6-1965

An experiment in group counseling at John Marshall High School, Richmond, Virginia

Daniel S. Marshall

AN EXPERIMENT IN GROUP COUNSELING AT JOHN MARSHALL HIGH SCHOOL, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty of the

University of Richmond

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

---

by

Daniel Summey Marshall

June 1965

APPROVAL SHEET

The undersigned, appointed by the Chairman of the Department of Education, have examined this thesis by

Daniel Summey Marshall, B. S.

candidate for the degree of Master of Science in Education, and hereby certify the approval of its acceptance.

Edward F. Overton, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
University of Richmond

Fred B. Dixon, Ed.D
Principal, John Marshall High School
Visiting Lecturer
University of Richmond

Austin E. Grigg, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
University of Richmond

Calvin H. Phippins, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Limestone College
Visiting Lecturer
University of Richmond

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Ellen H. Chewning and Mr. Robert V. Turner, both of the guidance staff of John Marshall High School, who devoted many hours to counseling the experimental groups, and to Mr. James O. Cook and Mr. James F. Barrett, both of the history department of John Marshall High School, for their participation as teachers in the experiment. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Fred B. Dixon, Principal of John Marshall High School and Visiting Lecturer at the University of Richmond, for his wise counsel and vital interest in the experiment; to Dr. Austin E. Grigg of the faculty of the University of Richmond for his most helpful advice concerning the statistical treatment and its implications; to Dr. Calvin H. Phippins, Visiting Lecturer at the University of Richmond, for his good counsel in syntax; and to Dr. Edward F. Overton of the faculty of the University of Richmond for his inspiration and words of encouragement which made this thesis possible. Appreciation is also expressed to the members of the faculty at John Marshall High School who participated by willingly completing the five hundred seventy questionnaires which were used in compiling the data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION

Introduction. A request was made by the principal of John Marshall High School to the guidance staff that experimentation be done in the area of group counseling. The writer, who had previously served on the guidance staff and subsequently as a teacher, agreed to coordinate the experiment. In addition to the coordinator, two teachers and two counselors assisted in the implementation and performance of the experiment.

The objective of the experiment was to see whether there was improvement in citizenship and academic achievement manifested as a result of the experiment in group counseling of problem students. With this objective in mind the coordinator and the two counselors met to outline the procedures to be used. From that point the writer, serving as coordinator, has developed this thesis.

Definition of group counseling. In April 1964, Dr. Benjamin Cohn, Counseling Consultant, Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Westchester County, Bedford Hills, New York, was guest speaker at a meeting of Richmond Public School counselors. At this meeting Dr. Cohn demonstrated group counseling. A counselor in the school in which the

meeting was held chose six underachieving boys to be Dr. Cohn's group to be counsàled. For those in the audience this was a most rewarding experience. Watching him develop a rapport with the boys and instilling in them confidence in him was a real lesson in group counseling technique. Actually Dr. Cohn's technique differed little from that used in individual counseling.

One is led to an oversimplified definition of group counseling, namely, group counseling is the plural of individual counseling. The implication intended is that the two are alike in every aspect, except that one is plural and the other singular. This definition, however, is not adequate. Group counseling is more than individual counseling with several people.

> Group counseling is a social process. The persons involved approach problems at their own speed within the safety of a social setting. Here they may explore problems that are important to them within the security of a group of peers who share their problems and with whom they identify.[1]

> Group counseling is an educational process conducted primarily in an educational setting.[2]

---

[1]Charles F. Combs, Benjamin Cohn, Edward J. Gibian, and A. Mead Sniffen, "Group Counseling: Applying the Technique," The School Counselor, vol 11, no 1, October 1963.

[2]Benjamin Cohn, Charles F. Combs, Edward J. Gibian, and A. Mead Sniffen, "Group Counseling: An Orientation," Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol 42, no 4, December 1963.

> Group counseling, as we see it, is a dynamic, interpersonal process through which individuals within the normal range of adjustment work within a peer group and with a professionally trained counselor, exploring problems and feelings in an attempt to modify their attitudes so that they are better able to deal with developmental problems.[3]

Warters feels that in group counseling there is the opportunity for individuals to withdraw protectively while still maintaining participation.[4] In interpreting Warters, Cohn, et al., suggest that when a member finds a discussion is becoming too painful or threatening he can withdraw easily, sitting in silence while still participating through listening, thinking, and feeling.[5] Values of group counseling are pointed out by Boy, Isaksen, and Pine as they contend that group counseling enables the counselor to help more pupils each day, thereby resulting in a more economical use of counselor time.[6] The primary value of group counseling, according to Boy, Isaksen, and Pine is that a contact is established which may be needed more in a group relationship

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Jane Warters, Group Guidance, McGraw Hill, New York, 1960.

[5] Benjamin Cohn et al., loc. cit.

[6] Angelo V. Boy, Henry L. Isaksen, and Gerald J. Pine. "Multiple Counseling: A Catalyst for Individual Counseling," The School Counselor, vol 11, no 1, October 1963.

than in an individual relationship.[7] Wright believes that multiple counseling is a situation in which the counselor counsels with more than one individual at a time, stating, with this in mind, the objectives of counseling, "...(The counselee gets from counseling) (1) evaluation of himself, or gaining knowledge necessary for wise choices--i.e. learning; (2) decision making and self-direction--or growth in the ability to make decisions and be responsible; and (3) carrying through of learning to action--i.e. changed behavior.[8]

> The counseling relationship, whether individual or group, is essentially a human relationship; an interaction between and among people; a helping relationship. It is characterized by warmth, acceptance, permissiveness, and empathy. It is genuineness and human confrontation at a most fundamental level. It is love.[9]

Though a simple definition of group counseling seems non-existent, in essence group counseling is a process wherein more than one individual meets with a counselor. Members of the group often serve in counselor capacity to the rest of the group. A member of the group could have a better perception and give a better reply to another member

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] E. Wayne Wright, op. cit.

[9] John Gawrys, Jr. and O. Bruce Brown, "Group Counseling: More than a Catalyst," The School Counselor, vol 12, no 4, May 1965.

then could the counselor.

The expression, "problem students," is used throughout the thesis. In the present context a problem student is one who is an underachiever and/or exhibits characteristics of poor citizenship in his conduct, participation and attitude.

Nowhere in the literature is found any implication that group counseling is a substitute for individual counseling and should replace it. Group counseling is good when there are common problems, the verbalization of which can be made in groups.

CHAPTER II

THE EXPERIMENT

Composition of the groups. The experimental group comprised a ninth grade basal history class, which was taught by Mr. James E. Barrett. The ninth grade history course, which is required, is world history. The word "basal" is used in the vernacular of curriculum in the Richmond City Schools. Basal is a term used in the categorization of the depth into which and rigor with which courses are taught. The basal classes are those into which students with lower academic achievement are placed. The students in this class were, for the most part, problem students. Their academic achievement was low and they exhibited traits of poor citizenship.

The control group was another ninth grade basal history class, also taught by Mr. Barrett. The two classes were approximately the same size. The students in the two classes had the same general characteristics.

Procedure. The experimental group was divided into four smaller groups. Each Friday during the history class period the smaller groups met. Two of the smaller groups met with Mrs. Ellen H. Chewning and Mr. Robert V. Turner, who are counselors; the other two smaller groups met with Mr. Barrett and Mr. James O. Cook, who are teachers of

history. The groups met with the same leader throughout the experiment. Of the total, Mrs. Chewning worked with six, Mr. Turner with five, Mr. Barrett with six, and Mr. Cook with five. On Monday through Thursday each week the entire group of twenty-two met for regular class with Mr. Barrett. The control group attended regular class sessions with Mr. Barrett five days a week throughout the experiment.

Mrs. Chewning and Mr. Turner counseled with their respective groups. Mr. Barrett and Mr. Cook continued the teaching of history to their respective groups.

Length of study. The experiment began with the sending out of questionnaires in November 1963, and ended with the sending out of similar questionnaires to the same teachers in May 1964. The groups were divided for the small group counseling and instruction for seventeen sessions, one period each week. "Group counseling seems to be most effective on a one-period-per-week basis, running approximately 15 to 20 weeks."[10]

Methods of counseling. At the first meeting of the groups to be counseled during the experiment the students were given mimeographed copies of "Rules of the Game."

---

[10] Combs, et al., op. cit.

RULES OF THE GAME[11]

1. Group counseling is a cooperative job. We must all work together to help each other solve problems.

2. We can't solve problems if we refuse to look at them honestly. Let's try not to let our previous ideas get in our way.

3. Try to really listen to what the person next to you is saying. Don't just try to convince him that you're right. Listen to what he says, just as you expect him to listen to you when you have something to say.

4. Stick with a topic; don't get side-tracked. Wait until the rest of the people seem to be willing to let a topic rest for a while before you try to change it.

5. Speak whenever you have something to say. Don't be afraid to speak up even if what you have to say isn't particularly clear in your own mind. But on the other hand, be careful not to cover up what you mean to say by saying too much.

6. One of the best ways you can help the others is to let them know that they are not alone in what they feel. If you have experienced the same feeling, tell them. You may be surprised to find that you will be able to understand more about the way you feel as you find yourself talking to others about how they feel.

7. Don't feel that you have to come to a group solution or agreement. The purpose of the group is to explore problems together. The decision that you as a person come to must be your own. The only solutions that are good for you must be those that have a personal meaning for you. Someone else's answer may not apply to the way you feel.

---

[11] Ibid.

8. A group discussion goes along best when everybody trusts each other. Be careful that the others don't feel that you are making fun of them. If you are going to work together and solve problems, you're going to have to trust each other. The more quickly you get to know the others and they get to know you, the more quickly this group is going to "pay off" for you.

Frequent consultations were held between the counselors to insure that essentially the same approach and techniques were being used throughout the experiment. The techniques ran the gamut from directive to eclectic to non-directive methods, with the non-directive approach predominating. An attempt was made to allow the students to verbalize their problems in a friendly, accepting, and permissive atmosphere. The counselors maintained their positions of leadership in the group, not allowing their permissiveness to result in anarchy.

The students freely expressed themselves concerning home, manners, school, teachers, vocations, dating, dress, attitudes, peer relationships, behavior, and many other topics. The counselors avoided structuring the sessions to any great degree, but allowed the students to steer the course with a minimum of guiding from the counselor.

CHAPTER III

MEASURES USED IN THE EXPERIMENT

The questionnaire. The questionnaire (see page 65) was sent to each subject teacher of each student in both the control and experimental groups in November just prior to the beginning of the experiment. The teachers were requested to rate each student on each of six categories, attendance, conduct in class, participation in class, attitude toward classmates, homework, and grade to date. After the termination of the experiment in May, identical questionnaires were sent to the same teachers for ratings for both the control and experimental groups.

The questionnaire was prepared on a seven-point rating scale. In addition to facilitating the rating for teachers the seven-point scale was used in order to get a fairer picture of each student. An average was obtained by dividing the total score for each of the six categories by the number of teacher ratings received for each category. This average was computed for each student in each category in November and in May.

For statistical purposes the seven-point ratings were translated to a two-point rating for each student in each category. The statistical method applied is useful only for frequencies.

Student and counselor evaluation. In order to get an evaluation from the counseled experimental group an evaluation sheet (see page 66) was given to each of the counseled students to be filled in by them. This evaluation was made at the conclusion of the experiment.

A brief report was submitted by the counselors to the principal upon the conclusion of the experiment. Each of the two counselors was asked to submit a statement of his opinions and personal observations concerning the experiment.

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF THE EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Chi square. The statistic used in testing significance of difference in the experiment was chi square. In the application of chi square the experimental and control groups were divided into three groups: (1) the control group, (2) the counseled experimental group, and (3) the instructed experimental group. Each group was tested individually and against each other in the six categories which were rated. Chi square is useful in testing significant differences where frequencies are involved, as they are in this experiment.

Explanation of the tables. Each of the forty-two tables is divided into two parts. The upper portion shows the frequency of ratings in the first two columns in the categories listed to the left. The third column and the bottom row show the totals vertically and horizontally. The last figure in the third column is a two-way total. The figures in parentheses are the expected frequencies, which are computed by dividing the product of the column and row totals by the two-way total.

The lower portion of each table shows the computation of chi square. The column headings are: O, the observed frequency taken from the upper portion of the

table; E, the expected frequency taken from the figures in parentheses in the upper portion of the table; O - E, column two subtracted from column one; $(O - E)^2$, the square of the third column; and $\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$, column four divided by column two. Chi square is the sum of the fifth column.

Tables I through XVIII test November good and poor ratings and May good and poor ratings of each group in each of the six categories. This test is for significance of difference between good and poor ratings in November and in May.

Tables XIX through XXIV test the significance of difference between the control group, the counseled experimental group, and the instructed experimental group from November and May good ratings. These six tables test all six categories on the questionnaire.

Tables XXV through XXX test the good ratings of the two experimental groups for November and May. The comparison of the counseled and the instructed experimental groups is a test for significant differences in technique.

The instructed groups, which are the control group and the instructed experimental group, are compared in Tables XXXI through XXXVI on good ratings in November and May.

Tables XXXVII through XLII test the significance of difference between the control group and the counseled

experimental group from November to May. This test includes both size and technique to be taken into consideration.

Tables I through XVIII and Tables XXV through XLII are 2 x 2 (two by two) tables. In these tables there is one degree of freedom. At the five per cent level of significance the value of chi square is 3.84 per cent with one degree of freedom.

Tables XIX through XXIV are 3 x 2 (three by two) tables. In these tables there are two degrees of freedom. At the five per cent level of significance the value of chi square is 5.99 per cent with two degrees of freedom.

Interpretation of the results of the chi square test of significant difference. In interpreting the results of the chi square computations, repetitions of the number of degrees of freedom and the values of chi square at the five per cent level of significance for the various numbers of degrees of freedom will not be given. When the expected frequency of any cell is less than five, chi square is difficult to interpret, but the data have been reported to give some suggestion of the trends.

In Table III the value of chi square, 6.700, for the control group participation in class is significant. It can readily be seen empirically that there was more class participation in May than in November.

The value of chi square in Table XXXIX, 5.000, is

CONTROL GROUP--ATTENDANCE

	poor	good	Total
November	7(8)	17(16)	24
May	9(8)	15(16)	24
Total	16	32	48

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
7	8	-1	1	.125
17	16	1	1	.063
9	8	1	1	.125
15	16	-1	1	.063
			$X^2 =$	.376

TABLE II

CONTROL GROUP--CONDUCT IN CLASS

	poor	good	Total
November	11(9)	13(15)	24
May	7(9)	17(15)	24
Total	18	30	48

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
11	9	2	4	.444
13	15	-2	4	.267
7	9	-2	4	.444
17	15	2	4	.267
			$X^2 =$	1.422

TABLE III

CONTROL GROUP--PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

	poor[1]	good	Total
November	23(19.5)	1(4.5)	24
May	16(19.5)	8(4.5)	24
Total	39	9	48

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
23	19.5	3.5	12.25	.628
1	4.5	-3.5	12.25	2.722
16	19.5	-3.5	12.25	.628
8	4.5	3.5	12.25	2.722
				$X^2 = 6.700$

TABLE IV

CONTROL GROUP--ATTITUDE TOWARD CLASSMATES

	poor	good	Total
November	8(8)	16(16)	24
May	8(8)	16(16)	24
Total	16	32	48

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
8	8	0	0	0
16	16	0	0	0
8	8	0	0	0
16	16	0	0	0
				$X^2 = 0$

TABLE V

CONTROL GROUP--HOMEWORK

	poor	good	Total
November	17(18.5)	7(5.5)	24
May	20(18.5)	4(5.5)	24
Total	37	11	48

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
17	18.5	-1.5	2.25	.122
7	5.5	1.5	2.25	.409
20	18.5	1.5	2.25	.122
4	5.5	-1.5	2.25	.409

$X^2 = 1.062$

TABLE VI

CONTROL GROUP--GRADE TO DATE

	poor	good	Total
November	23(23)	1(1)	24
May	23(23)	1(1)	24
Total	46	2	48

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
23	23	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0
23	23	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0

$X^2 = 0$

TABLE VII

COUNSELED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--ATTENDANCE

	poor	good	Total
November	0(.5)	11(10.5)	11
May	1(.5)	10(10.5)	11
Total	1	21	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
0	.5	-.5	.25	.500
11	10.5	.5	.25	.024
1	.5	.5	.25	.500
10	10.5	-.5	.25	.024
				$\chi^2 = 1.048$

TABLE VIII

COUNSELED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--CONDUCT IN CLASS

	poor	good	Total
November	3(2.5)	8(8.5)	11
May	2(2.5)	9(8.5)	11
Total	5	17	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
3	2.5	.5	.25	.100
8	8.5	-.5	.25	.029
2	2.5	-.5	.25	.100
9	8.5	.5	.25	.029
				$\chi^2 = .258$

TABLE IX

COUNSELED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

	poor	good	Total
November	7(8)	4(3)	11
May	9(8)	2(3)	11
Total	16	6	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
7	8	-1	1	.125
4	3	1	1	.333
9	8	1	1	.125
2	3	-1	1	.333
				$\chi^2 = .916$

TABLE X

COUNSELED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--ATTITUDE TOWARD CLASSMATES

	poor	good	Total
November	1(2)	10(9)	11
May	3(2)	8(9)	11
Total	4	18	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	2	-1	1	.500
10	9	1	1	.111
3	2	1	1	.500
8	9	-1	1	.111
				$\chi^2 = 1.222$

TABLE XI

COUNSELED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--HOMEWORK

	poor	good	Total
November	8(8.5)	3(2.5)	11
May	9(8.5)	2(2.5)	11
Total	17	5	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
8	8.5	-.5	.25	.029
3	2.5	.5	.25	.100
9	8.5	.5	.25	.029
2	2.5	-.5	.25	.100
				$X^2 = .258$

TABLE XII

COUNSELED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--GRADE TO DATE

	poor	good	Total
November	11(11)	0(0)	11
May	11(11)	0(0)	11
Total	22	0	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
11	11	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
11	11	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
				$X^2 = 0$

TABLE XIII

INSTRUCTED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--ATTENDANCE

	poor	good	Total
November	1(2)	10(9)	11
May	3(2)	8(9)	11
Total	4	18	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	2	-1	1	.500
10	9	1	1	.111
3	2	1	1	.500
8	9	-1	1	.111
				$X^2 = 1.222$

TABLE XIV

INSTRUCTED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--CONDUCT IN CLASS

	poor	good	Total
November	3(4.5)	8(6.5)	11
May	6(4.5)	5(6.5)	11
Total	9	13	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
3	4.5	-1.5	2.25	.500
8	6.5	1.5	2.25	.346
6	4.5	1.5	2.25	.500
5	6.5	-1.5	2.25	.346
				$X^2 = 1.692$

TABLE XV

INSTRUCTED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

	poor	good	Total
November	7(6.5)	4(4.5)	11
May	6(6.5)	5(4.5)	11
Total	13	9	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
7	6.5	.5	.25	.038
4	4.5	-.5	.25	.056
6	6.5	-.5	.25	.038
5	4.5	-.5	.25	.056
				$X^2 = .188$

TABLE XVI

INSTRUCTED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--ATTITUDE TOWARD CLASSMATES

	poor	good	Total
November	3(2)	8(9)	11
May	1(2)	10(9)	11
Total	4	18	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
3	2	1	1	.500
8	9	-1	1	.111
1	2	-1	1	.500
10	9	1	1	.111
				$X^2 = 1.222$

TABLE XVII

INSTRUCTED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--HOMEWORK

	poor	good	Total
November	8(9)	3(2)	11
May	10(9)	1(2)	11
Total	18	4	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
8	9	-1	1	.111
3	2	1	1	.500
10	9	1	1	.111
1	2	-1	1	.500
				$\chi^2 = 1.222$

TABLE XVIII

INSTRUCTED EXPERIMENTAL GROUP--GRADE TO DATE

	poor	good	Total
November	11(10.5)	0(.5)	11
May	10(10.5)	1(.5)	11
Total	21	1	22

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
11	10.5	.5	.25	.024
0	.5	-.5	.25	.500
10	10.5	-.5	.25	.024
1	.5	.5	.25	.500
				$\chi^2 = 1.048$

TABLE XIX

GOOD RATINGS--ATTENDANCE

	November	May	Total
Control	17(17.1)	15(14.9)	32
Counseled	11(11.2)	10(9.8)	21
Instructed	10(9.6)	8(8.4)	18
Total	38	33	71

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
17	17.1	-.1	.01	.001
15	14.9	.1	.01	.001
11	11.2	-.2	.04	.003
10	9.8	.2	.04	.004
10	9.6	.4	.16	.017
8	8.4	-.4	.16	.019

$X^2 = .045$

TABLE XX

GOOD RATINGS--CONDUCT IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Control	13(14.5)	17(15.5)	30
Counseled	8(8.2)	9(8.8)	17
Instructed	8(6.3)	5(6.7)	13
Total	29	31	60

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
13	14.5	-1.5	2.25	.156
17	15.5	1.5	2.25	.145
8	8.2	- .2	.04	.005
9	8.8	.2	.04	.004
8	6.3	1.7	2.89	.459
5	6.7	-1.7	2.89	.432

$X^2 = 1.201$

TABLE XXI

GOOD RATINGS--PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Control	1(3.4)	8(5.6)	9
Counseled	4(2.2)	2(3.8)	6
Instructed	4(3.4)	5(5.6)	9
Total	9	15	24

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	3.4	-2.4	5.76	1.694
8	5.6	2.4	5.76	1.028
4	2.2	1.8	3.24	1.473
2	3.8	-1.8	3.24	.853
4	3.4	.6	.36	.106
5	5.6	- .6	.36	.064

$X^2 = 5.218$

TABLE XXII

GOOD RATINGS--ATTITUDE TOWARD CLASSMATES

	November	May	Total
Control	16(16)	16(16)	32
Counseled	10(9)	8(9)	18
Instructed	8(9)	10(9)	18
Total	34	34	68

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
16	16	0	0	0
16	16	0	0	0
10	9	1	1	.111
8	9	-1	1	.111
8	9	-1	1	.111
10	9	1	1	.111

$X^2 = .444$

TABLE XXIII

GOOD RATINGS--HOMEWORK

	November	May	Total
Control	7(7.2)	4(3.9)	11
Counseled	3(3.3)	2(1.8)	5
Instructed	3(2.6)	1(1.4)	4
Total	13	7	20

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
7	7.2	-.2	.04	.006
4	3.9	.1	.01	.002
3	3.3	-.3	.09	.027
2	1.8	.2	.04	.022
3	2.6	.4	.16	.062
1	1.4	-.4	.16	.114
				$X^2 = .233$

TABLE XXIV

GOOD RATINGS--GRADE TO DATE

	November	May	Total
Control	1(.7)	1(1.3)	2
Counseled	0(0)	0(0)	0
Instructed	0(.3)	1(.7)	1
Total	1	2	3

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	.7	.3	.09	.128
1	1.3	-.3	.09	.069
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	.3	-.3	.09	.300
1	.7	.3	.09	.128
				$X^2 = .625$

TABLE XXV

GOOD RATINGS--EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS--ATTENDANCE

	November	May	Total
Counseled	11(11.3)	10(9.7)	21
Instructed	10(9.7)	8(8.3)	18
Total	21	18	39

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
11	11.3	-.3	.09	.008
10	9.7	.3	.09	.009
10	9.7	.3	.09	.009
8	8.3	-.3	.09	.011
				$X^2 = .037$

TABLE XXVI

GOOD RATINGS--EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS--CONDUCT IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Counseled	8(9.1)	9(7.9)	17
Instructed	8(6.9)	5(6.1)	13
Total	16	14	30

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
8	9.1	-1.1	1.21	.133
9	7.9	1.1	1.21	.153
8	6.9	1.1	1.21	.175
5	6.1	-1.1	1.21	.198
				$X^2 = .659$

TABLE XXVII

GOOD RATINGS--EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS--PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Counseled	4(3.2)	2(2.8)	6
Instructed	4(4.8)	5(4.2)	9
Total	8	7	15

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
4	3.2	.8	.64	.200
2	2.8	-.8	.64	.228
4	4.8	-.8	.64	.133
5	4.2	.8	.64	.152
				$X^2 = .713$

TABLE XXVIII

GOOD RATINGS--EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS--ATTITUDE TOWARD CLASSMATES

	November	May	Total
Counseled	10(9)	8(9)	18
Instructed	8(9)	10(9)	18
Total	18	18	36

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
10	9	1	1	.111
8	9	-1	1	.111
8	9	-1	1	.111
10	9	1	1	.111
				$X^2 = .444$

TABLE XXIX

GOOD RATINGS--EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS--HOMEWORK

	November	May	Total
Counseled	3(3.3)	2(1.7)	5
Instructed	3(2.7)	1(1.3)	4
Total	6	3	9

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
3	3.3	-.3	.09	.027
2	1.7	.3	.09	.053
3	2.7	.3	.09	.033
1	1.3	-.3	.09	.069
				$X^2 = .182$

TABLE XXX

GOOD RATINGS--EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS--GRADE TO DATE

	November	May	Total
Counseled	0(0)	0(0)	0
Instructed	0(0)	1(1)	1
Total	0	1	1

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0
				$X^2 = \frac{0}{0}$

TABLE XXXI

GOOD RATINGS--INSTRUCTED GROUPS--ATTENDANCE

	November	May	Total
Control	17(17.3)	15(14.7)	32
Experimental	10(9.7)	8(8.3)	18
Total	27	23	50

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
17	17.3	-.3	.09	.005
15	14.7	.3	.09	.006
10	9.7	.3	.09	.009
8	8.3	-.3	.09	.011
				$X^2 = .031$

TABLE XXXII

GOOD RATINGS--INSTRUCTED GROUPS--CONDUCT IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Control	13(14.7)	17(15.3)	30
Experimental	8(6.3)	5(6.7)	13
Total	21	22	43

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
13	14.7	-1.7	2.89	.196
17	15.3	1.7	2.89	.189
8	6.3	1.7	2.89	.459
5	6.7	-1.7	2.89	.431
				$X^2 = 1.275$

TABLE XXXIII

GOOD RATINGS--INSTRUCTED GROUPS--PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Control	1(2.5)	8(6.5)	9
Experimental	4(2.5)	5(6.5)	9
Total	5	13	18

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	2.5	-1.5	2.25	.900
8	6.5	1.5	2.25	.346
4	2.5	1.5	2.25	.900
5	6.5	-1.5	2.25	.346
				$X^2 = 2.492$

TABLE XXXIV

GOOD RATINGS--INSTRUCTED GROUPS--ATTITUDE TOWARD CLASSMATES

	November	May	Total
Control	16(15.4)	16(16.6)	32
Experimental	8(8.6)	10(9.4)	18
Total	24	26	50

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
16	15.4	.6	.36	.023
16	16.6	-.6	.36	.022
8	8.6	-.6	.36	.042
10	9.4	.6	.36	.038
				$X^2 = .125$

TABLE XXXV

GOOD RATINGS--INSTRUCTED GROUP--HOMEWORK

	November	May	Total
Control	7(7.3)	4(3.7)	11
Experimental	3(2.7)	1(1.3)	4
Total	10	5	15

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
7	7.3	-.3	.09	.012
4	3.7	.3	.09	.024
3	2.7	.3	.09	.033
1	1.3	-.3	.09	.069
				$X^2 = .138$

TABLE XXXVI

GOOD RATINGS--INSTRUCTED GROUPS--GRADE TO DATE

	November	May	Total
Control	1(.7)	1(1.3)	2
Experimental	0(.3)	1(.7)	1
Total	1	2	3

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	.7	.3	.09	.128
1	1.3	-.3	.09	.069
0	.3	-.3	.09	.300
1	.7	.3	.09	.128
				$X^2 = .625$

TABLE XXXVII

GOOD RATINGS--CONTROL-COUNSELED--ATTENDANCE

	November	May	Total
Control	17(16.9)	15(15.1)	32
Counseled	11(11.1)	10(9.9)	21
Total	28	25	53

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
17	16.9	.1	.01	.001
15	15.1	-.1	.01	.001
11	11.1	-.1	.01	.001
10	9.9	.1	.01	.001
				$X^2 = .004$

TABLE XXXVIII

GOOD RATINGS--CONTROL-COUNSELED--CONDUCT IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Control	13(13.4)	17(16.6)	30
Counseled	8(7.6)	9(9.4)	17
Total	21	26	47

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
13	13.4	-.4	.16	.012
17	16.6	.4	.16	.010
8	7.6	.4	.16	.021
9	9.4	-.4	.16	.017
				$X^2 = .060$

TABLE XXXIX

GOOD RATINGS--CONTROL-COUNSELED--PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

	November	May	Total
Control	1(3)	8(6)	9
Counseled	4(2)	2(4)	6
Total	5	10	15

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	3	-2	4	1.333
8	6	2	4	.667
4	2	2	4	2.000
2	4	-2	4	1.000
				$X^2 = 5.000$

TABLE XL

GOOD RATINGS--CONTROL-COUNSELED--ATTITUDE TOWARD CLASSMATES

	November	May	Total
Control	16(16.6)	16(15.4)	32
Counseled	10(9.4)	8(8.6)	18
Total	26	24	50

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
16	16.6	-.6	.36	.022
16	15.4	.6	.36	.023
10	9.4	.6	.36	.038
8	8.6	-.6	.36	.042
				$X^2 = .125$

TABLE XLI

GOOD RATINGS--CONTROL-COUNSELED--HOMEWORK

	November	May	Total
Control	7(6.9)	4(4.1)	11
Counseled	3(3.1)	2(1.9)	5
Total	10	6	16

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
7	6.9	.1	.01	.001
4	4.1	-.1	.01	.002
3	3.1	-.1	.01	.003
2	1.9	.1	.01	.005
				$X^2 = .011$

TABLE XLII

GOOD RATINGS--CONTROL-COUNSELED--GRADE TO DATE

	November	May	Total
Control	1(1)	1(1)	2
Counseled	0(0)	0(0)	0
Total	1	1	2

O	E	O - E	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	1	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
				$X^2 = 0$

significant. The upper portion of the table shows that the control group received more good ratings in May than in November, while the counseled experimental group received fewer good ratings in May than in November.

The value of chi square in Table XXI is 5.218. Although this is not significant, it is of interest, since it is among the largest obtained in the experiment.

In none of the other tables is the value of chi square significant. In several of the tables the value of chi square is zero. A zero value of chi square is caused when the observed frequency and expected frequency are equal in all categories.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS ACCORDING TO RATED CATEGORIES

For the following discussion the tables are broken down according to the performance or attributes on which the students were rated. It has already been shown that the majority of the tables show no significant differences. There are, however, some interesting facts set forth in the tables.

Attendance. (Tables I, VII, XIII, XIX, XXV, XXXI, and XXXVII) More good ratings were given in attendance than any other one category on which students were rated. There were consistently fewer good ratings on attendance in May than in November. Neither of these two facts is surprising.

It has been previously stated that the students in the control and experimental groups were mostly problem students. For the most part the "problems" were in citizenship and academic performance--not in attendance. A discussion of the dropouts in the groups will follow, however, it should be stated at this point that there were dropouts. The ratings of the dropouts were not included in the statistical treatment due to the fact that ratings could not be made on them in May at the end of the experiment. If these ten dropouts had remained, the attendance ratings for

for the entire group would have undoubtedly been lower, since one of the symptoms of a prospective dropout is erratic attendance.

The second fact stated is even more obvious. It is well known that attendance tends to be lower in the spring than in the fall for students who are not attaining a high degree of success in school. The writer has verified this statement by checking the attendance record of his poorer students for the past three years.

Conduct in class. Tables II, VIII, XIV, XX, XXVI, XXXII, and XXXVIII) In comparing the tables on conduct in class there are two observations which should be made. First, there were more good ratings than poor, which would seemingly indicate that conduct, discipline, and orderliness in the classroom were not the prime difficulty of these problem pupils.

The second observation is more subtle and concerns the aggregate good ratings. In Table XX it is noted that the control group and counseled experimental group both had more good ratings in May than in November, a larger plurality going to the control group than to the counseled group. On the other hand the instructed experimental group received fewer good ratings in May than in November. There are obviously reasons for this, though the reasons themselves may not be so obvious.

Statistically there are no significant differences in any of the tables concerned with conduct in class. Empirically there are differences. The control group remained with the same four or five teachers throughout the year in regular classes. It is readily understandable that students would become more acquiescent in complying with the rules of order and discipline of teachers as the year progresses. Why, then, did the instructed experimental group move in the opposite direction and the counseled experimental group not improve as much as did the control group?

There is the possibility that in the small class of only five or six students once a week, where misconduct on the part of individual students could more easily go unnoticed or without reprimand if it were noticed, that these students were unwittingly led into a laxity in conduct in the classroom. A somewhat similar situation would be that of the counseled experimental group, the only difference being that they were not instructed and therefore not in class in the technical sense. This would lead to their lesser improvement in class conduct than that shown by the control group. The fact that the instructed experimental group was in a classroom situation, even when in the small group, while the counseled experimental group was in a counseling situation could explain the difference between

these two groups in good ratings on conduct in class.

Participation in class. (Tables III, IX, XV, XXI, XXVII, XXXIII, and XXXIX) Interesting to note is the fact that the only two computations of chi square which showed significant differences were concerned with participation in class. There was only one other chi square which even approached significance, and it was also in participation in class.

In class participation, unlike conduct in class and attitude toward classmates, the good ratings are outnumbered by the poor. As far as classroom participation is concerned the students in this experiment would naturally tend to be more reserved than their more academically inclined peers. These students in the experiment are not necessarily scheduled in basal classes every period. Most have one or two regular classes each day in which they compete with "regular" students.

Participation in class by the control group, Table III, is statistically significant according to chi square. This is empirically obvious from the ratings in the upper portion of the table.

Table XXXIX, in which chi square indicates significant difference, supports the observation which can be made in Table XXI. While the good ratings for the control group increase from November to May, the good ratings for the

counseled experimental group actually decrease. The fact that Table XXXIX shows a significant value of chi square affirms that students who are not counseled receive better ratings on participation in class than do students who are counseled. Since students who participate to a greater extent in class receive better ratings on class participation, it logically follows that students who are not counseled participate in class to a greater extent than those who are counseled.

This phenomenon, on the surface, could be most disconcerting to the counselor, guidance worker, or guidance administrator. There are, however, deeper implications than merely an outcome diametrically opposed to that which one might expect or for which one might hope. Two questions are raised: Is it the purpose of counseling to raise the level of class participation? Why does counseling apparently lower the level of class participation?

The first question will be discussed in the section on student evaluation, when some of the objectives of counseling will be brought out. The second question leaves an opening for further research, but it is discussed here.

The findings of Table XXXIX have positive aspects. In the counseling sessions the students participated actively. There is the likelihood that upon entering the classroom

they were content to remain more or less passive, allowing others to participate to a greater extent. The counseled students were a part of one of the two counseled groups, one containing five students and the other six. The students were accustomed to express themselves in small groups and could certainly show some reticence in the larger classroom group. There is also the possibility that the good which these students derived from counseling, which fact will be discussed later, in the form of a better self understanding caused these students to feel they could gain more by a passive participation.

Attitude toward classmates (Tables IV, X, XVI, XXII, XXVIII, XXXIV, and XL) The outcome of attitude toward classmates is quite similar to that of conduct in class. There is a preponderance of good ratings. Table XXII shows that exactly the same number of students in the control group received good ratings in November and May. This apparent consistency is in frequency only. According to the original tally sheet four students went from poor to good between November and May while four went from good to poor.

The number of good ratings for the counseled experimental group decreased slightly during the interval, and the number of good ratings for the instructed experimental group increased coincidentally by the same amount. Certainly a plausable explanation of this is that the counseled group

in their counseling sessions were able to develop a rapport with one another which could not be developed in an ordinary classroom situation. In the regular classroom surroundings, on which the students were rated by their teachers, overt manifestations of positive feelings for their peers would not be as noticeable.

The instructed experiemntal group, on the other hand, attend small and informal, though structured, classes in history. In such a situation attitudes developed in the small group would carry over into other classes, size being the only difference in the two situations.

Homework. (Tables V, XI, XVII, XXIII, XXIX, XXXV, and XLI) The figures in the tables show that homework is a difficulty of these problem students. There were more poor ratings than good. The number of good ratings decreased from November to May throughout the tables. Of the forty-six students in the control and experimental groups only one moved from poor to good between November and May. Students with poor ratings remained poor, with the one exception mentioned, and students with good ratings became poor. Even with regular--as opposed to basal--students this would come as no surprise to many teachers, since most teachers would agree that the diligence with which students set themselves to the task of preparing their homework is considerably less in May of the school

year than in November. It would seem that this would be more evident among students who are in academic difficulty and do not feel the real challenge of school.

Grade to date. (Tables VI, XII, XVIII, XXIV, XXX, XXXVI, and XLII) The only category of the six on which students were rated in which the number zero occurs as a frequency of good ratings is grade to date. A glance at the number of poor ratings on Table VI, Table XII, and Table XVIII readily indicates to the reader a major problem of these students. Only three good ratings were given, one in November and two in May. Each of these three students received a poor rating on grade to date in the month other than that in which he received the good rating.

Analysis summary. These findings seem to be borne out by the literature. Reporting on a study at Iowa by Goodstein and Crites, Tyler says:

> A much more recent study at Iowa (Goodstein and Crites, In press) produced even more negative results. The subjects...were in the lower half of their respective high school classes and had scored in the bottom 30 per cent on placement tests. Some of them were invited to make use of the counseling service and others used as a control group. Although the N's are small, the differences are clear-cut and significantly in favor of the group not offered counseling. This was true for both summer and fall termsgrades and even when the effects of differences in academic ability were removed by covariance

procedures.[12]

The present experiment indicates no significance. However agreement is certainly held with Tyler's contention that there are no established conclusions except that more research is needed in the field.[13] In another similar experiment, in which the effect of counseling on academic performance was tested, the achievement scores did not show clear-cut superiority for the counseled group.[14] Broedel, Ohlsen, Proff, and Southard found that an experimental group improved more in acceptance of self and others than the control group, but that there was no improvement in academic achievement.[15]

---

[12]Leona E. Tyler, The Work of the Counselor, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961, pp 272-273.

[13]Tyler, op. cit.

[14]S. Reed Calhoun, "The Effect of Counseling on a Group of Under-Achievers," Guidance Readings for Counselors, edited by Gail F. Farwell and Herman J. Peters, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1960, chapter 10, section 75.

[15]Broedel, Ohlsen, Proff, and Southard, "The Effects of Group Counseling on Gifted Adolescent Underachievers," Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol 7, pp 163-170, 1960.

CHAPTER VI

STUDENT AND COUNSELOR EVALUATION OF THE EXPERIMENT

Student evaluation. In this section the answers to the twelve questions asked of the students in the counseled experimental group will be reported seriatim. The counseled experimental group consisted of eleven students, all of whom filled in the evaluation sheet. Due to the nature of this particular questionnaire and the various types of questions a statistical treatment will not be made.

1. Have you benefited from our meetings together? How? Ten students answered "yes" and one "no" to the first part of this question. To the second part seven gave positive responses, one negative response, and three no response.

2. Do you feel that you would have benefited more from individual counseling, a group of 3, a group of 6, a group of 8, or a group of 12? Six students marked "a group of 8;" three students marked "a group of 3;" and two students marked "a group of 6." No students marked "individual counseling" or "a group of 12."

3. Would you have preferred that our meetings be more often, less often, or once a week, as we did? Four students marked "more often" and seven students marked "once a week, as we did." No students marked "less often."

4. Has your school work improved since these meetings were started? Six students answered "no" and five students answered "yes."

5. Have your relationships improved any since these meetings started with all of your teachers? with any of your teachers? To the first part of the question, "all of your teachers," seven students answered "no" and four students answered "yes." To the second part, "any of your teachers," ten students answered "yes" and one "no."

6. Do you feel that these meetings have helped you improve your relationship with parents? seven "yes" and four "no." ...with brothers and sisters? six "yes" and five "no." ...with friends? ten "yes" and one "no."

7. Do you understand yourself any better as a result of these meetings? All eleven students answered in the affirmative.

8. Are you more familiar with the guidance services of the school as a result of these meetings? Eleven answered "yes" and none answered "no."

9. Has being out of class one day a week been a disadvantage as far as your work in history is concerned? Nine students answered "no" and two students answered "yes."

10. If you had it to do over again, would you voluntarily choose to participate in these meetings? Ten students answered "yes" and one student answered "no."

11. What do you think was the purpose of dividing your class into these groups for Friday meetings? There were nine responses indicating an understanding of the purpose and two responses indicating a lack of understanding.

12. State briefly and frankly your opinion of our work together. There were eleven favorable responses and no unfavorable responses.

Analysis of student evaluation. 1. The student who responded in the negative answered the question "how?" with the statement, "haven't learned more than I knew about life because I have already talked with my clergyman about all these different things."

Some the positive responses are quoted: "It has helped me to realize that what I might have thought were my own problems were in fact the problems of most of the boys I knew. It enabled me to speak more freely if I wanted to talk over these problems."

"I got a better understanding about the subjects I plan to take in the future."

"I have learned to get along and understand others lots better."

"When I am in classes I am more attentive. Also, my home life is getting to be better." The results are similar to those in an experiment among seventh grade boys, which concluded:

1. Some members of the group arrived at a more realistic picture of themselves.

2. As far as relationships with their peers were concerned, these boys seemed to become more sensitive to the feelings of others. As counseling progressed the members took on more responsibility for disciplining their own group.

3. Their attitude toward school also changed. It was much less critical and seemed to reflect a more positive acceptance of authority.[16]

The students certainly felt that they benefitted from the experiment in group counseling. Does one, if he feels that he has been helped by counseling, actually derive benefits though objective data to substantiate this is lacking?

2. It is surprising to note that no student said that he felt that he would have benefited more from individual counseling. Wright says:

> In recent years, the concept that counseling must be a one-to-one relationship has been challenged. One who has led in this respect is Froehlich (Froehlich, Clifford P., "Multiple Counseling: A Research Proposal." Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley) who asserts that as long as the process has the same objectives of individual counseling and attempts to achieve these objectives it can be called counseling.[17]

---

[16] Benjamin Cohn and A. Mead Sniffen, "A School Report on Group Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol 41, no 2, October 1962.

[17] E. Wayne Wright, "Multiple Counseling: Why? When? How?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol 37, no 2, pp 551-557, April 1959.

The students in the experimental counseled group evidently felt that they respond better to the same counseling in a small group than in an individual relationship. The majority of the students felt that eight would be the optimum size, indicating a group of twelve to be too large.

3. Concerning the frequency of the counseling sessions the majority felt that once a week is best. No students felt that group counseling should be less often than once a week. Only one student made a comment on the third question. This student checked "more often," then gave the reason, "because evidently you would learn something you didn't know." It is of interest to note that this student is the same student who responded negatively to the first question.

4. In the light of the factual evidence that none of the students actually improved academically, which is shown in the tables concerned with grade to date, the answer to the fourth question on the student evaluation raised the same question which was raised in the analysis of the first question. Five students felt that their school work improved between November and May, while six did not. Why would a student feel that his academic achievement has improved when he is making the same grade in May that he made in November? There is the possibility that the students were attempting to answer this question in the way in which they

thought the questioner might like to have it answered. There is also the possibility that the enhancement of the self concept of the students caused them to feel honestly that their work had improved.

5. Four of the eleven students felt that their relationships with all of their teachers improved as a result of counseling; ten of the eleven felt that the relationship with one or more teachers was improved. There is no evidence in the experiment which indicates that the relationships with teachers did not improve.

6. Seven students felt that there was improvement in their relationship with parents; six felt that there was an improvement in their relationship with siblings; and ten felt that there was an improvement in their relationships with friends. Their friends were a part of the experiment and were there with them in the counseling situation, while parents and siblings were not. Any differences in understanding were discussed across the table with friends. Their families were not present. Discussion in a counseling relationship was not possible with families. The fact that the majority felt that relationships with parents and with brothers and sisters were improved indicates that the students felt some improvement as a result of their having brought to the forefront any hostilities and seen similar feelings in their peers. The fact that the majority

of felt improvements in relationships with friends was overwhelming concerning peer relationships is indicative of a felt improvement in relationships with those with whom the students were counseled.

7. All eleven students felt that they understood themselves better as a result of counseling. Self concept has been improved. Caplan tested multiple counseling in terms of its effectiveness in changing self concepts of a group of junior high school "problem" boys.[18] Significant differences between the groups favored the counseled students.

8. All eleven students answered in the affirmative the question having to do with more familiarity with the guidance services of the school as a result of the counseling group meetings. It would be hoped that as a result of this increased familiarity the students would avail themselves of the opportunity to utilize the guidance services. The counselors' report, which follows, indicates that this did not occur.

9. The answers given by the students to this question seemingly indicated that as far as the students were

---

[18]Stanley William Caplan, "The Effect of Group Counseling on Junior High School Boys' Concepts of Themselves in School," Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol 4, pp 124-128, 1957.

concerned group counseling could be done during a class period. No attempt has been made to evaluate teacher opinion, though it is unlikely that the teachers would so readily endorse this practice as did the students. In this experiment the express permission of the teacher was obtained. The teacher was most enthusiastic about the experiment and helped in its implementation.

10. Ten students stated that they would voluntarily choose to participate in the experiment if they had it to do over. The one student who answered the question negatively is the same one who answered the first question in the negative. Once again a generally positive feeling toward counseling has been expressed by the majority of the students.

11. Following are some of the purposes given by the students: "We had some rough people in our class and couldn't get much work done."

"To help us to better understand ourselves and our problems."

"To get better relationship between friends."

"To help us to understand oursâlves and others better."

"To understand the problems of other students."

"To understand group counseling."

One student drove the point home to its fullest on

two counts. The purpose given was "to see if group consoling can help you." That which the student intended to say is the precise answer to the question. The reason that the student actually gave has many implied ramifications in defining counseling. Some counseling is undoubtedly "consoling," which is as it should be. The unwitting wisdom of the student's reply must be acknowledged.

Most of the other purposes given by the students show a good sense of comprehension of counseling and its purpose. The first student quoted showed keen perception in giving a reason rather than a purpose.

12. There were eleven favorable responses to the final question, which asked for a brief and frank opinion of the work of the group together. Some of the statements were: "I think that the work that we have done together has helped me to understand my difficulties and enabled me to help myself."

"I feel that we can see what we want to do about the teachers within reason. Talk about our plans for the following years to come."

"My opinion of the work we've done is good. I think I have benefited and so have the others in the group. I think we all learned something, if it was nothing other than to get along with and know each other better."

"I found working together very beneficial."

"I got to know myself better and to get along with people. I learned more about counselors."

"I thought it was not a waste of time."

"I think the reason why they had these groups was to have us to realize our problems and try to better them."

The student evaluations, taken as a whole, are quite favorable. It is difficult to say whether or not some of this is "halo" effect. Grigg and Goodstein state:

> Clients who report favorable attitudes toward counseling outcome also report favorably on feelings while undergoing counseling. This finding may be contaminated by client's "halo" of the counseling experience as totally good if they feel happy about the outcome.[19]

The counseled students had a good feeling about counseling. They expressed a willingness to come back for more. This point is brought out very effectively by an approach from the opposite side by Goodstein and Grigg, who say, "Clients who are dissatisfied with their counseling experience will not, in all probability, regard counseling as a useful procedure regardless of whether or not they have actually been helped by the process."[20] Goodstein and

---

[19] Austin E. Grigg and Leonard D. Goodstein, "The Use of Clients as Judges of the Counselor's Performance," Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol 4, no 1, pp 31-36, 1957.

[20] Leonard D. Goodstein and Austin E. Grigg, "Client Satisfaction, Counselors, and the Counseling Process," Personnel and Guidance Journal, pp 19-24, September 1959.

Grigg further point out that it is clearly desirable that clients should be satisfied with counseling.[21] In an experiment where individual counseling was used to complement group counseling, Driver concluded that the persons in the groups felt that multiple counseling was enjoyable and that the group counseling facilitated rapport and made the individual counseling more efficient.[22]

Counselor evaluation. The counselors who participated in the experiment submitted a report. In addition to this report the counselors were requested to give a subjective and personal appraisal of the experiemnt.

The report indicated that the counselors expected an improvement in grades which was not shown.[23] None of the counselees sought individual counseling as a result of the group experience.[24] The report goes on to say:

> Examination of the student evaluation questionnaires completed by the students at the end of the experiment indicates improvement in attitudes and adjustment. It appears from our work with these groups that one of the

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Helen I. Driver, "Small-Group Discussion as an Aid to Counseling," School Review, vol 59, pp 525-530, December 1951.

[23] Robert V. Turner and Ellen H. Chewning, "Counselors' Report on Multiple Counseling Experiment at John Marshall High School," mimeographed, June 1964.

[24] Ibid.

chief benefits is enhancement of self concept. This was confirmed by Dr. Benjamin Cohn in his address in April 1964, as one of the major objectives of group counseling. Specifically noted was the improvement in the ability of some of the more withdrawn students to participate actively and express themselves orally.[25]

A counselor appraisal in the form of a personal letter portrays clearly her view of the experiment.

(This is completely subjective. I have no objective data to substantiate any of the following remarks.)

The members of the group appeared to grow in self-understanding. Their vocational goals became somewhat better defined and more realistic as they discussed aptitudes and personal characteristics necessary for success in particular fields of work. For example, the girl whose stated ambition was to become a doctor recognized that this goal was inconsistent with her low achievement in school, her dislike of science, and her failure to spend adequate time on lesson preparations.

The group was most cohesive during sessions when they were discussing school problems such as grades, behavior in the classroom, teachers, and subjects which they liked or disliked. With the exception of one isolate in the group they verbalized quite freely about these topics and seemed to gain insight into the cause of some of their difficulties in the classroom.

Members of the group seemed glad to have an opportunity to talk together with a counselor about social problems which affected their friends. When family relationships were discussed the group demonstrated less cohesiveness. This may have been due to the great dissimilarity in home backgrounds or to reluctance of students to express feelings about their home and family to peers.

For the most part the sessions were not structured, and members talked about anything which was on their

---

[25] Ibid.

minds. Sometimes the conversations were very superficial, and the counselor felt that the sessions were non-productive.[26]

Analysis of counselor evaluation. The counselors had a generally good feeling toward the experiment. Both agreed that group counseling has a definite place, and both have expressed a willingness and desire to participate in similar experiments for further exploration in group counseling.

---

[26]Ellen H. Chewning, a personal letter to the writer, June 1965.

CHAPTER VII

AN OBSERVATION AND SUMMARY

An observation. In the course of the experiment there was an occurence which was empirical and which cannot be treated statistically. However this was quite interesting and perhaps is germane to the experiemnt.

In the statistical report there were twenty-two students in the experimental groups and twenty-four in the control group. There were dropouts not included in the statistical report which were omitted because the final questionnaire could not be filled in concerning them in May. Originally there were twenty-five in the experimental group, three having dropped out of school prior to the completion of the experiment. Eight of the original control group of thirty-two dropped out of school, leaving the twenty-four on which the questionnaires were tabulated.

Twenty-five per cent of the original control group dropped out of school, while only twelve per cent of the original experimental group dropped out. Did the counseling and small group instruction play any part in causing some students to remain in school who otherwise might have dropped out? A study was not made concerning the reasons for the drop outs from these groups. It would be an excellent topic for subsequent research.

Summary. The students in the counseled experimental group developed a better self concept. They felt that they were better able to relate to home, school, and peers. They felt that they better understood their own problems and those of others in the group.

As rated by their teachers, the students in the counseled experimental group participated less in the classroom. This lesser participation was believed to be due to a satistion in the counseling group of their desire for constructive and active group participation.

The experiment in group counseling at John Marshall High School was conducted to see if group counseling would improve academic achievement and citizenship. Statistical treatment of the data failed to reveal any improvement due to group counseling.

The types of changes which were reported by the students who participated in group counseling were not readily discernible to their teachers. The outcome of counseling, like counseling itself, is of a personal and private nature.

Further research and study are certainly needed to determine the effectiveness of group counseling. Though it is very difficult to measure the results of counseling objectively, more research and study may lead to more effective measures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Tyler, Leona E. The Work of the Counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Warters, Jane. Group Guidance. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

Articles and reports

Boy, Angelo V., Iseksen, Henry L., and Pine, Gerald J., "Multiple Counseling: A Catalyst for Individual Counseling," The School Counselor, Vol. XI, No. 1, October 1963.

Broedel, John, Ohlsen, Merle, Proff, Fred, and Southard, Charles, "The Effects of Group Counseling on Gifted Adolescent Underachievers," Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. VII, 1960.

Calhoun, S. Reed, "The Effect of Counseling on a Group of Under-Achievers," Guidance Readings for Counselors. Edited by Farwell, Gail F. and Peters, Herman J. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960.

Caplan, Stanley William, "The Effect of Group Counseling on Junior High School Boys' Concepts of Themselves in School," Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. IV, 1957.

Cohn, Benjamin, Combs, Charles F., Gibian, Edward J., and Sniffen, A. Mead, "Group Counseling: An Orientation," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XLII, No. 4, December 1963.

Cohn, Benjamin and Sniffen, A. Mead, "A School Report on Group Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XLI, No. 2, October 1962.

Combs, Charles F., Cohn, Benjamin, Gibian, Edward J., and Sniffen, A. Mead, "Group Counseling: Applying the Technique," The School Counselor, Vol. XI, No. 1, October 1963.

Driver, Helen I., "Small-Group Discussion as an Aid to Counseling," School Review, Vol. LIX, December 1951.

Gewrys, John Jr. and Brown, O. Bruce, "Group Counseling: More than a Catalyst," The School Counselor, Vol. XII, No. 4, May 1965.

Goodstein, Leonard D. and Grigg, Austin E., "Client Satisfaction, Counselors, and the Counseling Process," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XXXVII, September 1959.

Grigg, Austin E. and Goodstein, Leonard D., "The Use of Clients as Judges of the Counselor's Performance," Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. IV, No. 1, 1957.

Turner, Robert V., and Chewning, Ellen H., "Counselors' Report on Multiple Counseling Experiment at John Marshall High School," mimeograph, June 1964.

Wright, E. Wayne, "Multiple Counseling: Why? When? How?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2, April 1959.

APPENDIX

JOHN MARSHALL HIGH SCHOOL
Richmond, Virginia

To:

From:

Date:

Please return this memorandum to me as soon as possible after completing the items listed below.

Student _____

Grade and Section _____ Homeroom _____

Number 1 would indicate poor, or the lowest, and number 7 would indicate excellent, or the highest. Please circle the number which you feel would best describe the student in each of the six categories listed..

Attendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conduct in Class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Participation in Class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Attitude toward Classmates	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Homework	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Grade to Date	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Additional Comments:

Teacher _____

Date _____

1. Have you benefited from our meetings together? yes__no__
   How?

2. Do you feel that you would have benefited more from
   a. Individual counseling?
   b. A group of 3?
   c. A group of 6?
   d. A group of 8?
   e. A group of 12?

3. Would you have preferred that our meetings be
   a. More often?
   b. Less often?
   c. Once a week, as we did?

4. Has your school work improved since these meetings started?

5. Have your relationships with your teachers improved any since these meetings were started?
   a. With all of your teachers? yes__no__
   b. With any of your teachers? yes__no__

6. Do you feel that these meetings have helped you improve your relationship with others?
   a. With parents? yes__no__
   b. With brothers and sisters? yes__no__
   c. With friends? yes__no__

7. Do you understand yourself any better as a result of these meetings? yes__no__

8. Are you more familiar with the Guidance Services of the school as a result of these meetings? yes__no__

9. Has being out of class one day a week been a disadvantage as far as your work in History is concerned? yes__no__

10. If you had it to do over again, would you voluntarily choose to participate in these meetings? yes__no__

11. What do you think was the purpose of dividing your class into these groups for Friday meetings?

12. State briefly and frankly your opinion of our work together.

VITA

Daniel S. Marshall was born March 31, 1926, the son of Adelaide Moseley Marshall and Hunter Marshall. He is a graduate of Central High School in Charlotte. He attended Davidson College one year and graduated from the University of North Carolina, receiving the degree, Bachelor of Science in Commerce, on June 6, 1949. He married Joan Cansler, of Charlotte, on September 16, 1950; they have five children.

From 1949 to 1952 Daniel S. Marshall was employed in Charlotte by the United States District Director of Internal Revenue as a Deputy Collector. From 1952 to 1954 he was an employee of Wachovia Bank and Trust Company, Charlotte, serving as Head Teller. From 1954 to 1961 he was Treasurer and Business Manager of the Presbyterian School of Christian Education, Richmond, Virginia. The first semester of the 1961-1962 school year he was engaged in full time study at the University of Richmond and taught mathematics during the second semester in the Hanover County, Virginia, Public Schools. Since September 1962 he has been a counselor and mathematics teacher in John Marshall High School, Richmond, Virginia.

Daniel S. Marshall is a member of Kappa Delta Pi, an Honor Society in Education, and Phi Mu Alpha, an honorary music fraternity. He is a member of the National Education

Association, the Virginia Education Association, and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. From 1957 to 1961 he was an active member of the Kiwanis Club of Richmond. He is a Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church. At John Marshall High School he is the sponsor of the Hi-Y and faculty representative to the Parent-Teacher Association.