study also attempted to evaluate the program's effect on self esteem and classroom behavior.

Two inner city elementary schools were used in this study. The schools, coming from the same attendance area, were matched according to pertinent socio-economic, ethnic and academic characteristics.

School I, the treatment school, located in the central city area of the Los Angeles City School District, has

\textsuperscript{16}Glasser, 1969, \textit{op. cit.}

been designated by the federal government as a poverty school eligible for special funds provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

School II, the control school, also located in the central city area of the Los Angeles City School District, has been designated by the federal government as a poverty school eligible for special funds provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Importance of the Study

Society's concern over improving the learning skills and attitudes of school children, particularly those attending urban or central city schools located in poverty areas, is well documented. The concern has been so great that various sources have offered substantial financial support to these schools only to have the results fall short of

expectations. Jensen\textsuperscript{19} suggests that applying more of the
same to compensatory education may not be helpful. Faced
with the condition of poverty, increasing demands and ex-
pectations, and changing values, educators and the public
alike have turned to the behavioral sciences for suggestions.

The behavioral scientists have recognized that the
everyday learning situation confronting the children who
attend these schools is varied and numerous ranging from
tasks the child can easily handle to tasks requiring all of
his intellectual capacities. Locus of control, self-concept,
achievement motivation, and task mastery are important inte-
gral aspects of young children's intellectual growth. Many
of these experts agree with the Coleman Report's\textsuperscript{20} conclusion
that one's belief in individual responsibility is important
to the pupil's success in school.\textsuperscript{21} It seems probable that

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] Arthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and
Scholastic Achievement?" \textit{Harvard Educational Review}, 39:108,
Winter, 1969.
\item[20] Coleman, op. cit.
\item[21] A. R. Cellura, "Internality as a Determinant of
Academic Achievement in Low SES Adolescents" (unpublished
manuscript, University of Rochester, 1963); J. E. Chance,
"Internal Control of Reinforcements and the School Learning
Process" (paper given at Society for Research in Child De-
velopment, Minneapolis, 1965); and V. J. Crandall, W. Kat-
kovsky and A. Preston, "Motivational and Ability Determinants
of Young Children's Intellectual Achievement Behaviors,"
\end{footnotes}
the child with a heightened belief that he rather than someone else is primarily responsible for his successes and failures in school will take more initiative, show greater effort, and persist longer on learning tasks. The question is no longer how to remediate school maladjustment and learning disabilities, but rather how to provide conditions early in the regular classroom that tend to develop those abilities and capacities which enable the pupil to function effectively on learning tasks—an emphasis on the positive, constructive, and developmental aspects of personality. More knowledge is needed about these variables and how they can be enhanced within the poverty school setting.

This study focuses on an innovative school program suggesting significant changes in educational philosophy, psychology, and methods which can be applied within the realistic limitations of most elementary school classrooms by the regular class teacher. In so far as this researcher can determine, there has been little or no investigation made relating to the effectiveness of Schools Without Failure—Reality Therapy programs. Perhaps this study may provide more thorough solutions to learning problems resulting from poverty. If so, the effort will be important, rewarding and challenging.
III. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

This study was based upon the following assumptions and limitations:

Assumptions

1. Human development to its fullest potential is not only important to those individuals living in a democratic industrialized society, but of major importance to the ongoing development of that society. For these societies and individuals, education is neither a luxury nor a privilege—it is a necessity. Tyler, 22 citing Bureau of Labor statistics, comments: "... not only is a high school education essential for most employment, but the percentage of jobs requiring persons with a college education is increasing at a rapid rate." An educational system upholding a philosophy, machinery, and expectation that its job is to pass some pupils and fail others causes some children early in their lives to develop a failure identity, 23 sets up an expectation in others that these children are unable to be successful in school, 24 and prevents these children from having much hope that they will be able to enter society as responsible adults and operate successfully. Advertisements on television, radio, movies, billboards, magazines, and newspapers consistently remind these people how unfortunate they are. Some, unable to stand the psychological pain accompanying such circumstances, search for ways to relieve the pain. The search frequently leads to serious withdrawal or delinquent behavioral patterns. The children and the society lose.

2. Selective, status-giving, and failure-oriented systems emphasizing the conventional school practices


23 Glasser, 1969, op. cit.

of memorization, measurement and grading based on middle class values and norms are, in themselves, detrimental to the learning potential of children living in poverty areas.\(^2^5\)

3. Traditionally, educators have attacked learning problems by individual and small group remedial programs, special education classes or individual and small group counseling and guidance. These attempts have not been successful in overcoming the initial differences between poor and more affluent children.

\[\text{... What starts as small measurable differences in the first grade become larger each year. By the end of the sixth year of school, there is a cumulative deficit in the school achievement of the culturally disadvantaged children which shows up most clearly in the tool subjects of reading and arithmetic. But, even in the measures of general intelligence many of these children appear to decline during the period of grade 1 to grade 6. It is this cumulative deficit which must be reversed as early as possible in the culturally deprived child's school career.}\]

What is needed are innovative and effective classroom techniques and programs designed for the regular classroom teacher to reverse the traditional pass or fail philosophy and to prevent or overcome early learning deficiencies in the development of each individual.

4. When children realize the positive cumulative effect of ongoing successful learning experiences in which they have had a personal hand in planning and when they are expected to be increasingly responsible themselves for the solution of social, behavioral, and learning problems within their classrooms and schools, they will tend to become more individually responsible, socially responsible, gain a sense of self-worth and confidence, and become better learners. Continuous failure in the first few years of elementary school seriously affects the child's self

\[^2^5\text{Glasser, 1969, op. cit.}\]

\[^2^6\text{Bloom, Davis and Hess, op. cit.}\]
concept and his attitude towards others, diminishes his interest in school learning, increases the probability of his dropping out of school, and significantly harms his future life.27 When children cannot successfully complete specific curricular tasks, their frustrations frequently cause them to become apathetic or rebellious in the classroom. One study showed deprived second grade children to have marked decrease in initiative, concentration, responsiveness to adult teachers and effectiveness of work habits as compared with their behavior a year earlier.28

5. The opportunity to participate verbally in ongoing classroom discussions should contribute to the development of the child's language skills. Language seems to be intimately related to perception, thought, and behavior.29 Research shows deprived children


are poorly prepared to deal with language as it is used in the school or as an aid in conceptualizing the world. As a result they have great difficulty in "learning to learn" and therefore not adequately prepared for the usual school curriculum.

6. Intelligence is not fixed nor development completely determined. Varied experiences with looking, listening, and talking play a most important part in intellectual and general development leading current experts to suggest that even anatomical structures of the central nervous system are affected in their development and function by these experiences. Predetermined maturation, based on the idea that the individual shows in summary form the development of the species, (biological recapitulation) is not the exclusive director of general organism development.


31Harlow, op. cit.


Learning is of considerable consequence. 34

7. In considering the development of motivation to learn, this study assumes that the traditional concepts of motivation which include painful stimulation, homeostatic need, or the drives based on these are not complete. Thinking or informational processing and taking action based on one's own thinking is intrinsically rewarding. 35

8. The opportunity for students to teach others not only improves the learning experience of those taught, but also improves the learning ability of those who teach. Teaching is one of the best learning experiences and methods. Creating situations in which reluctant and able learners have an opportunity to teach (to teach even those tasks with which they are having trouble learning) should aid their progress in school. 36


35 Hunt, op. cit.

9. Heterogeneous, rather than homogeneous, classroom grouping is more valuable in providing poor learners an opportunity to model after the behavior of the pupils who are more successful. Homogeneous grouping of children with learning problems severely limits the ability\(^{37}\) of the slow learner to learn more successful behavioral patterns.

10. The findings from this study make a significant contribution to knowledge because it applied the theory and methods from Reality Therapy and Schools Without Failure programs to a remedial or rehabilitative problem in a public school regular classroom setting, testing a school procedure for a given educational disability.

11. That the total milieu of environmental conditions and influences upon the subjects outside of the classroom situation would remain stationary and not materially change the self-concept or locus of control of the subjects.

12. The instruments selected for measuring self-concept and locus of control do indeed measure what they purport to measure.

13. The authorities cited for definitions were adequate as being responsible experts.

14. This study was not concerned with academic achievement per se. It was assumed that the student's general rate of academic growth would remain constant.

15. The teachers would not substantially change their method of instruction due to their participation in a research project.

Limitations

The limitations upon which this study was based were:

1. Those set by the specification that the subjects in the study would be limited to third and sixth grade

Black pupils attending federally designated poverty schools within the Los Angeles City School District.

2. Those inherent in the nature and scope of the various instruments used for measuring the locus of control and self-concept of the pupils.

3. Those inherent in the nature and scope of recording the pupil's classroom behavior by four different observers.

4. Those inherent differences existing between how a pupil responds to a questionnaire, how he sees himself, and how he behaves.

5. Those caused by the unintentional expectancies and biases of the researcher, test administrators, and observers.

6. Those caused by the effects of an impending teachers' strike because of severe fiscal difficulties in the school district.

IV. HYPOTHESES

1. School I, the Schools Without Failure\(^\text{38}\) program based on Reality Therapy\(^\text{39}\) will show significantly greater positive effect than School II, the control school, on the criterion measures observed following the treatment period.

2. Since girls tend to do better in school than boys\(^\text{40}\), Black elementary girls attending school in a poverty area will show significantly greater gains in internal

\(^{38}\)Glasser, 1969, op. cit.

\(^{39}\)Glasser, 1965, op. cit.

locus of control than will boys from the same population.

3. Black elementary girls attending school in a poverty area will show greater gains in self-concept than will boys from the same population.

4. One study shows internal control to be well established in childhood and increases little between the third and twelfth grade. Another suggests age to be a general factor in the development of internal responsibility. In terms of reflecting the effects of Schools Without Failure, it is predicted that younger children will show significantly greater gains in internalizing locus of control than will older children.

5. The foundations of self-concept are well-established in the early years of life. One authority suggests the first year of life to be the most important to


42 Crandall, Katkovsky, and Crandall, op. cit.


44 Glasser, 1969, op. cit.

the formation of self-concept. For this study, third grade children will make greater gains in self-concept than will sixth graders.

Since the initial phases and primary purpose of the Schools Without Failure program at the Miramonte School is to effect internal locus of control and not necessarily self-concept, the correlation coefficients between the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR) questionnaire results and those of the Sears Self-Concept Inventory (SSCI) will be higher prior to treatment than after.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Schools Without Failure: A school program based on Reality Therapy. Schools Without Failure programs are being developed and coordinated by the Educator Training Center, a division of the Institute for Reality Therapy.

2. The Institute for Reality Therapy: A non-profit tax-exempt foundation for the improvement of the behavioral sciences and education.

3. Reality Therapy: A system of psychotherapy developed by William Glasser, M.D. A more thorough explanation can be found on page 90 of this report.


5. Internal Locus of Control: A generalized expectancy that the attainment of one's goals is contingent upon

46 Ibid.

47 Glasser, 1969, op. cit.

48 Glasser, 1965, op. cit.

one's behavioral effectiveness. 50

6. External Locus of Control: A generalized expectancy that goal attainment and behavioral outcomes are determined by events independent of oneself i.e. luck, fate, or powerful others. 51

7. Self-Concept: The highest value held by the individual. The basic dimension for assessment of individual behavior. Jersild describes self-concept as, "... a composite of thoughts and feelings which constitute a person's awareness of his individual existence, his conclusion of who and what he is." 52

---


51 Ibid.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In Chapter I several professional references were cited relating to the urban school situation, the Black pupil, locus of control, self-concept, and learning. This chapter will serve to give a more detailed and extended review of those areas. The chapter includes the following seven subjects: I. Urban Schools and the Cumulative Deficit, II. The Behavioral Sciences and Group Process, III. The Black Pupil, IV. Locus of Control, V. Self-Concept, VI. Schools Without Failure Concepts, and VII. Research on Reality Therapy.

I. URBAN SCHOOLS AND THE CUMULATIVE DEFICIT

Conventional elementary school practices are not successful in overcoming the initial differences between culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged children. Traditional philosophy, expectations, methods, and materials do not help the culturally deprived child acquire the academic skills necessary to live in a complex industrial society.

Most teachers begin the school year expecting that one-third of the pupils will learn a great deal of what he has to teach, one-third will learn an average amount, and
one-third will just get by or fail. These expectations are supported by school grading policies and practices, are communicated to the pupils through classroom grading, methods and materials, and create a system seriously affected by a self-fulfilling prophecy.¹

Commenting on this state of affairs in school, Bloom draws a depressing picture:

This set of expectations, which fixes the academic goals of teachers and students, is the most wasteful and destructive aspect of the present educational system. It reduces the aspirations of both teachers and students; it reduces motivation for learning in students; and it systematically destroys the ego and self-concept of a sizable group of students who are legally required to attend school for 10 to 12 years under conditions which are frustrating and humiliating year after year. The cost of this system in reducing opportunities for further learning and in alienating youth from both school and society is so great that no society can tolerate it for long.²

What starts as a small measurable difference in the first grade becomes larger each year. This cumulative deficiency must be stopped as early as possible in the child's

²Ibid.
school career. If this reversal does not occur the child continues to suffer frustration and failure, is rarely rewarded, and meets with increasing disapproval each year. The teacher becomes frustrated, frequently blaming the children or their parents rather than focusing on the central problems—educational philosophy, curriculum, and methods of instruction.

As Deutsch comments:

The thesis here is that the lower class child enters the school situation so poorly prepared to produce what the school demands that initial failures are almost inevitable, and the school experience becomes negatively rather than positively reinforced. 4

If the elementary school years are not successful or satisfying, the child's interest in learning is stunted; his dropout status is increased, and his later educational and vocational life is jeopardized. 5 Young people are finding


it increasingly difficult to gain employment without completing the requirements for a high school diploma. "Less than half of U.S. employers will even consider hiring a high school dropout. Furthermore, the dropout, if hired, is the first fired, is the lowest paid, and has the least chance for advancement."6

Perhaps of more importance is the effect of continuous failure on the child's sense of self-worth and his attitude toward others.7 Erikson says the child's...

danger, at this stage, lies in a sense of inadequacy and inferiority. If he despairs of his tools and skills or his status among his tool partners, his ego boundaries suffer, and he abandons hope for the ability to identify early with others who apply themselves to the same general sections of the tool world... Many a child's development is disrupted when family life may not have prepared him for school life, or when school life may fail to sustain the promises of the earlier stages.6

Success gives one courage to attempt more and more


complex tasks—failure does not.

II. THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND GROUP PROCESS

Since the effect of poverty on learning is one of the most difficult and complex problems the teacher faces in the learning situation today, the behavioral sciences, in the form of psychological, counseling, and guidance services are increasingly being called upon by parents, administrators and teachers to help. Whether these services are effective is difficult to answer. Isaksen\(^9\) while pointing out the difficulties in measuring guidance services suggests the great need for research and evaluation in this field. Other writers also note that little clear-cut evidence has been accumulated in spite of the many studies done.\(^10\)

Maes\(^11\) suggests that the guidance worker is faced with clientele in such numbers that using large segments of his time for individual counseling often becomes impractical.

---


He also notes that learnings can take place in group processes which are more difficult to achieve in individual counseling.

Although many studies on the effectiveness of group sessions were found in the literature, none were described as being of regular classroom size (25-35 pupils); scheduled each day in the classroom as part of the curriculum, or directed by the classroom teacher as recommended by Glasser.\(^\text{12}\)

Lodato, Sokoloff, and Schwartz\(^\text{13}\) in an experiment were able to modify the attitudes of slow learners within the third to junior high grade levels. They assigned the slow learners to six groups that met from three to five times a week for a period of one year. Activities for the group included pantomime, role playing, psychodrama, structured and unstructured discussions, puppetry, and individual counseling. Positive changes were found in attitude toward learning and authority figures. Increases in self-concept, improved attendance records, satisfactory integration of many of the students into regular classes, and increased tolerance, insight and understanding of these students by


Daane and McGreevy\(^{14}\) suggest that behavioral deficiencies are the major assignment of counseling and psychological services. Several writers have defined counseling as a learning situation which deliberately attempts to promote changes in behavior and indicate the "behavioral" approach to counseling is both an efficient and effective means of assisting pupils to attain the behavioral changes they desire.\(^{15}\) Thompson\(^{16}\) indicated new ideas that are effective in terms of their goals are needed in developing elementary guidance. Blocher\(^{17}\) suggests that organizing existing knowledge and generating new knowledge about effective coping behavior can extend guidance services into new and relatively unexplored areas. Krumboltz\(^{18}\) indicates the literature is sadly lacking in specific techniques or procedures.

---


that will lead to specific outcomes with known degrees of probability.

Benson and Blocher\(^{19}\) found that one fifty-five minute group counseling session per week over 18 weeks showed significant gains for high school students in academic grades and feelings of adequacy of coping.

When a child is better able to deal with his environment psychological growth is promoted and adjustment is enhanced.\(^{20}\)

Since most learning problems are of a long term nature,\(^{21}\) Dillon\(^{22}\) recommended that guidance services be provided at the elementary school level because many dropouts have the intellectual ability to profit from a full school program. There seems to be considerable agreement that improved learning experiences for elementary school children would ward off many difficult consequences in later life.\(^{23}\)


\(^{23}\)Maes, op. cit., p. 21.
III. THE BLACK PUPIL

As Chapter I and the first part of this chapter indicate, the educational problems of the inner city are immense. Forty to seventy per cent of the school population in our twenty largest cities is made up of children from the most marginal economic and social circumstances. Most of these children are black. By the time these inner city children reach junior high school, sixty per cent are retarded in reading by one to four years.24

The Negro has been systematically barred from skilled or white collar jobs, politically disfranchised, and forced to attend segregated schools with inferior educational opportunities. The oppression and subordination of the Negro over the last 100 years has been stifling resulting in severe and crippling handicaps for the families of Black children.25

In a special issue entitled Black America, 1970, Time included the following economic situation report:

The economic gap between white and black is still tremendous, but it is narrowing. Negro median family income rose from 54% as much as white income in 1965


25Bloom, Davis and Hess, op. cit.
to 60% in 1968. The difference is less dramatic if the South, where half the blacks still live, is excluded. In the North Central and Western states, black family income runs 75% to 80% as high as white income.

The number of Negro families existing below the poverty level (33,553 for a nonfarm family of four) dropped from 48% in 1959 to 29% in 1968. Poverty depends partly on whether there is a man around the house. During the 1959-68 period, the number of non-white "poverty" families headed by men declined from 1,452,000 to 697,000, but those headed by women rose from 633,000 to 734,000. The number of black families with incomes of $8,000 or more tripled in the 1950s and nearly tripled again in the 1960s.

But blacks' wages tend to run much lower than whites'. The Negro who completes four years of high school earns less than the white who finishes only eight years of elementary school. The black with four years of college has a median income of $7,754--or less than the $8,154 earned by the white who has only four years of high school. "Under-employment"—work in seasonal or part-time jobs—is more common than for whites. Result: a black family often has to have two or more workers to earn as much as a white family with one member at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$5,359</td>
<td>$8,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below $5,000 a year</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 and above</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 and above</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$1,348</td>
<td>$2,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Overall</td>
<td>7.0%*</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Feb. '70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Among Married Men</td>
<td>2.5%*</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Feb. '70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Among Teen-Agers (Feb. '70)</td>
<td>25.3%*</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Welfare</td>
<td>16%*</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Professional Workers (doctors, lawyers, teachers, etc.)</td>
<td>692,000*</td>
<td>10,031,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Professional Jobs in 1960s</td>
<td>109%*</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Workers</td>
<td>254,000*</td>
<td>7,721,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Managerial Jobs in 1960s</td>
<td>43%*</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed (nonfarm)</td>
<td>293,000*</td>
<td>4,964,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership &amp; Ins. Coverage</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Home</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Car</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Black-and-White TV</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Color TV</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Insurance Coverage</td>
<td>$2,750*</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all "nonwhites"—Americans of Indian, Chinese, Japanese and other origins, as well as blacks, who make up about 92% of the total. 26

The depressed economic situation makes it difficult for the Black family members to seek the long range goals of education. Their primary interests are on a week to week or, at most, a month to month basis. Parental interest in education is low, reading in the home is not emphasized, and books, magazines and various reading materials are lacking. 27

In its situation report on education Time reports:

GRADE SCHOOL. Only 58% of black school children complete the eighth grade, as against 73% of their white classmates.

HIGH SCHOOL. About 40% of black teen-agers finish high school, compared with 62% of whites.

COLLEGE. Black enrollment has almost doubled since 1964, but the relative black total has barely changed: only 6.4% of U.S. undergraduates are black, compared with 5% in 1964. They number 434,000; almost half attend black colleges, mainly in the South. At major integrated universities, perhaps 3 out of 100 students are black.

GRADUATE SCHOOL. Blacks account for an estimated 1% of doctoral candidates (most of them in education), less than 3% of law students and 3% of medical students.

---


27 Bloom, Davis and Hess, op. cit.
TEACHING. Though 10% of public school teachers are black, few become administrators. In New York City, where 32% of students are black, the school system has 24 black principals—out of 893. In 1968, blacks constituted less than 1% of the faculties at 80 public universities. One major predominantly white university (Michigan State) has a black president.

INTEGRATION. Almost 40% of the South's black children now attend partly integrated schools, compared with only about 1% in 1964. Even so, three-quarters of Southern black pupils still attend schools that are at least 95% black. Outside the South, the proportion is nearly 1 out of 2.

PAYOFF. Black educational achievement does not lead to equal income. In 1968, white males who completed grade school earned more ($6,452) than blacks who completed high school ($5,801). White high school graduates earned more than blacks with four or more years of college.28 Of 849 anthropologists, psychologists and sociologists interested in the psychological effects of segregation, 90% felt that the segregated group suffered harmful effects. Eighty-three per cent felt that the group enforcing the segregation also was harmed.29 The author went on to say "... the value of living in a society can be gained only through full participation by the individual. Conversely, the society's values can be obtained only through the full participation of all members."30


30 Deutscher, op. cit., p. 283.
Several researchers have attempted to describe the inner city child.

Malone in observing nursery school age culturally deprived children listed the following:

1. They seem driven by tension (agile, yet they fall a lot).
2. Explorations of their environment are based on repetition.
3. Child to child contact is based on imitation.
4. They manifest low self-esteem, and a marked self devaluation.
5. Their mode of reinforcement finds them responding to the cues of others.
6. They seem unresponsive to attractive displays.
7. Because of their delayed cognitive development, they lack abstract thought.31

Another list compared the school advantages of middle class and lower class children:

1. Parents of middle class children are better educated. Therefore, they are more capable of helping their children with school work.
2. Middle class parents make school work more meaningful by indicating occupational applications of school subjects.
3. The middle class child acquires more verbal skills from his early training which better prepares him for the type of activities that go on in school.

4. Parents, friends and neighbors reinforce the middle class child's motivation for school success and increase the probability of a good school adjustment.32

Deutsch33 described learning problems of the disadvantaged child:

1. Because of initial failures, the school experience becomes negatively reinforced.

2. If a child is deprived of the variety of stimuli he is maturationally ready for, he will be deficient in learning development.

3. The more variation of experiences with which he has coped, the greater the capacity for coping. Essentially, one learns how to learn.

4. Segments of stimuli are less ordered in the environment of the poor and therefore contribute less to cognitive development.

5. The culturally deprived child is deficit in experience age not necessarily mental age.

6. Children from poverty backgrounds need educational experiences in word sequences.

7. Opportunities for varied verbal experiences on a routine and regular basis is needed for these children.

The culturally deprived child is deficit in auditory


attention and interpretation skills\textsuperscript{34} yet he has to rely on what he hears for learning without the encouragement to verbalize and without getting much feedback from interested others.\textsuperscript{35} The same authors suggest that speech is culturally determined, related to status, and acquired through interaction with more verbally mature speakers.\textsuperscript{36}

Raph adds that the children from poverty areas not only hear less speech, particularly that which is directed toward them, but what they hear is apt to be meager, restricted in vocabulary, repetitive and routine.\textsuperscript{37}

Using the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistics, Weaver found culturally disadvantaged children showing relative strength in the visual-motor channels as compared to a relative deficit in the auditory-vocal channels. The children utilized channels in the following order (1) Visual, (2) ...


\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.

Motor, (3) Vocal, (4) Auditory.  

John found that lower class children can enumerate what they see in a picture, but when compared with middle class children they are not as good at integrating (titling).  

Ego development among segregated black children does not follow a normal path. These children, as they move from primary status, resist identifying with their racial group and have difficulty identifying with their parents. This inability to obtain either primary or derived status leads to ego deflation. As a result, these children become dependent on an unsupervised peer group for their sense of status.

One author, after completing a three-year research project on social, personal and achievement variables in Negro poverty children, summed up with the conclusion: "The lower class minority group child lives in a milieu which


fosters self doubt and social confusion, which in turn serves substantially to lower motivation and makes it difficult to structure experience into cognitively meaningful activity and aspirations."41

IV. LOCUS OF CONTROL

Throughout this paper inference has been made that our highly industrialized urban society can no longer invest a great deal more in the prediction and selection of talent. Rather, it must invest in the development of all talent. Completion of secondary or advanced education is no longer for the few but for the many. Investment in the education of humans may pay off at a greater rate than investment in capital.42

Bloom commenting on this investment and the importance of successful learning experiences offers the following remarks:

"... The basic problem is to determine how the largest proportion of the age group can learn effectively those skills and subject matter regarded as essential for our own development in a complex society. ..."


we may express our concern for the intellectual and personality consequences of lack of clear success in the learning tasks of school. Increasingly, learning throughout life (continuing learning) will be necessary for the largest proportion of the work force. If school learning is regarded as frustrating and even impossible by the sizable proportion of students, then little can be done at later levels to kindle a genuine interest in further learning. School learning must be successful and rewarding on one basis for insuring that learning can continue throughout one's life as needed.\textsuperscript{43}

Learning how to master a task is a major education objective\textsuperscript{44} which has considerable effect on cognitive and affective consequences.\textsuperscript{45}

The construct, internal-external locus of control, is closely linked to strategies of mastery. Lefcourt,\textsuperscript{46} who recently made a summary of research concerning this


\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Bloom, op. cit.}

construct, advises:

Under various rubrics, and from diverse orientations, investigators have concerned themselves repeatedly with man's ability to control his personal environment. Concepts such as competence, helplessness, hopelessness, mastery, and alienation have all been utilized in one way or another to describe the degree to which an individual is able to control the important events occurring in his life space.

Lefcourt goes on to say that Freud's one time associate, psychiatrist Alfred Adler, is the theorist who has written the most extensively in the mastery area. White's concept of competence and effectance is similar to Adler's idea of man's "striving for superiority." Reality Therapy is also concerned with these ideas.

In studying animals, Richter concluded that the loss of hope caused severe apathy and eventual death. Another researcher found that a "fear from a sense of helplessness" seriously affected the eating habits in rats.

---

47Ibid.
As part of his social learning theory, Rotter sees the locus of control construct as a generalized expectancy related to the power the individual believes he has over what happens to him.

Lefcourt describes the construct as:

Internal control refers to the perception of positive and/or negative events as being a consequence of one's own actions and thereby under personal control; external control refers to the perception of positive and/or negative events as being unrelated to one's own behaviors in certain situations and therefore beyond personal control.

Phares developed a 13 item scale in what was the first attempt to measure internal-external control of reinforcement as a personality variable. After dividing his subjects into two groups, one group received the instruction that skill was primarily responsible for success, the other group was told that chance played the biggest part. Phares concluded that "categorizing a situation as skill leads the subject to use the results of his past performance in formulating expectancies for future performances."

---


James increased the length of the Phares scale to study its relationship with the Incomplete Sentence Blank Personal Adjustment Test. A significant correlation was found: Additional research using the Phares-James revised scale has found that external responsibility beliefs are correlated with defensive and maladaptive level of aspiration behaviors; appears more with schizophrenics than with normal people; and correlates highly with the California P Scale Scores which measures the degree to which individuals see the world as containing powerful forces that they cannot influence.

56 J. James, "Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcements as a Basic Variable in Learning Theory" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1957).


Research studies also suggest internal locus of control is related to demographic variables, attitudes and
behaviors of children.65

Katkovsky, Crandall and Good66 in studying internal control and parent child relationships found warm, praising, protective and supportive characteristics in parents positively related to internal control. However, in the same study especially affectionate and nurturant fathers encouraged their daughters to believe less that they had caused their own failures.

Other studies suggest subjects with high externality show a greater tendency to conform;67 tend to take more risks;68 frequently belong to social groups of minimal


68Liverant and Scodel, op. cit.
power, may be doubtful about their personal efficacy; have a lower need to achieve; and are more anxious and frustrated with guilt and self-accusatory gestures that detract from problem solving.

Several studies anticipating a high relationship between locus of control and learning and achievement have been done. These studies have found that pupil's belief of his internal-external locus of control of reinforcements predicts how well he will perform on academic tasks in


71Odell, op. cit.

school.73

The study done in 1962 by Crandall, Katkovsky and Preston74 attempted to examine how well the belief of internal responsibility would predict achievement competence and behaviors in children while they were engaged in academic tasks. Individual responsibility was found to be related to the amount of time lower elementary grade boys spent on academic tasks during free play ($r = .70$). Additionally, a correlation was done between the intensity with which the boys were striving on the tasks and self-responsibility. The results were significant ($r = .66$). Significant results for boys were found but not for girls. Correlation results with girls were not significant.

Boys also scored higher on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, ($4 = .52$, $p > .05$), arithmetic achievement tests ($r = .38$, $p > .10$), and reading achievement tests ($r =

---


74 Crandall, Katkovsky and Preston, op. cit.
Although Cellura\textsuperscript{75} found similar differences between boys and girls, Chance\textsuperscript{76} found a significant relationship between internal responsibility and arithmetic, reading and spelling scores for both boys and girls attending third through seventh grades. In Cellura's\textsuperscript{77} study boys' arithmetic achievement scores related positively with internal locus of control scores, but no relationship was found for girls.

Two separate studies reported by McGhee and Crandall\textsuperscript{78} dealt with internal-external control of reinforcements and academic performance as measured by course grades and achievement test scores. The subjects in each study ranged between elementary through high school.

The authors summarize:

While prediction of girls' performance scores was equally consistent from beliefs in their own instrumentality for successes and for failures, boys' performance scores were more consistently related to beliefs in responsibility for failure. In general, there was greater consistency of prediction across age levels for grades received than for achievement

\textsuperscript{75}Cellura, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{76}Chance, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{77}Cellura, op. cit.
test scores. 79

Crandall and Rabson's 80 study agreed with Rosenzweig's 81 research in which he found older children more frequently preferred returning to, and attempting to master previously failed tasks while girls were more apt to prefer repeating previously successful experiences. 82 Boys were also more dependent on others for help than girls and withdrew from threatening situations less.

The major study reported by Coleman et al. 83 mentioned earlier in Chapter I of this study involved a nationwide sample of white and non-white pupils in grades 6, 9 and 12. Internal responsibility accounted for more of the variance of the non-whites' achievement test scores than any other attitudinal, school, teacher, and familial variables studied. For white children internality was found to rank second in predicting achievement test scores.

Several studies have demonstrated that Negroes in the United States tend to possess greater externality than whites.

79 McGhee and Crandall, op. cit.
80 Crandall and Rabson, op. cit.
81 Rosenzweig, op. cit.
82 Crandall and Rabson, op. cit.
83 Coleman et al, op. cit.
Using the children's Picture Test of Internal-External Control, Battle and Rotter\textsuperscript{34} found lower class Negroes to be significantly more external than lower class whites or middleclass Negroes and whites. They also found that children with high external beliefs expected to succeed significantly less on a line matching test.

Another investigation using prison inmates successfully predicted higher external control expectancies among Negroes than among white inmates on six different measures.\textsuperscript{85}

Gore and Rotter's study\textsuperscript{86} which has been replicated by Strickland\textsuperscript{87} found Negroes with a high degree of individual responsibility were more able to commit themselves to behavior for social change than Negroes with a low degree of internality.

It is interesting to note that Lefcourt\textsuperscript{88} found

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34}Battle and Rotter, op. cit.
  \item \textsuperscript{86}Gore and Rotter, op. cit., p. 58-64.
\end{itemize}
Negroes to be generally less risk taking than whites. This was interpreted by the investigator as the... Negroes' disbelief that achievement in self-evaluative, skill demanding tasks is controllable. Success in externally controlled situations (luck or fate-determined) seems more controllable for the Negro who believes that goals derived through achievement will be denied him regardless of his efforts, while externally controlled goals are, at least, obtained fairly.

In another study Negroes continued to meet a competitive challenge with whites if they maintained expectancies other than those for themselves as Negroes.89

Lefcourt90 in this review of the research on internal-external control has this to say about the reported ethnic studies:

In all of the reported ethnic studies, groups whose social position is one of minimal power either by class or race tend to score higher in the external-control direction. Within the racial groupings, class interacts so that the double handicap of lower-class and "lower caste" seems to produce persons with the highest expectancy of external control. Perhaps the apathy and what is often described as lower-class lack of motivation to achieve may be explained as a result of the disbelief that effort pays off. In short, the "oppressed" groups can be described as analogous to Mowrer's rats whose "fear of fear" led

---


to nonsurvival behavior. Bettelheim\textsuperscript{91} discussed an analogous accommodation to decreased opportunity in Nazi concentration camps. He found that prisoners ceased to be active and responsible "subjects" and became passive, irresponsible, and childlike "objects" under such oppressive conditions.

In the foregoing research internal-external locus of control has been found to be useful in predicting different social behaviors, learning performances, and achievement related activities, but more investigation is needed. Lefcourt in summing up his summary of research concerning locus of control concludes:

Despite the leads from these research reports, little has been reported on how internal- or external-control expectancies become generalized across differing situations. Work needs to be done on specific antecedents of internal- and external-control orientations, and on the factors leading to the generalization of these orientations. In addition, the breakdown of external-control expectancies assumes more than a theoretical interest when programs are currently being devised by governmental agencies seeking to ameliorate problems of poverty and racial barriers, the very problems which seem to generate external-control orientations and their concomitants of apathy and lack of goal-striving behavior.\textsuperscript{92}

V. SELF-CONCEPT

Identity or concept of the self is important to the


theoretical underpinnings of Reality Therapy and Schools Without Failure programs. 93

Jersild94 notes that, "The self is a composite of thoughts and feelings which constitute a person's awareness of his individual existence, his conception of who and what he is." Others have added that the self is: "The organization of all that seems to the individual to be "I" of "me". It is what an individual believes about himself; the totality of his ways of seeing himself."95 Mead96 influenced by Cooley's interrelationship theory stressed the importance of considering the individual and the social order together as they relate to the emergence of self-concept.

The child is not born with a concept of himself. His self identity is affected by growth and experience.97 The child develops his identity primarily in relation to how


important and significant people in his life treat him.98

Once the child forms his identity his major concern and primary motivation is to keep that self intact. If one believes that he is a failure and incapable of learning he will adhere to all perceptions that bolster this picture of himself and refuse to accept ideas or perceptions to the contrary. The child must be faithful to this picture of himself or be threatened with loss of self.99 Establishing a successful identity is so important to the individual that being a successful failure is a certain kind of success and people do not give that up easily.100

Jersild101 points out:

Whenever a pupil is in a situation where he might learn something which goes against a view of himself to which he is strongly committed, his defenses will come into play, even if such learning might potentially improve his way of life. For this reason, learning something that really makes a difference to oneself, in the sense that there is a revision or change in the self concept, is likely to be painful.


The pupil who has a poor self-concept does not believe that he is protecting something unhealthy. He is safeguarding his concept of himself. The low achieving child sees himself as inadequate, unable to achieve and in need of defending himself in order to maintain his integrity. He may become withdrawn or delinquent but in the area of academic achievement he can be the winner. No one can make him achieve.\textsuperscript{102}

According to Glasser\textsuperscript{103} when children go through the first few grades of elementary school they begin to solidify their identity in one of two possible directions.

They either begin to believe themselves a successful person capable of learning the various tasks the school presents or as a failure oriented person incapable of successfully completing the various tasks.

Even the child who has a relatively good feeling about himself at entrance to school will soon change these ideas of himself if he consistently experiences failure in school.

Self-concept is also related to how one behaves toward others and therefore it is basic to satisfying personal


\textsuperscript{103}Glasser, 1969, \textit{op. cit.}. 
relationships. If one does not feel "O.K.," it is difficult to view others as "O.K." Berne and Harris\textsuperscript{104} in their theory of Structural and Transactional Analysis, describe four "life scripts" that people tend to develop by their behavior in interpersonal relations:

- I'm O.K. \quad \text{---} \quad \text{You're O.K.}
- I'm not O.K. \quad \text{---} \quad \text{You're O.K.}
- I'm O.K. \quad \text{---} \quad \text{You're not O.K.}
- I'm not O.K. \quad \text{---} \quad \text{You're not O.K.}

Karen Horney and Eric Fromm\textsuperscript{105} noted years ago that the person who does not believe himself lovable is unable to love others. Many others have supported this hypothesis.\textsuperscript{106}

A positive self-concept and attitude toward others


is intrinsically related to personality adjustment, general mental health and academic achievement.  

Bodwin investigated the relationship between immature self-concept and reading-arithmetic disabilities. His study included 100 subjects with reading problems, 100 subjects with arithmetic problems and 100 subjects with no education problems. The pupils were from grades 3 and 6 in three elementary schools in Flint, Michigan. The Draw-A-Person test was used to evaluate self-concept. His results showed:

1. A positive significant relationship between self-concept and reading problems; $r = .72$ at 3rd grade, $r = .62$ at 6th grade (both $p > .01$).

2. A positive significant relationship between self-concept and arithmetic problems; $r = .78$ at 3rd grade, $r = .68$ at 6th grade (both $p > .01$).

3. The $r = .60$ between self-concept and median

---


achievement test scores was significantly lower than the r's between either self-concept and reading or self-concept and arithmetic.

4. No significant difference between self-concept and reading versus self-concept and arithmetic.

5. The r's at the third grade level were significantly higher than the r's at the sixth grade level, indicating the influence of age differences.

Lumpkin\textsuperscript{109} studied 50 fifth grade pupils. Half were underachievers in reading, half overachievers. The pupils were matched for chronological age, mental age, sex, and home background. He explored self-concept, teacher perception of child, and peer status. His findings:

1. Overachievers in reading were also better in oral reading, comprehension, vocabulary, arithmetic, language, and work-study skills.

2. Overachievers revealed significantly more positive self-concepts, higher levels of adjustment, and saw themselves as liking reading.

3. Overachievers were viewed positively by both teachers and peers.

4. Underachievers had a negative perception of self, a desire to be different from the self-as-seen, and expressed feelings of conflict more frequently.

5. Underachievers were viewed by the teachers as having a high tendency toward developing problems.

The authors concluded that underachievement contributes to the underachievers negative feelings about himself and the world. The person's self-concept influences his behavior qualitatively and may determine the degree and direction of his expression in academic and social relationships. Achievement stems from intrinsic motivation as well as from environmental responses.

Roth after doing a study on the role of self-concept in achievement suggested that performance in task-oriented situations is influenced directly by the self-concept.

"... in terms of their conception of self, individuals have a definite investment to perform as they do. With all things being equal, those who do not achieve choose not to do so, while those who do achieve choose to do so."

Most experts agree that a negative self-concept

---

indicates stress and tension. The healthy functioning individuals are able to accept their particular and unique human nature with all its assets and liabilities. He knows who he is and is able to be comfortably open and transparent to others allowing for positive relationships. Those who are unsure of themselves or are convinced they are failures tend to shut themselves off from others not allowing to develop the intimate relationship necessary to encourage friendship, love, cooperation and competition.

Jervis, recognizing the significance of the negative self-concept, adds that a highly positive self-concept may suggest a well adjusted individual or a highly defensive one. Some individuals claiming an ideal self may be denying or suppressing undesirable characteristics of their personality and therefore could not be described psychologically healthy.

Most authorities tend to agree that the child is not born with a self-concept, but that it is formed at an early age.


112 Jahoda, op. cit.; Hanlon, op. cit.; and Hofstaetter, op. cit.

113 Jervis, op. cit.
age. \(^\text{114}\) In the beginning years, the child's family members are most significant in the development of self-concept. Later, the teacher looms as a major force in self-concept formation. \(^\text{115}\) Two investigations found that up to 90\% of the pupil's in the studies identified the teacher as a significant other. \(^\text{116}\)

A large majority of research indicates that there is a high correlation between self-concept and academic achievement. Boyko \(^\text{117}\) in reviewing the literature for his doctoral dissertation found only one study that reported no relation--


ship between these variables. Fink \(^{118}\) after investigating self-concept and achievement of high school students, concluded in his summary remarks, "Research evidence rather clearly confirms the hypothesis that a relationship does in fact exist between adequacy of self-concept and level of academic achievement."

VI. SEX DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOL

One of the independent variables with which this investigation is concerned was to determine what effect, if any, the experimental school program will have on boys versus girls. The following is a review of the literature focusing on school differences found between boys and girls.

Using batteries of the California Achievement Test to evaluate the school performance of third, fifth, and eighth grade children in forty-eight states, Clark \(^{119}\) corroborated earlier studies by showing that when differences existed they favored the girls. Northby \(^{120}\) examined the distribution of grade point averages of 12,826 high school


students in Connecticut. The girls not only received higher marks more often than boys, they also received low marks less frequently than boys. Bowman's work\textsuperscript{121} with the Quincy Youth Development Project reported findings similar to those mentioned above. Girls outnumbered boys three to one among the top ten per cent in grade point average. Recent research by Wellington and Wellington\textsuperscript{122} with high school pupils indicated the predominance of boys in the poor performance category. Their findings showed that three-fourths of the poor performers were boys.

Gewirtz and Caron and Gewirtz,\textsuperscript{123} in studies of attention-seeking behavior, found differences between boys and girls which they attributed in part to the sex of the adult who was interacting with the child.


Many authors state that next to the home the school has the most influence upon the life of the elementary school age child; that next to his parents the child's teacher is the most significant adult in his life during his school years.\(^{124}\)

An important implication of these findings is the child's task of sex role identification and the general female orientation of the elementary school in the United States.

Sexton\(^{125}\) likened boys' poor school performance to problems of delinquency and school dropout:

In vastly disproportionate numbers, boys are the maladjusted, the low achievers, the truants, the delinquents, the inattentive, the rebellious. . . . National delinquency rates are five times higher among boys than girls; in New York City 63 per cent of all dropouts are boys. . .

Havighurst and Neugarten\(^{126}\) substantiate this by


emphasizing the fact that wherever delinquency data are available, "boys outnumber girls . . . by a ratio ranging between 4 to 1 and 10 to 1."

Another current source is the dropout study completed in Fresno County, California, in 1965.127 "Boys outnumbered girls, as was generally expected, with the boys comprising fifty-seven per cent of the dropouts." Investigation of cumulative records in these schools revealed that regular failure in school work was a common characteristic of most dropouts and that general academic performance was usually below their potential to succeed. Patterns of failure emerged as early as second or third grade. These patterns were accompanied by truancy and a lack of interest in school.

Miller,128 in his 1963 nation-wide survey of the dropout problem, found that the majority of dropouts were boys and that lack of interest in school was given as the main reason for dropping out.

The findings from these and other investigations emphasize "the dropouts had been in the process of dropping out a long time before the occurrence of the precipitating

127Fresno County Schools, Dropout Study (Fresno, California: Fresno County Schools Office, August, 1965), p. 6.

incident which finally separated them from their school."129

A review of the literature130 clearly indicates that girls consistently make better school records than boys. It would seem that the entire elementary school experience is tailored to produce failure experiences for boys. Any school program with its aim to improve learning problems must consider the serious problems facing boys as they face the experience of what seems to be a female oriented school environment. It will be interesting to note the effect of the Schools Without Failure program on the boys and girls in this study.

VII. SCHOOLS WITHOUT FAILURE CONCEPTS

The Classmeeting--Involved, Relevance, Thinking

Over the years and particularly during the last decade, productive ideas have abounded throughout education without much external change observed in the classroom.131

129 Fresno County Schools, op. cit., p. 21.


Recommendation for change in the educational system must fall within the existing framework of the school. The basic unit of that framework is the classroom where the children and teachers are engaged in the learning process. The classmeeting, proposed as the initial and basic phase of the Schools Without Failure program, is a practical and feasible classroom technique designed to effect certain philosophical and behavioral changes in the classroom where it counts.

Schools Without Failure describes an attempt to extend the psychological concepts and practices of Mental Illness or Mental Health? and Reality Therapy to the educational setting. Theoretically, Reality Therapy suggests that a successful self-concept depends upon successful experiences and the individual's ability to fulfill two basic psychological needs: (1) the need to love and be loved and (2) the need to feel worthwhile toward yourself and others.

The child fulfills these needs in the classroom by being personally and actively involved, participating in learning activities which are known, important and essential to him and his well-being, and having the opportunity to

132 Glasser, 1969, op. cit.

133 Ibid.

think and respond without the fear of reprisal. To Glasser these ideas of involvement, relevance, and thinking are important and basic to education and comprise a major part of the philosophy of Schools Without Failure. He believes the cumulative effect of the classmeeting is one way all three of these ideas can be experienced simultaneously by the teacher and the children. Closely allied to the preceding concepts is Glasser's concern over the detrimental affects of the grading system, based on the normal curve, usually found in public schools.

Most educators are conditioned to the normal distribution. Grading practices are set by the normal distribution, teachers are considered "too easy" or "too hard" by their grading of pupils, children are taught they are "C" students or "F" students by the grading system, and teachers generally believe that only a few pupils are able to learn what is taught.136 Bloom explaining the absurdity of the situation states:

There is nothing sacred about the normal curve. It is the distribution most appropriate to chance and random activity. Education is a purposeful

135 Glasser, 1969, op. cit.
activity and we seek to have the students learn what we have to teach. If we are effective in our instruction, the distribution of achievement should be very different from the normal curve. In fact, we may even insist that our educational efforts have been unsuccessful to the extent to which our distribution of achievement approximates the normal distribution.

With this in mind and considering individual differences of students, Carroll suggests a model on which strategies be developed to enhance the fullest development of the individual.

Bloom gives the following description of the model:

... if the students are normally distributed with respect to aptitude, but the kind and quality of instruction and the amount of time available for learning are made appropriate to the characteristics and needs of each student, the majority of students may be expected to achieve mastery of the subject. And, the relationship between aptitude and achievement should approach zero.

The importance of a positive, authentic and personal relationship between the pupil and teacher was cited by Pearson in the following manner:

As one watches children through their years of growth, one is impressed by the fact that the motive of learning in order to be rewarded by the teacher's love is very important and powerful and continues not only through grade school but also into senior high school and college. . . If, to the child, the

---

138 Carroll, op. cit.
139 Bloom, op. cit., p. 3.
teacher seems to be interested in learning, he, too, must become interested in learning in order to be like the teacher and so be liked by him. . . . The reward which is most gratifying to the child is that of love from the adult whether this be the parent or a professional educator. When the child loves the teacher, he will do anything to please him, even to learning the most uninteresting subject, but he anticipates a real expression of love from the teacher in return, and as long as he gets it, he will continue to learn.

Ryan's observed that "the pupil's like or dislike for his teacher or his school (both of which are elements of the learning situation for the learner) must be considered. . . . It is not uncommon for dislike for the teacher to carry over to dislike for the material and consequently to conflict with the pupil's learning."

It is reasonable to assume that part of the variation in pupil response to educational situations can be attributed to variation in the degrees to which pupils feel they can identify with or imitate their teachers.

Several authors have proposed that children learn to identify during the early years of life and thereafter are inclined to imitate their parents and other people who are 

---


142 Havighurst and Neugarten, op. cit., p. 511.
significant to them.\textsuperscript{143} The selection of models who present behaviors which are appropriate to one's sex is one of the most fundamental aspects of identification, especially between the ages of 9-12 when:

most children. . . put an increasing emphasis on doing what is proper for their own role as a boy or girl. In fact, performing in this way is so much expected and demanded that we list it as a developmental task.\textsuperscript{144}

Cogan\textsuperscript{145} found a significant positive relationship between the amount of self-initiated and required work completed by 987 junior high school pupils and their descriptions of their teachers. Parsons\textsuperscript{146} stated that the pupil


who does well, or who tries to do well in school may be strongly impelled to do so because in identifying with the teacher he tries to please him and takes on the teacher's values about achievement. Sears\textsuperscript{147} designed a study to examine the specific aspects of the school's effect upon fifth and sixth grade children's attitudes, performances, and behaviors. She found a positive relationship between achievement and the pupils' expressed attitude toward school and teachers. Another study\textsuperscript{148} of teacher-pupil relationships clearly indicated that pupil liking for the teacher was highly related to pupil liking for the subject area and to subject-matter achievement. In another investigation of the relationship between teacher behavior and pupil aspiration, liking for the teacher was found to be strongly correlated with expressed desire to conform.\textsuperscript{149} Micali\textsuperscript{150} examined the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{147} P. S. Sears, "The Effect of Classroom Conditions on the Strength of Achievement Motive and Work Output on Elementary School Children" (Stanford, California: Stanford University, Cooperative Research Project No. OE 873, 1963).
  \item \textsuperscript{149} H. Rosenfeld and A. Zander, "The Influence of Teachers on Aspirations of Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, 52:1-11, 1961.
  \item \textsuperscript{150} R. Micali, "A Study of Expressed Attitudes of Sixth Graders Toward Selected Classroom and School Practices and Procedures" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1964).
\end{itemize}
relationship of four variables (ability level, sex, father's educational background, and academic achievement as measured by the California Achievement Test) to the attitudes of 216 sixth grade boys and girls toward school. The results of this investigation suggested that disillusionment with and disapproval of school and teachers may lead to underachievement and dropping out. Micali also suggested that the variables of men teachers as compared to women teachers should be subjected to further study.

The quality of the relationship between the pupil and teacher, although intangible, nevertheless is essential to the learning process and perhaps the most effective reinforcement for learning. The child moves from loving the teacher to love of learning. Glasser observes:

Probably drawing on the teachings of traditional psychiatry, many traditional educators wrongly believe that teachers should not become emotionally involved with their pupils. Both in psychiatry and in school, teachers and therapists too often stand aloof from children; they do not get emotionally involved; they are not warm, personal and interested; they do not reveal themselves as human beings so that the children can identify with them. Thus they fail to alleviate the loneliness of the many children.

---


153 Glasser, 1969, op. cit.
who need human warmth so desperately. Only in a school where teacher and student are involved with each other and equally involved with the curriculum through thinking and problem solving does education flourish, ... an education that prepares students to live successfully in the world.

The relevance of what is taught to the child, a second aspect or concept considered important to the philosophy of Schools Without Failure, has probably been discussed by educational philosophers before the times of Socrates, Comenius, and Pestalozzi. James, 154 1899, suggested beginning with the child's natural interest and offering him objects that have some immediate connection with those interests.

Dewey 155 emphasized that effort is naturally founded on interest. Montessori 156 based much of her educational program on the child's interest. And Thorndike 157 early stated:

The problem of interest in teaching is not whether children shall learn with interest or without it; they never learn without it; but what kind of interest it shall be; and from what the interest was derived.


Glasser\textsuperscript{158} suggests that too much taught in school is not relevant to the world of the children. Additionally, when something is relevant, the fact that it is relevant is not taught. And finally, that most school children consider what they learn in their out of school life is not relevant to school.

A third aspect which the classmeeting provides is the opportunity to talk, listen, and think in the form of a discussion. A discussion which allows for no failure. No matter how the child responds, his response is accepted. The higher thinking processes are emphasized rather than fact memory.\textsuperscript{159} For economically poor children language development with its effects on perception, thought and behavior is essential.\textsuperscript{160} Bloom, Davis, and Hess\textsuperscript{161} comment in this way:

As the child attempts to communicate with others,

\textsuperscript{158}Glasser, 1969, op. cit.


and especially with his parents, he uses a relatively crude and limited language. In many middle-class homes, the child's language is extended by the parent's responses to his statements and questions. In culturally deprived homes, the parent is more likely to respond to the child with a monosyllable or to nod the head without using any words. The point of this is that one major difference between culturally deprived and more advantaged homes is the extension and development of the speech of children. Such differences have become very evident as a result of the studies done in various homes where parents are observed interacting with their children.

As a child develops more complex language, he becomes more able to perceive aspects of his environment, to abstract such aspects and to fix them in his memory, and to gain considerable control over his environment through the use of language. The frequent use of language in relation to his environment and the people in it enables the child to use words and language as tools for thought. Furthermore, the child becomes able to use language to express his own emotions, intentions, and desires. He is able to consider alternatives with regard to his emotions and to develop ways of delaying the gratification of his desires. Finally, the child develops his ability to compare, differentiate, and abstract aspects of his environment as well as his own thoughts and emotions. Here, again the child in the culturally advantaged home is given a great deal of opportunity to use language in these more complex ways, while the child in the disadvantaged home has less opportunity to develop in this way.

Listening and speaking in the form of discussion are not only communicative devices; they may also be directly related to the development of the higher thinking process and thereby an aid in behavioral control.\textsuperscript{162} It is largely through the child's verbal participation that the teacher

\textsuperscript{162}Luria, op. cit.
forms her judgments of his learning progress, motivation, adjustment to home and peers, strengths and weaknesses as a person, even his physical health and vitality. The pupils adequacy in speech may profoundly effect not only his attitude toward others and his relationship with them, but his attitude toward himself as well. Hahn found a high correlation between the child's "leadership" abilities; and his willingness to give class speeches of the "show and tell" variety, suggesting that language ability is important to social success even in the first grade. The child's speaking will help him think, cooperate with other people, and help maintain his identity as an individual. What he says and how he says it will be a part of his total personality and will help others understand his actions. In a clinical study Moustakas began with the idea that the most


166Mackintosh, op. cit.

effective learning occurs in the educational situation where threat to the learner's self is minimal. He goes on to describe how second graders were able to increase their classroom verbalization by participating in discussions where they could express their feelings openly.

A study by Johnson with elementary school children demonstrated that five half hour sessions during a two week period where the counselor verbally and non-verbally reinforced verbal participation significantly increased verbal participation in the counselling sessions and that this behavior carried over in the classroom.

VIII. RESEARCH ON REALITY THERAPY

To this time only one study has been reported on Reality Therapy.

English, in a paper presented at the 21st Annual Conference of the California Association of School Psychologists and Psychometrists, describes the project:

This research project sought to determine whether


a reality therapy approach to working with small
groups of youngsters who were functioning below
grade level in reading achievement was more or less
effective than a performance/reward approach in pro-
ducing improvement in three areas of measurement:
self-concept, reading achievement, and classroom be-
havior. Each of the above approaches was also com-
pared to an instructional approach. The reality
therapy approach included group problem solving of
school related topics and social reinforcement; the
performance/reward approach included individualized
reading instruction and material reinforcement; the
instructional approach presented non-individualized
remedial reading but no system of reinforcement.

Three small groups were established from a total
matched sample consisting of thirty-six fourth, fifth,
and sixth grade students from two schools. All sub-
jects were of low average, average, or high average
intelligence. All subjects also had been identified
as eligible for, and were participating in, a remed-
ial reading program offered under the auspices of
Title I legislation. Matching criteria were: chrono-
logical level, and sex (by proportion).

One experimental group worked with the reality
therapy approach, the second worked with the perform-
ance/reward method, and the control group was the in-
structional group. Each group met for thirty minutes
once a week, for fifteen weeks in the Spring of 1968.

Pre testing was conducted in February, post test-
ing in June, and follow-up testing in late November,
by which time all students had moved on to new class-
room situations. As mentioned earlier, the areas of
measurement were self-concept, reading achievement,
and classroom behavior.

The author goes on to comment on the statistical re-
results:

Statistical analysis revealed no significant dif-
ferences in improvement between the two behavior mod-
ification techniques in any of the three areas meas-
ured. Nor was improvement of the performance/reward
group statistically significant in any of the three
areas measured when compared with the control group.
However, when the reality therapy group was compared to the control group, the former displayed improvement in self-concept significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. This improvement occurred during the fifteen weeks that the three groups were meeting; in other words, this information is a result of comparing post test data with pre test data.

Improvement for the reality therapy group was also significant in the areas of reading achievement and classroom behavior when compared with the control group. This improvement was apparent when follow-up data were compared with post test data. Improvement in reading achievement was significant at the .01 level of confidence and improvement in classroom behavior was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Another comparison of note — when pre and follow-up mean reading test scores are compared in terms of grade placement for each group, the following averages are obtained:

- Reality therapy: .97
- Performance/reward: .50
- Control: .54

The length of time from pre to follow-up testing was three quarters of one school year. If it is assumed that remedial readers will improve their reading during a year's learning at an average grade placement rate of .75, it is obvious from the above averages that the one group which received no reading instruction exceeded the expected rate of improvement.

English concludes:

This study posed a question: Would reality therapy, which includes interpersonal involvement, be more effective in producing improvement in reading, self-concept, and classroom behavior than a performance/reward technique, which takes an operant-impersonal approach? The answer is affirmative when each approach is compared to an instructional program which offered no system of reinforcement. It can be concluded from the findings that the significant differences between the reality therapy group and the instructional group demonstrate psychological theories investigated by others; namely, that acquisition of a positive self concept can effect behavior change and that learning
may be acquired covertly by means of vicarious reinforcement but not necessarily manifested in behavior change, or demonstrated overtly, until a later time. It also seems possible to conclude that interpersonal involvement, used either as a primary or a secondary reinforcer, played an important role in the results of this study.

If it can be assumed that the acquiring of a positive self concept is a legitimate educational goal, then the findings of this research study possess ramifications which deserve further exploration. The findings do not permit us to state that one method of behavior modification was more effective than the other in effecting behavioral change. However, the significance of the reality therapy group's progress in comparison to that of the instructional group does merit additional attention, since it appears that reality therapy used as a method of behavior modification could augment regular classroom instruction for the purpose of attaining earlier improvement in reading achievement and classroom behavior.

Two California school programs, one elementary and one secondary, in which Reality Therapy concepts played a part along with other methods found encouraging results. These were not controlled research studies and no conclusions concerning the effectiveness of Reality Therapy or that Reality Therapy was the essential factor can be made. What can be concluded is that Schools Without Failure methods based on Reality Therapy played a part in the success of the program.

The unpublished data on the programs can be obtained from Dr. Thomas Johnson, psychologist, San Juan Unified School District, Carmichael, California. Dr. Johnson participated with this writer in both programs.

The secondary program took place during the 1967-68
school year at Encina High School in the San Juan Unified School District. Eleven male students with essentially average or above average intelligence were placed in a special education class because of low school achievement caused by severe emotional or behavioral disorders. The program required them to spend two class periods a day in the special education program. The boys attended regular high school classes the remainder of the time. Once each week the students sat in a circle for discussion. Reality Therapy concepts as described in Chapter III were applied to the group process. The remainder of special program time was spent on specific plans designed to help the student be successful in specific classes. Provisions were also made to have as many of the boys as possible to be teacher assistants for nearby elementary schools. A third experience which grew from the once a week group discussions and seemed to have considerable impact on the behavioral change of the class members was a successfully carried out, student planned field trip to a nearby university.

At the beginning of the school year the students averaged nine D's or F's per boy. By the end of the first semester they averaged one D or F per student.

At the elementary level during 1968-69 school year, the San Juan Unified School District identified three schools as eligible for Title I funds from the Elementary and
Secondary Act of 1965. In two of the schools, Mariposa and Orangevale, Reality Therapy played a part. Each school staff met once a week with several school psychologists to discuss various philosophies, techniques and methods from the behavioral sciences. The teachers were to choose and apply any idea or technique. Reality Therapy and Schools Without Failure were presented as part of the program. In addition, during the latter half of the school year, a psychologist expert in Schools Without Failure and Reality Therapy spent two days a week at the Mariposa and Orangevale schools.

The program results are noted on Tables I and II.

TABLE I

1969 STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS COMPARED TO 1967-68 TEST RESULTS
MARIPOSA, ORANGEVALE, AND "CONTROL" SCHOOL PER CENT OF STUDENTS IN LOWER "Q"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orangevale</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II
AVERAGE INSTRUCTIONAL MONTHLY GAIN OF TARGET CHILDREN IN PARAGRAPH MEANING AND ARITHMETIC COMPUTATION
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
OCTOBER 1968 TO MAY 1969 (A 6 MONTH INSTRUCTION PERIOD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>MARIPOSA PM</th>
<th>MARIPOSA AC</th>
<th>ORANGEVALE PM</th>
<th>ORANGEVALE AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mariposa School selected to continue the Schools Without Failure—Reality Therapy emphasis during the 1969-70 school year by running a Schools Without Failure Seminar at their school sponsored by the Educator Training Center (a division of the Institute for Reality Therapy) and Mount St. Mary's College. These are primarily self directed seminars with the objective of discussing the philosophy and implementing the various methods described in Schools Without Failure. The seminar consisted of 24 sessions which met once a week. Twelve sessions in each semester.

The 1969-70 achievement results are found on Tables III, IV and V.
### TABLE III
AVERAGE MONTHS OF GAIN FROM SEPTEMBER 1969 TO MAY 1970
(.90 Instructional Period)

**TITLE I TARGET CHILDREN MARIPOSA SCHOOL GRADES 2-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADES TOTAL GAINS</th>
<th>WORD MEANING MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>PARAGRAPH MEANING MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>WORD STUDY SKILLS MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>ARITH. COMP. MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>ARITH. CONC. MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>ARITH. APPL. MOS. OF GAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV

READING SCORES,* MARIPOSA SCHOOL 1969-70

GRADE 1

District Median----- 1.9
Publisher---------- 1.8
MARIPOSA---------- 2.44
(no one below 4th stanine)

GRADE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Mariposa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Meaning</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para. Meaning</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Study Skills</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRADE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Mariposa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Meaning</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para. Meaning</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Study Skills</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>20 mo.</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Local school district reading test administered to pupils in grades 1, 2 and 3. All children involved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>TOTAL WORD MEANING MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>PARAGRAPH MEANING MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>TOTAL READ. MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>ARITH. COMP. MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>ARITH. CONC. MOS. OF GAIN</th>
<th>ARITH. APPL. MOS. OF GAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research article and other data on Schools Without Failure and Reality Therapy, though sparse, is nevertheless encouraging and suggests the need for further study.
CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The primary goal of this study is to determine if there are significant differences in locus of control, self-concept, and classroom behavior between third and sixth grade Black pupils attending two inner city school programs. A Title I elementary school emphasizing Schools Without Failure methods and techniques based on the psychological concept of Reality Therapy served as the experimental school. A Title I elementary school not emphasizing Schools Without Failure methods and techniques served as the control.

The purpose of this chapter is: (1) to define the subjects and schools, (2) to discuss the Schools Without Failure—Reality Therapy program, (3) to describe the instruments used in the study, (4) to present the research design, (5) to outline the procedures used in collecting the data, and (6) to describe the statistical procedures used.

I. THE SUBJECTS AND SCHOOLS

The pupils included in this study were third and sixth grade Black boys and girls attending two typical Los Angeles central city elementary schools, Miramonte and the 66th Street School. Twenty-two classrooms were used in the study. Seven third grade and six sixth grade classes from Miramonte. Five
third grade and four sixth grade classes from the 66th Street School. One third grade class from Miramonte preferred not to take part in the study. Of the 340 pupils who participated in the study 89 were in the third grade at Miramonte; 73 in the sixth grade at Miramonte; 97 in the third grade at 66th Street School; and 81 in the sixth grade at the 66th Street School. All 22 classrooms used were normal in the sense that they were self contained heterogeneous classes, with only one grade level in each classroom. Miramonte was selected as the experimental school because the principal and staff were voluntarily planning to institute methods and techniques from Schools Without Failure and Reality Therapy during the 1969-70 school year.

All the central city Title I elementary schools had been exposed to Glasser's educational philosophy and school techniques through the Los Angeles City School District's inservice program. Each Title I school had the responsibility of developing its own inservice programs in cooperation with the central office administration, Dr. Glasser had been a consultant to the Elementary Division of the Los Angeles City School District for the past three years, spending two days a week in the classrooms of various central city elementary schools. As a part of his consultation experiences, the Los Angeles School system produced one classmeeting and several lecture films on the basic concepts and philosophy of
Schools Without Failure and Reality Therapy. These films were presented to the teachers and administrators throughout the district as mandatory viewing through the district's in-service program. From this exposure several schools decided to emphasize the Schools Without Failure program through their local ongoing inservice program—others did not.

After selecting the experimental school, the 66th Street School was then selected as the control because of its geographical proximity to Miramonte, and its similarity in regard to ethnic, cultural and socio-economic characteristics, and its inservice emphasis not directly involved with the Schools Without Failure program. Both schools were designated by the federal government to receive Title I funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title I funds are allocated to school districts to give aid to the culturally, economically, and educationally handicapped children. President Johnson's remarks reflected this aim when he signed Public Law 89-10 into existence: "Today we reach out to 5½ million children held behind their more fortunate schoolmates by the dragging anchor of poverty."\(^1\) In a brief description of the bill Harris and Hughes comment:

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education

---

Act of 1965 authorizes Federal support to local public education agencies for special education programs for educationally deprived children in attendance areas where low-income families are concentrated. Its aim is to help broaden and strengthen education for children of poverty, wherever they may be found—in public schools, in private schools, or out of schools. 2

The Los Angeles City School system in a memo sent to building principals describes its procedure for the selection of Title I target areas in the following manner:

The objective of Title I is to provide special educational services in areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families. The school district shall rank its school attendance areas in order of highest concentrations of low-income families. All attendance areas with concentrations at least as high as the district average shall be ranked, and no attendance area above the district average may be designated as a target area.

The ranking shall be based first on family income or other data reflecting severe poverty, such as payments of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Other factors which may be considered include housing statistics, health statistics, test scores, infant mortality rates, mobility and attendance records, and the number of children receiving such services as free lunches or other indications of need. 3

The Racial and Ethnic Survey Report completed in October of 1969 offers the following description of the two schools.

---


3 "Memo to Administrators of Title I Schools" (Los Angeles City Schools, 1966). ( Mimeographed.)
Minority IQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority IQ</th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%ile</td>
<td>17%ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achievement Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>11%ile</td>
<td>14%ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>11%ile</td>
<td>14%ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>14%ile</td>
<td>18%ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>9%ile</td>
<td>18%ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupils in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>1206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an interview Dr. Frank Toggenberger of the Los Angeles City School District noted the following comparisons taken from a 1960 census.

Family earnings under $5,000 per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heads of family with less than an 8th grade education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents divorced, widowed or separated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Living in dilapidated dwelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Toggenberger in that same interview revealed the Aid to Families with Dependent Children ranking that Miramonte and the 66th Street School held in the district during
the 1969-70 school year. Of a total of 436 schools making up the Los Angeles City School System, Miramonte ranked 57th with 40.8% of the families receiving Aid for Dependent Children. The 66th Street School ranked 36th with 51.6% of the families receiving Aid for Dependent Children.

II. SCHOOLS WITHOUT FAILURE—REALITY THERAPY

Reality Therapy

The purpose of this section is to briefly outline the central concepts and methods of the Schools Without Failure—Reality Therapy program. For a more thorough explanation, the reader is urged to consult three books written by William Glasser, M.D., "Schools Without Failure," "Reality Therapy," and "Mental Health or Mental Illness?" This section is divided into two parts: (1) Reality Therapy concepts, and (2) Schools Without Failure with emphasis on the class meeting.

Reality Therapy is based on the idea that everyone needs to have an identity and become actively involved with all that is around them. For some, this may be described as a "successful" identity because the person is able to become involved with life in a manner that allows him to fulfill two basic needs: Feeling worthwhile toward himself and others (individual responsibility); and to love and be loved (social responsibility). When one is unsuccessful in fulfilling any part of these needs he suffers. One suffers not only if he
is unable to be loved, but also if he is unable to give love— it's a two-way street.

Dr. Glasser⁴ in a speech to primary reading specialists in the Los Angeles City School District, has commented:

These are two-way needs: to love and be loved, implies someone to love and someone who loves me. If we don’t have this we suffer. For some children the form of this suffering is not learning to read and they won’t learn to read until they get the idea that someone is able to care for them and they can learn.

Because these suffering children are in the process of developing failure identities by their very experiences and behavior, they are unable to make the kind of relationships with responsible people that are necessary for them to fulfill their needs. It then becomes the first responsibility of the teacher to make contact with them in a way that is open, transparent, honest, and congruent. One needs to meet them as a human being who cares. Without this type of encounter, their chances of shifting from a failure identity (characterized by delinquency or withdrawal) to a successful identity (characterized by self-esteem and love) will be slim indeed. (See Figure 1). People need people. As Glasser⁵ puts it:

⁴William Glasser, "Speech to Primary Reading Specialists in the Los Angeles City School District" (unpublished, 1968). ( Mimeographed.)

⁵Ibid.
# FIGURE 1

CONCEPTS BASIC TO REALITY THERAPY AND SCHOOLS WITHOUT FAILURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Worthwhile Behavior</th>
<th>Individual Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Irresponsibility</td>
<td>Withdrawn Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td><strong>IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Irresponsibility</td>
<td>Delinquent Behavior</td>
<td>Love Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorization</th>
<th>Think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on didactic</td>
<td>Emphasis on discussion--talk and listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right or wrong answers only (certainty)</td>
<td>Plan and act upon own thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation (reward and punish)</td>
<td>Experience natural consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective tests</td>
<td>Intrinsinc evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades based on normal distribution</td>
<td>Think, replan, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other directed.</td>
<td>Self-directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulated--shaped</td>
<td>Self-actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of self worth</td>
<td>Sense of internal control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to love</td>
<td>Sense of worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated--lonely</td>
<td>Ability to love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn--inactive--apathy</td>
<td>Involved--open--active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain--instant pain relievers (drugs)</td>
<td>Success identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency--violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children suffer by not learning or they get tired of suffering and cause others to suffer. . . . The teacher's first job is to make contact with these children. . . as a person who cares. . . a person interested in them. . . not as a teacher but as a person. . . Everyone is doing the best he can at the time. If he could do better he would. You can't convince them they can do better until they relate to you and begin to meet their needs.

By making this authentic and personal contact, the quality of involvement is such that loneliness begins to decrease. The cumulative effect of these personal encounters when experienced frequently is reflected by the child's increased motivation to learn the things he needs to learn.

As the discussion so far implies, the first essential and most important consideration in the application of reality therapy in the classroom is to become personally involved. It is important for the child to know that you are interested in him as a person, not only as a pupil in the class, a name on the attendance book, a 1.5 reading level, or a 107 IQ score. Casual, interested, and authentic conversation where you get to know one another as people is extremely important. It is important for him to know that you enjoy playing tennis, watching "Bewitched," have two boys and one girl, and a husband who sells carpets at Sears. It is important for you to know personal things about him. Spontaneous, casual give-and-take, one human being to another, creates a quality of involvement that causes one to hurt if the child is unable to learn.
A second guideline of this approach is to accentuate the present time. Do not get involved in reinforcing the set that Helen is always doing something such as blowing on the pages of her book when she should be doing arithmetic, that Tom and Sam have a past history of scuffles, that Bill has always been a behavior problem, or that Johnny was unable to read in the past. Being successful at not succeeding is a certain kind of success, and so we have some very successful failures. Do not reinforce past failure but rather expect and help Johnny plan to be successful at reading in the present, expect and help Helen plan to complete the arithmetic lesson successfully today, expect Tom, Sam, and the class to come up with a solution to their scuffling, expect and help Bill plan to be successful in helping a younger child learn.

A third consideration is to deal with behavior. The purpose is not to search for why he is behaving the way he does or how he feels about it. The valuable point is to help the child become aware of what he is doing that is contributing to his failure, and what he can do to significantly increase his chances of success. The teacher encourages the child in a nonpunitive manner to describe, as best he can his actual behavior. The process of describing helps to bring the behavior to the child's most optimum conscious level.

These first three concepts, establishing personal in-
volvement and accentuating present behavior, put the situation clearly in the open and set the stage for a fourth experience, which is one of the most important, relevant, and meaningful learning opportunities anyone can have: The opportunity for one to reflect upon and make a value judgment about his own behavior. The value of this experience of responsible self-evaluation leading to self direction cannot be overemphasized. It is extremely important when working personally with individuals, small groups, or large classroom groups, to work toward a situation in which pupils begin making value judgments about themselves and their school program. This is usually best accomplished by the teacher asking non-evaluative questions, not making statements. "Does it help you to blow on your book?" "Does it help you to complete the arithmetic lesson?" "Is it worthwhile to learn to read?" "Is it worthwhile to help another student?" "Does it help you to kick someone in the shin?"

On this point, Glasser\(^6\) states, "You can't tell them it is important to learn to read. They must make their own value judgments." When the child decides it is worthwhile to change his behavior, the teacher must work with him in an effort to come up with a specific plan and then encourage the child to make a commitment to his plan. Making a plan

\(^6\)This.
and committing oneself to it are steps five and six. The initial operational objectives of the pupil's plan should be such that its successful completion is guaranteed quickly. It is these frequent successful experiences that we are after, and upon which more difficult plans requiring greater delay of gratification can be made. The cumulative effect of frequent self directed successful experiences encourages a positive self identity enhancing the pupil's belief that he is primarily responsible for his successes in school. Once again, questions are important, rather than statements or directions: "What can you do about it?" "What is your plan?" "Will you commit yourself to the plan?" "Will you do it?" "When?"

The seventh and eighth concepts of Reality Therapy are to eliminate punishment and to not reinforce excuses. Punishment and excuses for behavior are of no value when working with children who already hurt.

As Glasser\(^7\) remarks:

> Discipline is hard because we not only deal with excuses, we ask for them. Discipline is poorly understood—it has nothing to do with hurting or harming children. It is teaching someone that the way he is going is not helping him and getting him to make better choices. It takes a long time for a child to fulfill his commitments. He will check you out. He will try to see if you will take excuses. If you accept excuses, it proves you don't really care and the

---

\(^7\)Glasser, 1968, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
old failure pattern recurs. If you accept excuses you are saying, "You are worthless." If the assignment is not done say, "When will you do it?" "Can you do it?" "Can you do it in school today?" "After school?" Not, "Why didn't you do it?" If you don't ever accept excuses you are saying, "You are a worthwhile person and I'm waiting for you to complete your commitment."

It should be noted that the cumulative effect of many people becoming personally involved, dealing with present behavior, changing why to what, emphasizing thinking and value judgments through techniques such as regularly scheduled classroom meetings, accentuating, expecting and planning for the successful completion of specific classroom tasks, eliminating excuses, and not resorting to fear or punishment, creates a distinct environment. This atmosphere itself becomes an added force toward responsible behavior, a successful identity, and the capacity to learn.

**Schools Without Failure**

In Chapter II several aspects of the teacher-child relationship were discussed. Personal involvement, thinking, relevance, measurement, evaluation, and school grading were considered in light of the literature. This section deals with a brief discussion of the Schools Without Failure program with emphasis on the classmeeting. The Schools Without Failure programs are usually started by the classroom teacher arranging for and participating in self directed classmeetings as an usual and bonified part of the regular day's
curriculum. From these classroomings, other ideas or methods are added.

The Schools Without Failure program is based on the assumption that failure should be avoided or eliminated from the learning experiences of children whenever and wherever possible. Early cumulative failure experiences in learning significantly contribute to later failure experiences in school, encourages a negative self-concept, lowers self-confidence, leads to withdrawal or delinquent behavior, and results in an early drop out from school. A carefully planned sequential learning program for each child based on continual success at small tasks should be emphasized. Once more, the pupil himself should be given as much opportunity as possible to participate in the development of those programs. In order to do this, the pupil—teacher relationship needs to become one that is more authentic and personal. A relationship that encourages thinking and open discussion of topics that are relevant and important to the child. The relationship needs to be one in which the child states what he thinks with no chance to fail and no fear of reprisal. The pupil needs to take cues less from the teacher and to think more critically by himself. Since most "right" answers are closely tied to memorization activities, these activities and their related grading systems which allow for failure, needs to be deemphasized or eliminated.
It is assumed that one of the most wasteful activities of most public schools is their emphasis on memory, evaluation, and grading, for the purpose of selecting those who shall pass and those who shall fail. The Schools Without Failure program chooses to emphasize personal involvement, social and individual responsibility, thinking and discussion predicated on the idea that no one need fail. 8

Philosophical and methodological changes of these dimensions are difficult to achieve and in many instances take considerable time, effort, involvement and commitment by those who are directly engaged in the classroom learning process. Specific behavioral and attitudinal changes in the children, teachers and principals are crucial. In the attempt to initiate these changes the "classmeeting" has been developed. The classmeeting is a practical and realistic classroom activity which most teachers and children can participate in easily. The regularly daily scheduled classmeeting is considered the initial phase and continuing backbone of the Schools Without Failure program around which other operations such as parent—child—teacher reporting methods, student tutoring, and student coordinated classroom and school programs are based. The strength of the "classmeetings" is in their intermittent and cumulative effect on the

8Glasser, 1969, op. cit.
relationship between the teacher and the pupils.

The three types of classroom meetings are:

1. **Social and Behavioral-Problem-Solving Meetings:**
   This type of meeting attempts to solve the individual and group behavioral and social problems of the class and the school.

2. **Open-Ended Meetings:**
   This meeting is concerned with intellectually important subjects. The children are asked to discuss any thought provoking question related to their lives, questions that may also be related to the curriculum of the classroom. The teacher is specifically not looking for factual answers. She is trying to stimulate children to think and to relate what they know to the subject being discussed.

3. **Educational-Diagnostic Meeting:**
   This meeting is designed to find out how well the students understand the concepts of the curriculum. It is directly related to what the class is studying. These meetings are used by the teacher to get a quick evaluation if whether or not teaching procedures in the class are effective.
Guidelines for Classmeetings

1. All problems relative to the class as a group and to any individual in the class are eligible for discussion.
2. The discussion itself should always be directed toward solving the problem; the solution should never include punishment or fault finding.
3. Meetings should always be conducted with the teacher and all the students seated in a tight circle. In the elementary school, the daily meetings require approximately 15-30 minutes of classroom time.

Of the three types of meetings, the open-end sessions are the most frequently used and perhaps the most valuable. The sessions are designed to supplement the academic program by stimulating the children to think and respond. The cumulative effect of the sessions provide the children and teacher with a daily situation that gives each pupil the opportunity for intellectual success without the possibility of failure. The child makes no mistake by his response or answers. Thinking, speaking, and listening in the form of discussion are accentuated rather than memory evaluation and grading.

III. THE INSTRUMENTS

Locus of Control

Locus of control was measured by the Intellectual
Achievement Responsibility (IAR) Questionnaire. In 1965, Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall\(^9\) described the full scale, rationale for its construction, and descriptive statistics on a sample of 923 third to twelfth grade pupils.

The IAR presents the child with a number of items representing common intellectual achievement situations which he experiences in everyday life. The questionnaire is composed of 34 forced-choice items, 17 dealing with responsibility for success situation (e.g. being able to solve a puzzle quickly) and 17 for failures (e.g. not doing well on a test at school). The child is asked to decide whether his behavior usually causes the event to occur (internal responsibility) or whether these experiences are mainly caused by the behaviors of others such as parents, peers, and teachers (external responsibility). In this study two scores were used: (1) the frequency with which the child believes that he, rather than others, causes his successes (IAR+), and (2) the frequency with which he assumes responsibility for his failures (IAR-). A complete copy of the instrument is included as Appendix A of this report.

---

Self-Concept

Self-concept was measured by the Sears Self-Concept Inventory (SSCI) developed by Dr. Pauline Sears at Stanford University's Laboratory of Human Development.

In a memorandum, Sears notes that:

Spaulding (1963, 1963, 1964) and Sherman (1964) have used a revised edition of the inventory, incorporating some new items involving self-concept for creativity as well as the other areas. Reliability of .85 and .82 for height of self-concept and differentiation, respectively, are reported for this instrument.

In 1966, Dr. Sears developed an abbreviated, 48 item form of the inventory. The original form had contained 100 items. With 32 third graders, Sears found a .90 total score reliability with the Kuder-Richardson. This abbreviated form was used in this study.

The 1966 revised inventory may be administered to children in the third grade and above. Approximately forty minutes are needed for its administration and this may be

---

done in group form. Sears\textsuperscript{11} adds:

Precautions should be taken to preserve confidentiality of response; the person administering or scoring the inventory should have the confidence of the children and results should probably not be made a part of permanent records. Parental consent for administration of a potentially "sensitive" instrument is desirable in most cases.

A complete copy of the instrument is included as Appendix B of this report.

Classroom Behavior

Classroom behavior ratings were derived from the Behavior Survey Instrument (BSI). The Behavior Survey Instrument was developed at the Center for Research and Development in Teaching at Stanford University as a practical method of observing and recording the behavior of children in their classrooms. The instrument consists of six major categories of behavior:

1. Task Orientation: This broad category of behavior describes the child's orientation, attention or involvement with respect to whatever tasks the teacher has prescribed or whatever tasks can be assumed to be appropriate to the school setting. "Tasks," are defined as "work" or "play" set up by the teacher.

\textsuperscript{11}\textsc{Sears, op. cit.}
2. **Cognitive**: This broad category has to do with behavior in which processing and seeking information are salient and apparent. This is usually easier to observe in the more formal or structured parts of the classroom activity.

3. **Motivation**: This relates to what incentives or needs are involved in the child's activity. For this research three sub-categories were examined.

   A. **Mainly Achievement**: Behavior motivated primarily by the sense of competence mastery and achievement to be derived from a given task or classroom activity. Apparent striving to attain some standard of performance or perceived expectation of performance. Shows evidence of comparison with either internal or external standards; e.g., the child working at his desk attempting to add a column; working to climb higher than his companion on the climbing rope.

   B. **Mainly Social**: Defined as behavior motivated primarily by the satisfaction to be derived from interactions with other people through a given activity or task; e.g., dramatic play; discussing a class related activity; team learning; the exchanges of affectionate gestures and smiles.
C. **Routine Compliance**: The main characteristic here is that the child responds to the teacher's request or to a classroom activity in a routine, automatic and uninvolved way; e.g., child participates in a group dance activity without apparent involvement, just "going through the motions."

4. **Interpersonal Behavior**: This broad category concerns aspects of the interactions between the observed child, the teacher and other children. The following three areas were analyzed in this study.
   A. Teacher child interaction.
   B. When the child initiated the interaction.
   C. Child and child interaction.

The four trained observers using the Behavior Survey Instrument were able to achieve and 88% over all percentage of agreement. To establish this agreement, the observers made simultaneous observations on the same children, scoring independently and without knowledge of each other's judgments. Each observer recorded the child's behavior on the Observation Sheet of the Behavior Survey Instrument which is Appendix C of this report.

The procedure used for recording behavior, known as point sampling, requires observing the child just long enough to be sure what the behavior is—rarely longer than twenty
seconds. If the observer watches a child longer than a moment, he will find that he will have to try to categorize several units of behavior, rather than just one. After this brief observation the recorder fills in the letters in this child's column and then begins observing the next child. (If the assessment program calls for repeated observations on one child, then the observer may wait for a specified length of time and simply make the next observation on this same child).

Observers must exercise great care to be quiet and unobtrusive in the classroom and to refrain from interacting with the children. Initially the children often try to engage the observers in conversation; however, if the observers resist the temptation the children will quickly come to ignore their presence.

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study was designed to test the effects of a Schools Without Failure--Reality Therapy program on the locus of control and self-concept of third and sixth grade Black pupils attending a Title I central city school. The classroom behavior of these pupils was also studied. A pre-test--post-test research design patterned after Campbell and
Stanley's Design 4 was used. In analyzing the locus of control and self-concept data, a three way factorial design was used. Two school treatments (an experimental and a control school), classification by grade level (third and sixth), and classification by sex were the independent variables. The dependent variables were a measure of internal-external locus of control and a measure of self esteem.

A more graphic portrayal of the 2x2x2 factorial design can be found in Figure 2. This design was selected because it allows for the manipulation and control of two or more variables simultaneously and permits the study of the interactive effects of the independent variables and the dependent variables.

The three way factorial design results in the testing of seven hypotheses for each dependent variable considered. Results at the .01 and .05 levels were selected as significant for all analyses of covariance. Each analysis of covariance consisted of the following:

Main effects:

1. Between the two treatment schools 
   \[(A_1, A_2)\]

---

## FIGURE 2

**EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>A₁ (Experimental) (Mirmonte)</th>
<th>A₂ (Control) (66th Street School)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C₁ Boys</td>
<td>C₁ Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C₂ Girls</td>
<td>C₂ Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>A₁₁B₁C₁</td>
<td>A₂₁B₁C₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Third)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>A₁₁B₂C₁</td>
<td>A₂₁B₂C₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sixth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₁₁B₂C₂</td>
<td>A₂₁B₂C₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Between third grade and sixth grade pupils
   \((B_1, B_2)\)

3. Between boys and girls
   \((C_1, C_2)\)

**Interactions:**

4. Interaction: \(A \times B\)
   Treatment and grade level

5. Interaction: \(B \times C\)
   Grade level and sex

6. Interaction: \(A \times C\)
   Treatment and sex

7. Interaction: \(A \times B \times C\)
   Treatment and grade level and sex

The **Sign Test** was used to test the significance of the data derived from the classroom behavior observations. Results at the .20 and .10 levels were selected as significant for this and the correlation data because of the rougher statistical procedure used and the increased sources of error present when comparing two correlation statistics.

**V. PROCEDURES**

**Schools and Subjects**

After authorization was given by the Los Angeles City School District to proceed with the study, a conference was held with the principals of the Miramonte and 66th Street
Schools to secure their approval and cooperation. With their approval each third and sixth grade teacher was asked individually if they wished to participate in a doctoral research project. They were informed the study would require approximately two hours of classroom time the last week in September and first week in October, and the last week in January and the first week in February. Additionally, observers would be in their rooms during these weeks, but no special arrangements nor use of classtime would be needed. Of the twenty-three teachers contacted, one preferred not to participate leaving a total of twenty-two classrooms for the study.

Seven third grade classes and six sixth grade classes from Miramonte, the experimental school. Five third grade classes and four sixth grade classes from 66th Street School, the control. Three hundred and forty Black pupils from these classes participated in the study.

Data Collection

During the last week in September and the first week in October of the 1969-70 school year, the investigator and three trained examiners administered the IAR and SSCI questionnaires to all the children in the classrooms selected for the study. The questionnaires were administered separately each taking approximately three-quarters of an hour. IBM mark sensed answer cards, a special scoring pencil, and a
copy of the questionnaire were given to each pupil during the testing sessions. The items were then presented orally to the class.

During this same period of time four trained observers using the Behavior Survey Instrument systematically recorded the behavior of three pupils during regular classroom time. The three pupils were randomly selected from each class and each class was randomly assigned to the observers by use of a table of random numbers.\textsuperscript{13}

The data collected provided the Locus of Control, Self-Concept, and Classroom Behavior pre-treatment scores for the students. After 16 weeks of treatment, at the end of the first semester, this same procedure was followed to gather the post-treatment data.

VI. STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

The major purpose of this study was to determine the effects of a Schools Without Failure--Reality Therapy program on the locus of control and self-concept of Black children attending a typical central city public school located in a poverty area. An analysis of covariance was done on the IAR+, IAR-, and SSCI data to determine if sex and school grade

level were significant independent variables.

The pre and post-test results from the IAR+, IAR- and SSCI measures were punched into the IBM cards.

The 34 item IAR results were punched into the IBM card in a way which allowed the researcher to analyze the degree to which the program affected the student's belief that he is responsible for his successes (IAR+) and for his failures (IAR-).

The code for the computation included: (1) school, (2) grade, (3) teacher, (4) student, (5) sex, (6) test, (7) time. With this data punched into the cards, it was possible for the computer to electronically analyze the data.

The Behavior Survey Instrument results were recorded on the Observation Sheets and later compiled to give pre and post ratings on the various behavioral categories.

Summary

In this chapter the writer has (1) defined the population and subjects, (2) described the instruments used in the study, (3) discussed the Schools Without Failure—Reality Therapy program, (4) presented the research design, (5) outlined the procedures in collecting the data, and (6) described the statistical procedures used. Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data in terms outlined in this chapter.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The primary purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analysis of the data and to interpret these results. The chapter is divided into three sections. In Section I, the writer discusses the locus of control and the self-esteem results which were statistically treated by analysis of covariance. Section II deals with changes in classroom behavior which were tested statistically by the Sign Test. Section III discusses the comparisons of the pre and post correlation coefficients (r.) between the measures of locus of control and self-esteem.

The .05 and .01 levels of probability were used to determine the significance of all statistical tests used with analysis of covariance. The .05 level indicating the results are probably significant; further study needed. The .01 level indicating statistical significance.

The .20 and .10 levels of probability were selected to determine the significance of: (1) all statistical tests used with the Sign Test and (2) the comparison of the two parametric statistics (r.). The .20 level indicating the findings are probably significant; further study needed. The .10 level indicating statistical significance. These levels of significance were selected because (1) when nominal data
are used as with the Sign Test and (2) when comparing two
parametric statistics, the statistical procedures are not as
precise compared to when interval data are used as in the
case of analysis of covariance.

In Section I the seven null hypotheses for each de-
pendent variable will be stated prior to the presentation of
the pertinent data for that particular variable. The de-
pendent variables were the Intellectual Achievement Responsibil-
ity Questionnaire (IAR+ and IAR−) and the Sears Self-Concept
Inventory (SSCI). Tables of Means were also prepared to in-
dicate the scores obtained by each cell on the different de-
pendent variables. Each Table of Means will be followed by
an Analysis of Covariance Table for each variable.

One null hypotheses for each of the eight dependent
variables will be stated prior to the presentation of the
pertinent data in Section II, Classroom Behavior. The de-
pendent variables from the Behavioral Survey Instrument were:
(1) Task Orientation, (2) Cognitive Orientation, (3) Moti-
vation—Achievement, (4) Motivation—Social, (5) Motivation—
Compliance, (6) Social Interaction; Teacher x Child, (7) So-
cial Interaction; Child Initiated, (8) Social Interaction;
Child x Child.

Sign Test Tables were prepared to follow the state-
ment of null hypothesis to aid in the interpretation of the
data.
A null hypothesis concerning the significance of the difference between correlations will be stated in Section III, The Relationship Between IAR and SSCI. A Significance of Difference Between \( r \)'s Table will follow the statement of the null hypothesis.

I. LOCUS OF CONTROL (IAR+ AND IAR-) AND SELF-CONCEPT (SSCI)

Dependent Variable #1: Intellectual Achievement Responsibility for Success (IAR+)

Null Hypothesis (1): There will be no significant differences between Treatment School I, experimental, and Treatment School II, control, in terms of internal locus of control as measured by the Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall, Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire for successes (IAR+).

Null Hypothesis (2): In relation to the two treatment schools, third grade pupils will not score significantly higher than sixth grade pupils on internal locus of control as measured by the IAR+.

Null Hypothesis (2): In relation to the two treatment schools, boys will not score significantly higher than girls on internal locus of control as measured by the IAR+.

Null Hypothesis (4): There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools and grade level as
measured by the IAR+.

**Null Hypothesis (5):** There will be no significant interaction between grade level and sex as measured by the IAR+.

**Null Hypothesis (6):** There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools and sex as measured by the IAR+.

**Null Hypothesis (7):** There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools, grade level, and sex as measured by the IAR+.

**Analysis of Covariance.** Table VI presents the result of an Analysis of Covariance for gains made in internal locus of control for successes as measured by the Crandall-Katkovsky and Crandall Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire for successes (IAR+). The independent variables were: (1) Treatment Schools, (2) Grade level, and (3) Sex.

Table VI shows the F ratios for treatment and grade level from the Analysis of Covariance for internal locus of control for successes (IAR+) to be statistically significant at the .01 and .05 levels of confidence, respectively. The differences between the means for the two treatment groups and the two grade levels are depicted in Table VII. Table VI indicates that none of the remaining five F values approached significance. Therefore, the null hypotheses for these five
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>541.28369</td>
<td>78.3049</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.94325</td>
<td>3.60838</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.84764</td>
<td>.70128</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.25675</td>
<td>.75046</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.57628</td>
<td>.37269</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.93993</td>
<td>1.71717</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.96166</td>
<td>.42845</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>6.91258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE VII
TABLE OF MEANS FOR IAR+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sources were accepted.

Dependent Variable #2: Intellectual Achievement Responsibility for Failures (IAR-)

Null Hypothesis (1): There will be no significant differences between Treatment School I, experimental, and Treatment School II, control, in terms of internal locus of control as measured by the Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire for failures (IAR-).

Null Hypothesis (2): In relation to the two treatment schools, third grade pupils will not score significantly higher than sixth grade pupils on internal locus of control as measured by the IAR-.

Null Hypothesis (3): In relation to the two treatment schools, boys will not score significantly higher than girls on internal locus of control as measured by the IAR-.

Null Hypothesis (4): There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools and grade level as measured by the IAR-.

Null Hypothesis (5): There will be no significant interaction between grade level and sex as measured by the IAR-.

Null Hypothesis (6): There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools and sex as measured by the IAR-.
Null Hypothesis (2): There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools, grade level, and sex as measured by the IAR-.

Analysis of Covariance. Table VIII presents the result of an Analysis of Covariance for gains made in internal locus of control for failures as measured by the Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire (IAR-). The independent variables were: (1) Treatment Schools, (2) Grade level, and (3) Sex.

Table VIII shows the F ratios for treatment and grade level from the Analysis of Covariance for internal locus of control for failures (IAR-) to be statistically significant at the .01 and .05 levels of confidence respectively. In addition the interaction of treatment and grade level was found to be statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. Table IX indicates the differences between the means for the two treatment groups and the two grade levels. Figure 3 graphically illustrates the significant interaction between treatment and grade level. Table X depicts the mean for the interaction. The remaining four F values did not approach significance. Therefore, the null hypotheses for these five sources were accepted.

Dependent Variable #3: Self-Concept

Null Hypothesis (1): There will be no significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>675.85962</td>
<td>75.79381</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.47009</td>
<td>3.97777</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.38123</td>
<td>1.27634</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180.67265</td>
<td>20.26140</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.04085</td>
<td>1.23817</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.93717</td>
<td>.32939</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.31739</td>
<td>1.04489</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>8.91708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IX

TABLE OF MEANS FOR IAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 3

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR IAR-
INTERACTION: TREATMENT x GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A₁ = Miramonte</th>
<th>A₂ = 66th Street School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>A₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miramonte  66th Street School
TABLE X

TABLE OF MEANS
INTERACTION: TREATMENT x GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th>66th Street School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A_1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_1 )</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_2 )</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( M_{g} = 10.8 \)
differences between Treatment School I, experimental, and Treatment School II, control, in terms of self-concept as measured by the Sears Self-Concept Inventory (SSCI).

Null Hypothesis (2): In relation to the two treatment schools, third grade pupils will not score significantly higher than sixth grade pupils on self-concept as measured by the SSCI.

Null Hypothesis (3): In relation to the two treatment schools, boys will not score significantly higher than girls on self-concept as measured by the SSCI.

Null Hypothesis (4): There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools and grade level as measured by the SSCI.

Null Hypothesis (5): There will be no significant interaction between grade level and sex as measured by the SSCI.

Null Hypothesis (6): There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools and sex as measured by the SSCI.

Null Hypothesis (7): There will be no significant interaction between treatment schools, grade level, and sex as measured by the SSCI.

Analysis of Covariance. Table XI indicates the F ratio for grade level from the Analysis of Covariance for self-concept as measured by the SSCI to be statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. None of the other
TABLE XI
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE
SELF-CONCEPT (SSCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.36744</td>
<td>1.03401</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.90680</td>
<td>25.06468</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07683</td>
<td>.21622</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01090</td>
<td>.03067</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02173</td>
<td>.06114</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: A x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55340</td>
<td>2.40155</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: a x B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18347</td>
<td>.51630</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>.35535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XII
TABLE OF MEANS FOR SSCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miramonte</th>
<th></th>
<th>66th Street School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>N = 340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F values approached significance. Therefore the null hypotheses for these sources were accepted. Table XII depicts the means for the two treatment groups and the two grade levels.

II. CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

The pre and post behavioral observation relating to each dependent variable was recorded for the three children in each classroom. The sign (+ or -) of the differences between the two members of each pair was then determined.

The number of pairs (N) whose differences showed a sign were then determined by counting.

Next, the value of x, the number of fewer signs was determined.

The value of p was determined by entering the Table of Probabilities Associated with Values as Small as Observed Values of x in the Binomial Test.

If the p yielded by the test was equal to or less than .10 or .20, then the null hypothesis was rejected.¹

Dependent Variable #1: Task Orientation

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant difference

between the experimental, Treatment School I, and control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Task Orientation as measured by the Behavior Survey Instrument (BSI).

**Analysis of Data by the Sign Test.** Table XIII indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment School I, Miramonte, for Task Orientation as measured by the BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

**Dependent Variable #2: Cognitive**

**Null Hypothesis:** There will be no significant difference between the experimental, Treatment School I, and control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Cognitive as measured by the BSI.

**Analysis of Data by the Sign Test.** Table XIV indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment School I, Miramonte, for Cognitive as measured by the BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

**Dependent Variable #3: Motivation—Achievement**

**Null Hypothesis:** There will be no significant difference between the experimental, Treatment School I, and control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Motivation—Achievement as measured by the BSI.

**Analysis of Data by the Sign Test.** Table XV indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment School I, Miramonte, for Motivation—Achievement as measured by the
TABLE XIII
ANALYSIS BY THE SIGN TEST
BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT
TASK ORIENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XIV

**ANALYSIS BY THE SIGN TEST**

**BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**COGNITIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XV**

ANALYSIS BY THE SIGN TEST
BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

MOTIVATION—ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

Dependent Variable #4: Motivation--Social

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant difference between the experimental, Treatment School I, and control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Motivation--Social as measured by the BSI.

Analysis of Data by the Sign Test. Table XVI indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment School I, Miramonte, for Motivation--Social as measured by the BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

Dependent Variable #5: Motivation--Compliance

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant difference between the experimental, Treatment School I, and control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Motivation--Compliance as measured by the BSI.

Analysis of Data by the Sign Test. Table XVII indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment School I, Miramonte, for Motivation--Compliance as measured by the BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

Dependent Variable #6: Social Interaction: Teacher and Child

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant difference between the experimental, Treatment School I, and
### TABLE XVI

**ANALYSIS BY THE SIGN TEST**

**BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**MOTIVATION--SOCIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Social Interaction: Teacher and Child as measured by the BSI.

Analysis of Data by the Sign Test. Table XVIII indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment School I, Miramonte, for Social Interaction: Teacher and Child as measured by the BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

Dependent Variable #7: Social Interaction: Child Initiated

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant difference between the experimental, Treatment School I, and control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Social Interaction: Child Initiated as measured by the BSI.

Analysis of Data by the Sign Test. Table XIX indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment School I, Miramonte, for Social Interaction: Child Initiated as measured by the BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

Dependent Variable #8: Social Interaction: Child and Child

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant difference between the experimental, Treatment School I, and control, Treatment School II, schools in terms of Social Interaction: Child and Child as measured by the BSI.

Analysis of Data by the Sign Test. Table XX indicates the p values for the third and sixth grades of Treatment
TABLE XVIII
ANALYSIS BY THE SIGN TEST
BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT
SOCIAL INTERACTION: TEACHER \times CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant increase of teacher \times child interaction for Miramonte 6th grade.
### TABLE XIX

ANALYSIS BY THE SIGN TEST
BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SOCIAL INTERACTION: CHILD INITIATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant increase of child initiated interaction for Miramonte 6th grade.
### TABLE XX

**ANALYSIS BY THE SIGN TEST**
**BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**SOCIAL INTERACTION: CHILD x CHILD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


School I, Miramonte, for Social Interaction: Child and Child as measured by the BSI to be significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

III. PRE AND POST CORRELATIONS (r) BETWEEN IAR + AND -, AND SSCI

Correlations were made between the IAR and SSCI before and after the treatment period. These pre and post correlations were then subjected to a statistical procedure to determine what effect, if any, the treatment had upon these correlations.

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant differences found on the pre and post correlations between the IAR (both parts of the questionnaire IAR+ and IAR-) and the SSCI.

Table XXI indicates none of the critical ratios were significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the results of the statistical analyses carried out in relation to the stated hypotheses. Conclusions and recommendations are presented in the following chapter.

The chapter presented the data in three sections:
I. Analysis of Covariance design with three independent variables and three dependent variables:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR+</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR-</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR+</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR-</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR+</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR-</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR+</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SSCI &amp; IAR-</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Independent variables
1. Treatment Schools
2. Grade level of the pupils
3. Sex

B. Dependent variables
1. Intellectual Achievement Responsibility for successes (IAR+)
2. Intellectual Achievement Responsibility for failures (IAR-)
3. Sears Self-Concept Inventory (SSCI)

II. Analysis of classroom behavior by the Sign Test.

The eight behavioral categories examined were:
1. Task Orientation
2. Cognitive
3. Motivation--Achievement
4. Motivation--Social
5. Motivation--Compliance
6. Social Interaction: Teacher x Child
7. Social Interaction: Child Initiated
8. Social Interaction: Child x Child

III. The correlation relationship between IAR and SSCI.

In Section I each dependent variable was analyzed separately. For IAR+ and IAR-, Treatment I, and the third grade level were found to be significant at the .01 and .05 levels of probability, respectively. In addition, the IAR-
data showed a significant interaction at the .01 level of probability between the treatment and third grade level. For SSCI the third grade level was found to be significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The analysis of the behavioral data showed significant for both grade levels for the experimental school, Miramonte, on Task Orientation, Motivation—Social, and Motivation—Compliance. In addition, Treatment I, showed significant gains for third graders only on Motivation—Achievement, and significance; further study needed for the third and sixth grade on the Cognitive behavioral category.

On the data regarding Social Interaction (Teacher x Child; Child Initiated, and Child x Child) two categories were found to have significant gains beyond the .10 level of confidence. Those two categories were in favor of the experimental schools sixth graders on Teacher x Child interaction and Child Initiated behavior.

The control school, 66th Street, results showed significance; further study needed for third graders only on Motivation—Compliance.

No significance was found in analyzing the pre and post correlation data between the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire (IAR+ and IAR-) and the Sears Self-Concept Inventory.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this dissertation was to report an investigation of the effects a certain school program might have on individual responsibility, self-concept, and classroom behavior of third and sixth grade Black children attending central city schools located in a poverty area. The instruments used were: (1) the Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire, (IAR+ and IAR-), (2) the Sears Self-Concept Inventory, (SSCI), and (3) the Behavioral Survey Instrument (BSI).

The data for the IAR+, IAR-, and the SSCI were subjected to a three way, factorial, analysis of covariance research design in order to test the statistical validity of the seven hypotheses generated for each dependent variable. The independent variables were (1) the two treatment school programs, (2) the third and sixth grade levels, and (3) the sex of the pupils.

The data from the BSI were subjected for statistical analysis by the Sign Test in order to test the validity of the eight hypotheses related to each behavioral category. The behavioral categories were: (1) Task Orientation, (2) Cognitive, (3) Motivation--Achievement, (4) Motivation--Social, (5) Motivation--Compliance, (6) Social Interaction: Teacher
An additional aspect of the investigation was concerned with the effect, if any, the different school treatments would have on the relationship between the locus of control (IAR+ and IAR-) and self-concept (SSCI) measures. Correlations were made between the results of these instruments before and after the treatment period. The pre and post correlation co-efficients (r) were paired and subjected to a difference between r's test.

The analysis of covariance and the correlation procedures were processed by an electronic computer. Chapter III describes in detail how the study was organized, designed, and carried out.

Conclusions Based on Analysis of Covariance

The analysis of covariance results indicate that the experimental school program at Miramonte did significantly affect the belief in internal locus of control for success and failures of the third and sixth grade Black pupils included in the study. Grade level (third grade) was also found to be significant for internal locus of control (IAR+ and IAR-), but to the degree that further study is needed. When the third grade level and the experimental treatment were allowed to work together significant gains in individual responsibility
for failures were recorded.

The self-concept of the pupils was not significantly affected by the treatment although third graders regardless of the school programs showed greater gains over the treatment period in this regard than did sixth graders. The grade level results suggest that individual responsibility and self-concept may be more susceptible to change in younger than in older children.

It is also a possibility that some children who are overwhelmed and seriously hampered in their learning by the effects of urban poverty, may, as a reaction formation, rate themselves unrealistically on self-concept measures. Experiences designed to increase the belief that they are primarily responsible for their successes and failures in school may in turn cause them to rate themselves more realistically causing post-test results on a measure of self-concept to remain relatively the same. It seems that additional research in this area is needed.

Another noteworthy point was that although no significant results were found for sex, a very slight increase of the mean for Miramonte's (experimental school) third grade boys on responsibility for successes indicates the need for more research in this area to determine if Schools Without Failure programs may be particularly effective with boys. This is noted in view of a similar, but as yet unreported
study on a Schools Without Failure program being conducted in the Palo Alto, California, School District which found boys doing significantly better than girls on several variables.

**Conclusions Based on Sign Test**

In this investigation, significant changes were found in the classroom behavior of pupils attending the Schools Without Failure--Reality Therapy experimental treatment school.

The third and sixth grade pupils attending Miramonte, the experimental school, showed significant increases in their orientation, attention or involvement behavior toward tasks assumed to be appropriate to the school setting.

These same pupils significantly increased their behavior in which processing and seeking information were salient and apparent.

In examining what incentives or needs were involved in the child's activity, Miramonte's third graders significantly increased their behavior motivated primarily by the sense of competence-mastery and achievement derived from a given task or classroom activity. Both the third and sixth grade pupils from Miramonte significantly increased their behavior which is primarily motivated by the satisfaction derived from interacting with other people through a given activity or task. In comparison with the increases made in the
two behavioral motivation categories just mentioned, Miramonte's third and sixth graders showed a significant decrease in behavior characterized by the pupil's response to a teacher's request or to a classroom activity in a routine, automatic, and uninvolved way (compliance). In this same category, sixth grade pupils from the 66th Street School showed a moderately significant decrease of compliant behavior.

Social interaction was studied in three areas: (1) Teacher x Child interactions, (2) Child initiated interactions, (3) Child x child interactions. Sixth graders from the experimental school (Miramonte) were the only pupils from either school showing significant gains. They showed a significant increase in the number of teacher and child interactions and in the number of child initiated interactions.

From these results the investigator was able to conclude that the Schools Without Failure—Reality Therapy program was a significant factor in changing certain classroom behavioral reactions of third and sixth grade pupils participating in this study.

Conclusions Based on the Correlations (r) Analysis

Pre-test and post-test Pearson r correlations were computed between the two subsections of the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire (IAR+ and IAR-) and the Sears
Self-Concept Inventory (SSCI). The data were then subjected to a statistical analysis to determine the significance, if any, of the difference between the pre and post-test correlations. No significant differences between the pre and post-test IAR and SSCI correlations were found. Based on these findings, it was concluded that these instruments probably measure essentially different personality characteristics. Therefore a program designed to affect change in one may, in the beginning, not necessarily affect change in the other.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Further research is needed to develop more sensitive instruments for the measurement of locus of control, self-concept and classroom behavior. Development of instruments applicable to pre-school through third grade aged children is particularly needed.

2. Research investigating parental behaviors and attitudes and their relationship to individual responsibility and self-concept may reveal important findings.

3. If and when effective instruments for younger children are developed, duplication of this study with younger children would be worthwhile.

4. Longitudinal studies similar to this investigation covering at least one full school year and preferably longer periods of time should be conducted in order to assess
more adequately the effects of Schools Without Failure programs and Reality Therapy or alternative treatment programs on variables such as individual and social responsibility.

5. The literature indicates that boys generally have more difficulty being successful in schools than girls. There is some suggestion that the Schools Without Failure program based on psychological concepts from Reality Therapy may be somewhat effective in helping boys in this regard. More research is needed.

6. Important findings may accrue from additional research investigating the relationship between the development of locus of control and self-concept.

7. The effect that different types of teachers have upon the development of internal responsibility in pupils should be investigated further. Attention to the specific behavior of teachers and their influence on enhancing specific behaviors in children would be very interesting and important.

8. Further research is needed to determine how internal-external control expectancies become generalized over various school and life situations.

**Summary**

This study attempted to study the effects a specific
school program would have on individual responsibility, self-concept and certain classroom behaviors of selected elementary school pupils. The investigation demonstrated that the program had significant effects on the development of individual responsibility and encouragement of certain classroom behaviors, but not on self-concept. The sex of the pupils made little difference on the effectiveness of the program but the younger grade level did. No significant results were found when the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR) Questionnaire and the Sears Self-Concept Inventory (SSCI) were compared for their correlation coefficients before and after the treatment period.
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APPENDIX A
APPENDIX A

The Intellectual Achievement
Responsibility Questionnaire

Name____________________________________
Grade____________________________________
Birthday___________________________________
Sex (Male or Female)_______________________

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire describes a number of common experiences most of you have in your daily lives. These statements are presented one at a time, and following each are two possible answers. Read the description of the experience carefully, and then look at the two answers. Choose the one that most often describes what happens to you. Put a circle around the "A" or the "B" in front of that answer. Be sure to answer each question according to how you really feel.

If, at any time, you are uncertain about the meaning of a question, raise your hand and one of the persons who passed out the questionnaires will come and explain it to you.

1. If a teacher passes you to the next grade, would it probably be
   A. because she likes you, or
   B. because of the work you did?

2. When you do well on a test at school, is it more likely to be
   A. because you studied for it, or
   B. because the test was especially easy?

3. When you have trouble understanding something in school, is it usually
   A. because the teacher didn't explain it clearly, or
   B. because you didn't listen carefully?

4. When you read a story and can't remember much of it, is it usually
   A. because the story wasn't well written, or
   B. because you weren't interested in the story?
5. Suppose your parents say you are doing well in school. Is this likely to happen
   A. because your school work is good, or
   B. because they are in a good mood?

6. Suppose you did better than usual in a subject at school. Would it probably happen
   A. because you tried harder, or
   B. because someone helped you?

7. When you lose at a game of cards or checkers, does it usually happen
   A. because the other player is good at the game, or
   B. because you didn't play well?

8. Suppose a person doesn't think you are very bright or clever.
   A. Can you make him change his mind if you try to, or
   B. are there some people who will think you're not very bright no matter what you do?

9. If you solve a puzzle quickly, is it
   A. because it wasn't a very hard puzzle, or
   B. because you worked on it carefully?

10. If a boy or girl tells you that you are dumb, is it more likely that they say that
    A. because they are mad at you, or
    B. because what you did really wasn't very bright?

11. Suppose you study to become a teacher, scientist, or doctor and you fail. Do you think this would happen
    A. because you didn't work hard enough, or
    B. because you needed some help, and other people didn't give it to you?

12. When you learn something quickly in school, is it usually
    A. because you paid close attention, or
    B. because the teacher explained it clearly?

13. If a teacher says to you, "Your work is fine," is it
    A. something teachers usually say to encourage pupils, or
    B. because you did a good job?

14. When you find it hard to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it
    A. because you didn't study well enough before you tried them, or
    B. because the teacher gave problems that were too hard?
15. When you forget something you heard in class, is it
   A. because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or
   B. because you didn't try very hard to remember?

16. Suppose you weren't sure about the answer to a question
   your teacher asked you, but your answer turned out to
   be right. Is it likely to happen
   A. because she wasn't as particular as usual, or
   B. because you gave the best answer you could think of?

17. When you read a story and remember most of it, is it
   usually
   A. because you were interested in the story, or
   B. because the story was well written?

18. If your parents tell you you're acting silly and not
   thinking clearly, is it more likely to be
   A. because of something you did, or
   B. because they happen to feel cranky?

19. When you don't do well on a test at school, is it
   A. because the test was especially hard, or
   B. because you didn't study for it?

20. When you win at a game of cards or checkers, does it
    happen
    A. because you play real well, or
    B. because the other person doesn't play well?

21. If people think you're bright or clever, is it
    A. because they happen to like you or
    B. because you usually act that way?

22. If a teacher didn't pass you to the next grade, would it
    probably be
    A. because she "had it in for you," or
    B. because your school work wasn't good enough?

23. Suppose you don't do as well as usual in a subject at
    school. Would this probably happen
    A. because you weren't as careful as usual, or
    B. because somebody bothered you and kept you from working?

24. If a boy or girl tells you that you are bright, is it
    usually
    A. because you thought up a good idea, or
    B. because they like you?
25. Suppose you became a famous teacher, scientist, or doctor, Do you think this would happen A. because other people helped you when you needed it, or B. because you worked very hard?

26. Suppose your parents say you aren't doing well in your school work. Is this likely to happen more A. because your work isn't very good, or B. because you are feeling cranky?

27. Suppose you are showing a friend how to play a game and he has trouble with it. Would that happen A. because he wasn't able to understand how to play, or B. because you couldn't explain it well?

28. When you find it easy to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it usually A. because the teacher gave you especially easy problems, or B. because you studied your book well before you tried them?

29. When you remember something you heard in class, is it usually A. because you tried so hard to remember, or B. because the teacher explained it well?

30. If you can't work a puzzle, is it more likely to happen A. because you are not especially good at working puzzles, or B. because the instructions weren't written clearly enough?

31. If your parents tell you that you are bright or clever, is it more likely A. because they are feeling good, or B. because of something you did?

32. Suppose you are explaining how to play a game to a friend and he learns quickly. Would that happen more often A. because you explained it well, or B. because he was able to understand it?

33. Suppose you're not sure about the answer to a question your teacher asks you and the answer you give turns out to be wrong. Is it likely to happen A. because she was more particular than usual, or B. because you answered to quickly?
34. If a teacher says to you, "Try to do better," would it be
   A. because this is something she might say to get pupils to try harder, or
   B. because your work wasn't as good as usual?
At certain times in the year, many people like to think about their work and how it is going. Some boys and girls have thought about the things they do and decided that the items on these pages were helpful in thinking about themselves. This is a chance for you to look at yourself and decide what your strong points are and what your weak points are. This is not a test, we expect everyone to have different answers—so be sure your answers show how you think about yourself. Your answers are private and will be kept in confidence.

Read each item and then answer the question: Compared with other boys and girls my age how do I rate now?

Find the box which indicates your answer. The words at the top show what the boxes in each column stand for. Mark an X in one of the boxes to show your answer. Now, go right ahead. Work as fast as you like.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Better than most</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Not so good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being good at sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning things rapidly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Making friends easily, with my own sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Having new, original ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Getting my school work in on time, and not getting behind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being able to read well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being a good size and build for my age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Remembering what I've learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Being willing for others to have their way sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Solving problems in ways others haven't tried before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Being confident, not shy or timid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Knowing how to do math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Being good at things that require physical skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Being a good student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Being a leader—the one to get things started with my own sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Thinking up answers to problems—answers no one else has thought of

17. Being able to concentrate

18. Being interested in science—learning about things that scientists do

19. Being attractive, good-looking

20. Having the brains for college

21. Making other people feel at ease

22. Learning about new things even when other people aren't interested—studying about things on my own

23. Getting a lot of fun out of life

24. Writing creative stories and poems

25. Being a good athlete

26. Being able to apply what I've learned

27. Having plenty of friends, among my own sex

28. Seeing new ways of thinking about things and putting ideas together

**Excel lent** | **Very good** | **Better than most** | **O.K.** | **Not so good**
---|---|---|---|---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Better than most</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Not so good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Spending most of my time on my work, not goofing off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Having good handwriting even when I'm in a hurry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Being not too skinny, not too fat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Having brains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Being sensitive to what other people are feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Being able to see things in my mind easily when I want to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Being able to change things when they don't suit me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Being able to spell correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Enjoying games and sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Being active in social affairs, with my own sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Being smart in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Interested in new things, excited about all there is to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Well organized, having materials ready when they're needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. Learning about people around the world and being interested in them

43. Having nice features (nose, eyes, etc.)

44. Knowing what to do to get the right answer to a problem

45. Being easy to get along with

46. Letting my imagination go when I want to

47. Enjoying myself in school

48. Doing well in art work, painting, or drawing
# APPENDIX C

**BEHAVIORAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**OBSERVATIONAL SHEET**

Stanford University  
Center for Research and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Observer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TASK ORIENTATION:**  
T prescribed and T appropriate; is not nec. while group activity

| A. Intent on individual work |
| B. Engaged in individual work |
| C. Attentive to other child |
| D. Social work |
| E. Attentive to other child |
| F. Intent on other work—not T prescribed |
| G. Disinterest or aimless wandering |

**H. Disruptive**

**SATISFACTION:** In response to whatever behavior is occurring

<p>| A. High |
| B. Moderate |
| C. Low |
| D. Listless |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Mainly sensory-motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mainly achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mainly social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Seeking information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Offering information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Curiosity and experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Following cognitive plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. None observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTILITY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expansive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Constricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR**

6.1 Child & Teacher; A. Present; B. Absent

Initiation: A. Child; B. Teacher

Response to T: A. Complices; B. Ignores; C. Resists; D. None

Seeks support, help, affection, approval: A. Strong; B. Moderate; C. Slight; D. None

Seeks recognition for achievement: A. Strong; B. Moderate; C. Slight; D. None

Verbalization to T: A. Confident; B. Resistant; C. Whine; D. Perseveration; E. Stammer; F. None

Asks re: Task mechanics: A. Present; B. Absent

6.2 Observed child to other child: A. Present; B. Absent

A. Active interchange; B. Approach tentatively; C. Passive participation; D. Passive watchings; E. Imitates; F. Avoids

A. Dominative; B. Submissive; C. Neutral

A. Active sharing; B. Not tolerate sharing; C. None observed

A. Active competition; B. Avoid competition; C. None observed

Verbalization to other child: A. Confident; B. Hesitant; C. Whine; D. Perseveration; E. Stammer; F. None