The purpose of this study was to determine whether the use of group counseling procedures combined with reading skill improvement techniques affects improvement in self-concept and reading skills among small groups of community college students to a greater degree than the presentation of reading skill improvement techniques alone.

Hypotheses tested were the following:

\[ H_1 \] Treatment group I (group counseling and reading skills instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in reading skills achievement as measured by The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A than Treatment Group II (reading skills instruction only). The score considered on this test was the Total Score.
Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading skills instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form than Treatment Group II (reading skills instruction only). Scores considered on this instrument were the following: 1) Total Positive Score; 2) Row 1, Identity Score; 3) Row 2, Self Satisfaction Score; and 4) Row 3, Behavior Score. Other sub-scores were discussed as deemed appropriate.

Procedures

Differences between pre- and post-test response variables on both instruments were statistically analyzed at .05 and .01 levels of significance by a two-way classification of analysis of variance to determine changes in reading behavior and in self-concept of both treatment groups. A one/two factor analysis of variance was performed on all pre-test scores to determine whether any significant (.05 or .01 levels) differences existed between the two treatment groups and dropouts in terms of entering behavior as measured by both instruments. The Fisher Exact Probability Test was run on attrition differences between the two treatment groups to determine if significant differences in attrition existed.

Findings of the Study

Although greater (.20 level of significance) gains were made on reading scores by Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading
instruction) than by Treatment Group II (reading instruction only), gains were not significant at the predetermined .05 and .01 levels. Therefore, \( H_1 \) was rejected, and it was concluded that no significant difference existed between the two treatments in terms of reading improvement of subjects. Significance (.005 level) was found, however, in terms of attrition. Those subjects receiving counseling did not drop out, while the attrition rate for subjects receiving reading instruction only was approximately 66 percent.

Although not all score differences on the TSCS proved significant, most showed greater improvement for Treatment Group I. Moreover, significant scores indicated that for those subjects receiving counseling, personality integration significantly (.01 level) improved, a more balanced (.05 level of significance) self-definition was achieved, a sense of relationships between both close associates and people in general improved significantly (.05 level), a significantly (.05 level) better sense of identity was achieved, a significantly (.01 level) greater sense of personal worth was gained, and global self-concept improved significantly (.05 level). On the basis of these findings, \( H_2 \) was accepted, and it was concluded that group counseling in combination with reading instruction changed self-concept of subjects in Treatment Group I as compared to those in Treatment Group II to a significantly greater positive degree.
Implications

The results of this study indicated that group counseling in combination with reading instruction can significantly improve self-concepts of students in community college reading skills improvement programs. Also suggested was that, although not significant for this study, reading improvement gains can be greater for students receiving counseling in combination with reading instruction and that given a larger N (N for this study was 14), gains might become significant. Furthermore, the results of this study indicated that group counseling combined with reading instruction may be an effective way to reduce attrition from reading improvement programs.

Recommendations

1. Longer term counseling in combination with reading instruction might be undertaken. Limitations to this suggestion are term lengths and attrition rates of community colleges.

2. Replication of the study with a larger N is suggested to further investigate effects on reading gains.

3. A replication of the study might be made with the inclusion of a third treatment group that receives group counseling only.

4. More time might be spent in group counseling sessions relating feelings to reading specifically.
5. More time might be given in counseling sessions to areas of self-perception that showed no significant change in this study.

6. An environment that is less institutional than a classroom is suggested for future studies of this type.

7. Further research is suggested in the relationship between Treatment I as used in this study and attrition rates from community college reading improvement programs.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

College instruction has traditionally been an impersonal fare of lecture, discussion, and laboratory. While the average college student learns and eventually earns his degree from traditional college pedagogy, research (Dickenson and Truax, 1966; Strang, 1966; Stanton, 1967; Janssen, 1969; Ankenbrand, 1971; Santucci, 1972, and others) shows that the potentially bright student who does poorly in the traditional college classroom environment may be failing partly because of weaknesses in the basic communication skills, and also because of affective variables such as a low self-concept. The typical college class, due to its impersonality, does not provide for bolstering a student's self-concept. Affect is largely ignored as part of the learning process.

If the premise, stated in the research cited above, that affect plays a large role in whether or not many students will ultimately succeed in college is correct, is it not indeed strange, in an age that prides itself on educational advances and innovations, that more emphasis is not placed on positively developing the self-concepts of
students in the typical college milieu? But to the contrary, colleges in general spend little time nurturing students' affective behavior. Even the amount of research in the area of affect and its relationship to college success reflects a general disinterest. Beginning with Strang (1966) and ending with Maxwell (1973), only about 25 studies address themselves to the problem.

Interest in self-concept and other personality factors as they relate to college success has been growing steadily but slowly over the past five to ten years, but much is yet to be investigated. Representative among recent research is Whitehill's (1972) study of the personality types of students in college reading programs. He concluded that reading programs should be tailor-made according to personality types of students. Edwards and Tuckman's (1972) study of the differences between self-esteem of university freshmen and community college freshmen concluded that the community college may be a

. . . viable alternative to the university for many students. . . especially. . . for those students who lack the self-confidence necessary to succeed in the competitive university environment. It appears that the community college provides the opportunity for success that is essential to developing self-esteem and realistic occupational identification (p. 571).

These and other studies (Blaine, 1961; Bruner, 1968; Lindgren, 1969; Smith and Winterbottom, 1970) indicate that positive self-concept is a vital element for college success. Such being the case, does it
not behoove colleges, at both the institutional and classroom levels, to become more aware of self-concepts of students? Would it not be just as appropriate, and perhaps even more important, to in some way "test" for self-concept of entering students as it is to test for all the aptitude skills presently screened for on college entrance exams? Having determined as nearly as possible the self-concept levels of students, would it not be relevant to integrate into the cognitive learning process--particularly for students below college norms in basic communication skills such as reading--a program aimed at improving the non-cognitive areas such as self-concept? The present study dealt with exactly these questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the use of group counseling procedures combined with reading skill improvement techniques affects improvement in self-concept and reading skills among small groups of community college students to a greater degree than the presentation of reading skill improvement techniques alone.

Hypotheses

$H_1$ Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading skills instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in
reading skills achievement as measured by The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A than Treatment Group II (reading skills instruction only). The score considered on this test was the Total Score.

H$_2$ Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading skills instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form than Treatment Group II (reading skills instruction only). Scores considered on this instrument were the following: 1) Total Positive Score; 2) Row 1, Identity Score; 3) Row 2, Self Satisfaction Score; and 4) Row 3, Behavior Score. Other sub-scores were discussed as deemed appropriate.

Testing Instruments

The following instruments were used for pre- and post-testing both Treatment Group I and Treatment Group II: 1) Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form (1965), and 2) The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A (1960).

Limitations of the Study

1. Time limitation forced by the college term length may have contributed to the following conditions:
a) Significant measurable changes in self-concept may be difficult to determine in a ten week term.

b) Significant measurable changes in reading skills achievement may be difficult to determine in a ten week term.

2. Chance class scheduling which would assign only students of lower aptitudes or only students of higher aptitudes to either group might have affected results of the study.

3. Conducting the study in one community college limited findings to the extent that community college may not represent a true cross section of community college populations.

4. Such variables as time of day and days of the week when each group met may conceivably have affected findings of the study.

5. Uncontrollable variables such as background differences, general health, and unexpected or undetermined emotional upsets of students in both groups may have influenced experimental and test results.

6. Personality and other uncontrollable variables of one reading instructor as opposed to another may have affected results of the study. However, the type of statistical treatment of data used in this study (see Chapter III) was chosen for its ability to eliminate many of these variables.

7. Personality and other uncontrollable variables of the counselor
may have produced results that would differ should another counselor replicate the study.

8. Because both testing instruments used required reading by examinees, variations in students' reading abilities may have affected findings.

Significance of the Study

Students in Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading skills instruction) were expected to make a significantly greater positive gain in reading skills achievement and in self-concept than students in Treatment Group II (reading skills instruction only). If this expectation was realized, one may conclude that group counseling in combination with reading skills instruction can be a more effective approach to improving reading skills of community college students than reading instruction alone and that this technique could be considered relevant for integration into community college reading improvement programs.

Need for the Study

A relationship between self-concept and reading skills attainment at elementary and secondary levels of education has been demonstrated by much research, as can be found in journals such as \textit{The Reading Teacher, Journal of Reading, and Reading Research}
Quarterly and in many dissertations of the past 20 or more years. Relatively little conclusive research on the relationship between self-concept and reading skills at the college level has been undertaken over the past 20 years but growing interest in such research has recently been shown (Hannah, 1971; Luther, 1972; Maxwell, 1973). The need for this study, therefore, was obvious. Regardless of findings, this study will help to lessen a paucity of research in the field to date and thereby help to lay a slightly broader foundation for further studies of college reading skills as related to self-concept.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used consistently throughout this study and should be understood to have meanings as defined below:

Corrective Reader, Poor Reader, Disabled Reader. These terms, as used in this study, describe those students who scored below norms for their chronological age and college placement as measured on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Form A. The assumption was made that these students generally had no serious physical, psychological, or neurological handicaps that would make reading improvement impossible.

Group Counseling, Group Counseling Processes, Non-Cognitive Learning Processes. These terms, as used in this study, refer to the activities that took place at group meetings consisting of two or more...
students and a counselor and which convened in an informal, relaxed setting for one and one-half hours per week throughout a ten week period. At these meetings group processes intended to build self-concept of group members were used. These processes included group interaction--planned and spontaneous--that concentrated on the objectives of 1) developing self-understanding, 2) developing feelings of positive self-regard, 3) developing insight into personal goals formation, and 4) developing a more positive global self-concept.

Group counseling implies the following:

... group counseling is not an instructional-information giving type experience. It is, however, a learning experience in that the individual learns about himself by examining his beliefs, attitudes, and emotions. In this experience an individual is provided the opportunity to compare, explore, and change his self-concept through a close, personal relationship with other members of the group (Huston and Knighten, 1966, p. 1-2).

Group counseling is a dynamic interpersonal process focusing on conscious thought and behavior and involving the therapy functions of permissiveness, orientation to reality, catharsis, and mutual trust, caring, understanding, acceptance, and support. The therapy functions are created and nurtured in a small group through the sharing of personal concerns with one's peers and the counselor. The group counselees are basically normal individuals with various concerns which are not debilitating to the extent of requiring extensive personality change. The group counselees may utilize the group interaction to increase understanding and acceptance of values and goals and to learn/or unlearn certain attitudes and behaviors (Gazda, Duncan and Meadows, 1967, p. 306).

Relationships can be developed between the counselor-leader and group members, or between members themselves, that can help them to function better outside the group. ... (Glanz, 1962, p. 270).
Counselor. Counselor, as defined in this study, was the person who facilitated group interaction through assisting group members to clarify ideas and feelings. This was done by questioning group members as to the meaning and implications of statements, supporting group members in their attempts to verbalize feelings and ideas, and answering questions completely and honestly (Axmaker, 1970).

Self-concept. Self-concept, as used in this study, consists of the perceptions an individual has of himself in terms of the three major categories of self-perception measured on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale plus the Total Positive Score given on that instrument. The three categories are the following: 1) Identity (What he is), 2) Self Satisfaction (How he accepts himself), and 3) Behavior (How he acts). Each of these categories is included in the Total Positive Score, and each includes the following: 1) physical self, 2) moral-ethical self, 3) personal self, 4) family self, and 5) social self.

Self-esteem, Self-regard. These terms, as used in this study, refer to the degree--positive or negative--to which an individual accepts and values himself.

Summary

The primary premise of this study was that self-concept plays a large role in college success in general and in reading improvement of community college students in particular. In addition, another
premise contained herein was that not enough has yet been done either in practice or in research to deal with the questions raised by the primary premise. The purpose of this study was defined in this chapter as the attempt to determine the effectiveness of using group counseling techniques with small groups of community college students enrolled in corrective and developmental reading courses and to determine how such treatment affects improvement in self-concept and in reading skills. Hypotheses stated that those students receiving both group counseling and reading instruction would demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in both reading skills and self-concept than those students receiving reading instruction only.
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Personality Factors and College Success

Since 1961 several researchers have examined the relationship between personality factors of students and college success.

In a discussion of Rorschach findings on college dropouts, Blaine (1961) stated:

The drop-outs did not show the dramatic Rorschach picture that lay beneath so many student neuroses. Rather, the opposite was the case. The drop-outs tended to give barren performances, devoid of feelings. All they wanted was the facts!...

This lack of emotion and dry interest in the facts is an attitude known to psychologists as anti-intraception. These boys who drop out do not see into themselves. In addition, the drop-outs do not seem to be able to attach their feelings to any external goal (Blaine, 1961, p. 102).

Somewhat later, Lindgren (1969) also discussed the relationship between learning and personality of college students and reiterated that learning—as opposed to rote memorization of facts which are usually forgotten once an exam is passed—takes place only when it can be integrated into the person's personality. He outlined the central differences he detected between successful and unsuccessful learners:

Students who make the most successful learners usually are more complex than most people because they have more interests and are more broadly and deeply involved in the world around them. What happens to these people as they proceed through the college experience is that they become
even more involved in still more activities. ... The fact that college produces this kind of change sheds some light on the reasons why some students experience a great many problems in learning and retention: these individuals are likely to be the ones whose interests are more restricted and who are involved in a limited range of activities. ... Such students suffer from a chronic inability to relate material to be learned to other aspects of their lives; there are just not enough facets to relate things to (Lindgren, 1969, p. 21).

It should be noted that both Blaine and Lindgren imply that disabled learners at the college level have either a negative self-concept or very little perception of self at all. With either, these and other studies (Plant and Minium, 1967; Hannah, 1971; Maxwell, 1971, 1973) seem to indicate, one not only can (and probably will) easily become entrapped in the "self-fulfilling prophecy" net and fail in learning tasks, but he also may find himself in a double bind by being unable to internalize learning experiences because there is nothing within him to which such experiences can be related. Is this not what Bruner (1968) talked about when he spoke of "degree of personal relevance"?

Curiously, Hannah (1971), who explored personality traits of "dropouts and stay-ins" with the Omnibus Personality Inventory, suggested that

... individuals of both sexes who think at a less simplistic level; who exhibit greater tolerance for ambiguity and experimentation; who tend to express impulses in terms of overt action; who are more hostile, aggressive, and anxious; and who tend to create poorer personal impressions will more likely than not be found among dropouts. ... (p. 18).

But he also admitted that those students who dropped out were "less
personally integrated than... their persisting peers," which would again suggest that dropouts tend to have either low or flat self-concepts.

Maxwell (1971) found that "generally, poor achievers are self-deprecatory, lack a clear system of goals and values, are vulnerable to disparagement by others, have immature relations with parents, lack insight into their problem and are likely to be anxious and depressed." These findings supported Oakland's (1959) contention that

...students with average intellect are in need of the traits of persistence and self-confidence if they are to achieve, while students with superior aptitude can rely on their intellectual abilities to get them well along toward achievement unless subverted by emotional conflicts and problems (p. 457).

Earlier, Plant and Minium (1967) had said that "the evidence indicates that non-intellectual development is similar in its trend to that of intellectual development," and more recently, Smith and Winterbottom (1970) found that

...probation students have unrealistically optimistic expectations concerning grades, attribute their difficulties to academic factors rather than personal concerns, and tend to be defensive, lacking in positive motivation for academic work, and relatively dependent on their parents (p. 391).

Plant and Minium (1967) had also found that "there is strong evidence that high-aptitude groups of young adults have substantially more 'psychologically positive' nonintellectual development over time."

Speaking specifically about college students with reading problems, Neal (1967) found that "the fast, non-comprehending reader is
basically a depressed and asocial, withdrawn and self-destructive, non-emotional person who tends to repress his feelings. And Hedley (1968) found that "in general, positive personality attributes relate to higher reading performance and neurotic characteristics of personality tend to correspond to a poorer reading performance."

In comparing improving and non-improving students in an educational skills course, Gelso and Osterhouse (1971) found that improvers... prior to taking the course... already enjoy and find meaningful the curricular aspect of college... have 'found themselves' in that they know the general direction their lives should follow, feel that college has an important place in their plans... and are self-reliant, assertive individuals (p. 503).

In 1965, Brookover insisted that "if self-concept of academic ability is enhanced then higher academic achievement will result" (Brookover and Erickson, 1965). Maxwell (1971) agreed wholeheartedly with this and insisted that it is extremely "doubtful that exposure to a reading improvement course, to a pacer or tachistoscope or to study techniques--without intensive counseling--will change these students' habits or enhance their chances of succeeding academically."

Most recently, Braun and Neilsen (1973) concluded about adult readers that

A negative self-concept of the learner is developed and maintained by consistent, continual confirmation of failure and lack of ability. Changing this will be the initial and
often most difficult task of the clinician who is working with adults. In most instances this self-image will be firmly established and highly resistant to change (p. 158).

Furthermore, Maxwell (1973) insisted that "the reading specialist needs counseling skills and insights in working with individual students with emotional and motivational problems."

Introduction of Group Counseling Techniques into College Reading Improvement

Although numerous studies on the relationship between personality factors and reading levels have been conducted in the past decade, the number of studies relating specifically to group counseling techniques used with poor readers at the college level has been relatively small. Since 1965 approximately 25 such studies have appeared in journals--most of which were counseling and guidance journals--or in dissertations. Only recently have reading journals taken an interest in group techniques. The earlier of these studies called for further examination of the relationships between reading instruction, anxiety factors related to reading, and counseling, and suggested group counseling as a possible answer. Few experimental studies (Leib and Snyder, 1967; Riegert, 1968; Pearson, 1969; Trotzer and Sease, 1971) conducted to date that used group counseling techniques had negative findings, which would seem to indicate the relevancy of such practice.
Personality Factors

Boyd (1965), a pioneer in small group techniques for instruction, reported that his findings would seem to indicate that in instruction groups for adults certain factors were important: personality factors of individual group members, size of group, congruency of individual levels of aspiration, group goals, and type of group leader and interaction (i.e., directive versus non-directive). A year later Brunken and Shen (1966) reported on personality factors they found to be related to reading levels of college students and suggested further study of relationships between reading instruction and counseling. Graff (1971) found group desensitization techniques (deep muscle relaxation, use of standardized hierarchy related to test anxiety, and counterconditioning) useful for groups of highly anxious students.

Group Counseling and College Achievement

Experimenting with group counseling techniques and underachievement of college students there were approximately 25 pertinent studies conducted since 1965. Among these some disagreement exists as to the validity of such techniques for solving the poor reader's problems. Favoring such techniques are such people as Dickenson and Truax (1966), Strang (1966), Roth (1967), Stanton (1967), Gardner and Ransom (1968), Mezzano (1968), Janssen (1969), Vriend

Studies Favoring Group Counseling Techniques

Strang (1966) felt that "most, if not all, of our guidance problems are related to, if not caused by, failure in reading," and argued for a close working relationship between the two areas. (She used the term "guidance" somewhat loosely and in the same sense that the term "counseling" is usually used.) Dickenson and Truax (1966) concluded from their experiment that "with adequate group counseling...attrition rate in college could be cut by one-half at relatively low cost and without any lowering of academic standards..." And Stanton (1967) insisted that

...an individual's reading ability is only one facet of his total behavior. If he has difficulty reading, there are probably a multiplicity of reasons...each compounding the other... Emphasis should be placed on therapy, with reading instruction following as emotional readiness is determined (p. 95).

Roth (1967) found improvement in grades for probationary
students required to participate in group counseling which began with an authoritarian approach to eliminate study avoidance mechanisms and moved (after five to eight sessions) into a client-centered mode.

Mezzano's study (1968) contradicted negative findings in the area and defined problem areas of underachievers which can best be dealt with in group counseling as "feelings of hostility, feelings about self, family relationships, pressure from outside sources, feelings of guilt, and feelings of depression." He felt that negative findings in some studies were a result of the fact that "it takes some time before the results of newly gained insights resulting from group counseling are translated into action."

Gardner and Ransom (1968) discovered that their typical remedial reader employed avoidance behavior and felt that based on information developed in counseling (i.e., manner in which the student perceives himself, his rationale for school difficulties, and his unique avoidance patterns in learning situations) a reading program should be tailored to fit each individual.

Working with minority students, Vriend (1969) found counseling groups invaluable for training peer counselors and for the students that these "counselors" later worked with.

Janssen (1969) found that "the use of student leaders to conduct small counseling groups was effective in helping the low-achieving freshmen improve their academic performance."
Anthony (1971) found that a study skills course in conjunction with a self-understanding program had a significant effect on the academic improvement of low achieving college students.

Ankenbrand's findings (1971) suggested that "high risk students bring poor self concepts with them to the community college [so] it would appear that the initial focus of remediation needs to be on non-academic factors."

Luther (1972) found that at the end of one semester "counseled subjects had significantly higher mean grade point average than did noncounseled subjects" and that they also had "significantly higher mean scores on four of seven scales of the CPI." He was experimenting with the use of high-achieving, same-age peers as leaders for counseling groups in an attempt to raise self-esteem and academic achievement of marginal college freshmen.

Studying the effects of T-Group process and study skills training on self-confidence of minority students, Santucci (1972) found that the "combination of T-Group/study skill training was significantly effective in producing higher grade point averages."

Finally, GPA's of a group of college students "improved more than expected" in Kaye's study (1972), which combined individual counseling, group counseling, and academic skills training.
Negative Findings

While considerably more studies revealed positive correlations between group counseling and academic achievement than negative correlations, those few that were negative should be mentioned.

Leib and Snyder (1967) experimented with two groups of students from reading and study skills classes. One group met with a group leader who used counseling techniques, guiding discussion on general topics such as motivation, negative effects of under-achieving, positive aspects of achieving, independence from conformity and merits of self-direction, efficient use of time, specific study problems, difficulties with parental communication, resolution of common problems and conflicts; the other group met in regular reading-study skills classes which placed emphasis on lecture with specific questions and answers. Both groups improved in reading abilities with no significant differences occurring between them. The researchers concluded that group counseling was not particularly relevant in this case.

Riegert (1968) investigated the problem of whether "group counseling with marginal risk college freshmen [was] effective in improving their academic performance and personal adjustment" and found that the only significant change was the score on self-image of counseled students. No significant academic improvement appeared to be evident.
Pearson (1969) studied the effects of a combined reading and group counseling program on college students enrolled in reading improvement classes and found "no significant differences between the total experimental and control groups on reading improvement, self-concept, anxiety, study habits and attitudes, and grade point average as a result of group counseling."

The findings in Trotzer and Sease's study (1971) were also negative or inconclusive. This study dealt with three groups: 1) an encounter group that was unstructured and focused on personal awareness and development of relationships with other group members, 2) a discussion group in which specific topics such as religion, student unrest, and Vietnam were discussed, and 3) a control group that received no treatment. The factors measured resembled those given by Maslow (1968): self-ideal, self-congruence, self-acceptance, acceptance of others, positiveness, self-criticism, and self-satisfaction. The result of the experiment was that "no group experience had any noticeable impact on the members' self-concepts."

Inconclusive Findings

Falling somewhere between positive and negative findings regarding the relationship between group counseling techniques and the improvement of college learning disabilities are six inconclusive studies.
Gilbreath (1967) found in two studies on "leader structured" and "group structured" counseling groups for underachieving college males that "dependent" males achieved in leader structured groups while "independent" males achieved in group structured groups. In a follow-up study in 1968, however, he changed his mind when he found that the differences apparent immediately after the experiment did not persist except in highly-dependent male underachievers in leader structured groups.

Brown (1969) focused on anxiety of the underachiever and experimenting with three groups (unstructured, structured, and skills class) found that high anxiety people were helped most by unstructured groups and low anxiety people best by structured groups, saying that "there is even the possibility that for high-anxious students a structured group experience or classroom approach has a negative impact on personal growth and academic progress."

Thelen and Harris' study (1968) resulted in the conclusion that "those underachievers who want group therapy and on tests appear to be relatively well adjusted have the most to gain from group therapy, and the most to lose from not obtaining such help.‖ But they neither suggested that group therapy or group counseling were answers to academic problems nor that they were to be discarded.

Wahlberg (1970) examined the effect of process intervention on the attitudes and learning in a college freshman composition class and produced inconclusive results.
Hendricks (1972) compared two methods of improving study effectiveness. One of these was a conventional study skills course. The other was a group in which study skills were briefly taught but in which the main emphasis was in eliminating self-defeating behavior. He found both methods equally effective in improving study skills and in modifying self-concept and anxiety.

**Summary**

In review, the question of group counseling for treatment or partial treatment of reading problems of college students is still at issue. While all indications would tend to favor the use of such techniques, much research is still needed in order to come to any sort of ultimate conclusion. As Paul (1967) so succinctly stated, we usually ask the wrong questions. Instead of asking whether or not group counseling works, we should ask, "What treatment, by whom, is most effective for this individual with that specific problem, and under which set of circumstances?"
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND RELATED PROCEDURES

Subjects

The population from which the subjects for this research were selected consisted of all students enrolled in corrective and developmental reading courses during the ten week 1974 Spring term at Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon. Those students scheduled to attend any of four specified reading courses offered in the Study Skills Center at Lane Community College were designated as subjects. Each of the two participating instructors offered one of these classes on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and one of these classes on Tuesday and Thursday throughout the term. Thus, there were two classes of reading improvement offered on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and two classes on Tuesday and Thursday. Hence, both treatment groups were matched as nearly as possible in respect to instructors.

The Tuesday-Thursday classes were designated as Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading instruction) so that equal amounts of time per week could be spent in reading skills instruction (for 1 1/2 hours) and in group counseling (for 1 1/2 hours). Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes were selected as Treatment Group II (reading instruction only).
Testing Instruments

After examining a number of instruments, the researcher selected the two testing instruments used in this study because of their relatively high validity and reliability (see Appendix A). The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A was used to determine subjects' reading ability and achievement. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form was used to determine the subjects' self-reported self-concepts. Scores considered were as follows:

1. One score was considered on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A: Total Score (vocabulary plus comprehension).

2. Scores considered on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form were as follows:
   a) Total Positive Score
   b) Identity Score
   c) Self Satisfaction Score
   d) Behavior Score

The Nelson-Denny Reading Test

The Nelson-Denny Reading Test is one of the better known and most widely used college-level reading tests. The manual states three intended purposes for the test: 1) to predict probable success in college, 2) to section incoming college or high school classes, and 3) to diagnose reading problems. In addition, the test is commonly
used by college reading instructors to pre- and post-test for reading achievement gain. The test was designed for use in grades nine through sixteen and was normed accordingly. It measures reading skills in three areas: 1) vocabulary, 2) comprehension, and 3) rate of reading. Reviews of the test by Buros (1972) were generally good. Buros' main criticisms regarded comprehension questions that are primarily of the factual-recall variety and the fact that rate of reading too strongly influences scores. Although these criticisms are well-taken, they might be made about almost any standardized college reading test presently on the market known to this researcher.

Norming groups for the Nelson-Denny were relatively large and catholic. Total N (grades 9 through 16) was 20,866. Total N for grades 13 and 14 (levels considered in this study) was 4,937. Of that number, 609 subjects were drawn from community colleges (the type of institution considered in this study). Norming groups were selected from all portions of the United States and from all types of secondary schools, colleges, and universities.

Validity for the revised form of the test--the form used in this study--was determined by item analysis. Selection of test items was made from the original forms of the test; a trial test was given to subjects; an item analysis was performed on the basis of trial test results; changes were made in individual items as deemed appropriate; a retest was given to subjects; another item analysis was
performed; and selected items were divided equally between forms A and B of the revised test (see Appendix A for validity and difficulty data).

Reliability coefficients were derived from the equivalent forms method. Both A and B forms of the test were administered to the same students, the time interval between administrations being one week. N consisted of 110 students from a University Extension Division course in Efficient Reading. Half of these students were given Form A first, and half were given Form B first. Reliability of rate was checked with students who had had no class work in reading and with those who had completed a reading course (see Appendix A for reliability coefficients).

The standard error of measurement was used in judging reliability to estimate the amount of fluctuation to be expected in any individual score, because "since no test measures with absolute accuracy, scores should not be thought of as points but as bands, within the limits of which the student's true score is most likely to fall. The standard error of measurement indicates the width of the band or the estimated variability of the test scores" (Manual, 1960, p. 27) (see Appendix A for standard errors of measurement for grades 13 and 14).
Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale would appear to be one of the better self-concept measuring instruments (Buros, 1972). The respondent chooses one of five response options labeled from "completely false" to "completely true" on each of the 100 items that result in 15 profile scores: a self-criticism score; nine self-esteem scores (identity, self-satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, social self, and total); three variability of response scores (variation across the first three of the self-esteem scores, variation across the last five self-esteem scores, and total); distribution score; time score. These scores are reported on the "counseling form" of the scale. Thirty profiled scores appear on the "clinical and research form," which include the 15 scores from the counseling form plus these: response bias; net conflict; total conflict; six empirical scales (defensive positive, general maladjustment, psychosis, personality disorder, neurosis, personality integration); deviant signs; and five scores consisting of counts of each type of response made. As Buros (1972) has stated, the scores yield a vast amount of information from only 100 items.

The norming group for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was drawn from "various parts of the country," ranged in age from 12 to 68 years, included approximately equal numbers of both sexes,
included both Negro and Caucasian representatives, represented all social, economic, and intellectual levels and educational levels ranging from grade six through the Ph.D., and came from high school and college classes, employers at state institutions, and "various other sources" (Manual, 1965). N was 626. Findings of subsequent studies have not differed appreciably from original norms (Manual, 1965). Two problems existed with the norming groups: 1) the group did not reflect the population as a whole in proportion to its ethnic composition, and 2) over-represented in the group were college students, Caucasian subjects, and persons age 12 to 30 years. These faults should present no serious threat to the present study, however, since the population from which samples were drawn consisted primarily of subjects falling into these very categories.

Validity of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was determined by four procedures: 1) determination of content validity, 2) discrimination between groups, 3) correlation with other personality measures, and 4) observation of personality changes under particular conditions.

Content validity was determined by a panel of judges consisting of seven clinical psychologists. Items were retained in the Scale only upon unanimous agreement among judges regarding their correct classification within the Row Scores and Column Scores format of the test.
A discrimination between groups validity approach was based on personality theory and research that suggests that groups which differ on certain psychological dimensions should also differ in self-concept (e.g., differences should be expected between psychiatric patients and non-patients, between delinquents and non-delinquents, and so on). Hence, 369 psychiatric patients were compared with the 626 non-patients of the norming group and with 75 people characterized as high in personal integration (PI). This latter group would fall on the extreme opposite end of a mental health continuum from the psychiatric patient group. In most instances highly significant (.001 level) differences were demonstrated (see Appendix B).

Correlation with other personality measures is yet another way by which validity was assessed. Correlations appeared between the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and several other personality measures. The Scale correlated on most scores with the MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory), one of the most widely used of all personality measures, for example (see Appendix B).

Personality changes under particular conditions would be expected to occur. For example, logically one would expect positive changes in self-concept due to positive experiences and negative changes in self-concept due to negative experiences. A number of studies have demonstrated that the Scale reflects such changes with regularity. Ashcraft and Fitts (1964) completed one of the most
thorough such studies in which they used the TSCS to measure on a test-retest basis 30 patients who had six months of therapy against 24 patients who had no therapy but had been waiting for therapy for approximately six months. The therapy group changed significantly in the expected direction on 18 of 22 variables studied.

Reliability of the TSCS is generally high. With the exception of the NDS Score (number of deviant signs), which was not considered in this study, other scores yield raw score distributions that conform fairly closely to the normal curve. Test-retest reliability coefficients of all major scores on both forms of the Scale appear in Appendix B.

In spite of its shortcomings, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale has great potential and it "ranks among the better measures combining group discrimination with self concept information" (Buros, 1972, p. 151).

**Testing Procedures**

All subjects (N = 28) in both treatment groups were administered The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form during the week of April 1, 1974. Standard testing procedures as described in respective test manuals were meticulously followed to assure that testing was as accurate as possible.
All subjects (N = 14) except the 14 who had dropped out of the reading program during the term were post-tested on the same forms of the same instruments during the first week of June, 1974. Again, prescribed testing procedures were strictly observed.

Selection of Treatments and Treatment Implementation

According to individual class scheduling, during the ten week term beginning March 25, 1974, Treatment Group I met one and one-half hours each week on Tuesday in one or the other of the two pre-designated reading classes. Each of these classes was taught by one of the two participating instructors. Treatment Group I also met one and one-half hours on Thursday of each week with a counselor (the researcher in this study) for participation in group counseling. The group counseling took place in the regular classrooms at the Lane Community College Study Skills Center. The reading classes met in the same classrooms on alternate days. A total of seven subjects was included in Treatment Group I.

At the first group counseling meeting, the counselor presented information on the difference between cognitive and non-cognitive learning, explained why awareness of non-cognitive learning might be important to the individual, and initiated a process designed to build trust among group members. The process used, "Active Listening,"
was selected from those described in detail in Appendix C. Time permitted only one process to be used. Although the activities of the first meeting may have opened doors to the central goals of the study, that was not their prime function. Rather than concentrating on specific goals relating to self-concept change, the activities of this meeting were considered "ice-breakers" and were used to initiate subjects into group counseling in a non-threatening way.

Since global, or total positive, self-concept can be many-faceted, and thus countless sub-areas of self-concept might become goals of such a study as this one, time and other such limitations permitted only selected goals. Thus, four goals were selected as most pertinent for this study: 1) to develop positive global self-concept, 2) to develop self-understanding, 3) to develop feelings of positive self-regard, and 4) to develop insights into personal goals formation. Goals 2, 3, and 4 may be thought of as subsections of goal 1 and are reflected in positive global self-concept.

The four goals for Treatment Group I relate to four measures of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: 1) Total Positive Score (the individual's overall level of self-esteem), 2) Identity Score (what the individual is as he perceives himself), 3) Self Satisfaction Score (how the individual feels about the self he perceives), and 4) Behavior Score (how the individual thinks he acts). Just as goals 2, 3, and 4 relate to and are reflected in goal 1 (to develop positive global self-concept),
scores 2, 3, and 4 relate to and are reflected in score 1 (Total Positive Score).

Specific processes were selected from those in Appendix C to achieve each of the three specific goals included in goal 1 (to develop positive global self-concept):

1) Processes selected to develop self understanding:
   a) Animal Game
   b) Color Book
   c) Using Quiet Time
   d) Who Are You?
   e) Backward Name Fantasy Trip
   f) Intellect-Emotions

2) Processes selected to develop feelings of positive self-regard:
   a) Negative Self Image
   b) Hole-Card
   c) Strength Exercise
   d) Strengths
   e) Proud Whip
   f) I Learned Statements

3) Processes selected to develop insights into personal goals formation:
   a) Either-or Forced Choice
   b) Three Characters
   c) Alligator River
   d) Communication Game
   e) Personal Coat of Arms
   f) Boundary Breaking

Since global self-concept includes the three goals for which processes were listed, all of the above processes were regarded as designed to develop positive global self-concept as well; therefore, a separate
list of selected processes for this goal was neither considered necessary nor compiled.

Nine group counseling sessions were devoted to the goals above--three sessions to each goal. Six exercises for each goal were selected with the assumption that two exercises could be completed at each session. However, the research design assumed that should lack of time or unexpected group and individual needs rule out any of the planned processes, the experiment would not be damaged for several reasons: 1) many processes had dual-purpose objectives, and thus an overlap often existed between process objectives and experimental goals (e.g., a process selected for developing self-understanding could be applicable to developing feelings of positive self-regard as well); 2) but most important, in any group counseling situation attention to group members' immediate needs must be considered basic to positive self-concept building and therefore must command attention over specific process techniques. For example, should group members find themselves unexpectedly embroiled in a conflict-resolution or decision-making problem, dealing with that problem could be more beneficial in building positive self-concept than any planned process and thus would be justified as a substitute. In short, counseling groups were structured to the extent that planned processes were utilized but non-structured to the extent that digressions into immediate and pressing group and individual needs were
made at the discretion of the counselor and group members when deemed necessary.

During the interaction of the counseling group, any member had the option to "pass" during any single process or discussion without censure of any kind on the part of the counselor. The counselor was both a leader and a participant of the group.

To have a working record from which to evaluate group sessions, an anecdotal record (see Appendix D) was kept by the counselor on processes used, discussions, group concerns, apparent reactions and results, any noted changes (positive or negative) in individual subjects, and any other information deemed pertinent to the study. Some sessions were taped, but strong objections from some group members precluded taping of all sessions. The main purpose of taping was to aid the counselor in notetaking and in understanding nuances missed at the original session.

Treatment Group II (reading instruction only), which met on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, received pre- and post-testing on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A and on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form, and no treatment other than regular three-hour-per-week reading skills instruction during the same ten week term. Reading classes attended by Treatment Group II were taught by the same two instructors who taught Treatment Group I reading skills. Reading skills covered for
both Treatment Groups I and II consisted of the following: 1) vocabulary building through phonetic analysis, structural analysis, and context clues; 2) comprehension building through association of ideas, organization of ideas, appreciation, critical reading, interpretation, and application to problem solving; and 3) study skills building through the SQ3R method. Treatment Group II students also had as part of their instructional program individual reading laboratory projects such as using a controlled reader, a reading pacer, film strips, and the like. However, the time ordinarily spent in individual laboratory activities was spent in group counseling by Treatment Group I--this being the only portion of the reading skills instruction program to differ from that received by Treatment Group II.

Analysis of Data

Data collected from pre- and post-tests in this study were statistically treated by a two-way classification of analysis of variance. This analysis was performed at the .05 and .01 levels of significance. This statistical test was chosen because of its ability to remove effects of teaching styles, plus other uncontrollable factors, of the two teachers (Petersen, 1973; Snedecor and Cochran, 1973) involved in the study when comparisons of Treatment Group I (reading instruction and group counseling) versus Treatment Group II (reading instruction only) were made. In using this statistical method, the assumption was
made that students were randomly assigned to groups by class scheduling and that groups were all samples from the same population (Petersen, 1973). The statistical test was run on response variable differences—differences between pre- and post-test scores on each of the two instruments used—in order to determine significance of any changes made by the subjects on selected scores and on total scores.

Summary

The population from which treatment groups were selected for this study consisted of all students enrolled in corrective and developmental reading courses taught at the Study Skills Center at Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon, during the 1974 Spring term. Four reading classes taught by two instructors were selected as the treatment groups. The students enrolled in reading classes taught by each of the two instructors on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday were designated as belonging to Treatment Group II (reading instruction only). Students in these classes received reading instruction only throughout the term. The students enrolled in reading classes taught by each of the two instructors on Tuesday and Thursday were designated as belonging to Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading instruction). Students in these classes received reading instruction for one and one-half hours each week and group counseling for
one and one-half hours each week throughout the term. The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form were selected to pre- and post-test all individuals in both groups. At the end of the ten week study, test data were statistically treated by a two-way classification of analysis of variance at the .05 and .01 levels of significance to determine any significant changes in self-concept and in reading skills as measured by the selected instruments. Hypotheses of the study stated that significantly greater positive changes would occur in self-concept and in reading skills of students in Treatment Group I than would occur of students in Treatment Group II as measured on the above instruments.
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Treatment Groups

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the use of group counseling procedures combined with reading skill improvement techniques affects improvement in self-concept and reading skills among small groups of community college students to a greater degree than the presentation of reading skill improvement techniques alone.

From an original sample size of 28, complete pre- and post-test results were obtained from 14 subjects. Initial treatment group sizes were uneven. While Treatment Group II began the term with a total of 21 subjects, Treatment Group I began the term with only seven subjects. Each treatment group contained seven subjects at the end of the term--two subjects from each of the classes taught by one participating reading instructor and five subjects from each of the classes taught by the other participating reading instructor.

As reflected in the literature (Spache, 1964; Kerstiens, 1970; Adams, 1971; Hess, 1972; Barrios, 1973; Gabbert and Birdwell, 1973; Ross and Lyons, 1973), the attrition rate of reading improvement classes at the community college level is between 23-58 percent of the students who originally enroll. Therefore, the attrition rate (14 subjects) of Treatment Group II was typical of attrition from
community college reading classes in general. However, attrition from Treatment Group I was atypical, and a Fisher Exact Probability Test proved this difference to be significant at the .005 level.

Although each community college reading program has its own idiosyncracies, in respect to skills taught, pedagogy, philosophy, and clientele Lane Community College's reading program can be considered representative of many such programs as reflected in the literature (Joffe, 1968; Kerstiens, 1970; Strumpf, 1970; Hagstrom, 1971; Newman, 1971; Rosenberg, 1971; Booth, 1972; Erickson, 1972; Warrenburg, 1972; Barrios, 1973; Gabbert and Birdwell, 1973; Rosen, 1973).

Determined in advance was the fact that counseling groups would be structured to the extent that planned processes would be utilized but non-structured to the extent that digressions into immediate and pressing group and individual needs would be made. The non-structured approach was used more often for several reasons; 1) some selected processes were inappropriate for the unanticipated small size of counseling groups that resulted from low enrollment, 2) a close, open relationship between members developed relatively rapidly within the counseling groups, and 3) most group members were struggling with problems for which they sought group support (see Appendix D). General discussion remained within the four designated goal areas for counseling sessions. In addition to
non-structured interaction, the following processes were used: "Active Listening," "Who Are You?," "Hole-Card," "Personal Coat of Arms," "Boundary Breaking," and "Strengths" (see Appendix C). Each goal area was thereby represented by a pre-designated process at least once during the term.

In general, the counseling group was group-centered in that topics for discussion arose from group members. The counselor played several roles: 1) she was a leader in respect to promoting discussion and processes, 2) a reflector of feelings and ideas for the purpose of indicating acceptance and understanding and for clarifying ideas and feelings of individuals, 3) a synthesizer of ideas and feelings between group members for the purpose of promoting interaction, and 4) a participant who shared her own feelings and ideas freely for the purpose of promoting openness among group members.

**Analysis of Data**

A one/two factor analysis of variance was performed on pre-test scores of all subjects, including those who did not complete the term, to determine whether Treatment Group I differed significantly in entering behavior from either Treatment Group II or dropouts. No significant difference was shown. Hence, both treatment groups were considered representative of students enrolled in reading classes at the Study Skills Center at Lane Community College in respect to
reading levels as measured on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A and self-concept as measured on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form.

All subjects who did not drop out before the end of the term were both pre- and post-tested on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form and on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A. Score differences between pre- and post-tests were statistically treated by a two-way classification of analysis of variance at the .05 and the .01 levels of significance. Critical F-values were 4.96 at the .05 level and 10.04 at the .01 level of significance.

Hypotheses tested were the following:

H₁ Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading skills instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in reading skills achievement as measured by The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A than Treatment Group II (reading skills instruction only).

H₂ Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading skills instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form than Treatment Group II (reading skills instruction only).
Scores to be considered were the Total Score on the Nelson-Denny and four scores on the TSCS: 1) Total Positive Score; 2) Row 1, Identity Score; 3) Row 2, Self Satisfaction Score; and 4) Row 3, Behavior Score.

Nelson-Denny Score Analysis

Changes in the Total Score achieved by both treatment groups on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A were analyzed statistically. This score was analyzed in two ways: 1) score differences between pre and post-tests, and 2) percentage of improvement relative to the original score. Neither analysis proved statistically significant at .05 or .01 levels, but in both cases gains in reading at the .20 level of significance were evident in favor of Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading instruction) over Treatment Group II (reading instruction only). However, Treatment Group I had lower pre-test reading scores and achieved greater gains (Mean Scores: pre-test = 56, post-test = 66.3) than Treatment Group II (Mean Scores: pre-test = 74, post-test = 76) as measured by The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A. In terms of percentages, Treatment Group I made approximately a 11 percent greater gain in reading scores than Treatment Group II. Considering that the group that had greater gains had only half as much reading instruction as the other group, and considering that the difference between attrition
rates from the two groups was significant to the .005 level in favor of Treatment Group I, one could conclude that although one treatment was not significantly different from the other at the .05 or .01 levels in terms of reading improvement, Treatment I was just as good as, if not slightly better than, Treatment II in terms of producing reading improvement and in terms of preventing attrition. Mean change differences between group reading scores are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

**TSCS Score Analysis**

The following data resulted from statistical analysis of score changes on the *Tennessee Self Concept Scale*, Clinical and Research Form:

**Total P Score.** This score reflects the overall level of self-esteem of the individual. People scoring high on this measure tend to like themselves, feel they are persons of value and worth, have self-confidence, and act accordingly (Manual, 1965). All subjects scored below the norm mean (50th percentile) on pre-tests on this measure. Subjects completing Treatment Group II (reading only) remained below the norm mean on post-test scores, while subjects from Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading) rose above the norm mean on post-test scores on this measure (see Appendix E). Treatment Group I showed significantly (.05 level) greater gain in positive global self-concept as reflected by this score than Treatment Group II.
Table 1. Comparison of Mean Score Change of the Total Score on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>7.5000</td>
<td>0.7071</td>
<td>1.9058a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>11.4000</td>
<td>8.3546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment II (Reading only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>5.5000</td>
<td>13.4350</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>6.5802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p < .20 \]

Table 2. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Percentage of Improvement on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>11.5000</td>
<td>0.7071</td>
<td>2.8522a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>20.4000</td>
<td>13.5943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment II (Reading only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>16.9705</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>-0.3000</td>
<td>10.3295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p < .20 \]
Replications of the treatment having like variables would be likely to result in the same outcome more than 95 percent of the time. These data are reflected in Table 3.

**Row 1 P Score--Identity.** This score reflects the person's basic identity—what he is as he sees himself (Manual, 1965). As with the Total P Score, the Identity Score differences showed that Treatment Group I made a significantly (.05 level) greater positive gain than Treatment Group II. In other words, the treatment group receiving counseling gained a better sense of positive self-knowledge as measured by the TSCS than the group receiving no counseling, and such a change under like treatment conditions would probably take place 95 percent of the time. These data are presented in Table 4.

**Row 2 P Score--Self Satisfaction.** This score reflects the level of self satisfaction or self-acceptance an individual possesses (Manual, 1965). While this score showed a significantly (.05 level) greater positive change for Treatment Group I, it also showed significant (.05 level) change for the interaction between the two treatment groups. Therefore, one must conclude that score gains were dependent in part on teacher influence, and the two areas of significance cancel one another out as shown on Table 5.

**Row 3 P Score--Behavior.** This score reflects an individual's perception of his behavior or the way he functions (Manual, 1965). Although gains were greater in a positive direction for Treatment
### Table 3. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Total P Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F - value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>30.4055</td>
<td>7.0555*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>19.6000</td>
<td>19.4628</td>
<td>40.3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment II (Reading only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-32.5000</td>
<td>40.3050</td>
<td>1.4367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>6.8000</td>
<td>16.9911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.4055</td>
<td>19.4628</td>
<td>7.0555*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

### Table 4. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Row 1 P Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F - value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>15.5563</td>
<td>5.0761*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>6.8000</td>
<td>5.4497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment II (Reading only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-13.5000</td>
<td>19.0918</td>
<td>1.5007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.8740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.5563</td>
<td>5.4497</td>
<td>5.0761*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 5. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Row 2 P Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>18.3847</td>
<td>8.1833*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>7.4000</td>
<td>9.3968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment II (Reading only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-19.5000</td>
<td>9.1923</td>
<td>2.6449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>7.6000</td>
<td>7.9246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3753*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Table 6. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Row 3 P Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>5.5000</td>
<td>3.5355</td>
<td>1.2966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>5.4000</td>
<td>6.8410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment II (Reading only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>12.0208</td>
<td>0.0202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>-0.8000</td>
<td>9.3112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group I than for Treatment Group II (see Appendix E), gains were not statistically significant at .05 or .01 levels as shown on Table 6.

Although the significant gain in self-satisfaction by Treatment Group I was canceled out by a significance in interaction between treatment groups, and although no significant gain was shown in the Behavior Score, the fact that the Total P Score, which includes all self-esteem sub-scores on the TSCS, was significant should lead one to seek further significance in other sub-scores. Thus, 13 other sub-scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale were statistically treated: Column A--Physical Self, Column B--Moral-Ethical Self, Column C--Personal Self, Column D--Family Self, Column E--Social Self, Self Criticism, Total Variability, Column Total Variability, Row Total Variability, True/False Ratio, Total Conflict, Net Conflict, and Distribution scores. Of these scores, at least 95 percent showed greater positive gains for Treatment Group I than for Treatment Group II (see Appendix E), and five showed significantly (.05 or .01 levels) greater gains. Three Column Scores, which are reflected in the Total P Score and in all Row P Scores, were significantly different. The Row Total Variability Score and the True/False Ratio Score were also significant.

Column C--Personal Self. This score reflects the individual's sense of personal worth, his feeling of adequacy as a person, and his evaluation of his personality apart from his body or his relationships
to others (Manual, 1965). This score is central to all Row Scores on the **Tennessee Self Concept Scale** and important in the Total Positive Self-concept. It showed a highly significant (.01 level) positive difference for Treatment Group I as is reflected in Table 7. From these data one can conclude that Treatment I was more effective than Treatment II in building a sense of personal worth in subjects and that given the same treatment variables, the same results would be likely to happen 99 percent of the time.

**Column D--Family Self.** This score reflects the individual's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value in reference to his family and his closest and most immediate circle of associates (Manual, 1965). Positive changes in this score were significant (.05 level) for Treatment Group I, as shown in Table 8. These findings can be interpreted as meaning that those subjects receiving Treatment I gained significantly over those receiving Treatment II in respect to the way in which they viewed themselves relating to their closest associates and that the probability of such a change taking place as a result of the same treatment under the same set of conditions is better than 95 percent.

**Column E--Social Self.** This score reflects the individual's sense of adequacy and worth in his social interaction with people in general (Manual, 1965). This score showed significantly (.05 level)
Table 7. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Column C Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>1.4142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>6.4000</td>
<td>7.5033</td>
<td>12.0175**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment II (Reading only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-11.5000</td>
<td>4.9497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
<td>3.5071</td>
<td>4.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Table 8. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Column D Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.4142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>3.2093</td>
<td>9.0987*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment II (Reading only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-6.0000</td>
<td>1.4142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>0.6375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
greater positive difference for Treatment Group I than for Treatment Group II. One can conclude that Treatment I was more effective in raising the sense of social worth in subjects and that, given the same set of variables, the results would be similar 95 percent of the time (Table 9).

**Row Total Variability Score.** This score is the sum of variations across the row scores (Manual, 1965). Well-integrated people generally score below the norm mean (50th percentile) but above the first percentile on variability scores (Manual, 1965). On pre- and post-test measures Treatment Group II's scores changed from below the norm to above it, while Treatment Group I's scores changed from above the norm mean to below it (see Appendix E). This change would indicate a move toward more self-integration in the counseled group and a move away from self-integration in the non-counseled group. Since this change was statistically significant at the .01 level, Treatment I would be likely to produce the same results 99 percent of the time given the same variables. These results are shown in Table 10.

**True/False Ratio Score.** This score can be interpreted in several ways: as indicating response set or bias, to differentiate patients from non-patients, and from the framework of self theory (Manual, 1965). For purposes of this study, the latter approach would appear to be most relevant.
Table 9. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Column E Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>11.5000</td>
<td>14.8492</td>
<td>6.7567*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>7.4000</td>
<td>4.8270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment II (Reading only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-4.5000</td>
<td>13.4350</td>
<td>0.0350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
<td>2.5884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Table 10. Comparison of Mean Score Change of Row Total Variability Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-3.0000</td>
<td>2.8284</td>
<td>10.9534**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>-1.8000</td>
<td>3.4928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment II (Reading only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>1.4142</td>
<td>1.1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>2.8284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
High T/F Scores indicate the individual is achieving self definition or self description by focusing on what he is and is relatively unable to accomplish the same thing by eliminating or rejecting what he is not. Low T/F Scores would mean the exact opposite, and scores in the middle ranges would indicate that the subject achieves self definition by a more balanced employment of both tendencies--affirming what is self and eliminating what is not self (Manual, 1965, p. 4).

Although Treatment Group II's pre-test score on this measure was quite high, it became deviantly high on the post-test (see Appendix E). Treatment Group I's score fell near the norm mean (50th percentile) on the pre-test but moved closer to the norm mean (50th percentile) on the post-test (see Appendix E). Score changes were shown to be statistically significant (.05 level) in favor of Treatment Group I, which indicated that that treatment was most effective in helping the subjects achieve a more balanced self-definition and would prove effective 95 percent of the time under like treatment conditions.

These data are reflected in Table 11.

Since the Total Positive Score and six sub-scores--Identity, Personal Self, Family Self, Social Self, Row Total Variability, and True/False Ratio--on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale all showed significantly positive gain for Treatment Group I, and since at least 95 percent of the non-significant scores showed gains for the same group over Treatment Group II (see Appendix E), one may conclude that the treatment incorporating group counseling and reading instruction did raise self-concepts of the group in question to a greater
Table 11. Comparison of Mean Score Change of True-False Ratio Score on the TSCS for Treatment Groups I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I (Counseling + Reading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>-0.1650</td>
<td>0.1060</td>
<td>4.9651*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.3445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment II (Reading only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1 (N = 2)</td>
<td>0.8200</td>
<td>0.6222</td>
<td>1.9590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2 (N = 5)</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>0.3711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment I-Treatment II Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
positive degree than the self-concepts of the other group were changed and therefore Hypothesis 2 can be accepted.

Summary

Seven scores on the **Tennessee Self Concept Scale**, Clinical and Research Form showed significantly greater gain during a ten-week term for Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading instruction) than for Treatment Group II (reading instruction only) on a pre- and post-test as indicated by a two-way classification analysis of variance. These scores included the Total Positive Score, Row I--Identity Score, Column C--Personal Self Score, Column D--Family Self Score, Column E--Social Self Score, Row Total Variability Score, and True/False Ratio Score. Column C--Personal Self Score and Row Total Variability Score were significant at the .01 level; all other significant scores showed a .05 level of significance. On this basis, Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

The Total Reading Score gain and the percentage of improvement relative to the original level of reading as measured on *The Nelson-Denny Reading Test*, Revised Form A showed no significance at either .05 or .01 levels for either group, although Treatment Group I did make greater gains on this measure than Treatment Group II. These gains were significant at the .20 level. In other words, given the same treatment with the same variables this change would be
likely to result 80 percent of the time. Had a larger N been used in this study, one might speculate that reading score changes could have shown significance at the .05 or .01 levels because of the reduction of the variance error of the mean that results with a larger sample (Glass and Stanley, 1970). Hypothesis 1, however, was not accepted, but one might speculate that Treatment I was just as good as if not slightly better than, Treatment II in terms of producing reading improvement, of preventing attrition, and of building self-concept for the particular sample of students under study.
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the use of group counseling procedures combined with reading skill improvement techniques affects improvement in self-concept and reading skills among small groups of community college students to a greater degree than the presentation of reading skill improvement techniques alone. Twenty-eight subjects were enrolled in a reading skills improvement program at Lane Community College at the beginning of the 1974 Spring term. Of the 14 subjects completing the term, seven received only reading instruction for three hours per week, while the other seven received reading instruction for one and one-half hours per week and group counseling for one and one-half hours per week throughout the term. Both groups were taught reading skills by the same instructors. The researcher was the counselor. All subjects completing the term were pre- and post-tested on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form and on The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A. Hypotheses tested were the following:

$H_1$ Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in reading
skills achievement as measured by The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Revised Form A than Treatment Group II (reading instruction only).

Although the average gain made on reading scores by Treatment Group I was 12 percent greater than gain made by Treatment Group II, this gain was not statistically significant at the predetermined .05 and .01 levels. Therefore, $H_1$ could not be accepted, and it was concluded that no significant difference existed between the two treatments in terms of reading improvement. Attrition from Treatment Group I was atypical of attrition normally expected from community college reading classes, however, and a Fisher Exact Probability Test indicated this difference to be significant at the .005 level.

$H_2$ Treatment Group I (group counseling and reading instruction) will demonstrate significantly greater positive changes in self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form than Treatment Group II (reading instruction only).

Although not all score differences on the TSCS proved to be significant, at least 95 percent showed greater improvement for Treatment Group I. Moreover, significant scores indicated that for Treatment Group I personality integration significantly (.01 level) improved (Row Total Variability Score), a more balanced (.05 level
of significance) self-definition was achieved (True/False Ratio Score), a sense of relationships between both close associates and people in general improved significantly (.05 levels) (Column D and Column E Scores), a significantly (.05 level) better sense of identity was achieved (Row 1--Identity Score), a significantly (.01 level) greater sense of personal worth was gained (Column C Score), and global self-concept improved significantly (.05 level) (Total P Score).

On the basis of these findings, H2 was accepted, and it was concluded that group counseling combined with reading skills improvement techniques changed self-concepts of subjects in Treatment Group I as compared to those in Treatment Group II to a significantly greater positive degree.

**Implications**

Implications of this study are as follows:

1. Affective variables such as self-concept did seem to play a role in reading skills achievement of the subjects examined. However, since only a trend in reading score gains was found in this study, further research is indicated.

2. The trend from this study suggests that attrition from reading improvement classes may be lowered by combining group counseling with reading skills techniques. Further research in this area is implied.
3. If positive self-concept is important to community college students' reading skills improvement, as trends in this study suggest, group counseling combined with reading instruction might be considered as an alternative approach to existing community college reading improvement programs.

Recommendations

While the findings of this research regarding self-concept might be expected, research (Pearson, 1969; Axmaker, 1970; Taylor, 1970; Clausen, 1971; Trotzer and Sease, 1971) has shown that group counseling does not necessarily produce positive changes in self-concept of subjects. However, since a paucity of literature exists in the area covered by the present study, findings indicate that further research is suggested as follows:

1. Although not significantly higher, gains made in reading by Treatment Group I suggest that perhaps longer-term counseling in combination with reading instruction might be undertaken. One limitation to this suggestion is that--as affected this study--when one works with college students time is limited by term length. Another limitation to this suggestion is the high attrition and absenteeism rate for community college reading students generally as earlier suggested by research. The fact is
that most community college reading courses are non-credit or non-transferable and the pressure from academic work makes the probability of holding students for more than one term low.

2. Also suggested by reading score changes is that a replication of this study using a larger N might result in significance for Treatment Group I in terms of reading score gains.

3. A replication of the study might be made with the inclusion of a third treatment group that receives group counseling only.

4. In a similar study, part of the counseling time might be spent discussing reading and feelings related to it. The counseling group in the present study did not discuss reading at all.

5. In a similar study more time might be given in counseling sessions to the areas of self-perception that showed no significant change in this research.

6. An environment that is less institutional than a classroom is suggested for future studies of this type. Although Lane Community College's classrooms are "ideal" in the sense of small size, carpeting, lighting, decor, fixtures, and the like, they are, nevertheless, classrooms. They provided a fine setting for reading instruction, but since groups were forced to sit around a table or in tablet armchairs facing one another, the setting was less than ideal for group counseling. Far better
would have been an informal setting in which subjects could sit on the floor or in comfortable chairs.

7. Further research is suggested in the relationship between Treatment I as used in this study and attrition rates from community college reading improvement programs.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

THE NELSON-DENNY READING TEST STATISTICS
### Validity and Difficulty Data for Vocabulary Test Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31-71</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31-75</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Validity and Difficulty Data for Items in the Reading Comprehension Subtest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26-67</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difficulty values for each item were obtained by averaging the percent passing each item in the upper and lower 27 percent of the cases used for the item analysis. Validity indices are approximations of the item-total score correlations obtained by means of the Flanagan table.*

### Reliability Coefficients (computed by Equivalent Forms Method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vocabulary</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comprehension</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rate (initial)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate (after training)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard Errors of Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25.12</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ S.E.M. = \sqrt{1 - r_{11}} \times S.D. \]
APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE STATISTICS
Means and Standard Deviations on All Scores for Three Groups
Along the Mental Health Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Patient Group (363)</th>
<th>Norm Group (626)</th>
<th>PI Group (75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>35.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/F</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>323.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>345.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td>126.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>127.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>103.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>115.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. A</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>71.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. B</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>70.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. C</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>64.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. D</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>70.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. E</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>68.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. Variability</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>48.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Tot. V</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Tot. V</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>19.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>120.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>24.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>18.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>20.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>54.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>98.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>46.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>76.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>84.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDSA</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>(Median)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TimeB</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Conflict Subscores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Patient Group</th>
<th>Norm Group</th>
<th>PI Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. A</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. B</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. C</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. D</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. E</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Conflict Subscores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Patient Group</th>
<th>Norm Group</th>
<th>PI Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. A</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. B</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. C</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. D</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. E</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of data too skewed for mean and standard deviation to be meaningful. Medians are reported instead.
Based on different populations.
Erroneously reported as b.0 on C and R Score Sheet.
Correlations Between MMPI Scores and The Tennessee Self Concept Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>(.26) (.28) (.29) (.29) (.25) (.22) (.34) (.29) (.26) (.21) (.13) (.15) (.35) (.27) (.36) (.18) (.20) (.20) (.27) (.22) (.42) (.31) (.32) (.26) (.22) (.24) (.26) (.29) (.29) (.21) (.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>(.48) (.19) (.14) (.12) (.01) (.02) (.16) (.16) (.15) (.08) (.02) (.19) (.16) (.05) (.02) (.17) (.11) (.13) (.12) (.05) (.13) (.35) (.16) (.13) (.12) (.02) (.05) (.07) (.06) (.15) (.08) (.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(.05) (.37) (.42) (.38) (.40) (.37) (.35) (.39) (.32) (.33) (.22) (.25) (.30) (.26) (.38) (.29) (.30) (.24) (.32) (.42) (.30) (.34) (.40) (.25) (.34) (.15) (.25) (.24) (.33) (.34) (.37) (.57) (.60) (.37) (.36) (.59) (.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>(.60) (.43) (.38) (.39) (.43) (.42) (.27) (.35) (.42) (.46) (.36) (.34) (.39) (.25) (.37) (.38) (.47) (.32) (.28) (.38) (.53) (.20) (.37) (.29) (.29) (.30) (.47) (.38) (.43) (.28) (.18) (.17) (.30) (.30) (.45) (.43) (.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>(.25) (.35) (.29) (.35) (.29) (.26) (.36) (.13) (.16) (.13) (.02) (.06) (.03) (.07) (.07) (.02) (.06) (.03) (.01) (.00) (.01) (.01) (.02) (.03) (.01) (.00) (.01) (.01) (.01) (.02) (.03) (.04) (.05) (.06) (.07) (.08) (.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>(.30) (.34) (.29) (.36) (.38) (.35) (.27) (.24) (.37) (.43) (.38) (.32) (.30) (.28) (.23) (.30) (.28) (.33) (.33) (.25) (.30) (.27) (.28) (.29) (.30) (.31) (.32) (.33) (.34) (.35) (.36) (.37) (.38) (.39) (.40) (.41) (.42) (.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-E</td>
<td>(.30) (.28) (.26) (.28) (.28) (.26) (.26) (.26) (.25) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24) (.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-M</td>
<td>(.29) (.28) (.27) (.26) (.25) (.24) (.23) (.22) (.21) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20) (.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E</td>
<td>(.15) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33) (.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-T</td>
<td>(.27) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37) (.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The correlation ratio (Eta) is a measure of the strength of a relationship and not the direction. It always carries a positive sign. The underlying direction of Eta may sometimes, but not always, be noted from its corresponding r.
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Coefficients

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Reliability***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Criticism</td>
<td>35.54</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/F</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict</td>
<td>-6.91</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>345.57</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td>127.10</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2</td>
<td>103.67</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3</td>
<td>115.01</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. A.</td>
<td>71.78</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. B.</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. C.</td>
<td>64.55</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. D.</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. E.</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variability</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Total V</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Total V</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>120.44</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.36</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>56.40</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>98.80</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy</td>
<td>46.10</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>76.39</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDS* (Median)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict Sub-Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td>-6.59</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. A</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. B</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. C</td>
<td>-5.74</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. D</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. E</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict Sub-Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>4.24**</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. A</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. B</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. C</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. D</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. E</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This distribution so extremely skewed that conventional parametric statistics are meaningless, so the Median is used on Profile Sheet. Actual mean is 7.3 but about 68% of non-patients score below mean.

**This standard deviation erroneously reported as 6.0 on Score Sheet.

***Reliability data based on test-retest with 60 college students over a two-week period.
APPENDIX C

GROUP PROCESSES DESCRIPTIONS
A group process works by affecting the individual in much the same way that a well-performed drama affects an audience — through the experiencing of feelings or emotions vicariously. The central difference between drama and group process effect lies in the fact that the individual is one of the actors in a group process. Because a process is experiential, each individual is affected differently. Thus, it is almost impossible to predict how a particular process will work with a particular individual.

Generally, group processes encompass four basic levels of participation: 1) communication, 2) experiencing, 3) insight, and 4) acceptance. Communication can be either verbal or non-verbal and usually consists of two types: 1) between the facilitator and the group in giving directions, in participation in the process, in giving feedback, and in leading discussion, and 2) between group members during and following the process in which the individual expresses feelings, some of which may have been previously denied, to the group or to himself. Experiencing is usually of two types: 1) the mental understanding of and the physical performance of the process (the act), and 2) the emotional responses of various intensities (arising from the act). Insight involves recognition of and identification with others and self through the experience of the process and the
interchange of communication. Acceptance is tripartite: 1) acceptance of the process, 2) acceptance of others' behavior and feelings, and 3) acceptance of one's own behavior and feelings. These four levels of participation in group process conform relatively well to the six stages of group encounter set down by Rogers (1970):

**First Stage.** Communication is about externals. There is an unwillingness to communicate self. Feelings and personal meanings are neither recognized as such nor owned. Constructs are extremely rigid. Close relationships are construed as dangerous.

**Second Stage.** Feelings are sometimes described but as unowned past objects external to self. The individual is remote from his subjective experience. He may voice contradictory statements about himself as an object with little awareness that they are contradictory. He expresses himself somewhat freely on nonself topics. He may show some recognition that he has problems or conflicts, but they are perceived as external to the self.

**Third Stage.** There is much description of feelings and personal meanings which are not now present. These distant feelings are often pictured as unacceptable or bad. The experiencing of situations is largely described as having occurred in the past, or is cast in terms of the past. There is a freer flow of expression about self as an object. There may be communication about self as a reflected object, existing primarily in others. Personal constructs are rigid, but may at times be thought of as constructs, with occasionally a questioning of their validity. There is a beginning recognition that any problems that exist are inside the individual rather than external.

**Fourth Stage.** Feelings and personal meanings are freely described as present objects owned by the self. Feelings of an intense sort are still described as not now present. There is a dim recognition that feelings denied to awareness may break through in the present, but this is a frightening possibility. There is an unwilling, fearful recognition that one is experiencing things. Contradictions in experience are clearly realized and a definite concern over them felt.
There is an initial loosening of personal constructs. It is sometimes discovered that experience has been construed as having a certain meaning but that this meaning is not inherent nor absolute. There is some expression of self-responsibility for problems. The individual is occasionally willing to risk relating himself to others on a feeling basis.

**Fifth Stage.** Many feelings are freely expressed in the moment of their occurrence and are thus experienced in the immediate present. These feelings are owned or accepted. Feelings previously denied now tend to bubble through into awareness, though there is fear of this occurrence. There is some recognition that experiencing with immediacy is a referent and possible guide for the individual. Contradictions are recognized as being between attitudes in different aspects of the personality -- indicated by statements such as, "My mind tells me this is so but I don't seem to believe it." There is a desire to be the self-related feelings, "the real me," and a questioning of the validity of many personal constructs. The person feels he has a definite responsibility for the problems that exist in him.

**Sixth Stage.** Feelings previously denied are now experienced with both immediacy and acceptance. Such feelings are not something to be denied, feared, or struggled against. This experiencing is often vivid, dramatic, and releasing for the individual. There is full acceptance now of experience as providing a clear and usable referent for getting at the latent meanings of the individual's encounter with himself and with life. There is also the recognition that the self is now becoming this process of experiencing. There is no longer much awareness of the self as an object. The individual often feels somewhat "shaky" as his solid constructs are recognized as construings that take place within him. The individual risks being himself in process in the relationship to others. He takes the risk of being the flow that is himself and trusting another person to accept him as he is in this flow (Rogers, 1970).
ACTIVE LISTENING

Behavioral Objective

Attending and giving feedback.

Rules

Dyads. This process has four phases:

1. The "speaker" tells his partner about an early childhood experience. The "listener" is silent, but he avoids eye contact by every possible means. Trade roles after 2 minutes.

2. The "speaker" tells about another experience. This time the "listener" keeps interrupting with such statements as "Yes, I know how that is. You are so right. etc." Trade roles after two minutes.

3. The "speaker" tells about a recent frustrating experience. The "listener" constantly interrupts to interpret with such statements as "What you really mean is ..., etc." Trade roles after 2 minutes.

4. The speaker tells about another frustrating experience. The "listener" is silent, attentive, empathic, and maintains eye contact. After 2 minutes he gives the speaker positive feedback such as, "I like what you say. I like the way you express yourself. I'm glad you are here. You are a great addition to this group. etc." Trade roles.
After the four phases are completed, discuss feelings with partner or group as a whole. How did you feel during phase 1? Phase 2? Phase 3? Phase 4?

Variations

Feelings can be shared after each phase of the exercise. Topics can differ from those given above.

Process Description (What do people usually do? What happens?)

Most people find it difficult to talk during the first three phases. The listener may find interrupting statements difficult to come up with. Some listeners may find maintaining eye contact difficult in phase 4. Most people come to the recognition that they are not very good listeners, and feel the frustration of not being listened to.

Active Listening

I. Type of exercise - attending feedback

II. Interpersonal intensity - low
   Intraperisonal intensity - medium

III. Time implementation - early

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Mary Denman
   California State University
   San Diego, California
ANIMAL GAME

Behavioral Objective

Self-disclosing with some feedback.

Rules

Stage is set by the leader, suggesting members reflect on different animals, how they live, how they act. The group is asked to choose an animal they would most like to be, to analyze why they chose this animal -- physical and psychological reasons. The leader begins by describing the animal he chose and why he chose him, demonstrating self-disclosing behavior he expects from group members.

Variations

Have group members select animal roles for each other.

Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

LEADS: What are you saying about yourself? How do you feel about the feedback you are receiving? Does the feedback and self-disclosure have any special meaning for you? Do you see this person the way he sees himself?
Animal Game

I. Type of exercise - feedback

II. Interpersonal intensity - low
   Intrapersonal intensity - low

III. Time of implementation into the group - early

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement - Daniel I. Malamud and Solomon Machover
   Toward self-understanding
COLOR BOOK

Behavioral Objective

Feedback.

Rules

Members draw and color pictures of all group members. The pictures may be abstract.

Variations

Draw and color a picture of just one member. (May draw names out of a hat.)

Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

LEADS: How do you react to how you are pictured and colored?

How do you feel about the person as you drew and colored him?

Color Book

I. Type of exercise - feedback
II. Interpersonal intensity - medium
   Intrapersonal intensity - medium
III. Time of implementation - middle
IV. Type of group - mixed
V. Acknowledgement - Daniel I. Malamud and Solomon Machover
Toward Self-understanding
USING QUIET TIME

Behavioral Objective

To simulate intrapersonal exploration and develop readiness for self-revealing verbalizations.

Rules

Have all members push their chairs back to extend the size of the circle. Have everyone keep perfectly quiet for five minutes at which time the group comes back together for a "going round" session.

Variations

1. Increase the quiet time to 10 minutes.
2. Have members turn their backs to each other during the quiet time.

Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

This technique seems to work best when movement has reached a plateau (around the fourth session). The object is, by the use of contrast, to show the advantage of all members relating to each other.

Quite often group members who have been holding back relating some experience or some reaction to another person
in the group will resolve to speak up when the group comes back together, and they will do so.

**Using Quiet Time**

I. Type of exercise - self-disclosure

II. Interpersonal intensity - medium

Intrapersonal intensity - (no comment)

III. Time of implementation - middle

IV. Type of group - all

V. Acknowledgement - Dr. Robert Akridge, Psych. Dept.
   Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
   Ruston, Louisiana 71270
WHO ARE YOU?

Behavioral Objective

Introspection/Active listening: To help people to express feelings they have about themselves and to experience the feeling of being intensely attended to. To help people experience the feeling of actively attending to someone else.

Rules

1. Dyads - one person is the "speaker", the other is the "listener".
2. The "listener" asks the speaker, "Tell me who you are." He then remains silent, but attentive holding eye contact, while the "speaker" talks.
3. The "speaker" answers the above question with statements prefaced with "I am the kind of person who ...", "I like ...", etc. (5 minutes).
4. After 5 minutes, the "listener" says "Thank you," and roles are switched. Repeat at least three or four times.

Variations

"Tell me what is the meaning of life."
"Tell me what is happiness."
"Tell me what you do best."
Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

People usually start on a superficial level (i.e., "I am a teacher," etc.). They move to a deeper, more introspective level with each repetition. Often they uncover feelings they had buried.

Who Are You?

I. Type of exercise - self-disclosure

II. Interpersonal intensity - high
   Intrapersonal intensity - high

III. Time of implementation - middle to late (can be successfully repeated periodically)

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Dr. Claude Merzbacher
   California State University
   San Diego, California
BACKWARD NAME FANTASY TRIP

Behavioral Objective

Introspection/Active listening.

Rules

1. Each person in the group prints his first and last names backwards on a piece of paper.
2. He is asked to study these strange new words, pronounce them to himself, close his eyes and visualize what object or objects they stand for (5 minutes).
3. Each person shares the objects with the group.

Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

People usually have fun with this exercise. Introspection and discussion often results from the fact that some people tend to see their objects as beautiful objects, while others see ugly objects.

Backward Name Fantasy Trip

I. Type of exercise - self-disclosure and meditating
II. Interpersonal intensity - low
    Intrapersonal intensity - medium
III. Time of implementation - middle

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Dr. Claude Merzbacher
    California State University
    San Diego, California
INTELLECT/EMOTIONS

Behavioral Objective

Introspection/self-revelation

Rules

Each member of the group is provided with a large sheet of paper, which he is instructed to fold in half. He also is provided with crayons in various colors.

The group is asked to close their eyes and to imagine what their intellect looks like, what color it is, shape, etc. Whenever he is ready, each member of the group selects the crayon that most closely resembles the "color" of his visualized intellect and uses it to draw his "intellect" on one-half of the paper.

The same process is repeated, only this time emotions are to be visualized as a shape and color and drawn.

Variation

Individuals can share their drawings if they choose, explaining them to the group. Some probably will not want to do this.

Process Description (What do people usually do? What happens?)

People usually enjoy the activity of drawing with crayons. Usually they are surprised with results. Some will want to share, others won't.
Intellect/Emotions

I. Type of exercise - fantasy; self-revelation; some feedback if drawings are shared

II. Interpersonal intensity - low
Intrapersonal intensity - low to medium

III. Time of implementation - early to middle

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: WCRA Weekend Conference on Encounter Techniques for the Classroom Malibu, 1972
NEGATIVE SELF IMAGE

Behavioral Objective

1. To allow person to experience his acceptance/rejection of affirmation and affection.
2. To break through a rigid negative self image.
3. To allow group to experience affirming and supporting another.

Rules

Person who apparently rejects support and affirmation from others sits in center of group blindfolded or with eyes closed. Members of the group then talk with one another sharing their affirmative feelings and giving good qualities they observe about the person in the center.

Variations

Group members may speak directly to the person in the center. He is asked not to respond. May be done without eyes being closed.

Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

Center person hears and feels the support of others, is not able to verbally reject this or negate it. He frequently becomes deeply moved and overwhelmed by his feelings of
closeness and acceptance. This usually opens up his capacity to participate and express more openly in the group.

Group members find a sense of commonality and closeness in giving together to another. Often deepens the sense of trust and confidence within the group.

**Negative Self Image**

I. Type of exercise - feedback

II. Interpersonal intensity - medium

   Intrapersonal intensity - high

III. Time of implementation - middle or lage

IV. Type of group - couples, singles, (mixed)

V. Acknowledgement: Robert Bryant
   700 West 19th
   Austin, Texas 78701
Behavioral Objective

Self-disclosing and some feedback depending on the responses or process leads.

Rules

Group members write down a few things about himself he can tell no one. Members keep the cards they have written on and disclose to the group how they feel about what they wrote.

Variations

All cards are given to the leader. The leader then reads the responses aloud. Care is taken to keep the person anonymous.

Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

LEADS: How do you feel about information you don't want to share?
(if cards are read aloud) What do you think about this? Have you had this same feeling?
Hole - Card

I. Type of exercise - feedback and self-disclosure

II. Interpersonal intensity - low-medium
    Intrapersonal intensity - medium

III. Time of implementation - early

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Daniel I. Malomud and Solomon Machover
    Toward self-understanding
STRENGTH EXERCISE

Behavioral Objective

This exercise is to be used right after most of the mid-term exams have been taken. Goals should be structured to utilize individual strengths and to develop and strengthen behaviors which can eventually be counted as strengths. The emphasis should be on using the strengths to reach academic goals.

Rules

1. Give each person a blank piece of paper on which he is to list his strengths.

2. When they are finished have each student read his list of strengths. When an individual has finished reading his list, group members add strengths they have seen which have not been mentioned. The individual should add these to his list.

3. Set up some ground rules. "Don't apologize or explain a strength away because it isn't active all the time. No negative comments are to be made either about oneself or another."

4. Ask for volunteers to get started. If no one volunteers, use some sort of lottery system to get started. Counselors take part in this too.
5. When everyone has read his list and received additional strengths from the group, discuss the effects of this exercise.

6. Students should leave their list in their folders. These lists can then be referred to at appropriate times in other sessions.

Strength Exercise

I. Type of exercise - group disclosure

II. Interpersonal intensity - medium
   Intrapersonal intensity - medium

III. Time of implementation - middle

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Robert Sheverbush, Jr.
   Counseling Center
   Central Missouri State College
   Warrensburg, Missouri 64093
STRENGTHS

Behavioral Objective

To help individuals think positively about themselves.
To help others to express the feelings they have toward another.

Rules

1. Each person in the group takes a turn (2 minutes) making positive statements about himself, prefacing each statement with "One of my strong points is ..., Another of my strong points is ..., etc."

2. Each other person in the group takes a turn telling the individual what he sees as the individual's positive points, prefacing their statements with "One of your strong points is ..., etc." (3 minutes) This step takes place immediately following step 1 above, before going on to the next individual.

Process Description (What do people normally do? What happens?)

Most people find it more difficult to say positive things about themselves than to make negative self-statements. Some find it difficult to receive positive bombardment from others.
Strengths

I. Type of exercise - self-disclosure and feedback

II. Interpersonal intensity - high
    Intrapersonal intensity - high

III. Time of implementation - late

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgements: Dr. Claude Merzbacher
   California State University
   San Diego, California
PROUD WHIP

Behavioral Objective

To help members become more aware of the degree to which they are proud (value) of their beliefs and actions and to encourage them to do more things in which they can take pride. They may also hear new alternatives from other group members.

Rules

The group members are asked to consider what they have to be proud of in relation to some specific area or issue. The facilitator should emphasize that the type of pride that is called for here is not the boastful or bragging kind, but the pride that means, "I feel really good about" or "I cherish" this aspect of my life. Members take turns (can be called upon in order). They respond to questions with the words, "I'm proud of ..." or "I'm proud that ..." Any person may pass if he chooses, and the facilitator must be very supportive of those who do. No one should be expected to be proud of everything. Sometimes the facilitator deliberately selects an issue that he has to pass on, just to illustrate the point.

Variation

Could also be done in dyads.
Group members can volunteer topics, or topics may be chosen from questions such as the following:

1. What is something you are proud of that you can do on your own?
2. ... in relation to money?
3. ... that has to do with school?
4. ... about your gift giving?
5. ... that you have written?
6. ... in relation to your family?
7. ... that you have done about ecology?
8. ... any new skill you have learned recently?
9. .... that you did that did not take physical courage?
10. ... a decision that you made which required considerable thought?
11. ... a completed task that was very laborious, but which you stuck out?
12. ... some family tradition?
13. ... something you refrained from doing?
14. ... anything you've done for an older person?
15. ... a time when you said something when it would have been easier to remain silent?
16. ... a time when you didn't say something when it would have been easier to say something?
17. ... an athletic feat you did recently?
18. ... anything you made with your own hands?
19. ... a time recently when you made a shrewd purchase or got a good bargain?
20. ... a habit you worked to overcome, and succeeded?
21. ... anything you've done about increasing your re-
pertoire of responses to a situation?
22. ... a time you were especially loving to someone?
23. ... anything you did to resist conformity?
24. ... anything you did to conform when everyone
around you was resisting conformity?
25. ... a dangerous thing you tried and succeeded at?
26. ... a conversation recently in which you held no-
thing back, but told exactly where you were at?
27. ... a new learning?
28. ... a way in which you helped your family?
29. ... anything you did to contribute to racial under-
standing?
30. ... something you did to live by your religion?
31. ... anything you've done to add to the store of
beauty in the world?
32. ... something you've done to add to the quantity of
love in the world?
33. ... a way in which you helped make democracy mean
more than a word?
34. ... anything you've done to support your stand on
an important issue?
35. ... something you did for someone else which was
extremely tender?
36. ... a funny thing you did?
37. ... a time when you were an important example for a child?

Process Description (What do people usually do? What happens?)

No comment.

Proud Whip

I. Type of exercise - self-revelation

II. Interpersonal intensity - low
   Intrapersonal intensity - medium

III. Time implementation - middle

IV. Type of group - mixed.

V. Acknowledgement: S. B. Simon, L. W. Howe and H. Kirschenbaum
   Values Clarification (Hart, 1972)
I LEARNED STATEMENTS

Behavioral Objective

To provide feedback to the group and facilitator about the last activity. To clarify and reinforce what members have learned. To crystallize new learnings which many people might not have realized were taking place. Introspection. Sets a searching tone in the group. Provides a good summary or wind-up for almost any activity.

Rules

The facilitator prepares a chart with the following (or similar) sentence stems. The chart may be posted permanently in the room, or it may be posted just when it is to be used.

I learned that I ... I realized that I ...
I re-learned that I ... I was surprised that I ...
I noticed that I ... I was pleased that I ...
I discovered that I ... I was displeased that I ...

Right after an exercise, the facilitator asks group members to think for a minute about what they have just learned or re-learned about themselves or their values. Then they are to use any one of the sentence stems to share with the group one or more of their feelings. Individuals are not called on, but volunteer to speak whenever they feel comfortable about it.
The facilitator should not allow discussion to interrupt the free flow of I Learned Statements; it tends to destroy the mood and intensity of the activity. Statements should be kept short and to the point. They should be made but no attempt to explain or defend them should be made.

Individuals should try to focus on personal learnings rather than on general, intellectualized learning. There is a tendency to say "I learned that people ..." rather than "I learned that I ..."

Reassure members that there are no right answers. An individual should have the right to pass or sit the activity out without saying anything.

**Variation**

I learned statements can be written down before sharing them aloud.

This can be done with the entire group or in small subgroups or dyads.

**Process Description** (What do people usually do? What happens?)

There is a tendency to generalize to "people" rather than "I" statements. Often people find a learning has taken place which they had not recognized.
I Learned Statements

I. Type of exercise - introspection; feedback; meditation

II. Interpersonal intensity - medium
    Intrapersonal intensity - medium

III. Time implementation - middle

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Jerry Weinstein
   Center for Humanistic Education
   University of Massachusetts
EITHER-OR FORCED CHOICE

Behavioral Objective

To examine one's own feelings, self-concept, and values.

Rules

The group is divided in half. The facilitator asks an either-or question such as "Which do you identify with more, a Volkswagon or a Cadillac?" He indicates that those who identify with one go to one side of the room, those who identify with the other to the other side of the room. Each member is then to find a partner on the side he has chosen and discuss with him the reasons for his choice (2 minutes).

Everyone returns to the center of the room. Then another either-or forced choice is given, and members repeat the process.

Repeat five or six times.

Variation

Sample Either-Or choices:

Are you ...

1. More of a saver or a spender?
2. More like New York City or Colorado?
3. More a loner or a grouper?
4. More like a rose or a daisy?
5. More like breakfast or dinner?
6. More like summer or winter?
7. More like a teacher or a student?
8. More yes or no?
9. More here or there?
10. More political or apolitical?
11. More religious or irreligious?
12. More like the country or the city?
13. More like the present or the future?
14. More a leader or a follower?
15. More physical or mental?
16. More an arguer or an agree-er?
17. More intuitive or rational?
18. More establishment or anti-establishment?
19. More like a tortoise or a hare?
20. More likely to walk on thin ice or to tiptoe through the tulips?
21. More like patent leather or suede?
22. More like a paddle or a ping pong ball?
23. More like an electric typewriter or a quill pen?
24. More like a falling star or a beacon light on a mountain?
25. More like a rock band or a baroque string quartet?
26. More like a clothes line or a kite string?
27. More like a "No Trespassing" sign or a "Public Fishing" sign?
28. More like a fly swatter or fly paper?
29. More like a roller skate or a pogo stick?
30. More like a file cabinet or a liquor chest?
31. More like a motorcycle or a tandem bicycle?
32. More like a gourmet or a MacDonald's fan?
33. More like a bubbling brook or a placid lake?
34. More like a screened porch or a picture window?
35. More like a mountain or a valley?
36. More like "A stitch in time" or "Better late than never"?

Process Description (What do people usually do? What happens?)

No comment.

Either-Or Forced Choice

I. Type of exercise - fantasy; self-revelation; feedback

II. Interpersonal intensity - low
Intrapersonal intensity - low

III. Time implementation - early

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe and Howard Kirschenbaum Values Clarification (Hart, 1972)
THREE CHARACTERS

Behavioral Objective

To help the person become clearer about his own goals and purposes in life.

Rules

1. Group members are asked, "If you could not be yourself but could be someone else, what is the name of the character you would most like to be?" They each write down on a piece of paper the name of a person chosen from real life, fiction, the news, movies, literature, cartoons, history, etc.

2. Then they are asked to write down the name of a character "You would least like to be like."

3. They are asked to write the name of a character "Who is most like you."

4. They break into small groups of three to five members and take turns sharing their lists with their group and explaining their selections.

5. Individuals can pass when they wish. The need for tolerance should be emphasized. To ridicule someone's character choice is to ridicule the person himself.
Variation

After groups have discussed their characters, value clarifying questions such as "Were your characters males or females? Can you think of anyone whose list of characters you would be on? Would your list have been different three years ago? Would your best friend be able to guess the names on your list? etc."

If the group is cohesive and has built up a good deal of trust, this might be done within the whole group rather than in small groups or dyads.

Process Description (What do people usually do? What happens?)

A certain degree of trust is needed for this strategy to work well, so that people will feel comfortable sharing their characters with each other.

Three Characters

I. Type of exercise - trust; self-revelation; values of clarification

II. Interpersonal intensity - high
Intrapersonal intensity - high

III. Time implementation - late

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: S. B. Simon, L. W. Howe, and H. Kirschenbaum
Values Clarification (Hart, 1972)
ALLIGATOR RIVER

Behavioral Objective

To help people discover and examine their own values and attitudes by examining their reactions to the characters in the story.

Rules

The facilitator tells the story of Alligator River (see below). Following the story, group members are asked to privately rank the five characters from the most offensive to the least objectionable. The character whom they find most reprehensible is first on their list; then the second most reprehensible, and so on, with the fifth being the least objectionable.

After private rankings have been made, groups of four are formed in which they share their thinking and discuss all the pros and cons with one another. Try to come to an agreement.

Following the discussion, the facilitator might ask voting questions to find out how groups ranked each of the characters (i.e., "How many felt Abigail was the best character? How many felt she was the worst character." etc.).
Variation

Thought-provoking questions about the character they ranked as most offensive might be asked. For example: Is that the kind of person you least want to be like? What kind of person would be the opposite of this character? List three things you could do or are now doing to be like the opposite of the person you rated as worst. Then members might form into groups of three to share what they have written, or some might volunteer to read what they wrote to the whole group.

Process Description (What do people usually do? What happens?)

This strategy often generates a good deal of emotional involvement. People may attempt to attack and criticize each other's rankings. If listening to, or intolerance toward, others' ideas prove to be a problem, move into a listening exercise such as "Active Listening."

Alligator River

I. Type of exercise - fantasy; introspection; self-revelation; attending

II. Interpersonal intensity - high

   Intrapersonal intensity - medium to high

III. Time implementation - middle to late
IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement:  Rose Ann Lowe
                  Akron, Ohio
Once upon a time there was a woman named Abigail who was in love with a man named Gregory. Gregory lived on the shore of a river. Abigail lived on the opposite shore of the river. The river which separated the two lovers was teeming with man-eating alligators. Abigail wanted to cross the river to be with Gregory. Unfortunately, the bridge had washed out. So she went to ask Sinbad, a river boat captain, to take her across. He said he would be glad to if she would consent to go to bed with him preceding the voyage. She promptly refused and went to a friend named Ivan to explain her plight. Ivan did not want to be involved at all in the situation. Abigail felt her only alternative was to accept Sinbad's terms. Sinbad fulfilled his promise to Abigail and delivered her into the arms of Gregory.

When she told Gregory about her amorous escapade in order to cross the river, Gregory cast her aside with disdain. Heartsick and dejected, Abigail turned to Slug with her tale of woe. Slug, feeling compassion for Abigail, sought out Gregory and beat him brutally. Abigail was overjoyed at the sight of Gregory getting his due. As the sun sets on the horizon, we hear Abigail laughing at Gregory.
Once there was a girl named Abigail who was in love with a boy named Gregory. Gregory had an unfortunate mishap and broke his glasses. Abigail, being a true friend, volunteered to take them to be repaired. But the repair shop was across the river, and during a flash flood the bridge was washed away. Poor Gregory could see nothing without his glasses, so Abigail was desperate to get across the river to the repair shop. While she was standing forlornly on the bank of the river, clutching the broken glasses in her hands, a boy named Sinbad glided by in a rowboat.

She asked Sinbad if he would take her across. He agreed to on condition that while she was having the glasses repaired, she would go to a nearby store and steal a transistor radio that he had been wanting. Abigail refused to do this and went to see a friend named Ivan who had a boat.

When Abigail told Ivan her problem, he said he was too busy to help her out and didn't want to be involved. Abigail, feeling that she had no other choice, returned to Sinbad and told him she would agree to his plan.

When Abigail returned the repaired glasses to Gregory, she told him what she had had to do. Gregory was appalled at what she had done and told her he never wanted to see her again.

Abigail, upset, turned to Slug with her tale of woe. Slug was so sorry for Abigail that he promised her he would
get even with Gregory. They went to the school playground where Greg was playing ball and Abigail watched happily while Slug beat Gregory up and broke his glasses again.
COMMUNICATION GAME

Behavioral Objective

This exercise serves a number of purposes which are significant to developing more open and direct interpersonal relationships. It generally serves to:

1. Get people talking to each other comfortably in a personal way.
2. Build trust and involvement in the process of "laboratory learning" and a desire to learn more about communication.
3. Introduce people to several key concepts in communication:
   (a) listening with meaning
   (b) selective perception
   (c) feedback
   (d) the multi-dimensional nature of communication -- e.g., content vs. relationship.

Explanation. The exercise (or game) has four quarters. Each quarter has a different set of rules and takes a little longer than the preceding quarter. The exercise is designed to help you look at the ways in which you communicate with others and to help you communicate more effectively.
Rules

Quarter One

1. Divide into pairs -- generally it is better to select someone with whom you do not have a great deal of association. One member of the pair is to be A and the other is to be B. Please decide now who is to be A and who is to be B.

2. A is to make a statement to B either about himself, about B or about the relationship between them. Try not to make bland statements but say something about which you have some feelings and which can have real meaning for both of you.

3. B repeats the statement back to A exactly as A said it. He is to use the exact words, tone, inflections and gestures. He is to mirror the statement back to A exactly as he perceived it.

4. A makes a second statement to B. B mirrors it.

5. A makes a third statement to B. B mirrors it. There is to be no discussion of it. Simply make the statements and mirror them back.

6. Reverse the process. B makes three statements to A and after each one A mirrors them back.

7. Discuss the experience with each other. This may be followed by a short lecture or discussion on listening.
Quarter Two

1. A makes a statement to B similar to those made in the first quarter. He may either build on what was said before, or he may choose to talk about something else, but it should still be about himself or B or about their relationship.

2. B responds by saying, "What I think you mean is _______" and he then says what he thinks A meant. He does not try to speculate about why he thinks that or about why A might be saying that. He simply tells A exactly what he things A meant by the statement. A is not to correct B if he thinks he is wrong. The point is that what B heard was what got communicated, correctly or incorrectly.

3. A makes a second statement. B responds with "What I think you mean is _______" etc.

4. A makes a third statement. B responds as before.

5. Reverse the process. B makes three statements to A and after A responds with "What I think you mean is _______." 

6. Discuss the experience with each other. This may be followed by a short lecture or discussion on Selective Perception.

Quarter Three

1. A says something to B with the same rules as before.
2. B responds as in Quarter Two with "What I think you meant is ______." 

3. A and B negotiate until they are in complete agreement about what A really meant and A is able to respond to B with "Yes, that is exactly what I meant." Do not embellish or go beyond the original meaning and don't try to psychologize each other. Simply attempt to get at the exact meaning of what was said.

4. Repeat steps 1, 2 and 3 twice more.

5. Reverse the process with B initiating the statements and A responding (three times).

6. Discuss the experience with each other. This may be followed by a short lecture or discussion on feedback (e.g., the Johari Window). This is designed to illustrate the self-correcting nature of feedback through two-way communication and to provide a transition to the next quarter, which is a bit more threatening.

Quarter Four

1. Combine your pairs in groups of four. Assign the letters A, B, C, and D respectively to the four members of the group.

2. A is the "topic person" first. Each member of the group is to give A some positive and some negative
feedback as constructively as possible. This is to be done as follows:

3. B says to A "An observation I have made about you which I do not particularly like is ______." B then shares with A an observation he has made about A to which B has negative feelings or impressions.

4. A responds with "What I think you mean is ______" and tells B what he thinks B meant.

5. A then adds "My reaction to that is ______" and tells B what his spontaneous reaction to B's feedback was.

6. B then says to A, "An observation I have made about you which I like is ______." B then shares with A an observation he has made about A to which B has positive feelings or impressions.

7. A again responds with "What I think you mean is ______" and "My reaction to that is ______."

8. C and D then respectively go through the same procedure with A.

9. B, C, and D in turn become the "topic person" and receive both negative and positive feedback from the other three members of the group. Most people, if they are willing to be honest, do have both positive and negative impressions of others, even though they have never seen the other person before. Be as honest and specific and helpful as you
can. Feedback is the process by which we learn to relate to each other.

10. Discuss the experience either in your group of four or with the whole group. This may be followed by a brief summary of the purpose listed at the beginning, emphasizing clearly the "relationship" dimension of communication.

Communication Game

I. Type of exercise – feedback

II. Interpersonal intensity – medium
   Intrapersonal intensity – low

III. Time of implementation – early

IV. Type of group – applicable to any

V. Acknowledgement: Alan R. Anderson
   Department of Psychology
   University of Minnesota
   Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
PERSONAL COAT OF ARMS

Behavioral Objective

To help people think about the questions: What am I doing with my life? Am I simply settling? Am I just reacting to others, or am I in control of the direction of my life? Is my life making a difference? Introspection.

Rules

Each person is given a facsimile of the coat of arms on the following page, or is asked to copy it.

He is then to answer each of the following questions by drawing, in the appropriate area on his coat of arms, a picture, design, or symbol.

1. What do you regard as your greatest personal achievement to date?
2. What do you regard as your family's greatest achievement?
3. What is the one thing that other people can do to make you happy?
4. What do you regard as your own greatest personal failure to date?
5. What would you do if you had one year to live and were guaranteed success in whatever you attempted?
6. What three things would you most like to be said of you if you died today?
Art work doesn't count. The drawings can be simple, incomplete, and even unintelligible to others, as long as the person knows what they express.

Depending upon trust within the large group, members then share their drawings on their coat of arms, explaining the significance of the symbols. They may cover or omit any drawing they would rather not share. If not enough trust is built up within the large group to make sharing comfortable, then they share in small groups or dyads.

Variation

Other values questions may be substituted, such as these:

1. What is something about which you would never budge?
2. What is something you are striving to become? Or to be?
3. What one thing would you want to accomplish by the time you are 65?
4. Draw three things you are good at?
5. What is a personal motto you live by?

Process Description (What do people usually do? What happens?)

No comment.
Personal Coat of Arms

I. Type of exercise - introspection; self-revelation; values clarification; risking

II. Interpersonal intensity - medium to high
Intrapersonal intensity - medium to high

III. Time implementation - late

IV. Type of group - mixed

V. Acknowledgement: Sr. Louise
   Principal of St. Julian's School
   Chicago
BOUNDARY BREAKING
- GROWING AWARENESS -

Behavioral Objectives

To form a group interaction experience that works toward the end of creating a sense of community by bringing students together in groups.

To create an awareness of the other person by the use of questions that reveal more than the superficial conversations that fill most of the casual meetings of students that are not close friends.

To listen, knowing that it is basic to learning about the other person.

Rules

1. Sit around a table or in a circle; no one is to be out of the circle, and the circle is to be as tight as possible.

2. Questions are not to be explained. Each person is to react to what he hears, and the mood is to be kept serious at all times. If a person does not understand a question, repeat it with the same wording. Tell each person just to respond to what he hears.

3. Every question is to be answered by every participant.
4. Session length is best determined by the alertness of the group and the interest generated.

5. Switch to the Synthesis Set when interest is still strong, but do not tell the participants about the "Synthesis Set" beforehand.

6. We are here to listen.

7. We are not here to debate (this is urgent).

8. We are not here to disagree.

9. As each person answers, collect these answers in your head -- develop an idea of each person.

10. Key word is listen ... listen ... listen.

**Questions for Structured Conversation**

1. Who is the man most relevant to our times?

2. When you think of reality, what comes to your mind first?

3. What is the most beautiful thing about people?

4. What physical thing do you want to build more than anything else.

5. What is the most sacred thing you know?

6. What is the ugliest thing you know?

7. What event of the last three months stands out in your mind the most?

8. What force of history are you most aware of as you plan your life?

9. On what basis do you select your friends?
10. What is the greatest value that guides your life?
11. If you could be any animal other than man -- what animal would you choose to be?
12. If you could smash one thing and only one thing, what would you smash?
13. What is the greatest crime one man can do towards another?
14. If the atomic bomb was going to fall in ten minutes -- what would you do in that last ten minutes?
15. If you could travel to any place in the world -- where would you go first?
16. Select a word that best describes your total life at this moment of time?
17. What is the most beautiful thing you have ever seen?
18. What do you think people like in you the least?
19. What do you think people like in you the most?
20. What person has most influenced your life?
21. What would you like to be talented at that you are not at the present time?
22. When do you feel most lonely?
23. When do you sense being alive the most?
24. Select a word that you feel describes people your age?
25. In school you have seen certain people all year and you have not spoken to them -- why?
26. What future discovery are you looking forward to the most?
27. What is your greatest fear?
28. What do you love the most?
29. When you think of children under age three -- what comes to your mind?
30. If you had to use another word for God - what word would you use?
31. What person would you follow the farthest?
32. What one day in your life would you like to live over?
33. What is the most powerful force loose in the world today?
34. What do you want to be?

**Synthesis Set**

(Answer these questions in light of the answers given by the group members.)

1. Which person did you learn the most about?
2. Which person did you think was most honest?
3. Which person did you think hid himself from you the most?
4. Which person do you think you could get along with best over a long period of time (boy or girl)?
5. Which answer surprised you the most?
6. Which person is most sensitive to life?
7. Which person enjoys life the most?
8. Which person do you feel will make the best leader?
9. Which person do you feel is most like you?
10. Which person do you feel is least like you?
11. Which person is most balanced ... well rounded ... in the four areas mental, physical, social and spiritual?
12. Which person has the most charisma ... the capacity to make you want to believe, to follow them, to be with them?

You may create more questions for your group - questions that are more in harmony with your area and your youth.

Boundary Breaking
- Growing Awareness -

I. Type of exercise - feedback
II. Interpersonal intensity - medium
Intrapersonal intensity - medium
III. Time of implementation - early
IV. Type of group - applicable to all
V. Acknowledgement:
APPENDIX D

ANECDOTAL RECORD FOR COUNSELING GROUPS
April 4, 1974

Purpose

1. Introduction to group process
2. Administration of TSCS

Procedures

1. Presentation of the idea of group process, how it could be helpful (e.g., cognitive versus non-cognitive learning and how they interrelate), goals I hoped to help the group achieve (e.g., [a] better self-understanding, [b] self-acceptance and positive self-regard, [c] insights into personal goals formation), and types of things we would do.

2. We did a group process ("Active Listening") to accomplish these things:
   a. an experiencing of a process
   b. to help build attending skills
   c. to help build trust and participation

3. A short discussion of feelings about and during the process followed.

4. I administered the TSCS.

Results

All subjects participated in the following ways:

1. Asking questions about the presentation
2. Interacting in the process
3. Discussing the process
4. Taking the TSCS
April 11, 1974

Purpose
1. Trust building
2. Introspection
3. Self-revelation
4. Attending

Procedures
1. A process: "Who Are You"
2. Discussion

Results

Group I (N-2): Only A was present on this day. She was extremely nervous when she arrived and ready to bolt at any moment (e.g., she clutched her belongings tightly, sat as close as possible to the door, strained facial expression, and so forth). We went through "Who Are You" three times each, with me beginning each time. The second time around, A relaxed somewhat and put her belongings down. The third time around, she seemed even more relaxed, but the clicking of the timer bothered her. A revealed that she is an ex-convict and has many "hang-ups." After the process, we discussed feelings about it and what she was experiencing in doing it. She relaxed quite noticeably at this point and opened up further.
Group II (N-5): We went through "Who Are You" with A and B in attendance. A had great difficulty talking about himself. He could only say such things as "I'm me." He was visibly nervous and shy. B was far more outgoing and had little trouble talking about himself. During the discussion which followed, however, A had things to say about how he could relate to what B said about drugs, changing goals, and so forth. B is probably the first Black person A has ever associated with, and A was entranced by the fact that they both had so much in common. C entered the meeting late, but he participated little this time.

Evaluation

1. Relaxation of the subjects present was one plus for this meeting.

2. Participation and attendance was not as good as it could have been.

3. Once discussion started, people at both meetings forgot about time and became thoroughly involved (though not yet really at a "feeling" level). In both instances we were forced to vacate the room by incoming classes.

4. This session might be considered the beginning of involvement for subjects.
Purpose

1. Introspection
2. Self-revelation

Procedure

1. "Boundary Breaking"
2. "Who Are You"
3. "Hole-Card"
4. Discussion

Results

Group I (N-2): We went through all questions in "Boundary Breaking" and then through #3 on the "Synthesis Set" of questions in "Boundary Breaking." A was far more relaxed than at the last two meetings. For example, she put her belongings down as soon as she entered the room, was able to maintain eye contact, and so forth. B opened up a bit, but she was never as "closed" as A was at first. B's answers to "Boundary Breaking" questions were thoughtful -- sometimes long silences before she gave answers. Discussion following "Boundary Breaking" led into a variation of "Hole-Card" -- what things would you not wish to reveal to others? Why do we fear to reveal certain things? and so forth. Both subjects contributed to the discussion in a "feeling" manner. During "Who Are You," however, B was unable to say much.
Group II (N-5): We went through question #19 in "Boundary Breaking" and then into the "Synthesis Set" -- through #3. This led into a discussion which resulted in a variation of "Hole-Card." A was thoughtful in his answers and more open than he was last week -- sometimes silences while he groped for exactly the right words to express his feelings. D seemed to put up a defensive "bored" front during "Boundary Breaking" until we went into the "Synthesis Set." Then he was thoughtful and feeling in his answers and during the discussion leading into "Hole-Card." C was jovial and wordy throughout, until we reached the discussion and "Hole-Card." Then he became silent. Little depth or self-revelation was reached by C. During "Who Are You," C "talked" a lot but "said" little. A was much more able to talk about himself this week than he was last week. He could go the full five minutes in "Who Are You" without trouble (last week he could only go one or two minutes). D had no trouble talking. Neither did B or E. During the discussion we examined feelings. A explored why talking was easier for him this week. D lost his "bored" facade and became an involved member of the group during discussion.

Evaluation

1. A (Group II) has opened a good deal since meeting #1.

2. C (Group II) still is operating on a surface level.
3. D began to operate as a group member rather than as an observer.

4. B and E are both good contributing members of the group -- E more so than B. B examines some of his feelings, but remains more "surface" than E. E was open from the very beginning.

5. Attendance was 100% at both groups.

6. Both A and B in Group I are becoming more open and feeling.

7. In general, the groups seem to be progressing in interrelationships and individual introspection.
April 25, 1974

Purpose

1. Introspection
2. Insight into personal goals

Procedure

1. "Who Are You"
2. "Personal Coat of Arms"
3. Discussion

Results

Group I (N-2): A and B went through "Who Are You" several times each. B is now more open and able to talk about herself. At other times she was only able to say such things as "I am who I am" during this exercise. Both subjects entered into the discussion afterwards. A has strong feelings about being categorized (perhaps as a result of her prison experiences). B is accepting of most things in a fateful kind of way, while A is a "fighter." "Personal Coat of Arms" was a "mind-blower" for A. She has a "hang-up" about putting anything on paper and admitted it. She did very little with this exercise. B persisted in the activity thoughtfully. Time ran out before we had time to discuss this exercise.

Group II (N-5): C is still operating on a surface level. He could only talk about his army experiences and family responsibilities in "Who Are You." A became very
emotional about his stepfather, who is an army sergeant, while A is a hippy-pacifist. D reached some depth of feeling. B and E remained observably unchanged in behavior. In discussion, the group confronted C about why he seems to find it difficult to talk about himself but dwells on the army, etc. He admitted to this difficulty. Others talked about why it is more difficult to talk about feelings than about objects, and how "courage" seemed to develop a bit more each time they were forced to talk about themselves. All subjects participated in "Personal Coat of Arms," but most found it difficult to use symbols instead of words to express their achievements, failures, hopes, etc. required by the exercise. Time ran out before we could discuss results in any depth.

Evaluation

1. We tried to do too much this session. "Personal Coat of Arms" should have been saved until a later time, because there was not sufficient time for discussion regarding it.

2. Several subjects are becoming more open and more "feeling" each time we meet.

3. C is still a problem. His feelings have not yet been tapped.

4. "Who Are You" is a good exercise for any size group to get things going, but I think we've done it enough for awhile.
May 2, 1974

Purpose

1. Define "group" and determine if we have one
2. Discuss stereotyping people and what it does to them

Procedure

Discussion as follows:

Group I (N-2): Part of the time was spent discussing what is important in being a "person." The discussion began with A talking about a sociology assignment which required students to analyze a family. A was "uptight" about stereotyping people on the basis of impersonal data collected.

A: "There's no such thing as a anything. I'm a Catholic, but not like other Catholics."

B: "People are unique but have things in common -- similar but unique."

A: "My feelings change. I can't punch up people and put them in holes. That's what everyone tries to do to everybody. I don't want to be with the rest of the pack! I want out. Some want in. Why do we have to fight so much?"

B: "I've accepted that's the way things are."

A: "Children are pigeonholed and programmed."

Counselor: "What happens to people when they are pigeon-holed? Or cornered?"
A: "Either they lie down and die or fight -- or adjust. I won't accept it! People get into corners. We need a round world where one can't be cornered."

B: "There are too many angles? I think we are being cornered from within but not from what's around us."

A: "I'm trapped within myself, but also people put you in traps. Feeling is important. It leads to knowledge."

- Long Pause -

Counselor: "How would you like to use the rest of our time?" Pause. "If you have no suggestions, I'd like to raise a question. Do we have a group?"

B: "Sociology influences our thinking on "group." It is two or more people. Then there are primary groups and secondary groups."

A: "I fear being influenced by sociology and the like."

Counselor: "Well, the reason I raised the question is that one of my supervisors said to me, 'I don't think you have a group.'"

A: "You tell him that I'm a group all to myself!"

Counselor: "Perhaps I don't know what a group is."

A: "I have that problem too."

Counselor: "It's a problem for me, too, now."

A: "A group -- more than one, a unit, something holding us together. It makes no difference if a room is full of people or there are only three people -- unless something is holding them together, there is not a group."
B: "A group is two or more people."
A: "There must be something to pull them together. There's no groupness in a roomful of people necessarily. There are functional or disfunctional groups. There are no specific goals for individuals in a disfunctional group."
B: "Do you mean it has something to do with whether their behavior is appropriate?"
A: "It has nothing to do with behavior. There is one common element that all are involved in."
B: "If we are together for the same purpose at the same time we are a group then?"
Counselor: "Do we have a common purpose?"
A: "I think so!"
Counselor: "Can you define it?"
A: "More than one -- an attempt to learn something..."
B: "To learn about ourselves?"
Counselor: "That was originally our purpose."
A: "I'm not a judge -- I'm watching..."
B: "We have a valid group if we have enough people all here to learn about themselves from each other."
A: "But that leaves her (the counselor) out. She's part of the group."
B: "We're all here to learn. We're all students... A lady I met the other day told me about the 'overcoats' we all wear -- a 'student overcoat,' etc. In the center we are all O.K., but too many overcoats make us feel like we're not
O.K. We must take them off one by one. If we get too many on, we can't see who we are. It's not you getting pressure, but expectations people put on the coat you're wearing.

A: "Failure is from within oneself -- people's reactions -- over-reacting -- frustrations -- the control attempted by one person on another. If there was communication between people ... But communication brings fear of exposure, so most talk is surface talk. I feel a real threat to me if people say I over-react."

Counselor: "Time is almost up. Can we return to "groups" for a minute? Let me read you a definition: "The term functional group refers to two or more organisms interacting, in the pursuit of a common goal, in such a way that the existence of many is utilized for the satisfaction of some needs of each (Kemp, 1964). Do we have a group or not?"

A: "I think we have a group, and I like the way they said it in the book. I wish I could say it that way. We satisfy all of the things there."

B: "Yes."

Group II (N-5): Group II was low in attendance (3), so we saved the above discussion for next time and discussed feelings about self, stereotyping, and the like. No "processes" were used.
Results

Group I defined group and decided that we had a functional group.

Evaluation

1. Generally, this was a productive session in the sense of soul-searching discussion.

2. Discussion in Group II was generally productive in that D talked with more feeling and participated more freely than ever before.
May 9, 1974

Purpose

This time there were separate purposes for the two groups since we still had to discuss "group" in Group II.

1. Group I -- Introspection
2. Group II -- What is a group and do we have one?

Procedure

Discussion

Results

Group I (N-2): A did a self-search on her relationships with other people, which she said had been mostly negative. She admitted to having conflicting emotions and thoughts. She drew an analogy to several "little men" in her head all telling her conflicting things. She said that she tends to over-react -- but has an aversion to the word "over-react."

B's self-search had to do with what she really wants to do -- self-satisfaction as opposed to satisfaction of others' demands on her. Both A and B are controlled by social agencies -- A is on welfare and is also controlled by a parole officer and a social worker; B goes to school on Social Security and welfare funds, which are in danger of being withdrawn from her if she doesn't conform to specified curriculum requirements. She is struggling with the worth of taking courses she wants to take as opposed to those demanded of her by others with control over her life. A is
struggling with similar kinds of problems -- plus a fifteen-year-old daughter with an illegitimate child, a son in prison, a four-year-old of her own to care for, no husband, and a multitude of other problems. Both subjects were a good deal more open and introspective than previously.

Group II (N-5): Attendance was 100%. Discussion centered on a consideration of what a group consists of and whether or not we have one. With a few digressions into A's examination of his feelings about himself in relation to others he knows, the discussion and conclusion was similar to those of Group I on the same topic.

Evaluation

1. Generally, both sessions were productive in the sense or producing introspection.
2. All members were more introspective and more open than in the past.
May 16, 1974

Purpose

Introspection

a. feelings clarification

b. values clarification

Procedure

Discussion of group-initiated topics

Results

Group I (N-2): The discussion revolved mostly around religion and how it affected them -- their feelings about religion, magic, ESP, horoscopes, etc. based on their experiences. This topic arose from B confronting A about being "sour-faced" about her problems and saying that it had "rubbed off on her" last time. A expressed an "escape" wish, which led into the idea of "understanding" as related to "acceptance" of situations and ideas. This led into the possibility of truly knowing and the fear of the unknown (e.g., death), which went into a discussion of religion.

Group II (N-5): The general topics of discussion which arose in this group were aloneness versus loneliness, and the relationship between ideas, behavior, and feelings. A was on a truly feeling level in his expressions of his fear of breaking into a new group or of talking to new people. C began on his usual surface level, but he moved into his feelings in dealing with several social situations (e.g., a
dinner party with his boss; moving away from an unknown group of people at a cafeteria table). He truly examined his feelings and some of his conflicting thoughts for the first time in the group.

**Evaluation**

1. Group I did much intellectualizing and was not as much in depth of feeling as it could be.

2. I feel a real breakthrough was made by C in Group II in at last examining his **feelings**.
May 23, 1974

Purpose

Insight into values and personal goal setting

Procedure

Discussion

Results

Group I (N=2): The general topic of discussion was "What sacrifices would you make for a goal?" A was riddled with personal problems. Her fifteen-year-old daughter had run off and left A with the baby, which she brought to the group session on her back. This interfered with good discussion. A's fear and contempt of authorities prevented her from seeking child care for her granddaughter so that she could attend classes unencumbered. However, A is so determined to "better" herself that she was attending all of her classes with the year-old baby on her back. A said that she wants to "succeed," but she still is searching for a definition of success that will fit her. She admitted that other problems kept getting in her way -- her children, grandchild, authorities, etc. B was not certain where she was going or why. She is unwilling to set goals at this point and maintains a "que sera" attitude, which she admitted was perhaps a "cop-out."

Group II (N=5): Some of the topics tossed around were acceptance, positive thinking in spite of losing, trying
again in the face of failure, some success in any failure. When the question of whether there were any goals for which they might give up a part of their lives, D replied, "bodybuilding and track"; C ruminated on capitalizing on negative thoughts to reach a goal; D felt that success builds success. C tried to explain further that one can take negative comments by others as a challenge to succeed ... you are important to yourself ... success makes you feel important to yourself ... honesty gets you ahead ... D felt that C was wrong -- people are basically dishonest. C maintained that even though he may be defeated he wins if he is honest because he feels good about himself. The exchange between these two members generated a further exchange between all members regarding racial feelings amid a group of people who are all of a different race than your own (B and D are both Black).

Evaluation

1. The baby interfered with good interaction in Group I. However, its presence did bring into the open some of A's problems which were discussed.

2. With Group II the tone was generally open and searching. Group interaction was generally good.
May 30, 1974

Purpose

Post-test groups on both instruments

Procedure

Both groups were administered the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Form A and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form.

Results

Reported in the body of this dissertation.
APPENDIX E

GROUP MEAN SCORE CHANGE PROFILES FOR THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE
Group Mean Score Change Profile for TSCS: Treatment Group II (reading only), Teacher 1 (N = 2).

--- = pre-test  ---- = post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T SCORE</th>
<th>SELF-CRIT.</th>
<th>T/F</th>
<th>NET TOTAL</th>
<th>POSITIVE SCORES</th>
<th>PERCENTILE SCORES</th>
<th>VARIABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT.</td>
<td>COL. TOT.</td>
<td>ROW TOT. D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: The image contains a detailed graph with multiple axes and data points, which is not transcribed here due to its complexity and visual nature.
### Group Mean Score Change Profile for TSCS: Treatment Group I
(counseling and reading), Teacher 1 (N = 2).

--- = pre-test  
--- = post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T SCORE</th>
<th>SELF CRITICIZING</th>
<th>T/F CONFLICT</th>
<th>POSITIVE SCORES</th>
<th>PERCENTILE SCORES</th>
<th>VARIABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRITICIZING</td>
<td>ROW TOTAL</td>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T TOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Mean Score Change Profile for TSCS: Treatment Group II (reading only), Teacher 2 (N = 5).

--- = pre-test

--- = post-test
Group Mean Score Change Profile for TSCS: Treatment Group I (counseling and reading), Teacher 2 (N = 5).

--- = pre-test

--- = post-test