

The Effects of Developmental Guidance Activities  
" on the Promotion of Psychological Growth  
of Fourth and Fifth Grade Students

by

Betsy Lou Gentry  
T

Approved by

J. Edward Harrell  
Chairman, Thesis Committee

Harvey Padgett  
Member, Thesis Committee

George R. Wesley  
Member, Thesis Committee

Fred T. Badden  
Chairman, Department of Counselor  
Education and Research

Richard H. Rupp  
Dean of the Graduate School

The Effects of Developmental Guidance Activities  
on the Promotion of Psychological Growth  
of Fourth and Fifth Grade Students

A Thesis

Presented to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School  
Appalachian State University

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Ed.S.  
Degree

by

Betsy Lou Gentry

July 20, 1978



### Thesis Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of developmental guidance activities upon the promotion of psychological growth of fourth and fifth grade students.

The subjects were experimental groups of 27 fourth grade students and 27 fifth grade students and control groups of 25 fourth grade students and 30 fifth grade students. The experimental groups were exposed to 16 weeks of developmental guidance activities.

The Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test were administered as pre- and posttests. Test scores were analyzed through use of multivariate analysis of variance. When the interaction effect was significant the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance was used for comparison. Results indicated that the use of developmental guidance activities promoted psychological growth in some students. Experimental groups students showed greater progress in understanding proper behavior and perception of self as a good student; fourth grade experimental group students made most positive behavioral changes as measured by the perceptions of their peers; fifth grade experimental group students made less progress than fifth grade control group students in behavioral changes as measured by the perception of their peers; and fourth grade (control and experimental) students made greater gain in perception of self as an accepted member of the group.

## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	1
Statement of Problem	4
Significance of Study	4
Hypotheses	5
Major Null Hypothesis	5
Null Subhypotheses	5
Definitions	6
Developmental Guidance	6
Psychological Growth	6
Assumptions and Limitations of the Study	7
Assumptions of Study	7
Limitations of Study	8
2. Review of Related Literature	9
Rationale	9
Experimental Studies	16
Summary	22
3. Design of the Study	25
Subjects of the Study	25
Procedures	25
Instruments	29
Friendship Rating Scale	30
Primary Self-Concept Inventory	31
Snoopy Behavior Test	34

Chapter	Page
Statistical Procedure	35
Summary	36
4. Analysis of Data	37
Analysis of Variables	39
Null Subhypothesis 1	39
Null Subhypothesis 2	54
Null Subhypothesis 3	58
Correlation of Instruments	63
Null Subhypothesis 4	63
Null Subhypothesis 5	66
Null Subhypothesis 6	66
Summary	67
5. Summary, Conclusions, and Implications of Study	73
Summary	73
Conclusions	74
Implications of Study	76
Appendix	
A. Primary Self-Concept Inventory	78
Item Description Chart	78
Scoring Chart	79
B. Developmental Guidance Activities	80
References	82

# List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Subjects by Group or Grade	26
2. Adjusted Means for the Friendship Rating Scale for Subjects by Level, Treatment, and Interaction Effect	40
3. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Greets Others Score of the Friendship Rating Scale	41
4. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Honesty and Cheerfulness Score of the Friendship Rating Scale	42
5. Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions for the Friend- ship Rating Scale, Honesty and Cheerfulness Score	43
6. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Keeps Secrets Score of the Friendship Rating Scale	45
7. Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions for the Friend- ship Rating Scale, Keeps Secrets Score	46
8. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Best Friend Score of the Friendship Rating Scale	47
9. Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions for the Friend- ship Rating Scale, Best Friend Score	48

Table	Page
10. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Class President Score of the Friendship Rating Scale	50
11. Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions for the Friendship Rating Scale, Class President Score	51
12. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale	52
13. Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions for the Friendship Rating Scale, Total Friendship Score	53
14. Adjusted Means for the Primary Self-Concept Inventory for Subjects by Level, Treatment, and Interaction Effect	55
15. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Personal-Self Domain Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory	56
16. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory	57
17. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Social-Self Domain Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory	59
18. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Intellectual-Self Domain Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory	60
19. Adjusted Means for the Snoopy Behavior Test for Subjects by Level, Treatment, and Interaction Effect	61



Table	Page
20. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test	62
21. Correlation Matrix for Total Scores of the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test	64
22. Correlation Matrix for Total Scores of the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test	65

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

Guidance specialists have been in the public school systems since the 1930's (Myrick and Moni, 1976). In Rutherford County, North Carolina, counselors have been in the elementary schools since 1974. Yet the cartoon situation below actually took place in one of the Rutherford County schools in 1978. It seems quite obvious that the role of the elementary school counselor has not been clearly defined.



"Well, if our school does have a counselor, they haven't let me play with it yet!"

Defining the role of the elementary school counselor is not an easy task. This lack of clarification is true partially because people are familiar with the present role of the secondary school counselor, and this role is not appropriate for personnel dealing with young children. To add to the confusion, the whole area of school guidance is changing.

North Carolina is seeking to respond to this problem by developing a "master plan" for guidance. At the May, 1978 meeting of the State Board of Education, the Division of Pupil Personnel Services presented a resolution to develop a Master Plan for

Guidance for the State of North Carolina, an unpublished copy of which follows:<sup>1</sup>

WHEREAS, these legislative efforts are highly consistent with the North Carolina State Board's mission to reduce the incidence of basic-skill deficiency, school alienation, and premature school leaving; and

WHEREAS, such programs and services which prevent as well as correct this potential loss of human talent will necessarily require the unique skills representative of the professional counselor,

BE IT RESOLVED, that a State Plan for Guidance and Counseling be prepared by a committee appointed by the State Superintendent of Schools, upon the recommendations of the Division of Pupil Personnel Services and the Division of Vocational Education; that such a committee be constituted by race, sex, and educational levels; that such a committee be adjudged competent to articulate the professional function of the counselor at all educational levels K-12; and that the product of the committee's efforts be central to, and compatible with, similar efforts and plans addressed by this State Department.

Consistent with the above resolution, the Master Plan will be based on the following assumptions:

1. Programs will be student centered.
2. All students will be beneficiaries of the program.
3. Programs will be developmental rather than problem oriented.
4. Counselors will be accountable for the outcomes of the program.
5. Programs will be articulated throughout the student's enrollment (K-12).

---

<sup>1</sup>Was given to researcher by her superior at a county-wide meeting of school counselors - June 7, 1978.



This research project was developed to test one plan that proposed to meet all five assumptions listed above. In order to meet the needs of all students, elementary counselors must move from behind the office door and into the classroom with a planned, developmental guidance program centered around the needs of each particular age group. Only through systematic evaluation can counselors measure the effectiveness of their programs.

Herein lies one of the greatest weaknesses in describing elementary counseling to others. Elementary counselors must be able to show what has been accomplished.

But why move into the classroom? Because that is where the children and teachers are. Through interaction with their peers, children learn more effectively the lessons of living cooperatively together.

Lamb (1974) described the role of the elementary school counselor this way: "Consistent with the philosophy of education, elementary school counseling concerns itself with the child in the developmental process of maximizing his potential. Living and functioning effectively depends on the interaction of an individual's self-concept and the complexity of influences and experiences which he accumulates. The elementary counselor works within the educational framework and the child's total environment to enable the child to find his identity and to learn to make choices and decisions which lead to effective functioning as a worthwhile

being. Elementary school developmental guidance and counseling is concerned with each child's perception of the present and how they relate to the present and future; therefore, the counselor has direct contact with all children at all levels in the elementary school" (p. 219).

As children are greatly pressured by their peers, it is assumed by this researcher that the most effective "direct contact" would be contact involving the student and his/her peers. The classroom situation lends itself quite well to investigating this direct contact and, thereby, allowing the students to discover that they are not alone. Such investigations are the major goal of developmental guidance which this project attempted to measure.

#### Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of developmental guidance activities upon the promotion of psychological growth in two fourth grade and two fifth grade classrooms at Dunbar School, Forest City/Rutherford County, North Carolina.

#### Significance of Study

Counseling and Guidance is often an improperly defined and, therefore, a misunderstood profession within the school system in that counselors often practice skills without defining their goals or attempting to measure their effectiveness. Therefore, when an administration asks for proof of accountability, counselors have little or nothing to establish proof. This study was designed to

provide guidelines for an important area of elementary guidance, developmental guidance in the classroom, and to suggest a degree of effectiveness of this type program.

### Hypotheses

To deal with this subject the hypotheses were stated in the null form:

#### Major Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the psychological growth of fourth and fifth grade students who are exposed to developmental guidance activities and a control group who are not exposed to developmental guidance activities as measured by the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test.

#### Null Subhypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in psychological growth of developmental guidance students and control students (fourth and fifth grades) as measured by the Friendship Rating Scale.
2. There is no significant difference in psychological growth of developmental guidance students and control students (fourth and fifth grades) as measured by the Primary Self-Concept Inventory.
3. There is no significant difference in psychological growth of developmental guidance students and control students (fourth and fifth grades) as measured by the Snoopy Behavior Test.

4. There is no significant relationship between the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale and the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory.

5. There is no significant relationship between the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale and the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test.

6. There is no significant relationship between the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory and the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test.

#### Definitions

For the purpose of this study the following two terms were defined:

##### Developmental Guidance

Developmental guidance referred to a guidance program geared toward prevention rather than remediation or treatment. Other terms sometimes used to mean developmental guidance were "psychological education," "personal education," "confluent education," or "affective guidance."

##### Psychological Growth

Psychological growth was seen as the developmental process wherein a person moved toward a more positive view of himself or herself, became a more social being, made efforts to cooperate with those in his/her environment, and accepted responsibility for his/her actions.



### Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

The assumptions and limitations were recognized as follows:

#### Assumptions of the Study

For the purpose of the study the following assumptions were made:

1. The subjects of the study were a representative sample of fourth and fifth grade students at Dunbar School, Forest City/ Rutherford County, North Carolina.
2. The responses on the test questions were considered to be accurate as perceived and communicated by the respondents.
3. The Primary Self-Concept Inventory was a valid and reliable measure of self-concept for this age public school child despite inconsistent data given regarding reliability and validity.
4. The Friendship Rating Scale was a valid and reliable measure of friendship for fourth and fifth grade students despite absence of reported data on reliability and validity.
5. The Snoopy Behavior Test was a reliable and valid measure of knowledge of proper social behavior for fourth and fifth grade students despite absence of reported data on reliability and validity.
6. The counselor who administered the inventories was competent and did not in any significant way bias the responses.
7. The statistical techniques and analyses were adequate to treat and explore the data.

### Limitations of the Study

The following limitations for this study were recognized:

1. The results are limited to the subjects in the study and to similar populations.
2. Any changes reported in self-concept may not be permanent changes.
3. No technical data on reliability or validity is available for either the Snoopy Behavior Test or the Friendship Rating Scale.
4. As the Primary Self-Concept Inventory is a new instrument, data concerning reliability are still contradictory.

## Chapter 2

### Review of Related Literature

Much literature is available concerning the theoretical framework and the rationale of developmental guidance. There is, however, comparatively little experimental research. The first section of this chapter will review studies of theory and rationale; the second section will report experimental investigations; and a summary follows.

### Rationale

The concept of guidance has undergone numerous changes since Frank Parsons, the father of guidance, first opened the Vocation Bureau in 1908 with its emphasis on occupational assistance. In the public schools, the move from the remedial function of "treating" children in crisis to a preventive function of helping all school children develop a better self-concept and, thereby, learn to cope with the frustrations of life before the problems become insurmountable, is one of the changes with which this paper is concerned.

Peters and Shertzer (1964) expressed it this way. "More and more school officials and parents have accepted and are expecting that the guidance function will be available to all pupils, that it will not be confined solely to a crisis-oriented program, and that it will not concentrate exclusively on pupils experiencing academic or other difficulties. . . . Remedial work with elementary pupils has revealed a close tie between emotional and adjustment problems and difficulties in acquiring scholastic skills" (pp. 59-60).

Another author calls for "deliberate psychological education whose objectives of promoting healthy, personal growth of the student in the regular classroom should be educational instead of therapeutic" (Sprinthall, 1973, p. 363).

Still another writer sees the changes in the guidance function from crisis orientation to a dynamic outreach program geared to program planning and involvement before eruptions occur. This type program relies heavily on group process and must take place in the classroom (Aubrey, 1973).

According to Gumaer (1976), "School counselors can help prevent or reduce student conflict within the schools by helping teachers plan and implement affective education programs in the classroom" (p. 257).

He continued: "Some administrators, teachers, parents, and counselors have the mistaken notion that the school counselor's primary function is to work in crisis situations and to help correct problems as they occur. However, through developmental-affective education classes, teachers and counselors at all grade levels can help students learn not only to cope with problems as they occur, but also to prevent problems from happening" (Gumaer, 1976, p. 263).

Palumares (1973) stated: "Most school counselors touch the lives of a very small percentage of the student body. The counselor's position is often the first to go when the budget gets tight and monies are cut back, because the counseling program is not



operating on a wide scope of influence. . . .counselors concentrate most of their time on remediation. Only those students referred by their teachers as severe problems are being reached. Students avoid seeing counselors because they view counselors as disciplinarians. Too often when students display disruptive behavior in the classroom, they are sent to the counselor. Counselors can widen their scope of influence and take on a more dynamic role if they begin to shift their emphasis to preventive guidance" (pp. 656-657).

Along these same lines, Hass (1973) had this to say. "The traditional guidance function, built primarily on the development of trusting interpersonal relationships with students as a compensation for callous administration and authoritarian teachers, has generated serious problems, because students have been caught in the middle of a schizophrenic duality within the professional staff. Counselors cannot be privy to those qualities of open communication, trust, or even the role of 'guidance' itself. Counselors serve to facilitate the ability of students to cope, but they can do little or nothing in their present state to alleviate the source of pressure points. This is one of the basic reasons for a distinct change in the thrust of guidance in schools" (pp. 15-16).

In conjunction with the move to a preventive function there has been a move to establish more organized guidance programs in the elementary schools. As elementary school children were not

concerned with the selection of colleges or jobs, and because they were young enough to be forced to comply, for many years it was assumed that there was little or no need for counselors at the elementary level. Now, however, educators are beginning to realize that effective guidance programs begin at the kindergarten level and continue throughout the school program (Peters and Shertzer, 1964).

Indeed, North Carolina has increased the number of elementary school guidance counselors from 56 in 1974 to 450 in 1977 (Morton, 1977). According to the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Pupil Personnel Services, for the 1977-78 school year, the state employed 213 counselors for grades K-6 and 406 counselors for grades 7-8.

In 1966, the American School Counselor Association and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision established the definition of guidance as counseling, consulting, and coordination (Aubrey, 1975). Along with this definition, a necessary component of an effective elementary guidance program should be understanding and dealing with elementary pupils on their own developmental level. Aubrey (1975) stated that guidance "has emerged in the elementary schools as a vague entity defined as a continuous process concerned with determining and providing for the developmental needs of all pupils" (p. 269). If elementary counseling is to survive, the vagueness must be eliminated and

replaced with specific definitions and methods of implementation which have been proven to be successful.

A first step was to define an effective goal as Kohlberg (1975) chose to do: "The overall goal of counseling. . . .is the promotion of human growth and development" (p. 250). Rustad and Rogers (1975) were in complete agreement with this statement.

Self-concept is an important component of this psychological growth and development. If this factor is accepted and the fact that self-concept is formed as the individual develops and is a product of all learning experiences including both rewards and punishments (Engel, 1959), then counselors must look for methods of enhancing self-concept.

Being a part of the school family, counselors are in an advantageous position to deal with self-concept development. Indeed, the schools are part of the developmental environment and can be modified to enhance the child's self-concept (Parker, 1974). Schools can recognize that children with positive self-concepts succeed more easily in school (Colley, 1975); hence, moving toward implementation of Maslow's concept of hierarchical needs.

One school that has eagerly accepted this challenge is Brentwood School in Raleigh, North Carolina. In their book, Elementary Guidance--Brentwood Style, the rationale for such a program was given. "To facilitate the development of a child's total self, schools should provide opportunities for social, emotional, physical,



as well as academic growth. Classroom guidance pulls these areas together under the hypothesis that the child who has good socialization skills and feels good about self will be better able to learn and function as a person. Classroom guidance also gives the counselor contact with every child in the school, emphasizing the fact that the counselor is for all children, not just those with problems" (Koontz, Schumacher, and Yarbrough, n.d., p. 24).

Kohlberg (1975) seemed to agree with this point of view when he wrote: "The developmental approach suggests a new role for the counselor. Instead of waiting for referrals for diagnosis and diluted therapy, the school counselor. . . .will work to revise the narrow curriculum and modify the negative learning atmosphere in class. . . .In this model the role of counseling as educational intervention is the stimulation of cognitive and emotional development in all children through a variety of didactic and experimental learning activities" (pp. 255, 250).

Rustad and Rogers (1975) also recommended the developmental model suggesting that the schools relate "cognitive-developmental concepts to curriculum intervention" (p. 279).

Writing along the same lines Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1975) stated: "Personality growth of students, when it does occur is primarily a product of peer influence and that the formal curriculums have relatively little impact on this dimension of a student's life. . . .the students are actually turned off to class-work" (pp. 286-287).

They also recommended the adaptation of course material to provide affective growth through using the cognitive-developmental model (Widick, Knepfelkamp, and Parker, 1975).

Hillman, Penczar, and Barr (1975) also liked a comprehensive program designed for reaching all children rather than treating the "ill." Their "Activity Group Guidance" teaches skills in decision making, accepting responsibility and getting along with others. They feel the guidance program should provide: "an opportunity for the counselor and the teacher to develop confluent education, which integrates the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor aspects of learning into a unified whole. . . .students may learn affective guidance principles through a cognitive curriculum experienced in an action setting. . . .group members may be helped to understand the purpose of their own behavior and may learn skills for helping each other improve their behavior and attitudes"(pp. 762-764).

In reviewing the work of Alschuler, Tabor, and McIntyre (1970) Carkhuff (1971) wrote that psychological education programs are "calculated to promote excellence in planning, self worth feelings, and specific action strategies" (p. 73).

Two additional advantages of using developmental guidance activities were suggested by Hass (1973):

1. This use directly affects changes in teacher behavior through modeling and, thereby, indirectly enhances self-concept.

2. This use is "a means of returning the guidance function to the educational mainstream of education" (p. 15).

Three sources are of particular interest to elementary counselors. Corey and Harrick (1953) believed that: "The elementary pupil, ages 6-12, develops a self-concept, weans himself from close dependence on parents and adults, establishes a place for himself in a peer group, and achieves the motor, communication, and intellectual skills needed for greater personal and social effectiveness" (p. 40). "Remedial work with elementary pupils has revealed a close tie between emotional and adjustment problems and difficulties in acquiring scholastic skills" (Peters and Shertzer, 1964, p. 60). Ivey and Alschuler (1973) reported in their review of Kohlberg, LaCrosse and Ricks longitudinal studies of adult mental health (1971) that persons having poor peer relationships in the first three years of school and antisocial behavior in the second three years of schooling tended to have poorer adult adjustment than those without these problems. They suggested the importance of appropriate training in the area of self-concept development during these early years as being more effective in preventing these adults maladjustments than would be later remedial assistance.

#### Experimental Studies

A study conducted by Drummond, Cobb, and McIntire (1976) measured the stability of self-concept in elementary school children in two types of classrooms. While this study did not measure



developmental guidance, it is important here in that it suggested that the "self-concept of middle grade children is still somewhat fluid and changeable" (p. 303). As this is one of the variables to be measured in this study, the implications are important. In their study, 140 students were in self-contained classrooms and 88 students were in open classrooms. Over a period of two years, it was found that positive changes in self-acceptance and self-concept of the students in the open classroom showed a significant difference (.01) over that of the students in the traditional classroom. Implications of this study reported by the authors were:

1. Counselors need to recognize that the self-concept of elementary students is fluid and constantly changing.
2. Inservice programs should be held to help teachers identify and diagnose dimensions of self-concept.
3. Counselors should help teachers identify procedures and activities that will foster the development of positive self-concept in the classroom.
4. Counselors should make sure that when curriculum or organizational changes are projected, dimensions of self-concept of the students are considered to be an important aspect of the plan (pp. 300-303).

Gumaer and Voorneveld (1975) believed: "School counselors may effectively contribute to the affective development of all children. . . .by helping teachers plan and implement affective guidance

units in the classroom" (p. 90). To measure this contribution they compared five fourth grade students who met outside the classroom twice a week for five weeks for a period of 45 minutes with five fourth grade students from the same room who received no affective education. An entire fifth grade class was also studied. The class met inside the classroom twice a week for five weeks for periods of 45 minutes. The fourth grade group used relaxation and daydreams along with Transactional Analysis. The fifth grade class used Transactional Analysis only. The objectives, to reduce school anxiety and to improve interpersonal relationships, were measured by pre- and posttest using the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, a class sociogram developed by Dinkmeyer and Caldwell, and a sixteen word anxiety scale. Results showed that the fourth-grade experimental group and the fifth-grade class increased in self-esteem and class sociogram scores. The fourth-grade control group decreased in self-esteem and sociogram scores. The anxiety scale was used for a posttest only with the group counseling outside the classroom measuring as less anxious. The authors felt that this implied that classroom guidance is a useful tool. It might be more effective, however, if used in conjunction with relaxation exercises (Gumaer and Voorneveld, 1975).

Sanford Cooley (1975) reviewed the literature on experimental designs of affective education in school programs and reported the following: "Van-Koughnett and Smith (1969) reported significant differences between the experimental and control groups



in a program designed to enhance the self-concept of black students in the Pontiac, Michigan school system. Ojemann (1967), in a study with 400 elementary students reported significant gains in general affective development. In trying to determine the most effective mode for teaching a unit on drug education, Smith (1974) utilized three groups: an affective group, a didactic group, and a control group that focused on non-drug related problems. An instrument was used to measure both cognitive and affective gains: the affective group showed significant gains in both the cognitive and affective areas" (p. 612).

Cooley (1975) also studied literature concerning the use of packaged programs in affective education. He reported the following: "Using the DUSO materials with first, second, and third grade students, Koval (1972) found a greater feeling of belonging and greater self-reliance in student participants in all three grades, a greater sense of personal freedom among first grade participants, and no change in the sense of worth among student participants in any of the grades. Three experimental programs evaluated the effects of the Human Development Program. Montgomery (1971) employed the awareness portion of the program. He reported that, out of sixteen variables, students showed significant improvement on only the variables of self-awareness and sensitivity to others. McGee (1972), who used the program with preschoolers, found a significant increase in IQ scores but not in social or personal

adjustment. Because IQ scores are rather flexible at this age level, these results must be viewed with caution. Sweaney (1974), who used the program with first graders, found, in spite of overwhelming positive subjective reactions from students and teachers, no significant differences between the experimental and control groups on the affective variables " (p. 613).

Cooley (1975) went on to state that although the reports do not consistently support the effectiveness of such programs, counselors "should remain open in their consideration of the effectiveness of affective education in preventing maladjustment as well as in facilitating the development of human potential" (pp. 612-613).

Kaiser and Sillis (1977) reported on a study to determine the effect of classroom guidance activities on children's awareness and self-image. A total of 94 sixth grade students were in an experimental group and 90 in a control group. Counselors met with the four experimental classrooms for 40 minute periods twice a week for 21 sessions during a four-month period. Based on the Piers Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale entitled "The Way I Feel About Myself," pre- and posttests, the experimental group showed gains significantly greater than the control group (.05). There was also a significant difference (.05) in the achievement of the experimental group based on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Gum, Tannubus and Smaby (1973) explained a study conducted with 26 students randomly selected for the experimental group

against 25 control group students. Half of the experimental group met for once a week and the other half met twice a week for developmental guidance activities. Comparing the groups, pre- and post-tests, after eight weeks of developmental guidance, both of the experimental groups showed a significant increase in liking each other and in the amount and distribution of discussion. No figures were given.

Fearn and McCabe (1975) have included numerous studies based on the Human Development Program (Magic Circle) in their work and the following five investigations are cited in their book. Mestler (1973) found no significant differences in academic achievement or unexcused absenteeism in a one-school-year study of four third-grade classes in California. Two of the classes used magic circle for 20 minutes a day while the other two classes received no systematic program. There was a significant difference (.001) in personality development. Personality development included self-adjustment, social-adjustment, school adjustment, and physical adjustment as measured by the Cassell Child Behavior Rating Scale.

Hawkinson (1970) found no significance in interaction, teacher rating, or in self-image in groups of primary children after a one year study. This was contrasted with a study by Mosser and Evans (1973) in Florida. The Mosser and Evans study was based on 142 fifth grade students who were divided into three groups. A significant difference (.01) was found in the group who used magic



circle for 20 minutes a day twice a week for 25 weeks. The group who used magic circle for 20 minutes a day for four days a week for 13 weeks had a significant difference over the control group at the .05 level. Darrigrand and Gum (1973) found a strong trend but no significant difference in peer relationships and self-concept and a significant difference (.01) in school attitude in groups using magic circle for 25 to 50 sessions.

Fearn and McCabe (1975) quoted Strickler (1974): "Systematic application of attention to developmental guidance produces the greatest gain in self-concept and self-esteem and that the powerful variable in affective education is not the specific program, but the attention given to the program in terms of time and regularity. . .he found that wide and consistent use of a variety of guidance materials produced the greatest gain in self-esteem (Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory - Short Form) and self-concept (Waetjen's Self-Concept Instrument) and that consistent use of the Human Development Program circle sessions produced the second greatest gains" (pp. 109-113).

#### Summary

In summary it may be stated that theory and research have born out the following:

1. Guidance programs should be well organized and developmental in nature encompassing grades K-12.
2. Elementary school counseling should be designed to meet the needs of all the students. Because of the student's strong

need for peer approval this purpose can best be accomplished through use of group process within the regular classroom setting.

3. Specific definitions of school counseling need to be developed along with proven methods to implement the program in order to reach established goals. In order to do this task the role of the school counselor will necessarily need to change toward more specificity of goal setting and outcome evaluation.

4. As the use of developmental guidance activities is a relatively new concept, there is yet much controversy in the literature as to whether or not such activities promote positive changes in such areas as self-concept, peer relations, self-acceptance, self-worth, sensitivity to others and the like. Some research has found significant positive change, others merely trends, and still others no relationship at all. When reported, there seems always to be positive subjective reactions. Much more research into this problem is needed.

5. Using developmental guidance activities in the classroom is a tool which enables the counselor to model more effective behavior for the teacher as well as for the students. This modeling provides another avenue for changing the educational environment in ways that would tend to produce positive changes in student self-concept.

6. Developmental guidance activities are being recognized as important techniques which can be used by the school counselor to

assist in enhancing student self-concept, promoting psychological growth, developing decision making skills, and perhaps, even allowing for more positive mental health for the child when he/she becomes an adult.

7. There is an evergrowing recognition of the need for elementary school counseling programs to move from the remedial or crisis-oriented models to preventive models which help students learn to cope with life's stresses, promote healthy psychological growth, and indirectly, affect positive changes in academic skills.

### Chapter 3

This chapter is divided into four parts: (a) subjects of the study, (b) procedures, (c) instruments, and (d) statistical techniques employed in the treatment of the data.

#### Subjects of the Study

The subjects of this study were 109 students in two fourth grade classrooms and two fifth grade classrooms at Dunbar School, Forest City/Rutherford County, North Carolina during the 1977-78 school year. Table 1 contains a breakdown of the number of students by grade and group.

#### Procedures

In planning this project, the researcher first reviewed the available literature to determine what types of research had been done in this area and to determine what the outcomes had been. Upon selecting an experimental model, the researcher met with the guidance coordinator and the superintendent of the Rutherford County Schools to obtain their permission to do the study and to work out possible problems involved in testing this number of children.

The instruments used in this study (see section on instruments) were selected for the following reasons:

1. Many of the students read far below grade level. Each of the instruments selected, allowed students to respond to the items with minimal reading required.
2. The instruments were well suited to measure the areas of interest for this study.

Table 1  
Subjects by Group or Grade

Group	Fourth Grade	Fifth Grade
Control	25	30
Experimental	27	27
Total	52	57



3. The instruments were easy to administer and to score.

4. The instruments were designed to hold the interest of students of this age group.

The next decision was the selection of the school or schools in which the study would be made. To eliminate the differences in influences involved in using two separate schools, Dunbar School, Forest City, North Carolina was selected as it was the only school in which the researcher worked that was large enough to provide for both an experimental and a control group in the fourth and fifth grades. There were no repeaters in the fourth and fifth grade classes for this school year. Classroom assignments at Dunbar School were made by a committee of teachers so that each contained approximately the same number of Blacks/Whites (fourth grade 5/26, fifth grade 6/24), males/females (fourth grade 17/14, fifth grade 15/15), as well as the same numbers of reading levels. Each of the four classes had seven different reading levels as determined by the Houghton Mifflin Reading Program.

The researcher decided to use the lesson plans for developmental guidance activities which were used the preceding school year (see Appendix B).

At the beginning of the 1977-78 school year, the counselor posted sign-up sheets for any classes at Dunbar School interested in using developmental guidance activities. Four separate eight-week periods were established. Session #1 was scheduled from August 31 to October 19. Session #2 was scheduled from November 2 to December 14. Session

#3 was scheduled from January 18 to March 8. Session #4 was scheduled from March 22 to May 17. Enough space was provided for four or five classrooms each to request classroom guidance activities during any eight-week session. Classes were to meet once a week for 30 minute periods.

Five teachers signed for their classrooms to use developmental guidance activities during the second eight-week session from November 2 to December 14. These teachers' names were written on slips of paper and placed in a box according to grade level. One fifth grade teacher and one fourth grade teacher's name was drawn. These were designated the treatment groups for the project.

Likewise, five teachers signed for their classrooms to use developmental guidance activities during the fourth eight-week session from March 22 to May 17. The same procedure was used to determine the control groups as was used to determine the treatment groups.

The teachers for the classes selected as the experimental group were offered the option of extending their developmental guidance program for sixteen weeks. Both teachers readily agreed to this option.

Two weeks before the beginning of the guidance activities the counselor visited each of the classrooms involved, experimental and control, and gave an orientation to the counseling program. Following the orientation, plans were made with the teachers to begin the pretesting the following week.

For the first part of the pretesting, classes were divided into one male group and one female group for each grade level. The counselor and one proctor, another elementary school counselor, administered the Snoopy Behavior Test and the Primary Self-Concept Inventory to the boys first, then to the girls. A description of test procedures is given under the description of the instruments.

The second part of the pretesting was the administration of the Friendship Rating Scale during the first week of the program. Lesson plans given in Appendix B were followed for the sixteen weeks of the developmental guidance program. After completion of the developmental guidance activities, the counselor and proctor again administered the Friendship Rating Scale. One week later the Primary Self-Concept Inventory and the Snoopy Behavior Test were administered to the males and females in separate groups.

#### Instruments

Because some authors feel that "traditional self-report inventories may not be adequate by themselves to evaluate self-concept of students" (Drummond, Cobb and McIntire, 1976, p. 303), several measures were used. Three instruments were used to measure the effectiveness of the program. These instruments are the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test.

### Friendship Rating Scale

The first instrument used in this study was the Friendship Rating Scale (FRS). This instrument was a "noncompetitive" sociometric instrument which allowed students to "grade" others in their class using a scale of 1-5. One of the most outstanding features of this instrument is that it allowed the students to establish a hierarchial preference without forcing the students to choose between classmates. Each student was rated according to his/her classmates' perception of the individual student.

The scale is divided into five columns depicting five distinct categories of friendship or liking. Each classmate's name was typed in the name column.

Before the device was administered, the children were told that this exercise was not a test used for a grade and that no one in the class would know what score any other individual gave him/her. After the items were scored, each child was told the item on which he/she scored the highest and the lowest.

The administrator read the items one at a time and hung up a poster with the item on it. All students rated all other students on one item before the second item was read. The administrator and a proctor were available for any questions.

Each student could earn a possible score of 25 times the number of students "grading" him/her. The lowest possible score was five times the number of students "grading" him/her. As some



students were absent, it was necessary to divide the score obtained by each student who was present by the number of students present minus one. For those students who were absent, their score was divided by the number of students present for the administration. This technique provided the researcher with a meaningful and comparable score. The final scores to be used were, likewise, reduced to a low of 5 and a high of 25.

There are no statistical data available for this device other than there appears to be a fairly high correlation between the student's total score and his/her grade point average for that year (Bailey, 1975).

Total administration time was approximately 30 minutes for a class of 30 students. The device was simple to use and held the interest of the students easily.

#### Primary Self-Concept Inventory

The Primary Self-Concept Inventory (PSCI) is the final version of the Primary Self-Concept Scale (PSCS) developed by Douglas G. Muller, Ph.D. and Robert Leonetti, Ed.D. and published by Learning Concepts of Austin, Texas, 1974. This inventory may be administered individually or in a group. For the purpose of this study, the inventory was used as a group test.

The inventory was designed to evaluate several aspects of self-concept (view of personal-self, social-self, and intellectual-self) which are particularly relevant to school success. Although the



inventory was constructed to be used with children of Mexican and Spanish descent from the Southwest, it has been shown to be a successful measure of children of Anglo-American, Indian, and Black families as well (Muller and Leonetti, 1974).

The Primary Self-Concept Inventory is designed to be used with children age four who have had pre-school experience, such as kindergarten, through children in the sixth grade. One of the major advantages of this instrument is that it does not require that the students be able to read. The test booklet is composed of pictures of children in various situations. There is at least one child in a positive role and at least one child in a negative role. The administrator read a brief description of the situation to the students and the students were then directed to circle the child most like himself/herself. There are separate male and female booklets so that the students can more easily identify with each picture.

The inventory contains 20 items--two warm-up and 18 scored items. There are six scored items in each of the domains to be measured. Each domain is then divided into two factors (see Appendix A).

Basically, the inventory was easy to administer. It required only one proctor per 25 students at the fourth and fifth grade levels. The directions were very explicit and simple to follow. As care was taken to explain to the children that they were to mark

the child most like themselves rather than the one that they would most like to be or that their teachers/parents would like them to be, the children found the directions quite easy to follow and understand.

When scoring the inventory, the warm-up items, items 1 and 2 were not scored. For the remaining 18 items, one point was given for selecting a child in a positive role. No points were given for selecting a child in a negative role. There was a possible total of three points in each factor or a total of six points for each domain and a total of 18 points for the total inventory (see Appendix A).

As only three new items were added to the PSCS-R to develop the PSCI, the reliability of the PSCI was not directly assessed. When the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were compared for test-retest scores of the PSCS-R the coefficients were  $r=.91$  for the first sample of 372 students and  $r=.57$  for the scores of the second sample of 100 students. The low reliability for sample two was believed to be due to the small sample and later factor analyses showed a high factor structure consistency. According to the authors, factor analyses performed on the PSCI also yielded high consistent results.

To test for construct validity, 11 judges (seven advanced doctoral students and four doctoral level faculty members in the Counseling and Educational Psychology Department of New Mexico State

University) were asked to sort the items into the six categories. The results suggested high construct validity as only four judges misplaced one item each with no apparent pattern of misplacement.

The PSCI was not directly tested for content validity as there were only minor changes made in the PSCS to form the PSCI and the factor structure was essentially the same. Four specialists in testing and test construction were asked to examine the PSCS for content validity. Based on their judgement, the instrument was inferred to have high content validity (Muller and Leonetti, 1974).

#### Snoopy Behavior Test

The third instrument used in this study was a questionnaire designed by the Porter School to measure the students' beliefs and knowledge concerning social relationships. The questions covered such areas as understanding self and others, understanding feelings and emotions, understanding of group functioning, being a member of a group, getting along with others, and purposes of behavior.

This instrument, the Snoopy Behavior Test, was developed by the staff at Porter School in the Jersey Shore Area School District for the 1975-76 school year. No statistical information is available concerning the reliability or the validity of this instrument. Compared to the program to be used in this project, the Snoopy Behavior Test appears to be measuring the same objectives as those proposed in the developmental guidance activities discussed in Appendix B.

Each child was given a copy of the instrument which is composed of 30 statements. Below each statement are three different pictures of Snoopy depicting a. I agree, b. I don't know or no opinion, or c. I disagree. The student placed an X over the picture of the correct response.

As some of the students have difficulty reading, the administrator read the statement to the group allowing the students to answer one item at a time until the questionnaire was completed. Using this method, the questionnaire was completed in approximately fifteen minutes.

There is a possible score of 30 points. When scoring the questionnaire, one point was given for each correct response. No points were given for either an incorrect response or an "I don't know" answer.

As this questionnaire is not published or copyrighted, and as the authors have given their permission for others to use the instrument, copies of the questionnaire were duplicated by the central office for use in this project.

Both the Primary Self-Concept Inventory and the Snoopy Behavior Test were used for pre- and posttesting. The Friendship Rating Scale was also used for pre- and posttesting, but this instrument was used as part of the treatment stage.

#### Statistical Procedure

For the purpose of treating the data of the study multivariate analysis of variance with an F-ratio and the Duncan's Multiple



Range Test of Significance were employed. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed as a means of determining relationship between selected scores. The .05, .01, and .001 levels of significance were used as the criteria for rejecting or not rejecting the null hypotheses.

#### Summary

The study involved 109 subjects in two fourth grade and two fifth grade classrooms at Dunbar School, Forest City, North Carolina. One fourth grade experimental group (27 subjects) and one fifth grade experimental (27 subjects) were exposed to sixteen weeks of developmental guidance activities. One fourth grade control group (25 subjects) and one fifth grade control group (30 subjects) were not exposed to developmental guidance activities until after post-testing of experimental and control groups. The Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test were administered as pre- and posttests to both experimental and control groups. Multivariate analysis of variance with an F-ratio and the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance were used to determine whether there were any significant differences in the scores. The .05, .01, and .001 levels of significance were used to reject or not reject the null hypotheses.

## Chapter 4

### Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of a sixteen-week unit of developmental guidance activities on the psychological growth of fourth and fifth grade students. More specifically, the objective was to determine whether there was a significant difference in psychological growth as measured by the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test.

The subjects, 52 fourth grade students and 57 fifth grade students, were given pre- and posttests using the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test. The experimental groups, 27 fourth grade students and 27 fifth grade students, were exposed to sixteen-weeks of developmental guidance activities. The control group, 25 fourth grade students and 30 fifth grade students, were not exposed to the activities until posttesting of the experimental and control groups.

Three statistical techniques were employed in this study: multivariate analysis of variance, the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance, and the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. Multivariate analysis of variance was chosen for this study as it was not possible to match or equalize the groups prior to the experiment for psychological growth of students. The pretest scores for all subjects were used as covariates as the same instruments were used for posttests. By adjusting the final means of

each score, through use of regression coefficients, the effects of the treatment on the experimental groups were more accurately determined. When the interaction effect was significant, the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance (Bruning and Kintz, 1968) was used to determine which group(s) had significant gains. The .05, .01, and .001 levels were considered significant levels for each variable. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the extent to which each instrument correlated with the others. The .05, .01, and .001 levels were considered significant.

This chapter reports the results derived from the above techniques. The chapter is divided into three major parts. The first section sets forth an analysis of differences between the experimental and the control groups on the following measures: Honesty and Cheerfulness Score, Keeps Secrets Score, Greets Others Score, Best Friend Score, Class President Score, Total Friendship Score, Personal-Self Domain Score, Social-Self Domain Score, Intellectual-Self Domain Score, Total Self-Concept Score, and Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score. The second section presents the correlations of each instrument, pre- and posttest, with the other instruments. The null subhypotheses will be rejected or not rejected as the data and level of significance warrant. The third section contains the summary of the analysis.



### Analysis of Variables

The results of the computerized F-ratios will be discussed under restatement of each null subhypothesis.

#### Null Subhypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in psychological growth of developmental guidance students and control students (fourth and fifth grades) as measured by the Friendship Rating Scale.

The above subhypothesis was tested by using six separate scores for the Friendship Rating Scale. Table 2 shows adjusted means for the six scores of the Friendship Rating Scale. The Greets Others Score showed no significant differences between groups based on level, treatment, or interaction effects (see Table 3). The Class President Score yielded a significant difference between grade levels. The Best Friend Score and the Total Friendship Score showed significant differences between the experimental and control groups. The Honesty and Cheerfulness Score, the Keeps Secrets Score, the Best Friend Score, the Class President Score, and the Total Friendship Score yielded significant F-ratios for the interaction effect. Those scores with significant F-ratios are discussed below.

Table 4 contains the data reporting the results of the analysis of the Honesty and Cheerfulness Score. The F-ratio for interaction was significant at the .05 level. The Duncan's Multiple Range Test results in Table 5 indicate that the level of significance was at the .05 level for two comparisons. The fourth grade experimental group had significantly greater gain than both the fourth grade control group and the fifth grade experimental group.



Table 2

Adjusted Means for the Friendship Rating Scale for Subjects  
by Level, Treatment, and Interaction Effects

Source	Honesty and Cheerfulness	Keeps Secrets	Greets Others	Best Friends	Class President	Total Friendship
Level (Grade)						
Fourth	3.557	2.819	3.173	3.223	3.077	15.698
Fifth	3.503	2.680	3.141	3.340	3.253	16.176
Treatment						
Experimental	3.557	2.846	3.187	3.447	3.216	16.329
Control	3.501	2.649	3.113	3.124	3.123	15.574
Interaction						
Fourth Experimental	3.703	3.191	3.196	3.600	3.361	17.246
Fourth Control	3.398	2.418	3.147	2.816	2.771	14.027
Fifth Experimental	2.410	2.502	3.173	3.295	3.071	15.412
Fifth Control	3.586	2.840	3.109	3.380	3.417	16.863

Table 3

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Greets Others

Score of the Friendship Rating Scale

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	4.015	4.015	.323
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	5.615	5.615	.452
Treatment	1	3.132	3.132	.252
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	38.741	38.741	3.121

Table 4

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Honesty  
and Cheerfulness Score of the Friendship Rating Scale

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	35.681	35.681	144.863***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	.074	.074	.301
Treatment	1	.076	.076	.310
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	1.552	1.552	6.302*

\*.05 Level of Significance

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

Table 5

Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions  
for the Friendship Rating Scale, Honest and Cheerfulness Score

Comparison	Range	Standard Error of Means	Significant Studentized Value .05	Adjusted Mean Difference	Value		Level of Significance
					Minimum Mean Difference		
4C-5E	2	.10	2.800	-.12	.28		NS
4C-5C	3	.10	2.947	-.19	.29		NS
4C-4E	4	.10	3.045	-.31	.30		.05
5E-5C	2	.10	2.800	-.17	.28		NS
5E-4E	3	.10	2.947	-.29	.29		.05
5C-4E	2	.10	2.800	-.12	.28		NS



Table 6 shows the results of the analysis of the Keeps Secrets Score. The F-ratio for the interaction of level and treatment was significant at the .01 level. Table 7 gives the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance for the Keeps Secrets Score. The results indicate that the fourth grade experimental group had significantly greater gain than the fourth grade control group, the fifth grade experimental group, and the fifth grade control group. The fifth grade control group had significantly greater gain than the fourth grade control group and the fifth grade experimental group.

Table 8 contains the results of the analysis of the Best Friend Score. The F-ratios for both the treatment effect and the interaction effect were significant at the .001 level. The larger adjusted mean in Table 2 for the experimental group indicates that the experimental group had significantly greater gain on the Best Friend Score. Table 9 contains the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test for the Best Friend Score. These results indicate that the fourth grade experimental group had significantly greater gain on the score than either the fourth grade control group or the fifth grade experimental group. According to these results both the fifth grade experimental group and the fifth grade control group had significantly greater gain on the score than did the fourth grade control group.

Table 6

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Keeps Secrets  
Score of the Friendship Rating Scale

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	27.712	27.712	210.225***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	.487	.487	3.694
Treatment	1	1.001	1.001	7.590
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	8.191	8.191	62.134**

\*\* .01 Level of Significance

\*\*\* .001 Level of Significance

Table 7

Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions  
for the Friendship Rating Scale, Keeps Secrets Score

Comparison	Range	Standard Error of Means	Significant Studentized Value .05	Adjusted Mean Difference	Value Minimum Mean Difference .05	Level of Significance .01
4C-5E	2	.07	2.800	- .084	.196	.259 NS
4C-5C	3	.07	2.947	- .422	.206	.270 .05
4C-4E	4	.07	3.045	- .773	.213	.278 .01
5E-5C	2	.07	2.800	- .338	.196	.259 .01
5E-4E	3	.07	2.947	- .689	.206	.270 .01
5C-4E	2	.07	2.800	- .351	.196	.259 .01

Table 8  
Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Best Friend  
Score of the Friendship Rating Scale

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	20.630	20.630	86.185***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	.301	.301	1.258
Treatment	1	2.947	2.947	12.313***
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	4.913	4.913	20.524***

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance



Table 9

Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions  
for the Friendship Rating Scale, Best Friend Score

Comparison	Range	Standard Error of Means	Significant Studentized Value .05	Adjusted Mean Difference	Value		Level of Significance
					Minimum Mean Difference .05	Mean Difference .01	
4C-5E	2	.09	2.800	-.449	.252	.333	.01
4C-5C	3	.09	2.047	-.564	.265	.347	.01
4C-4E	4	.09	3.045	-.784	.274	.357	.01
5E-5C	2	.09	2.800	-.085	.252	.333	NS
5E-4E	3	.09	2.947	-.305	.265	.347	.05
5C-4E	2	.09	2.800	-.220	.252	.333	NS

Table 10 gives the results of the analysis of the Class President Score. The F-ratio for the level effect was significant at the .05 level. The larger adjusted mean for the fifth grade in Table 2 indicates the fifth grade had significantly greater gain in this area. Table 10 also shows the interaction effect was significant at the .001 level. Table 11 gives the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test for this score. The results indicate that the fourth grade experimental group had significantly greater gain than did either the fourth grade control group or the fifth grade experimental group. The fifth grade control group had significantly greater gain than did either the fifth grade experimental group or the fourth grade control group. The fifth grade experimental group had significantly greater gain than did the fourth grade control group for this score.

Table 12 shows the analysis of the Total Friendship Score. The F-ratio for the treatment effect was significant at the .05 level. Table 2 shows that the experimental groups adjusted mean was significantly greater than the control groups adjusted mean. Table 12 also shows the F-ratio for the interaction effect significant at the .001 level. Table 13 gives the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test for this score. The results indicate that the fourth grade experimental group had a significantly larger mean than did the fourth grade control group or the fifth grade experimental group. The fifth grade control group had a significantly greater mean than

Table 10  
Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Class President  
Score of the Friendship Rating Scale

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	25.556	25.556	187.032***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	.638	.638	4.671*
Treatment	1	.227	.227	2.025
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	5.665	5.665	41.462***

\*.05 Level of Significance

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

Table 11

Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment Interactions  
for the Friendship Rating Scale, Class President Score

Comparison	Range	Standard Error of Means	Significant Studentized Value .05	Adjusted Mean Difference	Value		Level of Significance
					Minimum Mean Difference .05	Mean Difference .01	
4C-5E	2	.07	2.800	-.300	.196	.259	.01
4C-4E	3	.07	2.947	-.590	.206	.270	.01
4C-5C	4	.07	3.045	-.646	.213	.278	.01
5E-4E	2	.07	2.800	-.290	.196	.259	.01
5E-5C	3	.07	2.947	-.346	.206	.270	.01
4E-5C	2	.07	2.800	-.056	.196	.259	NS



Table 12  
Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Total Friendship  
Score of the Friendship Rating Scale

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	758.650	758.650	481.327***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	5.172	5.172	3.281
Treatment	1	16.328	16.328	10.360*
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	145.548	145.548	92.343***

\*.05 Level of Significance

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

Table 13

Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance Among Level(Grade) x Treatment  
Interactions for the Friendship Rating Scale, Total Friendship Score

Comparison	Range	Standard Error of Means	Significant Studentized Value .05	Adjusted Mean Difference	Value Minimum Mean Difference .05	Level of Significance .01
4C-5E	2	.24	2.800	-1.385	.672 .888	.01
4C-5C	3	.24	2.947	-2.836	.707 .926	.01
4C-4E	4	.24	3.145	-3.219	.731 .952	.01
5E-5C	2	.24	2.800	-1.451	.672 .888	.01
5E-4E	3	.24	2.947	-1.824	.707 .926	.01
5C-4E	2	.24	2.800	-.383	.672 .888	NS

did the fifth grade experimental group or the fourth grade control group. The fifth grade experimental group had significantly greater gain than did the fourth grade control group. The null subhypothesis was rejected for the Honesty and Cheerfulness Score, the Keeps Secrets Score, the Best Friend Score, the Class President Score, and the Total Friendship Score, but was not rejected for the Greets Others Score.

#### Null Subhypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in psychological growth of developmental guidance students and control students (fourth and fifth grades) as measured by the Primary Self-Concept Inventory.

The Personal-Self Domain Score, the Social-Self Domain Score, the Intellectual-Self Domain Score, and the Total Self-Concept Score were used as criteria for rejecting or not rejecting the above subhypothesis. Table 14 contains adjusted means for scores of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory.

The Personal-Self Domain Score and the Total Self-Concept Score showed no significant differences between groups based on level, treatment, or interaction effects (see Tables 15 and 16). The Social-Self Domain Score yielded an F-ratio significant at the .05 level for the level effect and the Intellectual-Self Domain Score yielded an F-ratio significant at the .05 level for the treatment effect. These two scores are discussed below.

Table 14

Adjusted Means for the Primary Self-Concept Inventory for Subjects  
by Level, Treatment, and Interaction Effects

Source	Personal- Self Domain	Social- Self Domain	Intellectual Self Domain	Total Self-Concept
Level (Grade)				
Fourth	4.804	4.234	5.313	14.302
Fifth	4.600	3.594	5.048	15.566
Treatment				
Experimental	4.804	4.046	5.459	14.385
Control	4.592	3.755	4.894	13.458
Interaction				
Fourth Experimental	4.909	4.457	5.498	14.779
Fourth Control	4.690	3.993	5.114	13.787
Fifth Experimental	4.699	3.635	5.42.	13.991
Fifth Control	4.510	3.557	4.711	13.184



Table 15

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Personal-Self  
Domain Scores of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	59.521	59.521	40.883***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	1.135	1.135	.780
Treatment	1	1.117	1.117	.767
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	.006	.006	.004

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

Table 16

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Total Self-Concept  
Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	348.196	348.196	32.144***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	13.429	13.429	1.240
Treatment	1	21.781	21.781	2.011
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	.235	.022	.883

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

Table 17 gives the analysis of the Social-Self Domain Score. The F-ratio for the level effect was significant at the .05 level. Table 14 shows the adjusted means for the fourth and fifth grades. The larger mean suggests the fourth grade had significantly greater gain for the Social-Self Domain Score.

Table 18 contains the analysis of the Intellectual-Self Domain Score. The F-ratio for the treatment effect was significant at the .05 level. Table 14 shows the adjusted means for the experimental and control groups. The larger mean indicates the experimental group had significantly greater gain. The null subhypothesis was not rejected for the Personal-Self Domain Score and the Total Self-Concept Score, but was rejected for the Social-Self Domain Score and the Intellectual-Self Domain Score.

#### Null Subhypothesis 3

There is no significant difference in psychological growth of developmental guidance students and control students (fourth and fifth grades) as measured by the Snoopy Behavior Test.

The Snoopy Behavior Test yields only one score, i.e., Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior. Table 19 shows adjusted means for the subjects by level, treatment, and interaction effects. Table 20 contains the analysis of the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score. The F-ratio was significant at the .001 level for the treatment effect. The adjusted means in Table 19 show the experimental group mean was larger than the control group mean. This

Table 17

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Social-Self Domain

Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	19.031	19.031	9.151**
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	10.229	10.229	4.918*
Treatment	1	1.862	1.862	.895
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	1.006	1.006	.484

\*.05 Level of Significance

\*\*.01 Level of Significance



Table 18  
Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Intellectual-  
Self Domain Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	90.374	90.374	61.340***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	1.725	1.725	1.171
Treatment	1	8.214	8.214	5.575*
Interaction				
Level x Treatment	1	.722	.722	.490

\*.05 Level of Significance

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

Table 19

Adjusted Means for the Snoopy Behavior Test for Subjects  
by Level, Treatment, and Interaction Effects

Source	Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior
Level (Grade)	
Fourth	22.948
Fifth	21.837
Treatment	
Experimental	24.297
Control	20.472
Interaction	
Fourth Experimental	25.604
Fourth Control	20.080
Fifth Experimental	22.990
Fifth Control	20.799

Table 20

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Knowledge of  
Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Covariate				
Pretest	1	545.705	545.705	24.804***
Main Effects				
Level (Grade)	1	33.529	33.529	1.524
Treatment	1	387.367	387.367	17.607***
Interaction				
Level X Treatment	1	74.795	74.795	3.400

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

difference indicates a significant gain in the experimental group for this score as a results of the guidance activities. Null Subhypothesis 3 was rejected.

#### Correlations of Instruments

The results of the computerized correlations of each instrument with the other instruments will be discussed under restatement of each null subhypothesis.

#### Null Subhypothesis 4

There is no significant relationship between the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale and the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory.

The correlations for the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale and the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory are shown in Table 21 (pretest measures) and Table 22 (posttest measures). The correlations indicate that for both pre- and posttest scores there is a positive correlation at the .001 level of significance. These results indicate that students scoring high on the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale tend to score high on the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and students scoring low on the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory tend to score low on the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale. The null subhypothesis was rejected.



Table 21

Correlation Matrix for Total Scores of the Friendship Rating  
Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory and  
the Snoopy Behavior Test on Pretest Measures

Test	Friendship Rating Scale	Primary Self-Concept Inventory	Snoopy Behavior Test
Friendship Rating Scale	1.0000***	0.2992***	0.2691**
Primary Self-Concept Inventory	0.2992***	1.0000***	0.2542**
Snoopy Behavior Test	0.2691**	0.2542**	1.0000***

\*\* .01 Level of Significance

\*\*\* .001 Level of Significance

Table 22

Correlation Matrix for Total Scores of the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test on Posttest Measures

Test	Friendship Rating Scale	Primary Self-Concept Inventory	Snoopy Behavior Test
Friendship Rating Scale	1.0000***	0.3337***	0.4224***
Primary Self-Concept Inventory	0.3337***	1.0000***	0.3603***
Snoopy Behavior Test	0.4224***	0.3603***	1.0000***

\*\*.01 Level of Significance

\*\*\*.001 Level of Significance

#### Null Subhypothesis 5

There is no significant relationship between the Total Friendship Score on the Friendship Rating Scale and the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score on the Snoopy Behavior Test.

Tables 21 and 22 contain statistical information regarding the correlational study of these instruments. Table 21 indicates that there was a significant relationship between pretest scores on the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale and the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test at the .01 level of significance. Table 22 shows a significant relationship in the posttest scores of the two instruments at the .001 level of significance. These correlations indicate that those students scoring high on the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale tend to score high on the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test, and students scoring low on the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test tend to score low on the Total Friendship Score of the Friendship Rating Scale. The null subhypothesis was rejected.

#### Null Subhypothesis 6

There is no significant relationship between the Total Self-Concept Score on the Primary Self-Concept Inventory and the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score on the Snoopy Behavior Test.

Results of the correlational study of the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory and the Knowledge of

Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test are given in Table 21 and 22. These results indicate that for the pretest scores (see Table 21) there is a significant relationship at the .01 level and for the posttest scores (see Table 22) there is a significant relationship at the .001 level. These results indicate that students who score high on the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory tend to score high on the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test, and students who score low on the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test tend to score low on the Total Self-Concept Score of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory. The null sub-hypothesis was rejected.

#### Summary

The summary of the analyses of data is as follows:

1. Upon the basis of the statistical analysis of the scores of the Friendship Rating Scale the level effect was significant at the .05 level for the Class President Score. This score suggests that the students in the fifth grade showed a significant increase in their perception of their fellow students as having leadership potential. The other five F-ratios on the Friendship Rating Scale were not significant for the level effect.

For the treatment effect the Best Friend Score showed an F-ratio at the .001 level of significance and the Total Friendship Score at the .05 level of significance. These F-ratios suggest that



students in the experimental group showed significantly more positive perceptions of their fellow students as being close friends and overall friendly. The effects of developmental guidance activities seemed to promote closer relationships among students than did the normal intercourse in the control classes. The F-ratios for the other four measures of the Friendship Rating Scale for the treatment effect were not significant.

Significant F-ratios for the interaction effect for the six scores of the Friendship Rating Scale were significant with the single exception of the Greets Others Score. The Honesty and Cheerfulness Score was significant at the .05 level; the Keeps Secrets Score was significant at the .01 level; the Best Friend Score was significant at the .001 level; the Class President Score was significant at the .001 level; and the Total Friendship Score was significant at the .001 level. For each of these significant F-ratios a Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance was computed to determine which comparison(s) were significant.

The results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance are outlined as follows:

- a. On the five scores on the Friendship Rating Scale which had significant F-ratios the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance showed the fourth grade experimental group to have significantly greater gain than did the fourth grade control group and the fifth grade experimental group. These results suggest that students in

the fourth grade who were exposed to developmental guidance activities showed a significantly greater increase in their perception of their peers as being honest and cheerful, keeping secrets, being close friends, having leadership potential, and being overall friendly. The effects of developmental guidance activities assessed by the Friendship Rating Scale seemed to promote closer relationships among fourth grade students than did normal classroom activities in the fourth grade control class or developmental guidance activities in the fifth grade.

b. The fourth grade experimental group had more significant gain than did the fifth grade control group on the Keeps Secrets Score. This difference suggests that students in the fourth grade experimental group showed significantly greater increase in their perception of their fellow students as keeping secrets. The effects of developmental guidance activities seemed to develop more trust among fourth grade students than did the normal classroom setting among fifth grade control students.

c. The fifth grade control group had significantly greater gain than did the fourth grade control group on the Keeps Secrets Score, the Best Friend Score, the Class President Score, and the Total Friendship Score. These differences suggest that the fifth grade control group showed a significant increase in positive perceptions of their peers as keeping secrets, being close friends, having leadership potential, and being overall friendly. The normal classroom setting seemed to produce closer relationships among

fifth grade control students than did the same type setting among fourth grade control students.

d. The fifth grade control group had significantly greater gain than did the fifth grade experimental group on the Keeps Secrets Score, the Class President Score, and the Total Friendship Score. These gains suggest that the fifth grade control group showed significant increases in their perception of their fellow students as keeping secrets, having leadership potential, and being overall friendly. The normal classroom setting seemed to produce more trust, confidence, and liking among fifth grade control group students than did the effects of developmental guidance activities on the experimental group students.

e. The fifth grade experimental group had significantly greater gain than did the fourth grade control group on the Best Friend Score, the Class President Score, and the Total Friendship Score. These gains suggest that the fifth grade experimental group had a significantly greater increase in their perception of their classmates as close friends, having leadership potential, and being overall friendly. The effects of developmental guidance activities seemed to produce more trust, confidence, and liking among fifth grade students than did the normal classroom setting among fourth grade control students. The null subhypothesis was rejected for the Honesty and Cheerfulness Score, the Keeps Secrets Score, the Best Friend Score, the Class President Score, and the Total Friendship Score but not rejected for the Greets Others Score of the Friendship Rating Scale.



2. Upon the basis of the statistical analysis of the scores of the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, Null Subhypothesis 2 was not rejected for the Personal-Self Domain Score and the Total Self-Concept Score. The null subhypothesis was rejected for the Intellectual-Self Domain Score with the experimental group showing a significant gain, and for the Social-Self Domain Score with the fourth grade students showing a significant gain. These gains suggest that the students exposed to developmental guidance activities showed a significant increase in their perception of themselves as good students and that students in the fourth grade showed a significant increase in their perception of themselves as being accepted as a member of the group. The effects of developmental guidance activities seemed to promote a more positive view of self as good students than did the normal intercourse in the control classes. Fourth grade class settings seemed to promote greater feelings of social acceptance than did fifth grade settings.

3. Upon the basis of the statistical analysis of the Knowledge of Appropriate Behavior Score of the Snoopy Behavior Test, Null Subhypothesis 3 was rejected with the experimental group showing a significant gain. This gain suggests that students exposed to developmental guidance activities showed a significant increase in their knowledge of proper social behavior. The effects of developmental guidance activities seemed to promote more positive growth in students' understanding of social behavior than did the normal classroom setting.



4. Upon the basis of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, Null Subhypotheses 4, 5, and 6 were rejected at the .01 level for pretest measures and at the .001 level for posttest measures. These correlations suggest that the total scores of the three instruments seem significantly to be measuring the same constructs.

## Chapter 5

### Summary, Conclusions, and Implications of Study

This chapter includes a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the data, and implications of the study based on the results of the statistical analysis of the data and overall findings of the study.

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of a sixteen-week unit of developmental guidance activities on the psychological growth of fourth and fifth grade students.

Literature related to the study was reviewed under two headings: (a) rationale and (b) experimental studies.

The subjects were control groups of 25 fourth grade students and 30 fifth grade students and experimental groups of 27 fourth grade students and 27 fifth grade students at Dunbar School in Rutherford County, North Carolina matched for sex, ethnic origin, and reading ability level. The subjects were given the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test as pre- and posttests.

There were six null subhypotheses which were rejected. Three were rejected by use of multivariate analysis of variance with an F-ratio of .05, .01, and .001 being considered significant. Significant interaction effects were examined using the Duncan's Multiple Range Test of Significance with the .05 and .01 level

being considered significant. The remaining three null subhypotheses were rejected through use of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation with the .05, .01, and .001 levels being significant.

#### Conclusions

The following conclusions are made regarding the effects of developmental guidance activities on the promotion of psychological growth of fourth and fifth grade experimental group subjects as compared to fourth and fifth grade control group subjects.

1. Upon the basis of the statistical analysis of the data, the major null hypothesis was rejected. More specifically, Null Subhypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were rejected. There is a significant difference in the psychological growth of experimental group students and control group students (fourth and fifth grades) as measured by the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test. Developmental guidance activities are useful in the promotion of psychological growth of fourth and fifth grade students.

2. Students exposed to developmental guidance activities tend to show greater progress in understanding proper social behavior. This cognition would seem to be an early step toward later changes in behavior and self-acceptance.

3. According to this study it appears the fourth grade experimental group students more readily moved toward positive behavioral changes as measured by the perceptions of their peers.

This move would appear to be an intermediate step toward changes in self-perception.

4. The study showed the fifth grade experimental group moved much more slowly in this direction. In fact, the results showed that the control group showed significantly greater gain. One explanation might be that the fifth grade maturity level may have been such that the activities were not suitable for their developmental level. There may have been other factors not controlled in this study which may have affected the results of the score (e.g., participation level of the classroom teacher, the physical maturation of the child, external events, sex, etc.).

5. The study indicated the experimental group had greater gain in perception of self as a good student. Perhaps experiential participation in learning activities and being a participant in the learning of others may have affected this score in a positive way.

6. Fourth grade students showed significantly greater gain in perception of self as an accepted member of the group. The growth on this score may be understood in terms of student maturation level. These students are on the verge of puberty and seem ready for an increase in social awareness. This readiness may, in part, account for the exceptional gains of the fourth grade students when exposed to developmental guidance activities.

7. All three total scores of the Friendship Rating Scale, the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, and the Snoopy Behavior Test



correlated at .01 or higher. These correlations suggest that perhaps one or two tests at the most may have been adequate to measure the types of psychological growth evident in this study.

#### Implications of Study

This study indicated that there is a significant difference in psychological growth of some students when exposed to developmental guidance activities. Based on these findings the following implications are made:

1. That developmental guidance activities do promote psychological growth in some students who are exposed to the activities. Schools desiring to promote psychological growth in the students, therefore, might justifiably consider the inclusion of these activities in the school curriculum.

2. That the developmental guidance activities used in this study produced greater gains in fourth grade students than in fifth grade students as determined by certain scores on the Friendship Rating Scale. Counselors or teachers attempting to use such a program would be advised to consider carefully the developmental level of their students and the specific needs of each group to be exposed to guidance activities.

3. That further research is needed to determine the types of guidance activities most appropriate at each grade level.

4. That further research is needed to determine the long term effects of developmental guidance activities on students' psychological growth.

5. That further research is needed to determine the effects of programs of longer or shorter duration.

6. That further research is needed to determine what additional variables might interact with the treatment effect in producing significant change.

## Appendix A

## Primary Self-Concept Inventory

## Item Description Chart

Factor	<u>PERSONAL-SELF DOMAIN</u>
1	<u>Physical Size</u> : assesses child's perception of his/her physical size
2	<u>Emotional State</u> : assesses child's perception of his/her emotional state, i.e. happy or sad, angry or not angry
	<u>SOCIAL-SELF DOMAIN</u>
3	<u>Peer Acceptance</u> : assesses child's perception of his/her acceptance by his/her peer group
4	<u>Helpfulness</u> : assesses child's perception of himself/herself in the helper-helpee relationship
	<u>INTELLECTUAL-SELF DOMAIN</u>
5	<u>Success</u> : assesses child's perception of his/her tendency to succeed or fail in task-oriented pursuits
6	<u>Student-Self</u> : assesses child's perception of his/her ability to conform to classroom behavior expectations

Scoring Chart

Item Number	POSITIVE ITEM DESCRIPTION
3	The child successfully assembling blocks
4	Any of the children talking with each other
5	Smiling child
6	The child studying
7	The child successfully assembling puzzle
8	Any of the children playing with each other
9	The child pushing the wagon
10	The larger child pulling the rope
11	Any of the three children working on the wagon
12	The child studying
13	The smiling child
14	The child studying
15	The child helping the other child climb
16	The larger child
17	The child successfully studying
18	The larger child
19	The child giving the piggy-back ride
20	Happy child



## Appendix B

## Developmental Guidance Activities

- I. Orientation Review and Friendship Rating Scale - Fourth and Fifth Grades
- II. Friendship
  - A. Fourth Grade - "What animal am I like?"
  - B. Fifth Grade - Magic Circle - results of Friendship Rating Scale
- III. Friendship
  - A. Fourth Grade - Magic Circle - "People like me..."
  - B. Fifth Grade - Qualities of Friendship Posters
- IV. Friendship Book - Fourth and Fifth Grades
- V. Positive Self
  - A. Fourth Grade - Name Tag
  - B. Fifth Grade - Strength Bombardment
- VI. Warm Fuzzies
  - A. Fourth Grade - "Kim, Josh, and the Warm Fuzzies"
  - B. Fifth Grade - "Warm Fuzzy Fairytale"
- VII. Warm Fuzzies
  - A. Fourth Grade - Throne Game
  - B. Fifth Grade - Asking for Fuzzies and Listening
- VIII. Review - Fourth and Fifth Grades
- IX. Parent, Adult, and Child - Fourth and Fifth Grades
- X. Games People Play - Fourth and Fifth Grades

- XI. Relaxation and Guided Daydream - Fourth and Fifth Grades
- XII. Accepting Self
  - A. Fourth Grade - Magic Circle - Feelings
  - B. Fifth Grade - Memories of the Past
- XIII. Accepting Self and Others
  - A. Fourth Grade - Sources of Emotional Stress
  - B. Fifth Grade - Becoming a Better Me
- XIV. Accepting Self and Others
  - A. Fourth Grade - Dealing with Stress
  - B. Fifth Grade - Tower Building
- XV. Trust
  - A. Fourth Grade - Sharing
  - B. Fifth Grade - Blind Walk
- XVI. Review - Fourth and Fifth Grades

## References

- Aubrey, R. F. Issues and criteria in developing psychological education programs for elementary schools. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 14, 268-276.
- Aubrey, R. F. Organizational vicitimization of school counselors. The School Counselor, 1973, 20, 346-354.
- Bailey, J. A. The friendship rating scale: a sociometric instrument. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1975, 99, 218-224.
- Bruning, J. L., & Kintz, B. L. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Teaching achievement motivation: theory and practice in psychological education. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 50, 73-74.
- Colley, S. Personal education. Personel and Guidance Journal, 1975, 53, 610-614.
- Corey, S. M., & Harrick, M. The developmental tasks of children and young people, Readings in Educational Psychology, 1953, pp. 37-43.
- Drummond, R. J., Cobb, R. A., & McIntire, W. G. Stability of self-concept of elementary school children in two types of classroom organizations. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1976, 10, 300-303.

- Engel, M. The stability of self-concept in adolescence. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 38, 211-215.
- Fearn, L., & McCabe R. E. Magic circle: supplementary idea guide. California: Human Development Training Institute, Inc., 1975.
- Gum, M. F., Tamminen, A. W., & Smaby, M. H. Developmental guidance experiences. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1973, 51, 647-452.
- Gumaer, J. Affective education through the friendship class. The School Counselor, 1976, 23, 257-263.
- Gumaer, J., & Voorneveld, R. Affective education with gifted children. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1975, 10, 86-94.
- Hass, A. Psychological education: An intriguing beginning to the matter of survival. The School Counselor, 1973, 21, 14-20.
- Hillman, B. W., Penczar, J. T., & Barr, R. Activity group guidance: A developmental approach. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1975, 53, 761-767.
- Ivey, A. F. & Alschuler, A. S. An introduction to the field. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1973, 51, 591-597.
- Kaiser, H. E. & Sillis, P. C. Guidance effectiveness in the elementary school. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1977, 12, 61-64.
- Kohlberg, L. Counseling and counselor education: A developmental approach. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 14, 250-256.

- Koontz, F., Schumacher, R., & Yarborough, L. Elementary guidance--Brentwood style. Raleigh, North Carolina: Wake County Public Schools, n.d.
- Lamb, J. The unique role of the elementary school counselor. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1974, 8 219-224.
- Morton, J. What's happening in elementary guidance. NCSCA Newsletter, 1977, 4, 2.
- Muller, D. & Leonetti, R. Primary self-concept inventory manual. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1974.
- Muller, D. & Leonetti, R. Primary self-concept inventory technical report. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1974.
- Mynick, R. & Moni, L. A status report of elementary school counseling. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1976, 10, 156-164.
- Palumares, U. H. & Rubini, R. Human development in the classroom. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1973, 51, 653-659.
- Parker, H. Contingency management and concomitant changes in elementary school students' self-concept. Psychology in the Schools, 1974, 11, 70-79.
- Peters, H. J. & Shertzer, B. Guidance: Program development and management. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1964.
- Rustad, K & Rogers, C. Promoting psychological growth in a high school class. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 14, 277-285.



Sprinthall, N. A. A curriculum for secondary schools: counselors as teachers for psychological growth. The School Counselor, 1973, 20, 361-369.

Widick, C., Knefelkamp, L., & Parker, C. The counselor as a developmental instructor. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 14, 286-296.