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Editor's Comment
Larry Litwack

This issue is the first special issue of the Journal of Reality Therapy. Ten of the eleven articles deal with research, theory, and/or practice of Quality School concepts in the real world. With the development of the Quality School movement, it is important to report periodically on the status of the movement as practiced in individual schools throughout the world. Of particular note is the lead article by Renna, a Board member of the Quality School Consortium and the Director of a Quality School, in which he raises some important questions regarding the application of Quality School concepts within a special education setting.

I would also like to call readers' attention to the announcements on p. 51 and p. 87. The first calls for submissions for a special issue from a multi-cultural, international perspective. The second deals with the movement of the Journal of Reality Therapy towards becoming truly an international voice for the theory and practice of Reality Therapy, Control Theory, and Quality Management. I would also like to remind readers that ideas for special issues or articles are always welcome. This is your voice.

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND THE QUALITY SCHOOL: ARE WE ABOVE THE LAW?
Robert Renna

The author is Director of the LABBB Collaborative in Lexington, Massachusetts and is the Northeast Regional Board representative to the Quality School Consortium.

ABSTRACT
The Quality School movement strives to develop positive, coercion-free environments where self evaluation by both staff and students is used to increase the quality of all work. To this end, we have recently taken a strong, united stand regarding discipline programs as not being the answer to the problems in our schools. The focus of this article is to provide the reader with disability related legal information which is applicable as we move toward systemic change for promoting a learning environment to assist in the achievement of all students.

"In the middle of difficulty lies opportunity"
—Albert Einstein

As the field of Education approaches the new millennium, as a nation, we continue to struggle with school reform. Much has been written regarding the need to restructure our schools in an all out effort to maximize our obligation to help all students live up to their full capabilities. This change we speak about will need to be dynamic and creative in order to give rise to the critical new imperatives in our ever changing educational, social, and cultural systems. To this end, there continues to be a great deal of debate as to the “best” approach to follow. While none of us would claim to have cornered the market on truth, a growing number of educators have identified with the Quality School movement as a promising practice whose psychological frame of reference, Choice Theory, represents a major shift in how we view schools as organizations. It is Choice Theory which separates the Quality School movement from other reform designs which, no matter how successful in the short run, continue to operate from a Stimulus-Response psychological base. In doing so, the focus remains on student behavior, grades, rigid curriculum and boss management. The results thus far have been good intentions by well meaning, competent and highly committed educators with very little long lasting systems change.

Ironically, the strength of the Quality School movement, using lead management to focus on systemic change versus student behavior, has the potential to impact negatively on the education of children with special needs who are protected by federal and state statute which mandate certain individual social and behavioral accommodations and interventions.

Fundamentally, the question that we face as special educators using Choice Theory within a Quality School is: “How do we begin to truly develop an educational system that is genuinely committed to the success of all students when the success of many of our students with special need depends on the implementation of strong behavioral discipline programs in school? In short, many of our students’ special needs are their ineffective behaviors which can be documented as being “part of their disability”. Of
course, as practitioners of Reality Therapy, we can certainly debate whether any behavior *can be* deemed part of a disability and therefore somehow beyond the control of the person. However, the special education field is, for better or worse, based on a medical model and, as I will attempt to demonstrate, driven by the legal contract known as the educational plan. Both of these factors offer little or no forum for that debate. For example, in Massachusetts, it is not uncommon for a parent armed with a diagnosis of specific learning disability or attention deficit disorder from a Harvard Medical School affiliated hospital to request special education services from a school district who perhaps views a child as having more control over both these educational challenges. Not many school districts would be willing to spend over twenty thousand dollars on legal fees to contest these extensive neuropsychological assessments especially if, as the law provides, the parents prevail and the school department must also pay their legal fees. Unfortunately, misdiagnosis is a problem in Special Education. However, the service delivery of the individual educational plan (IEP) is driven by such diagnostic categories. Moreover, as a legal document, it is insulated from such philosophical debate as whether learning disabilities or attention deficit disorder *actually exist*. Neuropsychological testing cannot only prove that they exist, but can also pinpoint where in the brain the difficulty lies and what the functional relationship between brain and behavior is. Given that we are indeed seeing more and more students with these diagnoses in the public schools accompanied by extensive evaluations, there is no doubt that a major challenge to Choice Theory exists in regards to Special Education. It impacts on our Quality School premise which says that the roots of learning and behavior problems grow from a boss managed system versus the student. For many students with significant special needs, this may not be entirely correct. For those students accurately diagnosed, behavior may be a continuing challenge even in a Quality School. For those students who are misdiagnosed, as we will see, the educational plan will continue to view their disability as a “cause” of their behavior, a formidable challenge for a Quality School.

Following is a brief description of the federal and state (Mass.) laws and regulations which govern and ensure the provision for the delivery of special education services and a free and appropriate public education for children with special needs. I will attempt to illustrate key concepts such as “reasonable accommodation”, “related support services”, “the individual educational plan” and “due process” as they relate specifically to discipline. For many students with significant special needs, this is a major challenge to Choice Theory. It is my hope that this information will be helpful to all schools, present and future, who are moving toward Quality using Glasser's ideas. It is also my belief that no school can do so unless it successfully works together with special educators, parents and students to ensure protection, accommodation and inclusion in a flexible manner, minimizing the possibility of stigmatization, and maximizing the students’ development in the least restrictive environment.

A Quality School must not only be a school that is need satisfying for all students enrolled. It must also be a school that allows free access to all students with disabilities in the community who would otherwise go to that school if they were not disabled. Given that most students who present with ongoing challenging behaviors *are* identified as having special needs, this is by no means an easy task and, as will be explained, requires specific individualized behavior/discipline support. I know that there are currently many “Quality Schools” who would say that they don’t have any or many students with special needs requiring behavioral services through their educational plans. My question to those schools is quite simple: “Then, where are these students attending school, because I know they live in your community?”. A school that “selects” its students and refers others to outside placements can be an excellent school. But, can it be a Quality School? Since there are over five million students with special needs in this country representing 15% of our school population, I believe that question is an important one. Private, “out placement” schools are an option for some students with special needs, as long as it is an option that they and their families have self determined. The two largest national organizations representing students with special needs are The Association for the Severely Handicapped (TASH) and The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). Both of these organizations have been at the forefront of research, technology and systems change as it effects students with disabilities. In order for the Quality School movement to become the vehicle for educational reform in this country, it will have to incorporate policies and procedures that are in step with these two organizations whose strong membership will be asking for an answer to the aforementioned “access” question.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION LAWS AND REGULATIONS**

**FEDERAL**

**INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT, 1990 (IDEA)**

**EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT, 1974**

**EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT, 1975**

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, 1990 (ADA)**

**SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973**

**TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965**

**THE CIVIL RIGHTS RESTORATION ACT OF 1987**

**THE FAMILY EDUCATION RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT OF 1974**

**STATE (Example: Massachusetts)**

**MASSACHUSETTS SPECIAL EDUCATION LAW CHAPTER 766 OF THE ACTS OF 1972**

A detailed description of each law is certainly beyond the scope of this article, however what follows should be helpful as a general reference. For our purposes, I have attempted to synthesize commonly referred to regula-
tions, including definitions which would be applicable to any school program, public or private, implementing a Quality School design. Particular attention has been given to those areas where a student’s behavior could be judged to be “part of the disability” and therefore, subject to intervention (individual behavior/discipline plans) and other accommodation under the law.

In enacting all of the above legislation, government recognized that many students with handicaps have been victims of discrimination that has denied them an equal chance to lead full and productive lives. As a result of law, students with a wide range of disabilities now receive better and more integrated educational services, which, in turn, enable them to fully develop their potential. By eliminating discrimination against students with disabilities, these laws represent a major national commitment. Effective enforcement of these statutes at all levels of government (city, state and federal) provides an important opportunity to bring millions of students with special needs into the mainstream of our schools and communities. Before looking at how the rights of individuals with disabilities under Federal and State law relate to the Quality School, defining a number of “key” terms would be helpful.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND ACCESS

Each school shall ensure that children in need of special education have an equal opportunity to participate in, and receive credit for the educational, non-academic, extracurricular, and ancillary programs, services, and activities with children in the regular education program. All schools must design individual social/emotional support strategies including behavioral interventions to insure equal access to all school resources and activities.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Shall consist of specially designed instruction at no cost to the parents to meet the unique needs of a child in need of special education. The terms shall include: early identification and assessment, instruction in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions, instruction in physical education. Special education shall include speech and language therapy, adapted physical education, vocational education and any other related service as part of the specially designed instruction.

RELATED SERVICES

Shall include transportation, vocational, career and rehabilitation counseling, health services, orientation and mobility services, occupational therapy, physical therapy, audiology and social and psychological services not limited to the following:

individual and group counseling
family counseling
consultation by psychologist and psychiatrist as deemed necessary by the team

crisis intervention by counselor, social worker, psychologist or psychiatrist for student and family as deemed necessary by the team

obtaining, integrating, and interpreting information about child behavior and conditions relating to learning

planning and managing a program of psychological services, including counseling, discipline and behavioral plans

behavioral intervention and consultation by psychologist, counselor, psychiatrist, social worker or special educator that is individualized to meet the needs of the student. Such intervention may use one or more approaches/techniques as deemed appropriate by the team

TEAM

comprised of all professionals working with the student, paraprofessionals, parents, student and any advocate or specialist identified by the parent and/or student.

DISABILITY (Special Need, Handicap)

One or more of the following impairments:

Developmental Delay - the learning capacity is limited, or delayed: receptive and/or expressive language; cognitive abilities; physical functioning; social, emotional, or adaptive functioning; self-help skills.

Intellectual - the capacity for performing cognitive tasks is limited or delayed and is exhibited by: a slower rate of learning; disorganized patterns of learning; difficulty with adaptive behavior; difficulty understanding abstract concepts.

Sensory - the capacity to see, and/or hear is limited or impaired: reduced performance in visual or hearing acuity tasks; difficulty with written and oral communication; difficulty with understanding visual and auditory information.

Neurological - the capacity of the child’s nervous system is limited having difficulties in: memory, the control and use of cognitive functioning, sensory and motor skills, organizational skills, information processing, affect, emotion and social skills, or basic life functions.

EMOTIONAL - the capacity to manage individual or interactive behaviors is limited and exhibited by difficulty which persists over time and in more than one setting: the ability to understand, build, or maintain interpersonal relationships; the ability to react/respond within established norms; the ability to keep normal fears, concerns, and/or anxieties in perspective; the ability to control aggressive and/or angry impulses or behavior.

Communication - the capacity to use expressive and/or receptive language is limited: articulation; voice; conveying, understanding, or using spoken, written, or symbolic language.

Physical - the capacity to move, coordinate actions, or perform physical activities is limited.

Specific Learning - the capacity to use one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using spoken or written information is limited: a significant discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability in one or more of the following areas: listening, reading,
Health - the physiological capacity to function is limited or impaired: limited strength, vitality, or alertness; difficulty in performing basic life functions.

Child in need of Special Education - any person of ages three through twenty - one up to his/her twenty - second birthday, who has not obtained a high school diploma or its equivalent who has been determined to need special education based on a finding that the child has a disability and is unable to progress effectively in regular education. Defining the needs of the child shall in no way stigmatize the child, or limit the services, program, and integration opportunities provided to the child.

Informed Consent - agreement by a parent who has been fully informed of all information relevant to the activity for which consent is sought. The parent understands that the granting of consent is voluntary and may be revoked at any time.

Least restrictive environment - the program and placement which ensures that, to the maximum extent appropriate, a child in need of special education is educated with children who are not in need of special education and that separate schooling, special classes, or other removal of a child from the regular education environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the special needs is such that education in regular classes with the use of aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) - a written legal document for each child with special needs developed by the Team comprised of representatives of the school district, the parent, and whenever appropriate, the child. It includes: a statement of the present levels of educational performance of the child; a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives; a statement of specific educational services, support services, interventions and accommodations to be provided and the extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular educational programs; the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of services, and appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being achieved.

Due Process - a right to have any law applied by the federal or state government reasonably and with sufficient safeguards, such as hearings and notice, to ensure that an individual is dealt with fairly. Due process is guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Reasonable Accommodation - any design or modification in a program and/or environment that initiates or enhances a student with special needs ability to access a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive more normalized environment. This may entail making buildings and all facilities accessible for students with physical disabilities, providing assistive devices and technology such as computer assisted augmentative speech or other equipment modifications. It may also include the use of support services and individual intervention strategies and/or personnel as described under the regulations.

Exclusion/Zero Reject - exclusion occurs when children are denied public school education or provided an inadequate or unresponsive education for their needs. This includes functional exclusion which occurs when the child has access to the program, but the program design is of such a nature that the child cannot substantially benefit from it because of his/her special need. Zero reject states that no handicapped child can be excluded, suspended, or dismissed from any school program without reasonable accommodation to their special need as spelled out by the IEP. In other words, equal protection is for “students”, not just some students. The major reason is that the child’s disability is a distinction that justifies a different approach.

Discipline - If the school has a discipline code or utilizes a district or state-wide discipline code, a statement as to why a student is or is not expected to meet the regular discipline code or program must be on the IEP. Any modifications to the discipline code followed by the school must also be on the IEP with a plan for reasonable accommodation and interventions that relate to the child’s special needs. If a school has a particular philosophy regarding discipline, the IEP would supersede that philosophy if the student’s special need required an individualized discipline approach. The team must decide, with input from the parent and other professionals, whether the student’s misconduct or interfering behavior is related to the special need, or results from an inappropriate special education program/placement or an IEP was not fully implemented. Reasonable accommodation must occur with additional adaptations to the IEP as necessary to reflect procedures which would meet the student’s needs more effectively.

Having discussed the key points of the statutes, what then is the relationship between special education law and the philosophical and psychological frame of reference of the Quality School and Choice Theory? Where might there be conflicts and, therefore, a need for further discussion, collaboration, and/or clarification?

A Quality School is a place where all students enrolled are treated by all staff in a non-coercive manner. This is the main reason why it is a needs-satisfying school. Additionally, as Glasser states:

“the message from the staff has to be as follows; we run a caring school; teach useful skills and knowledge; give all a chance to improve what we do and therefore, to succeed; talk to all students in a warm and friendly way; teach them and encourage them to work together; demonstrate that we know what we are doing and that we believe it is good both for them and for us and, try as hard as we can to persuade them to begin to do quality work.” (Glasser, 1991)

Our experience in Special Education leads us to also believe that the true measure of a Quality School lies in its ability to work with students who present with challenging behaviors such as: stereotypic behavior (e.g., echolalia, finger or hand flicking, body rocking, perseverate verbal outburst), self injury (e.g., head banging, hair pulling, eye gouging),
destructive/disruptive behavior (e.g., excessive crying, rumination of food, breaking objects, running away and other physically aggressive behavior such as hitting, biting others) which may or may not be associated with certain developmental challenges such as autism.

To some extent, we would therefore challenge the generally accepted notion that all behavior problems with students who are challenging do not occur in Quality Schools. We certainly would agree, from our experience, that behavior difficulties greatly diminish with all levels of students with special needs when using the Quality School model and Choice Theory.

Nevertheless, as we see on a day to day basis, for some students with intensive special needs, their behavior is clearly associated with their disability and as such requires intervention and accommodation as per the IEP.

Glasser believes that serious problem students, of any age, in any school choose unacceptable behaviors as their best attempt to deal with a coercive system that has punished them for years for not being willing to expend effort. (Glasser, 1991) Eventually, he feels that these students place many of these behaviors in their Quality World as highly satisfying, a destructive (and ultimately also self-destructive) picture of being at war with anyone who gets in their way, either other students or staff. (Glasser, 1991) In Glasser’s experience, this may well be true. However, there still remains a large group of students with special needs (who do not have fully functioning central nervous systems, etc.) whose intense problem behaviors are less associated with a coercive system and more associated with neurological factors. For these students, it is a matter of helping them adopt new effective behaviors and decrease disruptive ones. The best way that we know to help them reach their full potential is to “creatively” use Choice Theory in a Quality School. However, even in the “best” of Quality Schools, managing these students will continue to be a challenge as many will continue to use problem behaviors as their best attempt to control their worlds.

As special educators in a Quality School model, we believe that intervening with the challenging behaviors of persons with developmental disabilities is an on-going process that requires methodological practices that are creative, flexible, eclectic and above all offer the student a consistent, structured, disciplined non-coercive approach. This is not only necessary, it is mandated by law. This is the challenge we face in a Quality School and we believe that it is worth pointing out.

Helping to identify appropriate support strategies for students and to evaluate their impact on the IEP and the law is a large part of our job. We must do that with every student that we work with and we must constantly attempt to find a “comfort zone” between our mandate and our commitment to the Quality School. For example, in terms of due process, and reasonable accommodation, we understand that a Quality School is not a permissive school. There are rules in all schools. However, as I read Glasser’s procedures regarding chronic offenders: “students who are not in good order cannot be in school until they are orderly.” (Glasser, 1991), I’m not sure if sending students home for three days at a time until they are willing to make a plan to behave would be entirely possible if the student was on an IEP. Again, modification of the IEP would be necessary, and parents would have to be informed and agree. A closer look at the student’s entire program and an individual behavior/discipline program could also be mandated by the IEP. Anything less could be construed as exclusionary.

For such a student on an IEP in a Quality School, upon reviewing his program, it could even be possible for an individual behavior/discipline plan to be designed on the IEP at the parents’ and advocates’ request as follows:

1. Individual and Group counseling using Reality Therapy.
2. Classroom behavioral management program using applied behavioral analysis. (A point system of “rewards” not Reality Therapy)
3. When further episodes of highly disruptive behavior occur: Time out with Restitution.

Again, all we can do as special educators is agree with some of the plan (#1) and attempt to gently persuade others not to sign off on other interventions (#2 and 4 in particular). We cannot dictate philosophy. The IEP is a legal contract that may include behavioral and medical interventions that are not part of a Quality School design or Choice Theory frame of reference. Special educators trained in Reality Therapy would be more than happy to sit across a table in an IEP dispute hearing and say, “We don’t use behavior modification”, or “If you are going to use medication to control John, then, based on Choice Theory, this is not the right school for him”. Unfortunately, this position is not possible under the law which allows for a variety of individualized interventions.

The primary focus of this article is to describe legal concepts associated with students having special needs in a Quality School. In doing so, I have attempted to give my perspective on how I define a Quality School in terms of equal access for all students. I am hopeful that I have clearly defined the challenges that face us as we attempt to accommodate due process rights into the Quality School framework particularly in regards to discipline.

I also realize that the differing aspects of my perceptions regarding problem behaviors will no doubt elicit strong feelings of ambivalence among many readers. Still, I believe strongly in what Choice Theory teaches us and I remain convinced that it represents the best approach to helping those students who present with on-going difficult behaviors lead more self-determined, independent lives. To this end, it is critically important that reality therapy trained special educators working toward Quality in their schools begin this dialogue which I am hopeful will lead to the development of strategies responsive to all students. This is not an easy task, but this is what Quality Schools do.
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Abstract

William Glasser makes the argument for implementation of reality therapy and choice theory in the schools. These concepts are briefly discussed and a review of the research in this area is presented. A search of PsycLit from 1980 to 1995 found six studies that had been conducted regarding the efficacy of Reality Therapy in the schools. A table summarizing these six studies is presented. The studies are reviewed; shortcomings are discussed; and recommendations for future research are made.


As early as the 1960s, Glasser applied the principles of Reality Therapy in efforts to develop better schools. He also has long been involved in teaching these principles to educators (Glasser, 1965, 1990). The principles of Reality Therapy have been applied in schools to various degrees. While there are many anecdotal reports of success (e.g., Dempster & Raff, 1989; Grimesey, 1990; Renna, 1990), very few outcome studies have investigated the efficacy of Reality Therapy in improving student performance, academically or behaviorally.

A search of PsycLit using the term Reality Therapy, paired with the terms classroom, school, and education, was conducted to find published studies in which the authors explicitly defined their intervention in the schools as Reality Therapy. The search found that six studies of the effects of Reality Therapy applied in the schools have been published since 1980 (see Table 1).

Glasser (1986, 1990) has applied control theory to explain why many children are not succeeding academically. Basically, they do not see school as fulfilling one of the basic needs. Although people are not always conscious of these basic needs, they do things to feel good, which usually meet one or more basic needs. School work does not make children feel good, so they do not do it or they do not do it well. Glasser has suggested that the principles of Reality Therapy and choice theory could be implemented by the schools to place the responsibility for learning on the students. In this way, school work becomes a need satisfying behavior. Two important ways of giving students responsibility is through cooperative learning and class meetings. The class meetings are designed to encourage students to think and to express themselves about issues that are relevant to them. Glasser stresses that teachers and school administrators must be leaders and not bosses, and that they should allow students to experience consequences, not punishment, for their irresponsible behaviors.

The Research 1980-1995

The following review focuses on the participants, the research designs, the intervention procedures, and the outcomes of the six studies published since 1980 that investigate the efficacy of Reality Therapy in a school setting. Table 1 presents a summary of these studies.

Participants in a study by Omizo and Cubberly (1983) were 60 learning disabled (LD) children. These 48 boys and 12 girls (M age = 12.7 years) were evenly divided into control and experimental conditions by random assignment. The experimental condition was split into two groups of 15 (the authors do not specify random assignment). All participants completed the Dimensions of Self-concept (DOSC), Form S (Michael & Smith, 1977, 1978, cited in Omizo & Cubberly, 1983) and the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale (Nowicki & Strickland, 1973, cited in Omizo & Cubberly, 1983) one week before and one week after treatment.

The DOSC is a self-report measure that has 70 questions with five response choices for each question. It consists of five subscales: Level of Aspiration, Anxiety, Academic Interest and Satisfaction, Leadership and Initiative, and Identification versus Alienation. Reliability coefficients of .23 to .84 have been reported for the DOSC subscales. The Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale is also a self-report measure and has 40 items to which respondents mark yes or no. Reliability coefficients of .68 to .81 have been found for this scale.

Two teachers attended a training session conducted by a therapist certified in Reality Therapy to learn about Reality Therapy and how to hold classroom meetings. The teachers were then assigned to teach one of the experimental groups. Their assignment to the experimental groups was randomized. The treatment consisted of 30-45 minute classroom meetings two times a week for eleven weeks. During these meetings, the teachers employed the principles they learned in Reality Therapy training: “personal involvement of the students, present timeliness, emphasis on behavior rather than attitudes, non-evaluative questions, elimination of punishment and avoidance of reinforcing excuses for failure” (p. 204).

The results of a multivariate analysis of variance showed that there were no significant differences between the experimental and control conditions on the pre-treatment scores on the DOSC and the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale. A multivariate analysis of variance and post hoc tests on the post-treatment scores showed that differences between the two groups were significant on the Level of Aspiration, Academic Interest and Satisfaction, and Anxiety subscales of the DOSC, while differences on the other subscales of the DOSC and the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale were not significant; however trends were consistent with predictions, and the authors conclude that under an extended treatment period, significant effects may be found.

The authors of this study make it clear that they were only interested in the effects of the classroom meeting on this population's self-concept and locus of control orientation; they were not studying the effects of following Reality Therapy principles during classroom instruction. However, to the extent that the experimental group teachers used Reality Therapy principles during classroom instruction, the results of this study were confounded. This variable was addressed by Slowik, Omizo, and Hammett (1984).

In 1984, Slowik, Omizo, and Hammett replicated the Omizo and Cub-
berly (1983) study in an effort to study the effects of using Reality Therapy principles in teaching and class meetings on the locus of control orientation and self-concepts of Mexican-American students. The design, treatment, and measures in this study were the same as the Omizo and Cubberly (1983) study. However, it was different in two ways.

Instead of learning disabled students, participants were about 80 seventh and ninth grade Mexican-American students from two schools matched for SES, ethnicity, and academic characteristics. Fifty-six of these students were included in the final analyses. Assignment of the four classrooms to the experimental and control conditions was randomized. Another difference is that the researchers considered results to be due not only to the effects of the classroom meetings, but also to the effects of the use of Reality Therapy during classroom instruction.

A multivariate analysis of variance showed that differences between the conditions on the pre-treatment tests were not significant. A multivariate analysis of variance and post hoc tests showed that post-treatment differences between the experimental and control conditions were significantly different on the Academic Interest and Satisfaction, the Leadership and Initiative, and the Anxiety subscales of the DOSC. While scores on the Level of Aspiration and Identification versus Alienation DOSC subscales and the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale were not significantly different for the two conditions, they were "in the expected direction" (p. 7) and were within the normal range.

Heuchert, Pearl, and Hart-Hester (1986) used Reality Therapy in a pilot study of two third grade students who were engaging in off-task behaviors and negative interactions with teachers and peers. Participant one was a nine-year-old boy and participant two was an eight-year-old girl. The researchers state that the teacher of these two students was "an informal subject" (p. 13). They chose to observe her positive and negative interactions with the two students because the observers felt that the teacher demonstrated behavior that was incongruent with Reality Therapy principles.

The study was conducted during the last six weeks of the school year. The researchers used an observation protocol that they had previously developed to measure the behaviors of the students. They observed each student "to the extent that it was possible...for 60 ten-second intervals each" (p. 13) in the morning during reading and spelling. Observers recorded the following behaviors during the second five seconds of each interval: on task, off task, positive interaction with peer, negative interaction with peer, positive interaction with teacher, negative interaction with teacher. Baseline observations were taken and intervention began on the seventh day of the study for participant one and on the tenth day of the study for participant two. An educational psychologist trained in Reality Therapy met with the students for 30 - 45 minutes during their lunch time each of nineteen days for the intervention.

When they analyzed interrater reliability, the researchers combined positive interactions with peers and teacher with on-task behaviors, and they combined negative interaction with teacher with off-task behaviors. By doing this, they had three categories to analyze: "on-task behavior, off-task behavior, and negative interaction with peers. Mean weighted agreement statistics were .82, .77, and .76, respectively" (p. 16). In analyzing the data, the researchers did not submit it to any statistical procedures to determine significant differences between baseline and intervention. They compared the mean percentage of behaviors during baseline with the mean percentage of behaviors during intervention. For participant one, on-task behavior increased from 19% during baseline to 30% during intervention, off-task behavior decreased from 24% to 20%, and negative interaction with peers decreased from 10% to 8%. For participant two, on-task behavior increased from 27% during baseline to 30% during intervention, off-task behavior decreased from 22% to 17%, and negative interaction with peers increased from 7% to 11%. Analysis of the data for each student using the autoregressive integrated moving average could have been employed to deter-

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comiskey, 1983</td>
<td>Controlled group study</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>Grp 1: RT group counseling</td>
<td>45 min./wk. for 12 wks.</td>
<td>Sig. differences for Grp 2 only: school attitude, self-esteem, attendance, &amp; achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edens &amp; Smyrl, 1984</td>
<td>Uncontrolled group study</td>
<td>16 M, 26 F</td>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>Grp 2: RT group counseling for behavior problems; RT class meeting once a week</td>
<td>As needed over 4 wks; 4 weeks</td>
<td>Disruptive behaviors declined from 31 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart-Hester, Heuchert, &amp; Whittier, 1989</td>
<td>Uncontrolled group study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>30-45 minute daily meeting with Reality Therapist</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Increase in % on task behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuchert, Pearl, &amp; Hart-Hester, 1986</td>
<td>Multiple baseline over subjects</td>
<td>1 M 9 yrs., 1 F 8 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 minute daily meeting with Reality Therapist</td>
<td>19 sessions over 4-5 wks.</td>
<td>Increase in % on task behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omizo &amp; Cubberly, 1983</td>
<td>Controlled group study</td>
<td>48 M, 12 F</td>
<td>Learning Disabled mean age 12.7 yrs.</td>
<td>Grp 1: 30-45 min class meetings twice a week</td>
<td>11 weeks</td>
<td>Improvement for Grp 1 in anxiety, aspiration, &amp; academic interest &amp; satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slowik, Omizo, &amp; Hammett, 1984</td>
<td>Controlled group study</td>
<td>55 jr. high students Mexican-American</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grp 1: 30-45 min class meetings twice a week</td>
<td>11 weeks</td>
<td>Improvement for Grp 1 in anxiety, academic interest &amp; satisfaction, &amp; leadership &amp; initiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mine if differences in behaviors from baseline to intervention were significant.

Heuchert, Heuchert, and Whittier (1989) implemented a study to determine how Reality Therapy would affect on-task behavior in teacher-directed and independent seatwork. The participants were four fourth grade students (age 9-11) who, according to the teacher, principal, and two observers, exhibited problem behaviors. The observation protocol used by Heuchert, Pearl, and Hart-Hester in their 1986 pilot study was also used in this study. The authors report a mean interrater reliability of 79% for this observational measure.

The four participants met with a reality therapist during the middle of the day for 30-45 minutes. During these meetings the students were given Reality Therapy lessons about choosing behaviors. The therapist engaged them in identifying goals, planning how to meet goals, evaluating progress toward goals, and modifying plans if necessary. The students were given the opportunity to make their own plans for reaching their goals. These plans were written as contracts and signed by the students and the therapist. The plans were revised when students had trouble meeting the requirements, but excuses were not accepted by the therapist who, in a noncritical manner, emphasized the students' abilities to choose behaviors.

Observations were made by two education doctoral students who had been instructed in the observation procedure. Sampling of behavior was done in 10 second intervals. Behaviors were recorded based on observations during the first five seconds of each interval. The authors state that "five minute samples were recorded for each subject on a daily basis" (p. 16). However, they do not report the beginning date of the observations, how many days the observations were made, or the length of the study. They also do not report how long intervention lasted. The authors do not report how data were analyzed. They say that "the data indicate a pronounced increase in the percentage of time on-task for each student" (p. 16).

Although this study lacks scientific rigor, the authors do make some important points in their discussion. They discuss the difference between being on-task and actually understanding tasks. That is, just because a student is on task does not guarantee that he or she is learning, understanding, or completing the task as instructed. The authors also point out that the teacher has a large role in the ultimate success of Reality Therapy as in any other therapeutic approach applied to the classroom setting. This issue certainly needs to be further addressed in future implementation of Reality Therapy techniques with students.

The purpose of the study by Comiskey (1993) was to examine the effects of Reality Therapy group meetings on at-risk high school freshmen's "self-esteem, locus of control orientation, academic achievement, school attitude, attendance and classroom behavior" (p. 59). The participants were 45 ninth grade students from two high schools who were identified as at-risk (likely to drop out of school or fail) because of poor attendance, grades, and behavior. Participation was voluntary.

The students were assigned to one of three groups so that there were 15 students in each group. Group 1 received Reality Therapy group counseling only. Students in this condition were given lessons in control theory and the basics of Reality Therapy. Group 2 received Reality Therapy group counseling and school-based intervention. The school-based intervention involved placing this group in many of the same classes and having them work with select teachers, counselors, and principals. Group 3 was a control group. These students took part in a career development program.

Each group had a 45 minute meeting each of the twelve weeks of intervention. They also met once before the intervention and once after the intervention for the pre- and post-intervention measurements. In addition to grades and attendance, these measures included the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale for Children, the Psychological Sense of School Membership Scale, and the Conners Teacher Rating Scale.

Eleven students in each group completed the study. Data were analyzed using analysis of covariance and t-test. Data were analyzed for any confounding effects of Age, IQ, and socioeconomic status. Although statistical results are not reported, the author does report that there were no significant differences among the groups in age, IQ, and socioeconomic status. The author claims that "the results of the data analysis revealed significant differences in the areas of achievement, school self-esteem, school attitude, and attendance in favor of the school-within-a-school group that participated in the RT training [Group 2]" (p. 61). It is unclear what is being compared here, pretest and posttest scores or groups?

Edens and Smryl (1994) investigated the efficacy of Reality Therapy for decreasing misbehaviors in a seventh grade physical education class (26 females, 16 males). In this four week pilot study, the sports skills taught and rules about dressing out were based on student preferences as indicated by a questionnaire completed at the beginning of the study. Students also shared the responsibilities of taking roll and choosing teams.

The class met to learn about control theory at least once a week as part of the regular instructional program. The teacher utilized Glasser's car analogy and worksheets about making choices in order to present the information and to promote discussion about behavior choices. The teacher used Reality Therapy in counseling students as problems arose.

The authors designed the Disruptive Classroom Behavior Assessment to record disruptive behaviors. They do not report who recorded the disruptive behaviors, when they were recorded, or what method of sampling was used. They report that 31 disruptive behaviors were recorded during Week 1 of the study; 11 were recorded for Week 2; 8 were recorded for Week 3; and 7 were recorded for Week 4. The authors conclude that this decrease in disruptive behaviors is the result of the application of control theory and Reality Therapy. They also claim that as a result of their intervention, the students were able to "learn more [and] have more fun" (p. 44). However, they provide no basis for this assertion as there is no evidence of any measures of learning or fun in the study.

**DISCUSSION**

These researchers all conclude to one degree or another that Reality Therapy was effective. However, these studies lack experimental control in
many areas. These include issues of voluntary participation and consent, measures used, sample size, length of intervention, lack of controls, and training of teachers using Reality Therapy.

Omizo and Cubberly (1983); Slowik, Omizo, and Hammett (1984); Heuchert, Pearl, and Hart-Hester (1986); Hart-Hester, Heuchert, and Whittier (1989); and Edens and Smryl (1994) do not address the issue of voluntary participation. Therefore, there is no way to determine if the participants had an opportunity to give their informed assent. Parents or legal guardians are not mentioned. Heuchert, Pearl, and Hart-Hester even observed the teacher informally, but they do not state that she was aware that she, too, was being observed. If this deceit was practiced, was she debriefed? The authors do not mention it. Comiskey (1993) is the only of the researchers to report getting voluntary participants, but she does not mention informed consent. Making participation voluntary and getting informed consent should be made more evident in future studies.

Omizo and Cubberly (1983) and Slowik, Omizo, and Hammett (1984) do not describe what, if any, kind of attention was given to the control group during intervention. Heuchert, Pearl, and Hart-Hester (1986); Hart-Hester, Heuchert, and Whittier (1989); and Edens and Smryl (1994) did not include control groups. Therefore, it is possible that the results of these studies were due to the effects of the attention itself that the experimental groups received. Any type of attention, not necessarily only the Reality Therapy, may have caused the changes. In this respect, Comiskey’s (1993) study, in which there was a control group who received the same amount of attention as the experimental groups, is superior to the other five studies in design.

Omizo and Cubberly (1983) and Slowik, Omizo, and Hammett (1984) use only self-report measures, the results of which are often affected by the extent to which respondents attempt to present themselves as socially desirable and the extent to which demand characteristics are in effect. The authors do not state that these self-reports were completed anonymously. Heuchert, Pearl, and Hart-Hester (1986); Hart-Hester, Heuchert, and Whittier (1989); and Edens and Smryl (1994) use more objective behavioral reports. However, these were not standardized measures, so their reliability and validity are not established. Also, Edens and Smryl are not clear who recorded the behaviors in their study. If it were the teacher, who is also one of the researchers, his recordings would have been susceptible to bias. In addition, it is unclear how well he could monitor and record all disruptive behavior while the class was split between the dressing room and the playing field. Comiskey (1993) uses both self-report assessments and objective rating scales as well as grades and attendance as measures in her study. Here again, her design is clearly superior to that of the others.

Benshoff, Poivevant, and Cashwell (1994) point out that “effective implementation of... [Reality Therapy] requires the collaborative efforts of students, teacher, and counselors in regulating student behavior” (p. 165). The studies reviewed in this paper have varying degrees of this collaboration. Teachers in the studies by Omizo and Cubberly (1983) and Slowik, Omizo, and Hammett (1984) had eight hours of training by a Reality Therapist. In the studies by Heuchert, Pearl, and Hart-Hester (1986) and Hart-Hester, Heuchert, and Whittier (1989) the teachers had no training; the intervention was conducted by a Reality Therapist. Comiskey (1993) does not specify who the interveners were or their credentials. Edens and Smryl (1994) do not specify how much, if any, training in Reality Therapy the teacher had.

Only Omizo and Cubberly (1983) attempted to determine if the intervention, as defined by them in their study, was implemented correctly. However, they did not have an independent observer evaluate the teachers, but used the same Reality Therapist who trained them, so his evaluation may not have been completely unbiased. Unbiased evaluation of the techniques of intervention is essential before making conclusions that the intervention, as defined by the investigators, was effective.

According to Glasser (1965), the first critical phase of Reality Therapy, involvement usually takes at least two to three weeks to establish. Researchers that reported the length of intervention, stated that it lasted from four weeks (Edens and Smryl, 1994) to 12 weeks (Comiskey, 1993). Hart-Hester, Heuchert, and Whittier (1989) do not even report the length of the intervention in their study. The short duration of intervention in these studies suggests that the results represent only trends in behavior for the first phase of the intervention. They may not be sustained over time.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Reality Therapy may be working to improve some schools, but because of the paucity of sound research, there is little to substantiate its efficacy. Very little can be concluded on the basis of the existing studies. There seems to be some support that Reality Therapy improves behavior and possibly interest in school, but not much support that it improves self-efficacy or self-concept. These conclusions are restricted only to the populations studied because the small samples of the studies limit the generalizability of the results. Based on the limited support of the studies reviewed here, the application of Reality Therapy in the schools merits further investigation to more carefully evaluate its effectiveness.

More sophisticated research designs are necessary to produce empirical evidence of the value of implementing Reality Therapy in the schools. These designs should include clearly defined experimental and control conditions. Experimental conditions should include interventions other than Reality Therapy so that comparisons can be made. All teachers and counselors who intervene should have intensive training in the principles of the condition in which they work. Several reliable and valid dependent measures should be used. These measures could include grades and attendance, self-reports, and objective behavior checklists with all behaviors operationally defined. All persons who administer assessments or act as observers should be professionally trained and qualified for their specific tasks. Some way of assessing how well the principles of the experimental interventions are followed should be created and used. Finally, future research should be longitudinal lasting at least a full school year and there should be many participants at all grade levels who volunteer with informed consent and who are randomly assigned to each condition.
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ABSTRACT

Members of a graduate class in educational research conducted, as a class project, a formal survey investigating the effectiveness of CT/RT Quality school programming in a rural K-4 elementary school. Findings concluded that there was improvement (or a positive effect) in most areas studied. The specific areas of interest were attendance, academic achievement, self (in school)-concept, and student-student-teacher interrelationships.

INTRODUCTION

A historical-based study was conducted to determine the effects of staff CT/RT training on four parameters of school environment and student characteristics. The primary objective of this study was to gain some perspective on, or determine the effectiveness of the initiative currently in progress establishing a K-4 elementary school as a “Quality School” according to the teachings of William Glasser’s Choice Theory/Reality Therapy. Members of a graduate class in education research looked at four indicators that were expected to reflect the principles of the Quality School program. The four parameters specifically measured by this study were (1) attendance (student and staff), (2) academic performance, (3) student self-concept, and (4) interschool-student/staff relationships.

These four parameters were selected in collaboration with the assistant principal who provided oversight for the project and facilitated the on-site efforts of the students. The decision to examine these four specific measures rested in the fact that they seemed to represent areas which were of most interest to the school as an organization and were ones in which, it would seem, the most readily measured gain from the CT/RT training could be expected. Additionally, these parameters were amenable to fairly simple research formats which, while fully exercising principles taught in the course, were also reasonably expected to fall within the capabilities of the students who carried out the four studies.

In brief, there were findings that supported some of the operational hypotheses in that there was a significant probability that improvements discovered were the result of the CT/RT initiative. There were also findings that failed to support some hypotheses. In the area of attendance, there was some improvement between the years 1993 and 1994, and between 1993 and 1995; however there was no significant improvement between 1994 and
1995. It would also appear that, overall, attendance was not or is not a serious problem at the school at any time during the period 1993 through 1995.

In-so-far as academic performance, the initial finding was that there was no significant difference that could be attributed to the CT/RT initiative in either reading or math. In fact, there was a serious decrement in both measures in the first year following CT/RT initiatives. Upon investigation (primarily through dialogue with the assistant principal), it was discovered that, at the same time CT/RT was being initiated at this particular school, the state had made significant changes in the standards and requirements for its Educational Achievement Plan (EAP) tests which provided the data base for this particular study. Since that original decrement in 1991, however, there has been significant improvement in the EAP scores in each succeeding year which most likely can be attributed to CT/RT implementation even though there are other extraneous variables which may prohibit an absolute declaration of this.

The study that focused on self-concept utilized an attitudinal survey designed by a member of the staff in 1992 and administered to the total student population at that time. These data formed the base line to which the present study was compared. In October 1995, the same survey was administered to the entire third grade class. Findings showed a moderate, yet significant, improvement in the overall feelings about school that these students proclaimed for themselves when compared to the third graders of 1992.

In the relationship study, students of CT/RT “trained” teachers were compared with the students of those teachers who were not yet trained in CT/RT. Additionally, an “attitude toward CT/RT” survey was administered to all teachers. Findings in this study showed that those students who were working with the trained teachers scored slightly better and reported feeling better about the school environment than did other students.

THE FOUR STUDIES

THE ATTENDANCE STUDY

This study looked at the attendance of both the students and the teachers in 24 homeroom classes, grades K - 4. Only teachers employed continuously since 1993 were included so as to control for equivalency of conditions year to year. Student data were taken from total overall classroom attendance rates as opposed to individual student records. Data were gathered for the month of October for the years 1993, 1994, and 1995. October was selected because there were no holidays or student days off in any of the years studied. All absences were included in the data regardless of the reason for the absence. All school-related activities were included, assuming the student was present. Once the data were assembled, student absence severity rates were compared between classrooms of CT/RT-trained teachers and those who are not yet CT/RT-trained. Severity rates were calculated as follows:

Total number of absences per room for the month divided by the number of days (21) times the number of students in the classroom.

THE ACADEMICS STUDY

This study compared the outcomes of the EAP scores for the years 1989 through 1994. The EAP (Educational Assessment Program) looks only at 4th graders at the elementary level. Table 1 shows the 4th grade scores for the two years just prior to initiating CT/RT training at the school.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the scores for succeeding 4th grade populations for the 4 years following the initiation of CT/RT training.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of days in all cases was calculated at 21 days.

This yielded a statistic expressed as a percentage of total student-days that were missed out of the total student-days that would be completed were there no absences.

Ranges of Severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Absences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2.14 to 7.98% absences out of total student-days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1.19 to 4.76% absences out of total student-days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1.61 to 9.96% absences out of total student-days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the data presented and as verified by a chi-square test of statistical significance, there was slight improvement between 1993 and 1994, and a slight decrement between 1994 and 1995. Overall, however, it doesn’t appear that there is a severe attendance problem among students at this elementary school for the times measured. In the case of teacher attendance, the severity rates of 14 CT/RT trained teachers were compared to 7 untrained teachers.

Absences for October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trained</th>
<th>Untrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences among the absentee rates for either trained or untrained teachers. Again, a chi-square test of significance was performed to verify expected and observed frequencies and proportions.
First glance suggests that there was a serious decrement in scores that occurred in conjunction with the inauguration of CT/RT, however such may not be the case at all. While the scores are significantly different between the periods prior to and subsequent to CT/RT training, it was at the same time that the state department of education set new standards based on entirely new assessments which resulted in similar outcomes across the state. Worthy of note is the consistent and dramatic improvement each year in both parameters measured subsequent to the initiation of CT/RT. Differences were verified by ANOVA at the .05 level of significance which supported the operational hypothesis that there would be a positive effect.

Discussion

The objective of this study was to examine the effect of teacher training in CT/RT on academic performance of fourth-graders at the school. While there is the confounding effect of the change in EAP standards, and there may have been other extraneous variables effecting observed changes which cannot be ruled out, the continuing improvement through the years 1991-1994 support the predicted hypothesis that, in fact, CT/RT has made a difference. It should be noted that, as an additional limitation of the validity of this study, no other areas of academic performance were evaluated. Only math and reading scores were reviewed, which leaves a broad spectrum of other subjects and the balance of the curriculum unexamined. Also worthy of note (and it may be a significant variable), there are more teachers trained now than were trained in 1991 and as this training continues, it would be reasonable to expect continued improvement and eventual leveling off of EAP scores at some time subsequent to attaining 100% CT/RT trained staff. Finally, it must also be recognized that the essence of the CT/RT-Quality School initiative does not address itself to raising scores specifically, but rather to provide the needs satisfying environment in which children are taught, among other things, to evaluate their own work and continually strive for improvement.

THE SELF-CONCEPT (ESTEEM) STUDY

This study focused on the effects of teacher CT/RT training on issues of student self-concept. Fortunately, for the purpose of this study, base-line data had been established for the entire elementary population through a survey developed by a member of the school staff, which was administered in December of 1992. This particular instrument consisted of eight items intended to assess how the students felt about school: coming to school; being in school; and about their teachers and school friends. Each item allowed for one of three typical “feeling” responses; a “happy face,” a “calm (neutral) face,” or a “sad face.” Students responded to the items by circling the face that most typified their feelings about the subject of a given item. The eight items are listed in Figure 1.

Figure 1: The Elementary Self-Concept Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This is how I usually feel before I come to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This is how I usually feel about coming to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>This is how I usually feel my teacher thinks about me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This is how I feel about making friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This is how I feel about helping others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This is how I feel about myself most of the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is how I usually feel about talking to my teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This is how I usually feel about the work I do in school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the present study, the third graders were arbitrarily selected for the survey. This was primarily for two reasons. First, the third grade class, for the most part, were included in the original survey as Kindergartners. Second, by surveying only one grade level, minimal disruption was imposed on the school environment as a whole. In hindsight, however, it may have been far more meaningful, and thus worth the time and disruption, to have examined all five grade levels in order to get a better snapshot of the effectiveness of programming, CT/RT or otherwise, at the school. The reason being because of all the other extraneous factors such as maturation, history, and general overall development that may have impacted the surveyed third graders subsequent to their time in kindergarten.

Results of the 1995 survey (Table 3) reveal a significant, however modest, improvement in the overall “happy face” scores of the third graders (4 percent) and a decrease in the number of “sad face” scores 9 (3 percent) over the 1992 data. Several items warrant special note in this survey. In item 2, students were asked to express their feeling about coming to school. In 1992, 110 to 150 students circled the “happy face.” In 1995, 82 out of 133 expressed similar feelings; an 8 percent decrease in “happy...” responses. In item 5, having to do with students’ feelings about helping others, 120 out of 150 expressed “happy face” feelings in 1992 while in 1995, 117 out of 133 expressed similar feelings; an 8 percent increase in “happy...” responses. In the present survey, item 8 reflected the greatest number of “sad face” responses (18/133) and the fewest number of “happy face” responses (77/133). These numbers represent 13.5 percent and 57.8 percent respectively. The other 28.7 percent fell in the “neutral” category. Note that in these three scenarios, as well as items 3 and 4, the majority of the movement was to or from the “calm” (neutral) category rather than from “happy” to “sad” or vice versa.

Discussion

Without considering other possible extraneous or confounding variables, these data would tend to support the hypothesis that CT/RT implementation coincides with overall improved feelings about school, the school environment, and the quality of life of third graders in general. Even so, it must be kept in mind that the school is a dynamic environment. There is constant change; change in both student and teacher population, change from grade level to grade level, and the general developmental changes that accompany childhood growth particularly during this time frame. All change, favorable or unfavorable, cannot be ascribed solely to the implementation of CT/RT. Caution is suggested before ascribing changes in the survey data from 1992 to that of 1995 entirely to the implementation of CT/RT.
Table 3. Results of the 1995/1992 Self-Concept Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Happy&quot;</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Calm&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sad&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1992 | 150 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| "Happy" | 94 | 110 | 108 | 112 | 120 | 83 | 104 | 80 | 68 |
| "Calm" | 40 | 25 | 36 | 30 | 24 | 47 | 38 | 50 | 24 |
| "Sad" | 16 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 20 | 8 | 20 | 8 |

THE RELATIONSHIPS STUDY

Glasser's teachings show that if a student feels no sense of belonging in school, no sense of being involved in caring or concern, then that child will pay little attention to academic subjects. Instead, he or she will engage in a desperate search for friendship and acceptance (1992). It may have been with this thinking that Glasser founded the premise of quality schools. The premise of Choice Theory-Reality Therapy is that humans behave in ways to satisfy their basic, personal needs of survival, belonging, freedom, power, and fun. According to CT/RT, people do not simply respond to what goes on around them, they make conscious choices by which to meet their own needs. When, for example, power is taken away, self-esteem goes with it; a self-perpetuating cycle. One way in which power is taken away is through administering punishment to students which serves to demonstrate, more than anything, that they have no power or control. In this way, students are made to feel unimportant and, according to Glasser, students will do little work in an environment wherein they feel little or no power.

In CT/RT-Quality Schools, teachers take on the role of “lead managers” rather than “boss managers.” Lead managers involve students in decision making, goal setting, and, to some extent, the development of the curriculum itself. Students make suggestions regarding the direction of their work and group decisions are made by the class. This is the essence of guided learning and the real work of the “lead manager teacher (Glasser, 1992).” Good relationships are essential between students and teachers as well as good relationships among the students themselves.

This study attempted to examine any changes in the nature and quality of the relationships between students and teachers and between students and other students. The study surveyed all second and fourth grade students at the school. At the time of the survey, approximately 75 percent of the teachers had received some training in the CT/RT approach. Again, like the self-esteem study, a “Smiley-face” survey built on a semantic-type scale was used for the instrument of measure for the students. Likewise, all teachers were asked to complete a similar semantic-type survey which attempted to assess their feelings, and attitudes about student-teacher relationships and the effectiveness of CT/RT. Finally, ten teachers were chosen for an informal interview covering the material included in the survey. The student and teacher surveys and the teacher interview questions are included as Appendices A, B, and C.

Since not all teachers have been trained in CT/RT, and those who have are at various levels of completion of the training, student surveys were sorted and evaluated on the basis of the level of training (or no training) of their respective teachers according to the following categories.

Teacher Levels of CT/RT Training

1. Level A - Basic training (4-5 day seminar).
2. Level B - Practicums I & II (2 days each).
3. Level C - Advanced training (4-5 day seminar).
4. Level D - Advanced Practicums I, II, & III (2 days each).
5. Level E - Certification in CT/RT (Reality Therapy Certified).

Levels C and E were not used due to the lack of teachers falling precisely within those two categories.

Results of the student surveys are shown in tables 4-7, with table 4 being a global or all training versus no training report. In all tables, 4-8, the numbers in parentheses indicate the expected frequencies in a chi-square test of significance for proportions. Differences were significant at the .05 level.

Table 4. Trained versus not trained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>48 (45.7)</td>
<td>164 (195.55)</td>
<td>845 (815.7)</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>31 (33.3)</td>
<td>174 (142.45)</td>
<td>565 (594.3)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Level A Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>28 (18.94)</td>
<td>92 (85.38)</td>
<td>244 (259.7)</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>31 (40.1)</td>
<td>174 (180.6)</td>
<td>565 (549.3)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Level B Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>14 (11.6)</td>
<td>41 (55.2)</td>
<td>211 (199.2)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>31 (33.5)</td>
<td>174 (159.8)</td>
<td>565 (576.7)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Level D Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>6 (10.7)</td>
<td>23 (57.19)</td>
<td>286 (247.1)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>31 (26.3)</td>
<td>174 (139.8)</td>
<td>565 (603.9)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher's Survey

The teachers were divided into two categories — trained and untrained — and were surveyed using the instrument found in appendix B. For purposes of reporting and calculating overall attitudes towards CT/RT, all responses were recoded to reflect a positive to negative progression for each statement from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree.” Results are reported here in terms of total number of responses in each category for trained and untrained teachers. Data for each individual response might be more informative, however it is unavailable. Table 8 shows the results of the teacher survey.

Table 8. Teacher Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>70 (77.6)</td>
<td>116 (105.5)</td>
<td>13 (15.9)</td>
<td>17 (15.9)</td>
<td>3 (4.0)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>66 (58.4)</td>
<td>69 (79.9)</td>
<td>15 (12.0)</td>
<td>11 (12.0)</td>
<td>4 (3.0)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the surveys, ten teachers were randomly selected for interview in regard to their feelings about CT/RT. All of the teachers interviewed indicated that they were familiar with CT/RT and most of them had been exposed to at least the basic training. Among the advantages commonly expressed regarding CT/RT were an overall improvement in student attitude, increased problem solving skills, and increased personal responsibility as demonstrated by the children. The chief complaint expressed by the teachers was a lack of time for individual attention to the students and the fact that disciplinary actions taken on behalf of (problem) students no longer seemed proportional to a given offense. Teachers confessed a tendency to regress to coercive tactics when frustrated or under time constraints. One teacher expressed concern that CT/RT did not adequately address situations outside the classroom.

Teachers who were interviewed felt that relationships with fellow staff members remained basically unchanged since the implementation of CT/RT. They did acknowledge the advantage associated with goal setting and using a “common” (CT/RT) language. On the other hand, there was a level of discomfort with a seeming lack of boundaries. Teachers acknowledged improved relationships between themselves and students and, as one teacher expressed it, “Teachers know students better. They no longer put a ‘Band-Aid’ on a problem like before.” The teachers felt the students were more willing to ask for assistance than before and were more willing to believe that the teachers really cared about them.

Discussion

The majority of the data supports the research proposal which states that relationships improve with CT/RT. In fact, it is well noted that there has been a significant increase in the level of communication and trust among the staff members and students alike. Also supported was the hypothesis that there was a difference between students with untrained teachers and students with trained teachers. One interesting outcome is that there seems to be a small detrimental effect in relationships when the teacher has only been exposed to Level A training. This is most likely due to the yet undeveloped level of comfort associated with early efforts to apply new paradigms to old, familiar situations and environments.
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Appendix A

Student Survey

Students were asked to circle the face that most nearly reflected their feelings about each statement.

1. I like my classmates.  (sad) (calm) (happy)
2. I like my school.
3. I am happy at school.
4. I feel safe at school.
5. I have fun at school.
6. I would talk to my teacher if I had a problem.
7. I feel like I am a part of the class.
Appendix B
Teacher Survey

Teachers were asked to respond by circling the response most closely reflecting their feelings about the item with the following choices:
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

1. I feel that I am able to effectively communicate with my students.
2. I feel that my opinion is not valued by my co-workers.
3. My students would feel comfortable talking to me if they had a problem.
4. I have problems with other teachers.
5. I feel that things are going well in the classroom.
6. I work in an unfriendly environment.
7. The administration supports me.
8. I feel uncomfortable with my peers.
9. I have a thorough understanding of CT/RT.
10. Other teachers support me.
11. I feel uncomfortable in confronting other teachers with whom I disagree.
12. I feel that I have successfully implemented CT/RT methods.

Appendix C
Teacher Interview Questions

1. What do you feel your level of skill is in using CT/RT (confidence level, success rate)?
2. How often do you find yourself reverting back to coercive tactics (old ways of doing things)?
3. How do you feel about the structure of the program now as opposed to that of three or more years ago (advantages/disadvantages)?
4. How do you feel CT/RT has impacted your students' behaviors, happiness, fun, and self-esteem?
5. How do you feel that relationships have been affected since the implementation of CT/RT (teacher-teacher, student-teacher, teacher-support staff, student-support staff)?

FROM BOSS MANAGER TO LEAD MANAGER:
A PERSONAL JOURNEY

Kaye Pepper

Since writing this article, the author has returned to college full-time to complete her doctorate. She lives in Starkville, Mississippi.

ABSTRACT

Making a change is never easy. The move from boss manager to lead manager means having the willingness to take risks, the courage to admit mistakes and learn from them, and being open-minded enough to look at things in a different way. This is a hard lesson to learn. Through my journey to becoming a lead manager, I realized the problems that teachers face; the effects these problems can have on a teacher, her students, and colleagues; and what is involved in making a change in the system that often creates the problem. I found Glasser’s lead management approach to be the best way to establish the kind of school that I wanted to lead. Change takes time and patience, but with perseverance, improvements can be made.

Change is very hard for most people to accept, especially the type of change that means a shift in the way a person thinks or believes. Change is a process and, in my case, a developmental stage that I am moving through to become a better leader. It has been a very difficult experience to realize that the problems in the school where I am principal are not all caused by the actions and attitudes of the teachers and other staff members, but that I and the educational system itself are large parts of the problem.

I have often heard that it takes three years working in a job before you really know what you are doing. I agree with this in some ways but I have found this period of my career to be very frustrating as well. This is my fourth year as principal of an elementary school in an urban district. I accepted the job with no experience as a principal in a school. After three years on the job, I feel competent in the day-to-day running of the school. I can develop schedules and solve routine problems with the best of them. My concerns and frustrations are coming from a much deeper aspect of the leadership role. I am not pleased with the school climate and culture. More specifically, I am concerned about the attitudes and underlying feelings of the staff and students. On the surface, everyone seems congenial, but there are problems lurking in the shadows that need to be addressed now. If we can begin improving these problems, perhaps the concerns with instruction, student achievement, discipline, and morale will improve as well. This article is about my personal journey through change, realizations I have come to, and a possible solution to the problems I see in our school.

BACKGROUND

For the past three years, I have been concerned about student achievement, discipline, and an undercurrent of discontent among the staff at the school. I was certain that the teachers and staff members were the root of the problem. If I could “fix” them, I felt sure the school would improve. First, I tried to determine why the teachers were so hardheaded. Why they refused to change their instructional strategies when they had been given
every opportunity through staff development and training. I felt that a change in instructional techniques would facilitate improvement in student achievement and student behavior. These changes, I felt sure, would improve the climate in the school. I tried every approach I could think of to assist the teachers in making this change. I coaxed, trained, modeled, allowed teachers to observe in other classrooms, encouraged teachers to collaborate with each other, offered advice and guidance, and even threatened; all without success. I determined that a portion of the teachers in the school were just incompetent, lazy, uncaring, unmotivated, and did not have the ability to change.

Out of frustration, I began searching for ways to help these incompetent teachers improve. A search of the literature led to some unexpected findings which changed the focus of my concerns. This change of focus and much soul searching has led me to the conclusion that my frustrations are not stemming from incompetent teachers, but from the educational system itself, my lack of knowledge about the change process, and a need to improve my leadership skills.

In the literature, I found that I was not alone in feeling teachers were the cause of the problems in the schools. On a much wider scale, teachers have been unjustly blamed by many for the state of education today. Much of the criticism of teachers started with the call for educational reform in the 1980s. The teachers were often blamed for the problems in education because they worked directly with these students who made low scores on the standardized tests. But as Ravitch (1985) points out, teachers certainly could not have single-handedly caused the state that education is in today. Surely, others have played a major role. Consider state legislatures, the press, the federal government, state education departments, and teacher education programs in universities as entities who have made changes in education that have not always been positive. Teachers should be considered the victims for having to deal with the consequences of these imposed changes brought on by so many different groups, rather than the cause of the problems.

It seems that when something goes wrong in our society today, people find a way to pin the blame on our educational system. A prime example of this statement is shown in the words of House Speaker Newt Gingrich (Speaker Ties Welfare State to Slayings, 1995) as he addressed a meeting of Republican governors. He stated that horrifying crimes are a byproduct of “...an educational system which allows kids to not learn and which rewards tenured teachers who can’t teach, while destroying poor children who it traps” (p.A3). I guess that education and teachers are easy targets for criticism. What we don’t seem to realize is the effect that these negative statements and accusations have on the very people and institutions that mold our future.

PROBLEMS TEACHERS FACE

Teachers are an integral part of the education system, yet the prestige of being a teacher is no longer what it used to be. Difficult working conditions make the need to survive a major focus for many teachers. It is very difficult for them to make changes in their current practice when they are overwhelmed by the day-to-day aspects of their job. Much more consideration must be given to their well-being and their work situation. Hargreaves (1994) describes three domains of teaching that are major problem areas for teachers. These problem areas encompass the work that teachers do, the time they have to accomplish the amount of work involved, and the culture of the school in which they work.

When looking at the work that teachers do, Hargreaves reminds us of the image that most people have of teachers. A teacher’s work comprises the day-to-day interactions with the students in the classrooms and the preparation needed to organize them. These interactions include giving directions and advice, presenting materials, evaluating student work, maintaining discipline, and assisting students in various other ways. We must also remember parent nights, staff meetings, professional development, and work taken home to complete aspects of a teacher's job. There are many other aspects of work that have been added to a teacher’s job description in the last few years that people do not consider. These tasks include working collegially and cooperatively with their peers, mentoring fellow teachers and first-year teachers, committee work of all kinds, more contact with parents in person and by phone, increased documentation for fear of litigation, and involvement in decision making. The tasks which comprise a teaching job are certainly overwhelming. It seems that more and more responsibilities continue to be added to the job description, but none are erased. This leads to the next problem area in the teaching profession, which Hargreaves specifies as time.

The lack of adequate time to complete the responsibilities that a teacher faces causes much frustration and stress. Elementary school teachers in our school are usually with their students at all times during the day. They may have a break if the students are scheduled for a class such as music, art, or library. There is also some time before and after school for planning, managerial tasks, and preparation when there are no staff meetings or parent conferences. Hargreaves states that this “scarcity of time makes it difficult to plan thoroughly, to commit oneself to the effort of innovation, to get together with colleagues, or to sit back and reflect on one’s purpose and progress” (p. 15). Many would consider these activities unimportant or unnecessary aspects of teaching but they are vital to the continued growth and development of any professional.

The third domain described by Hargreaves is that of culture. Culture is the overall feeling of the school: the beliefs, values, and habits. It is the closeness of the staff, students, and parents. Culture is the way things are traditionally done. Often, teachers are isolated and work individually to accomplish their personal goals for their students. A professional culture of teaching promotes collaboration among teachers in which they work together for a common goal to improve the environment of the school, achievement of the students, and relationships with parents. A problem may arise when administrators attempt to force collaboration. This may further alienate teachers who are not used to sharing or having a peer look objectively at their teaching. It can also affect groups who work together such as grade level teams, but who fail to work across the grade levels or subject areas. The atmosphere in which people work can certainly effect the
quality of the job they do.

There are other aspects of the teaching profession that cause major dilemmas for teachers in addition to the work, time constraints, and culture. Edgerton (1988) cites role conflict as a source of teachers' problems. The conflicting roles of executive and intellectual guide can often cause exhaustion, anger, and discouragement. As an executive, the teacher enforces rules, maintains authority, and evaluates academic performance. As an intellectual guide, the teacher provides intellectual leadership and instruction, which often leads to involvement in students' interests, activities, and personal problems. These contradictions of roles cause tension and uncertainty for the students and teacher because the teacher is constantly switching from one role to the other during the day. This behavior sends mixed messages which confuse the role of the teacher. Byrne (1994) cites role ambiguity as another concern that teachers face. Often teachers do not have a clear understanding of their rights, their obligations, status or guidelines for accountability. Problems that may arise include unclear and inconsistent policies regarding student discipline, government mandates to change existing curriculum and pedagogical approaches, and the perception of being held in low esteem by others. McLaughlin, Pfeifer, Swanson-Owens, and Yee (1986) state that teachers feel their omission in the decision-making process effects their success as a teacher. They usually do not have input into the size of their classes, types and amounts of materials purchased, or structuring of the school organization to avoid isolation and other problems.

STRESS AND BURNOUT

Teachers face overwhelming odds when attempting to successfully teach their students. There are many concerns and problems that effect the outcome of their work. There is no wonder that the problems of teacher stress and burnout are very real. Byrne (1994) cites four major areas that are causes of stress for today's teachers. Classroom climate is a major problem. Students who come to school with poor skills; who are disruptive, antagonistic, and rude cause a great deal of strife for teachers. In a study of 3,300 K-12 public school teachers, Feitler and Tokar (1988) found that the main cause of stress for most teachers is the one or two students in the classroom who constantly disrupt.

The second major area of stress cited by Byrne (1994) is the lack of involvement in decisions that effect the quality of their work life. Teacher assistance in making decisions and planning for the school program can maintain a positive work climate and overall job satisfaction. It can also minimize role conflict and ambiguity. A third cause of stress in Byrne's study is lack of support by administrators. Teachers are concerned that the principal will not look favorably on a mistake if they take a risk and are unsuccessful. This limits a teacher's willingness to experiment. However, teachers who feel they can approach their principal with concerns and suggestions have a much better attitude about their jobs. The fourth factor cited by Byrne that precipitates stress is work overload. There is not enough time in the day to accomplish everything that is expected of the teachers. These demands include increased paperwork, oversized classes, and more and more social work type of responsibilities.

EFFECTS OF STRESS

The effects that stress and tension have on teacher performance is shocking. Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) found that constant intensive involvement with people causes a stressful situation which can lead to a loss of care and commitment. This often is not characteristic of original attitudes. These feelings affect teachers in three ways. They create feelings of being emotionally drained, they develop negative attitudes and lower self-esteem. Teachers experiencing burnout can have a negative effect on people with whom they come into contact and on the reputation of the school system. Some studies have found that burnout is related to increased job turnover and low worker morale. There is also an increase in absenteeism which puts substitutes in the classrooms who are often unqualified for the job. In addition, burnout has been shown to correlate with physical, emotional, and psychological problems. Eventually, such problems can lead to a lowered quality of instruction for students and fewer positive relationships within the school.

McLaughlin et al. (1986) state that teachers often attempt to minimize their feelings of failure by acting in ways that are educationally counter-productive, such as developing negative attitudes, constantly complaining about salaries or other aspects of the job, leaving the profession or working toward a higher position. Kushman (1990) found that teachers in disadvantaged schools experienced role ambiguity, burnout, and loss of commitment because they were compelled to take on multiple helping roles for at-risk students. Morris' (1988) research showed that as a teacher's stress increases, his/her attitude toward everyone he/she comes in contact with becomes less positive. French (1987) reported that teachers tended to become more authoritative and put less time into planning lessons. Feitler and Tokar (1988) found that teachers reported a shortness of temper, uneasiness and depression as the major symptoms of stress. Byrne (1994) related that teachers who fall victim to burnout are likely to be less sympathetic toward students, have a lower tolerance for classroom disruptions, be less apt to prepare adequately for class, and feel less committed and dedicated to their work.

Dalmau (1988) found that some teachers were moving to other jobs and others were using teaching techniques that required students to stay seated and quiet for the entire day. Furthermore, many teachers chose to remain in the classroom because they had no other options. This situation simply increased the problems because the teachers felt that they were trapped in a job that they hated. Byrne (1994) advises that teachers who blame others for the problems they face are more likely to suffer from burnout. He also explains that persons low in self-esteem are more threatened by rejection and therefore more vulnerable to stress and burnout.

McLaughlin et al. (1986) contend that the very system in which the teachers work is managed in such a way that the teachers are set up to fail. When there are few opportunities for success, the teachers' commitment to and acceptance of the organization is weakened.

Hanchey (1987) found that the strongest personal characteristic for teachers which signalled burnout was a lack of commitment to the job. The
strongest environmental predictors of burnout rested on the principal's shoulders. A principal's negative views of school-based management, lack of sensitivity to school problems, and alienation from the teachers were major sources of the problems.

**Principal's Role**

A principal's beliefs and leadership style can have an effect on the school environment and staff attitude. Littrell, Billingsley, and Cross (1994) agree that a supportive principal creates the positive environment that nurtures positive attitudes in the staff. Nonsupportive principals can do much to alienate teachers and set the mood that results in stress and burnout.

Littrell et al. (1994) found that principal support comes in many forms. Principals can provide emotional support by being interested in the teachers and what they are doing in the classroom, by having an open-door policy, and showing teachers they are appreciated. It is important that principals provide the time, resources, materials, and space the teachers need to do their job well. Instructional supervision in which the principal provides open, honest feedback about how the teachers are doing and the assistance to help them make the needed changes is an important aspect of the support system. The principal needs to be sure the teachers know what is expected of them, what their role is throughout the school setting, and what their responsibilities are. Principal support plays an important role in the professional development and well being of the staff. The relationship between the principal and staff members should be open, honest, caring and non-threatening. Supportive principals are likely to have a positive effect on teachers' commitment, job satisfaction and retention.

It is important that principals allow teachers to participate in decision-making within the school because collective decision-making and collaboration strongly influence teacher job satisfaction. Teachers are more committed and function better, both mentally and physically, when principals communicate to them that they are valued colleagues. Principals who spend more time meeting and interacting with their teachers on work-related problems and concerns create a more productive and stimulating environment. The principal needs to be sure the teachers know what is expected of them, what their role is throughout the school setting, and what their responsibilities are. Principal support plays an important role in the professional development and well being of the staff. The relationship between the principal and staff members should be open, honest, caring and non-threatening. Supportive principals are likely to have a positive effect on teachers' commitment, job satisfaction and retention.

According to Littrell et al. (1994), principals who establish an environment of competition and confrontation divide the staff and cause suspicion and distrust. Uniting the staff through collaborative efforts will help teachers feel valued. They will develop relationships within their school family that allows them to accomplish more in a shorter amount of time. Principals should assess their behaviors to see if they are providing the support that teachers believe is important.

**The Process of Change**

Now that we are aware of the problems involved, what can we do to make things better? Principals play a key role in the climate and culture of the school and in the change process as well. In this time of such demand for change, there are several educational researchers that can assist in helping to begin this journey. Fullan and Miles (1992) contend that these principles should be incorporated into the thinking and reflected in the actions of those involved in change efforts (p. 749):

- Change is learning, loaded with uncertainty. Mistakes will be made and they should be accepted and used as learning experiences for improvement.
- Change is a journey. There is no blueprint to follow. Each organization that begins the process must find its own way because each organization has different needs and wants.
- Problems are our friends in the change process because they afford us the opportunity to work together collaboratively on a common cause to create a better working and learning situation.
- Change is often resource-hungry. Some aspects of change can require training and professional development which can be costly.
- Change requires the power to manage it and everyone should become leaders in a collaborative culture with common goals.
- Change is systemic and is much more effective when all levels of the system are involved in the training and development.
- All large scale change is implemented locally. Effective change can only take place when the need for change and planning is initiated by the ones it most directly affects.

I believe these are important aspects of change that should be shared with the group as the journey begins and kept in mind as the staff works through the change process.

To be significant, change efforts must focus on important issues and larger visions. Those issues and visions cannot be mandated, but they don't just happen on their own either. They must be created within a supportive environment that encourages people to learn about and to work through the change process. When we think about change, we should consider five building blocks established by Lieberman and Miller (1990). 1) Be willing to rethink curricular and instructional efforts in order to promote quality and equality for all students. Most educational policy makes teachers mere tools of other people's purposes. For positive change, we must ask ourselves if we are insuring that all students have the opportunity to be successful. 2) We should also be willing to make a change in the structure of the school to accommodate collegial and collaborative work by the staff. The team effort is a very important aspect of building a positive work environment. If the schedule does not allow teachers to meet during the regular school day, they may become worn down and captives of the schedule. Under these circumstances, collaboration becomes contrived or tagged on rather than integral to ordinary commitments and working relationships. It makes no sense to devote so much effort to working around basic structures that are so unsympathetic to professional collaboration. 3) Commit to establishing an environment in the school that provides students the opportunities to learn on all levels of understanding and provides the teachers with the things they need to continue to grow and develop together. Working together is a source of learning. It helps people to see problems as things to be solved,
not as occasions for blame. Collaboration helps participants to value the different and even dissident voices of more marginal members of the organization. Collaborative cultures turn individual learning into shared learning. An engaging environment will continue to pique the interest of students and adults alike. 4) Recognize the necessity for building partnerships and networks within your school, community and district. We must all learn together, and working with the various resources around us gives us more knowledge and experience from which to draw. 5) Recognize the importance of the increased and changing participation of parents and community. Parents and the community are integral parts of the school climate and culture. We must include them in our change process or risk the misunderstanding of our attempts. All of these are vital to a positive change in our work place.

Hargreaves (1995) adds to Lieberman and Miller's building blocks for school improvement. He cites “moving missions” as an important factor. The school staff should look at accomplishments and needs in order to plan for improvements in the future. They must develop their own mission and goals, and these will be different for each school because each one has different needs. Reculturing is another basis for change. Certain relationships that form the culture of the school must be built among teachers and others before effective, objective discussions about improvements can be held. A climate of trust must be developed in which teachers can pool resources, deal with complex and unexpected problems, and celebrate successes. A key component of reculturing is the willful involvement of critics and skeptics who might initially make change efforts more difficult. We must recognize that diverse expertise contributes to learning, problem solving, and critical inquiry. The last facet of change is positive politics. It should be noted that schools are intensely political places. Power can be used with other people to get what you need rather than be used over them to demand what you want. These are important areas of the change process that we must keep in mind as we move through this journey.

You must also be aware of other aspects of change. Fullan (1988) offers four important issues that may be detrimental to a change movement. Reluctant participants of the change process may look for reasons why a change in the status quo will not work. They may try to sabotage your efforts for renewal. There is a tendency to externalize the problem and to look for blockages at other levels of the system. You may hear such comments as, "They will never let us do that," or "That will cost too much money. You may as well forget that." Another negative to be aware of is the assumption that the entire system must be changed before improvements will occur. You may hear, "It makes no sense for us to try this when everybody else is doing it the other way." A third issue that could be detrimental to change is that most people perceive themselves to be in the middle in some way. They may feel that there are people above them expecting more and people below them immune to influence. Be mindful of comments such as, "I just can't win. My boss or the team wants this but I can't make my students do something they don't want to." A final problem area may be that everyone has some power, most often used not to do things. It seems that often people spend more energy trying to find ways to get out of doing something or to avoid change than they would if they were willing to try something new. The leader should be aware of these negative aspects and be ready to deal with them effectively keeping in mind that others’ opinions are important to the change process.

The starting point for change is not system change, not change in others around us, but change in ourselves (Fullan, 1988). This is more achievable and is the first step toward system change because it shows a commitment to improvement. The power of modeling your own beliefs and ideals is much more important and effective than merely telling others what should be. The following are ten guidelines for individual action suggested by Hargreaves. It is essential that these guidelines be viewed in concert, not as actions isolated from one another. It is also important that those progressing through change or renewal use these as personal guidelines to follow. These guidelines are (p. 25): (1) avoid “if only” statements, externalizing the blame and other forms of wishful thinking, (2) start small, think big, don’t overplan or overmanage because taking tiny steps are often the greatest strides you can make, (3) focus on something meaningful and important like curriculum and instruction or behavior management, (4) focus on something fundamental like the professional culture of the school which affects everyone, (5) practice fearlessness and other forms of risk-taking necessary to lead, (6) empower others to become a part of the decision-making process, (7) build a vision in relation to both goals and change processes, (8) decide what you are not going to do, (9) build allies, and (10) know when to be cautious and move slowly when you need to.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

I realize the problems teachers face with overwork, too little time, and a school culture that is not conducive to effective instruction and learning. I understand the effects these problems have on instruction, climate, culture, and discipline. I understand my part in the change process and I have some idea of what restructuring will entail. Where do I go from here in leading this process? I decided the next step would be to look at some educational theories for change and renewal. I reviewed Barth’s (1990) idea of improving schools from within through collegiality, Fullan and Hargreaves’ (1992) concept of interactive professionalism, Sizer’s (1992) Coalition of Essential Schools, Purkey and Novak’s (1984) Invitational Education, the Comer Model (Ramirez-Smith, 1995) and Glasser’s (1992) Quality School. Of these that I reviewed, the one that I feel would be the most effective for creating the kind of school that I want to lead is based on Glasser’s concepts of Choice Theory, Reality Therapy, and Quality Management.

The Quality School model is drawn from W. Edward Deming’s Total Quality Management concept which deals with the psychology of managing workers in industry. In his approach, Deming feels that workers’ efforts must be guided by a system of profound knowledge, including a deep understanding of human psychology and learning theory. Deming and his supporters stress the importance of preventing mistakes or problems before they happen rather than dealing with them afterward. They encourage educators to create school environments in which strong relationships of mutual respect and trust replace fear, suspicion, and division. Also, leader-
ship from administrators and policy makers should empower students and teachers to make continuous improvements in the work they do together (Bonstingl, 1992). Deming had profound results with these methods in industry in Japan.

Glasser feels that the traditional method of management in schools today in which students and teachers are told what to do, how to do it, and when to do it is the root of the problems we are facing. He believes that if we change to a lead management style and begin finding ways to satisfy the basic human needs, many of the problems we face will disappear, and students and teachers will find satisfaction in doing their best in school. The purpose of the Quality School journey is to create an environment within the classroom and school to help each student, staff member, parent, and members of the community satisfy their basic needs. The three main elements of a Quality School, drawn from Deming’s work, are: (1) persuading all students and teachers to think about “What is quality school work?” and the importance of it, (2) persuading all students to evaluate the quality of all they do in school, and (3) managing both students and teachers without the use of coercion (Glasser, 1992).

Embedded in the Quality School concept is Choice Theory and Reality Therapy. Choice Theory is a system of how the brain operates explaining how and why we behave as we do. It is based on the fact that we’re internally motivated and driven by needs that are built into our biological structure. From birth, we must struggle to try to survive and to try to find some love, some power, some fun, and some freedom. To the extent that we can satisfy these needs on a regular basis, we gain effective control of our lives. Glasser feels that the discipline problems we face in classrooms today is because school is not satisfying the basic needs for students. The students choose both responsible and irresponsible behaviors to control situations and people to get what they want. And what they are usually fighting for is power. Likewise, teachers are not striving for their best because their needs are not being met. Presently, the management technique most often used in schools is boss management because stimulus/response psychology is applied to get teachers and students to work. An example of this stimulus/response management is made evident when you realize that a student must study or he won’t get a good grade. We must realize that people will not complete work effectively or behave properly unless their basic needs of power, fun, freedom, belonging, and to a lesser degree survival are met. At that time, they feel good about themselves and their work. Choice Theory manages students and teachers without coercion by creating a school environment that satisfies these basic needs (Gough, 1987; Glasser, 1986).

The other component of Quality Schools is Reality Therapy. This is a communication process used to help individuals make more responsible choices. It helps people learn how to look at what they want, and what they are doing, then evaluate their behavior to see whether it is getting them what they want. Reality therapy helps individuals accept responsibility for their actions and evaluate their behavior. It does not allow for placing blame, finding fault, dwelling on the past or feeling sorry for oneself. It helps people to do better within the reality of their own situation. It helps individuals to focus on their wants, evaluate their behaviors, and choose responsible behaviors to improve (Glasser, 1965). Teachers can help students work through this process to understand their actions and how to make a better choice next time. Likewise, principals can work through the process with teachers.

A Quality School, therefore, is a warm, caring environment where students, teachers, administrators, staff, parents, and the community work together to satisfy the basic needs of belonging, power, fun, freedom, and survival. Some examples of ways to satisfy these needs are by allowing everyone to assist in planning and decision making; allowing choices to be made about what will be taught, how it will be taught and projects to be completed; and working in teams to build relationships and collaborative teams. The basic needs of fun and survival are usually satisfied in schools without giving much thought to it. When a problem arises, the individual is guided through the process to let him determine what he wants, what he is doing, is it helping him get what he wants, and what does he need to do to get what he wants? Everyone in the school family is taught choice theory and reality therapy so they will understand the concept and be able to use it in their own lives and with one another.

Making this change to a Quality School will be no easy task. Change never is. The change in the belief system that is required in an individual from a boss manager who uses a stimulus/response approach to a lead manager who uses choice theory will be a large step for some in our building. Greene (1994) related how Glasser’s concept helped improve the school where he was principal. He told how they had tried many different staff development programs but none of them lasted for over a year or two. He came to realize that these programs dealt with ways to improve teachers, make students conform and become better learners, or ways to correct student behavior. Glasser showed the staff that the lack of quality work was not the fault of people, but that the problems were within the system. The key to change was a massive paradigm shift. Greene stated that they “learned to see things in a different way and adopt new paradigms so that their attitudes and their behavior changed, thus leading to increased quality in their relationships, the school environment, and the student’s work” (preface).

I believe that our school would benefit greatly by becoming a Quality School as defined by Glasser, but where do I begin as the leader to get us started? Gossen and Anderson (1995) have worked through this process and offer a framework for change to a Quality School. They offer six developmental stages of the change process: cognitive change, personal change, systems change, culture change, program change, and continual change. Cognitive Change is simply gathering information from books, videotapes, workshops, and other resources. In this stage, you learn the concept. The Personal Change stage entails a shift in belief from stimulus/response boss management to choice theory lead management. The individual begins using the techniques and following the beliefs of choice theory and reality therapy. Systems Change involves the switch from individuals experimenting with the concept alone to an agreement that people in the school will work together to make this change. They must decide how they will work together based on this new understanding that they have. The staff will need to be given process-centered tools for visioning, consensus-
building and making social contracts. The next stage is Culture Change and it relates to conflict resolution. With the change in belief systems and ideals comes decision-making. The culture must shift from a congenial atmosphere to a collegial atmosphere with people in the school coming to a consensus on many items. This is not always a smooth process. The staff must look for win/win solutions so that the needs for freedom, belonging and power are satisfied. The fifth stage is Program Change. This stage is the alignment of what we want with what we believe. Changes in the practices, programs, and curriculum to fit the new plans are made at this stage. The last stage is Continual Change or renewal. This comes with constant self-evaluation and changes for improvement.

I can see that this change will be a monumental task, one that will not happen overnight. I also know that I can not force the change on the staff in our school. I can only present the information in such a way that perhaps they will see the benefits and necessity for this change as I do. I am working through the Cognitive and Personal stages of Gossen and Anderson's change process now. I am reading, studying, and conversing with others who are more knowledgeable than I. I have talked with other principals in the state and region who are successfully implementing these concepts in their schools. Their enthusiasm is infectious. I have attended a Quality Schools Consortium Conference and completed a week of intensive training in the ideas and concepts of choice theory and reality therapy. I have begun to try my hand at lead management in the school. I have given the staff information about choice theory and opportunities to discuss it among themselves and with others better trained to use the concept. Hopefully, they will want to learn more about the practice for themselves. Most of the comments about Choice Theory have been negative from those staff members who always resist change of any kind, but I know there are a few staff members who are interested. They just have not spoken up yet. Maybe as time goes by and they are more knowledgeable and comfortable discussing the ideas, they will begin to open up. I plan to start a discussion group for the staff with a person in our district who has been through a great deal of training in Glasser's ideas. If I can establish a small group of believers in the school, perhaps their example will help to bring others around.

Most of the information and written work on the Glasser's ideas deals with the teacher-student relationship, but I believe that they must be adapted to the principal-staff member relationship as well for the concept to be successful. I should keep the basic needs of the staff members in mind and work to be sure their needs are satisfied. I am beginning to use Reality Therapy when there are problems because I believe by modeling the concepts, the staff will understand and accept them much more readily.

We may not be able to solve all of the problems that teachers face by using the Quality School concept, but I believe that the majority of the problems will be eased. The work and time constraints will be the hardest problem areas to address because of local and state mandates and policies. But when teachers are able to assist in the planning and decision-making for the operation of the school, I believe that they will come up with some innovative options to the way things are done now. Surely, the culture of the school will make a change for the better with the movement to lead management for both administration-teacher relationships and teacher-student relationships. Also, the improved climate of the school, the more positive attitude of the teachers and students, and the collaborative nature of the planning process will assist in this.

The problem of role conflict will be eliminated because the executive role of the teacher which entails enforcing rules and maintaining authority will be eliminated. In its place will be a more caring, needs satisfying classroom where the student wants to be and where he is proud of his work. Likewise, the concern about role ambiguity will be eliminated. With teachers in a role of decision maker, they can develop clearer, better defined policies on such things as their rights, obligations, objectives, and guidelines for accountability within the school setting. With these changes will come better instruction, higher student achievement, more positive attitudes, and a classroom of happy students excited about learning and proud of their accomplishments. The relationship of the staff will improve as well.

I believe we all know that our school is not the best it can be. The only way to improve is to make a change. We as a staff must make up our minds to begin the change process for the benefit of our students and for ourselves. The road will be bumpy as we move along, but we must keep our goal in mind as we go. My job as principal is to lead us through the trying times ahead and know that we have succeeded for everyone.
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ABSTRACT

American K-12 schools have been the subject of a number of serious criticisms for over a decade. Teacher-dominated, assessment-driven instruction that neither facilitates the acquisition of content knowledge nor the improvement of thinking skills is seen by some as being at the very heart of what is wrong with American education. This article examines constructivist learning in the light of what is known about classroom learning and effective teaching. The implications that pedagogical approaches such as constructivism have for quality schools is discussed.

QUALITY SCHOOLS AND CONSTRUCTIVIST TEACHING

While diverse opinions persist regarding the purposes of school, most would agree that educators must provide learning experiences that facilitate the acquisition of knowledge and skills that will assist students in becoming effective citizens and consumers (Cohen, 1993; Diessner, 1987; Romanish, 1993; Webb, 1993). The dominant goal of teaching and learning within quality schools must be to prepare students for their futures after they exit school. In order to achieve such a goal, however, meaning must be made an important part of the entire learning process (Wigle and Manges, 1995). Making good decisions about what teachers will ask students to learn and communicating good reasons why they should learn are two critical factors in generating meaning. However, an equally important factor is how students go about the process of school learning (Gage, 1985; Good & Brophy, 1991; Good & Brophy, 1986). Constructivism is an approach to teaching and learning which emphasizes the active role of the learner in building understanding and making sense of information. Because it focuses on the ways that students use what is in their quality worlds to construct meaning from new information and experiences, constructivism is an approach to teaching and learning that is highly congruent with choice theory and the goals of quality schooling.

American K-12 schools have been the subject of a number of serious criticisms for over a decade. Some critics have berated schools for failing to facilitate the learning of what they would identify as important academic content and the failure to adequately assess that learning (Bennett, 1986; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Other calls for educational reform have questioned the efficacy of centering school learning on content acquisition and standardized testing and instead have urged that schools focus their efforts on the teaching of critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Goodlad, 1984; Shanker, 1988; Sizer, 1984). Such
critics have pointed out that an instructional emphasis on content acquisition does not necessarily result in an increase in students’ abilities to utilize the content nor an improvement in student thinking skills. Reliance on instruction driven by standardized assessment leads to increased teacher domination in the classroom and decreased active student involvement in classroom learning (Farrell, 1991; Goodlad, 1992, 1991). Teacher-dominated, assessment-driven instruction that neither facilitates the acquisition of content knowledge nor the improvement of thinking skills, is seen by some as being at the very heart of what is wrong with American education (Cohen, 1993; Fox & Powell, 1990; Golner & Powell, 1992; Goodlad, 1992, 1991; Goodlad & Keating, 1990).

Nationally, K-12 schools face an ongoing challenge to provide students with opportunities to exercise thinking and problem-solving skills while also emphasizing content knowledge (Glasser, 1990; Hirsch, 1990; Resnick & Klopfer, 1989; Resnick & Resnick, 1992). If the primary goal of school is to facilitate the acquisition of important knowledge and cognitive skills, a quality school needs to achieve that goal. However, given the tension between expectations for increased content knowledge and increased thinking and problem-solving skills, how might classroom teachers accommodate these important, but not totally compatible goals? The purpose of this article is to describe an instructional model that emphasizes thinking and problem-solving skills while achieving increased content knowledge.

WAYS STUDENTS LEARN

Prior experience, or background knowledge, has been established as a key element in acquiring new learning. Prior experience provides a perspective from which new learning makes sense (Brewer, 1995, 1990; Brewer & Tryens, 1981; Hunter, 1992, 1976). Further, prior experience influences what we perceive (Resnick & Klopfer, 1989). Hunter (1992, 1991, 1990, 1976) has suggested that by linking new knowledge with previously existing knowledge and experiences, students actually increase their ability to store, retrieve, and utilize new knowledge.

Unfortunately, teachers often present complex content and skills with an emphasis on mastering specific pieces of information while ignoring the value of linking the material to background information the student already possesses. Current theory on the acquisition of content-specific knowledge suggests that stair steps provide a good model for knowledge acquisition. The deepest understandings come at the top of the stairs where material is most applicable to “real” issues (Armstrong, 1994; Bloom et al, 1956; Costa & Marzano, 1991). In addition, some research suggests that reasoning processes are essential to increased content knowledge. (Glasser, 1990; Resnick & Klopfer, 1989).

To exercise critical thinking effectively, and to demonstrate problem-solving skills, students must explore information in depth while applying what they know in order to interpret what they are learning. Content and reasoning, therefore, must be emphasized together if students are to become truly effective learners. Recent theories of learning address the brain’s role in understanding and suggest that learning occurs best when activities are available that allow students to employ previous experiences to construct their own meaning of those learning activities (Smilkstein, 1993). From this perspective, effective teaching becomes a process of helping students construct meaning in the context of their own beliefs, experiences, and understandings (Condon, 1993; Tittle, 1993).

WAYS TEACHERS TEACH

Frequently, teachers present curriculum in a drab style, making no effort to connect content to the immediate needs of their students. The subject matter relates only to a list of objectives that usually appear in behavioral terms (Cohen, 1993; Glasser, 1990; Goodlad, 1992, 1991). In many traditional, teacher-dominated classrooms, the emphasis is on content learning, and recall-level assessments that measure that learning. In such classrooms, students have a superficial exposure to a vast amount of content material that makes little sense to them and that they perceive as having little relevance or value in their quality worlds (Glasser, 1990; Porter, 1989; Shanker, 1988). Teachers expect students to “learn” the content they are presenting at least long enough to perform adequately on written assessments. Furthermore, little opportunity exists for students to apply their learning in actual problem-solving contexts.

In contrast to traditional content-centered and teacher-dominated classrooms, constructivist classrooms make the experiences and prior knowledge in students’ quality worlds an essential component of the learning within the class. Constructivist teaching begins with the assumption that individuals actively construct knowledge from the interaction between what they already know and what they encounter as new information (Derry, 1992). Students construct knowledge when their teachers give them multiple opportunities through classroom activities to connect the new experiences and concepts they encounter to pictures they have already placed in their quality worlds. Connecting the new with what students already know and value not only results in knowledge, but it also invites students to assign meaning to that new information. In this constructivist approach, the role of the teacher becomes one of a guide and a facilitator. The role of the student becomes one of active thinker, explainer, interpreter, and questioner. The focus of this collaborative model of teaching involves letting students put their own efforts to understand at the center of the educational enterprise (Prawat, 1992).

Instead of a fleeting exposure to codified bits and pieces of information that students “learn” through simplified problems and basic skills drills, constructivist teaching assumes that students should deal with complex situations and “fuzzy,” ill-structured problems. The real world presents few step-by-step directions to apply to simple problems, so to equip students with the cognitive skills demanded by that world, schools make sure that every student has experience solving complex problems (Driscol, 1994; Marshall, 1992). Within this more realistic process, the teacher takes on the role of facilitator, provides the support that students need as they work on complex problems, and helps them find resources while keeping track of their progress. In this context, students not only actively process content material, but they also develop important higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills that a more traditional and teacher-dominated
classroom does not accommodate (Cunningham, 1992).

Simply allowing students to construct meaning by actively involving them in complex problems offers them no structure or guidelines for those times when they may create inaccurate or faulty constructions. Since all students have unique experiences that impact the way they interpret information, teachers must facilitate the learning process by presenting information unambiguously in order to eliminate misconceptions (Marzano, Pickering, & McTighe, 1993). Even as teachers encourage students to construct meaning as they learn, they must also help their students become aware that they learn about content and their own abilities within the zone and restrictions of their personal beliefs and experiences. Students' prior experiences provide them with a frame of reference, or a reference level (Powers, 1973). If students' views become too narrow, teachers must work with them to persuade them to modify and enlarge those perspectives. The role of a teacher must be to help students determine whether the pictures they have already placed in their quality worlds should remain there. Teachers do this through persuading and offering counter arguments or other information to support or vary from the students' ideas. By actively involving students in a learning dialogue, teachers can help them to identify misperceptions, misconceptions, and errors in their constructed knowledge. In this way, students can repeatedly enjoy opportunities to expand not just their knowledge, but their cognitive skills as well.

IMPLICATIONS FOR QUALITY SCHOOLS

For more than three decades, Glasser has worked to improve schools by seeking to apply the principles of choice theory, reality therapy, and quality management to transform schools. Throughout his work, the concepts of student involvement, thinking skills, relevance, and quality have been central to his Quality Schools efforts. The full transition to quality schooling, however, will occur only when teachers begin to adopt specific instructional models that allow them to apply Glasser's conceptual and theoretical framework in their individual classrooms on a daily basis. Constructivist teaching is one such specific instructional model that fully resonates with choice theory.

Constructivist teaching is very student-centered because the only genuine learning that students can do is constructivist learning. By assuming that student learning is an active process in which they construct knowledge by connecting experiences and events to what they already know, students change their classroom role from passive recipients of information to active thinkers, explainers, questioners, and constructors of knowledge. By assuming this proactive role, students' involvement in the whole learning process significantly increases. In addition, facilitating substantial student involvement increases the probability that students will see what teachers ask them to do in the classroom as relevant because learning materials and projects match their quality worlds. The more relevance students perceive in their learning tasks, the harder they will work in order to produce quality products. Students also discover that they can do quality work and that quality has a direct relevance to their lives since it depends on their own individual acts of construction. Such results are very need-satisfying for students and a source of profound intrinsic motivation as quality schoolwork becomes a stronger picture in their quality worlds.

Teachers often face conflicting demands that are serious sources of frustration for them as professionals responsible for the growth and development of young people. One curricular tradition envisions teachers as dispensers of officially sanctioned content from a pool of officially sanctioned curricula. Another curricular thrust insists that teachers help students acquire cognitive skills so that they will become life-long learners in whatever content areas they eventually pursue. Constructivist teaching is a model that can bridge the two parallel worlds of content and cognitive skills. Making meaning in school is an approach to learning that deliberately focuses on thinking and problem-solving skills as tools to facilitate the construction of knowledge in any given subject. At the same time, fostering active student involvement in learning and connecting new experiences and activities to students' quality worlds, will result in effective knowledge acquisition. For teachers, the constructivist approach to facilitating student learning may allow them to pursue two important goals in such a way that classroom teaching and learning become more need-satisfying in their own quality worlds. The more need-satisfying an instructional method is, the more likely it is that teachers will implement the approach.

CONCLUSION

Through constructivist teaching, students can tap into their natural learning potential because their experiences, their prior knowledge, and their personal interpretations become essential components of all classroom activities. Consistent and effective teaching creates conditions in which students can acquire content knowledge, build critical thinking and problem-solving skills, and find personal meaning in what they do. Consistent and effective teaching creates conditions in which students may construct their own knowledge. As they actively engage in learning activities that they label relevant to their quality worlds, school becomes a need-fulfilling experience and they choose to work harder to produce quality products. As students become more involved in quality work, the classroom also becomes a more need-satisfying experience for teachers. The more need-satisfying their work is, the harder teachers will choose to work to provide consistent and effective learning experiences for students.

This article does not propose one narrow teaching method for creating quality schools. If such a transformation is to happen, however, schools and the teachers in them must identify the exact steps to take and the specific tools to use in launching the quality journey. Glasser has provided a theoretical framework containing the reference perceptions for the goals and the rationale for quality schools. Teaching methods such as constructivist learning provide at least one practical tool that will allow teachers to begin to actualize these high quality reference perceptions that define the most useful, meaningful, enjoyable, and productive schooling.
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ABSTRACT

This article juxtaposes Glasser’s distinction between the worlds of moral reality and moral pretense and Hume’s distinction between individual morality and social morality. In particular, the article explores the dual nature of moral reality/individual morality in urban high schools: students’ neighborhood values and teachers’ middle-class values. It also posits that if Glasser’s belief that moral reality can be taught in class meetings and Hume’s belief that what we learn as children in families becomes social morality are true, then those values must be respected and exchanged: students’ individual morality must become teachers’ social morality and vice versa.

In his chapter on morality in Schools without Failure, Glasser stated that the process of judging a human act right or wrong is not ordinarily discussed or taught in public schools because people react to the content of moral judgments so emotionally and because they believe that telling other people what to do is so controversial. That conclusion is not strictly correct: both teachers and students discuss their own values as standards to judge the correctness of an act. There seems to be no discussion or teaching because each group, solipsistically, uses its own values to judge the other’s acts. In an urban high school, the teacher’s telescope frames the school’s horizon: middle-class values. The student’s wide-eyed curiosity explores the school’s foreground: neighborhood values. Foreground and horizon are parts of the same picture, but when one is peered at, the other blurs.

Teachers, seeing few middle-class values displayed in the actions of urban students, remember the classroom of a generation ago: instructor lecturing students seated at desks rigidly aligned, American flag hanging limply in front, wobbly pencil sharpener pendant from a side wall. Kelly (1996), speaking of society at large, said that “the idea of a majority party built on the economic values of wage earners, the cultural values of churchgoers, and the social values of middle-class families is not such a novelty.” There has already been such a party. It was called the Democratic Party, and it held the majority of American voters for four decades (from Roosevelt in 1932 to Johnson in 1968)” (p. 62). Responding to such nostalgic yearning, the staff of one urban school recently recalled and reaffirmed some core values: trust, respect, honesty, responsibility, courtesy, patience, caring, tolerance, loyalty, and consideration (Bennett High School, 1996). Not seeing those values in the blurred foreground of student interest, the staff cried out, as if in a wilderness, for a reaffirmation of what they had grown up with.

Students, finding few neighborhood values in the school setting, explore their community and learn by traversing the tangled web of amity and enmity holding friends, acquaintances, and relatives together. Foster (1994) spoke of cultural solidarity evident in the urban environment in the use of kinship terms, parental, family terms, and metaphors, and relationships “marked by social equality, egalitarianism, and a mutuality stemming from a group” (p. 235). Thus, the community is really an extended family including aunts and cousins. Any middle-class urban teacher, whose cousins are mostly distant, knows that urban students have an extended array of brothers, cousins and aunts who are not necessarily related by blood. From them, students learn how to press (challenge), sweat (give a hard time), represent (be part of a street coterie), rib (mock), in a word, succeed in their environment. Not seeing those values on the distant horizon of teacher interest, students learn them from their neighborhood.

Despite the tangential relation between the values of student and teacher, Glasser (1969) believed that schools could discuss and children could learn certain generally-accepted moral principles: “it is better for both us and our children to live without lying, cheating, blackmailing, and stealing” (p. 186). Discussion and learning, however, do not take place when each ignores the other’s values. Glasser said that students “understand early in life that we really live in two worlds, the world of pretense, where we spout the moral values, and the world of reality, where we pay as little attention to them as possible” (p. 190). In this world of reality, students ascribe no worth to the values teachers spout. When a student speaks about cousins, love, threats (“she be callin’ me out my name”), the teacher ignores the students’ language because it is non-standard and their values because they are not middle-class.

Glasser, recognizing that the process of learning and teaching morals could not be accomplished by propping up commandments with punishments, believed that it happened in classroom meetings where “moral behavior could be presented as a part of life rather than as dogma” (p. 186). Without this process, “morality and responsibility will only be words for most children” (p. 192). Hume (1992), the Scottish moral philosopher, said that “the end of all moral speculations is to teach us our duty” (p. 14). This article will demonstrate that Hume’s moral philosophy, rightly understood, can inform Glasser’s philosophy of quality and that classroom meetings are essentially moral speculations in which duty is taught.

In perambulating thus far through the territory of value, we have discussed several dichotomies. Glasser spoke of two worlds: the one acknowledged by students and the other acknowledged by parents. I described the near foreground of students’ neighborhood values and the further horizon of teachers’ middle-class values. Moral philosophers separate individual morality, created by an independent decision of a community member to acknowledge (or not) social morality, and social morality which is the community’s acknowledgment of a system of right conduct evolved over time. Thus, the dichotomies described by Glasser and by me are between youngsters and adults in a school setting: moral philosophers, such as Hume, describe the dichotomy as one between the individual and society. Whitely (1970) goes further, saying, that “the morality of a com-
munity consists of those ways of behavior which each member of the community is taught, bidden and encouraged to adopt by the other members” (p. 22). Thus, even moral philosophers place their dichotomies in an educational setting.

What is moral value? The values brainstormed by the Bennett staff resulted from moral judgments which the Oxford English Dictionary defines as “of or pertaining to the distinction between right and wrong, or good and evil, in relation to actions, violations, or character of responsible beings.” The Bennett staff judged their values in relation to a standard that can broadly be described as middle-class American. While the staff were making moral judgments about respect and honesty, students were negotiating their way through the school using values, ribbin' and pressin' and representing', that broadly come under the heading of urban neighborhood values. Most of us reading this acknowledge middle-class values such as the ones identified by the Bennett staff. Many of us do not recognize neighborhood values. For example, urban culture values cooperation over competition; the reverse is true in the culture of most urban schools where competition is identified with the marking system and cooperation with cheating.

Hume founded his moral sense theory on the experience of growing up in a family. Baier (1987) noted the centrality of devoted rearing to Hume's theory: “at the very heart of Hume's moral theory lies his celebration of family life and of parental love” (p. 42). Neilsen (1974) focused on the same experience: “The foundations of one's character are developed through unconscious imitation way before perplexity over morality can possibly arise” (p. 491). Teachers acknowledge the middle-class values of personal responsibility and competitiveness. Urban students honor the group and value cooperation. Ladson-Billings (1995), speaking of community values, said that urban students progress by giving and getting help, by having a "study buddy," by not working against the unity and cohesiveness of the group (pp. 70, 72-3). Foster (1994) speaks of teachers in terms of “an extended family, an umbilical cord, and being connected to the cord” (p. 229). Teachers “encourage a community of learners; they encourage their students to learn collaboratively” (Ladson-Billings, p. 25). Lee (1994) also talks about African-centered practices which use the indigenous language, community and cultural practices, support cultural continuity, self-sufficient future, positive social relationships (p. 297). No wonder discussion of values is scarce, when the values espoused by teachers and students seem diametrically opposed.

Given the dual nature of value (neighborhood and middle-class) in an urban school, how does one begin the process of respecting and exchanging these problems and learn the value of the truth” (p. 192). Glasser consistently in his writings set the stage for quality: he described the necessary environment, but hesitated to say how that should be created. Because Glasser had confidence in the quality teacher, he refused to tell the teacher how to perform the task of teaching, but this confidence is frustrating to teachers who are new to the quality school philosophy. And it is precisely in the classroom that moral philosophers can help teachers understand Glasser.

When people live together over time a system of right conduct, an action guide for social activity, evolves. Hume (1992) believed that this system was founded on the scientific method that generated “general maxims from a comparison of particular instances” which can be deduced to build “the foundation of ethics, and find those universal principles” (p. 16). One philosopher (Cooke, 1996) recently summarized: “These are things that the wise man always remembers, but the fool doesn’t. I mean these kinds of truths: one should speak the truth; promises should be kept; other people should not be manipulated; murder is wrong; hurting other people is wrong; hurting yourself is wrong; human beings are responsible for their actions” (p. 2). Those universal principles of living together, have the interests of other people in mind. MacIntyre (1970) quotes Hume that the moral agent must “depart from his private and particular situation” (p. 34). Moral judgment thus is a kind of sympathy, a sentiment for others, but it also goes beyond that emotion to the passions: empathy and altruism. Sympathy, from its Greek roots, means to suffer along with. It is closely connected with understanding. Empathy, again bowing to Greece, is suffering inside the other; it is more closely connected with feeling than with understanding alone. Altruism has a Latin root meaning another person and, in this context, it means putting the interests of another person ahead of one's own. A moral code of conduct is created by what enlarges our passions: empathy and altruism. They compose a part of human nature which Hume calls a fellow-feeling, a moral sense, that when aroused will judge a choice worthy of approbation or blame. That moral sense, as noted before, is founded on standards learned in the context of family. Thus the class meeting must begin with an exploration of neighborhood values which, once found, can be enlarged by empathy and altruism. In the best possible class meeting, the teacher can move the student from the proposition that his friends should not be hurt to the larger proposition that hurting other people is wrong.

A class meeting usually is called because of a problem that pits the values of the teacher against the values of the students: an arena for a moral choice. To value something is to assign worth to it, and, as we have seen, Hume finds that first value in the family. These family values are not the ones trumpeted in the media, but the ones learned within the confines of the family. They are personal: respect for elders; honor for family connection; acknowledgement of hierarchy within the family; definition of family as primary unit. Both teacher and student hold these values dear, but the teacher has extended them to society, the student has not.

Hume’s moral sense theory assumes that human beings, living together over time, have to reconcile competing interests. A moral sense theory also assumes that human beings will rank those interests and then freely choose one over another. Thus the ability to see that some social interests are more
important than others is necessary for Hume's moral sense theory. In the act of ranking (Hume's sense of approbation or blame) lies the beginning of choice. Toolan (1995), speaking about the dialectic of sexuality, states: "yet the claim of utter freedom in the matter of sexual identity runs into the stubborn fact that for most people sexual orientation precedes choice" (p. 21). Rawls (1976), in discussing what qualities are necessary to judge competently about morals, states that "a competent judge is required to have a sympathetic knowledge of those human interests which, by conflicting in particular cases, give rise to the need to make a moral decision" (p. 373). Here we revert to what is, for Hume, the beginning: moral sense developed in the setting of a family. To paraphrase Toolan, freedom of moral sense runs into the stubborn fact that for most people moral orientation precedes choice.

The fact that people, in the view of Hume's moral sense theory, consider some interests important and are able, after ranking those conflicting interests, to choose freely one of them to the exclusion of the other surely limits. But that limit is the limit of freedom. Further, continual ranking and choosing, the foundation of moral development, of conflicting interests over time, the individual changes in moral stance.

Hume's moral sense theory can help the quality school teacher in class meetings. First of all, Hume would say that moral speculation is what happens in class meetings and that moral speculation teaches us what our duty is. But that duty is not simply given from on high. It should be extracted from the moral system already existing in the student. Cooper (1970) states that "if you want to know what a man's moral values and principles are, you should study what he thinks to be most important" (p. 91). In the case of an urban school, the teacher who conducts the class meetings should be a person who has studied what the student thinks and says. African-American prosodic features: vowel elongation (daagl), changes in meter (just checkin' the flypaper, see what's stickin'), tempo (she be pressin' me, she got my name in her mouth, and she be frontin' me), rhythm (the teacher, she disrespected me, she got all up in my face. I'm saying, she disrespected me), cross-speaker anaphora (They be my peoples. Word. Your peoples), single-speak repetition (she said to me, whatever, whatever, blase, blase), manipulation of grammatical structures (I be goin' [the iterative present in the Gullah dialect]), figurative language (She be screw-facin' me. She be buggin'. They be prankin' my crib)" (Foster, p. 234). "Ideally, this person should live in the community and share the culture of the children. . .She or he should share, understand, and participate in Black culture. On the other hand, the teacher should have assimilated enough of mainstream culture to be able to model behaviors that will enable the children to become upwardly mobile" (Hale, p. 167). Dove (in press) says that "what becomes apparent from these descriptions is that an educator is a learning growing person who has a responsibility to continuing her own growth, those she is entrusted to teach and the development of her society."

Morality is a system of rules by which people live together over time, and those rules are passed from one generation to the next either critically or uncritically. One of the school's most basic functions is to pass along the values of the community to its children critically. A school, committed to logic and reason, must encourage every student to challenge every value, and, as a representative of society, must encourage the student to judge a value, such as truthfulness, in a right manner. Until the student challenges that value it remains a societal judgment, but when the student judges truthfulness to have value, the societal judgment becomes an individual judgment. If critically, then society negotiates the rules and creates new meanings and becomes itself progressive. This renegotiation and recreation is what is presently happening between teachers and students in the best quality schools.
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ABSTRACT

Policies on education are aimed at parents and teachers. Education would be much more effective if it were looked at from the point of view of pupils and their needs.

The child or pupil is the direct beneficiary of education so his needs must be central to educational planning. There have been attempts to view learning from the pupil’s point of view, but often without considering the complete basic needs of the pupils.

WHERE IS THE CENTER?

Schools are organized mainly for the benefit of the teachers or according to administrator’s ideas; so in that respect education is teacher-centered. The present UK government is in favor of giving greater parental choice in education and parents think they have a right to control their children’s education; thus education becomes parent oriented.

Part of being a caring parent or teacher is the control and guidance of the children under your care, but many of the problems stem from the fact that so many of the pupils in our schools feel they have very little power over what happens at school; there is very little freedom; no fun; no real sense of belonging; and a sensing no one really cares for them or their future; and for some even survival is jeopardized. It is no wonder many of our pupils are disruptive, lazy, bored, rude and uncooperative.

The answer is not for parents and teachers to give up and take no guiding hand in their children’s education. It is necessary for them to be partners in the whole process. Real child-centered education is a radical step. Without throwing away what is really of value in the present system, we must focus on children’s needs, not only in the academic field of acquiring knowledge, but also as developing people. This is done not by punishing the pupils, or gaining better control over the teachers and the curriculum, or blaming the parents; but to bring in pupil-centered education. Even the usually successful students would gain from lessons without disruption, having a higher standard of work and cooperation with the teacher.

MY POSITION AND EXPERIENCE

For over 30 years, I was a teacher in secondary schools in England (11-18 year old pupils) mainly with difficult and disadvantaged pupils. I was also for the latter 15 years, a school counsellor. In each of the four schools in which I worked I changed the conditions under which these children worked and also the way in which they were taught, so that the pupil was more at the center of the educational process. This I now realize was moving towards what Glasser calls ‘a quality school’.

MARKS OF A PUPIL-CENTERED EDUCATION

What then are the marks of this child-centered education? It is based on looking at all the issues from the pupil’s point of view, bearing in mind those basic needs of love and belonging, freedom, power, and fun.

A PLEASANT FRIENDLY ENVIRONMENT

Children need to feel teachers and parents love and care for them and that there is a place of real worth for them in the school so they can each make a valued contribution to that community. The environment that greets the child on his arrival in the school and particularly in the classroom can make a great difference. As a teacher, I always went into school the day before term began and set out my classroom, taking with me plants and flowers, putting up colorful posters and pictures, laying out books and equipment. This all said more about my attitude and intentions and what was expected of my pupils than any words could. It also meant I was freer, having got the classroom organized and with a relaxed atmosphere, to give time to my new pupils, either as a group or individually.

Class size and arrangement can make a great difference. I found with 20 pupils, I could give each some individual attention. If the class size rose above that number it was more difficult to give that attention. Individual attention or time given to small groups within the class is important in two respects: 1. to give help to someone in difficulty, or to one who wants to proceed deeper into the subject; 2. to show each he is not only a member of the class but is of value in himself.

When I was a pupil, the teacher sat on a high seat at a high desk on a platform with the class arraigned before him in solid rows of desks. Years later I returned to the same school as a teacher and was glad to find the high desks and platforms gone, but the desks were still in rows. Years before, I had discovered the best classroom arrangement to be an open square, with children’s desks on three sides and the teacher’s desk taking up the fourth. This has many advantages.

1. Eye contact can be maintained. This can prevent problems.

2. All the children can see the teacher even when he is sitting. I found difficult and restless pupils would sit still when the teacher was sitting rather than standing and walking up and down which can be distracting.

3. It makes for easy discussion. Discussion arose easily within a lesson without having to prepare specially for it as Glasser suggests.

4. The space in the middle can be used for drama and role playing.

5. Models and plans to illustrate a lesson can be placed in the open space.

6. There is easy access to each pupil from in front or behind for teacher or helper to assist a pupil.

7. Each side of the square can form a team and work together. I placed the two most able pupils in each team on the ends of a desk row team, and the least able pupils next to them. This is particularly helpful in a mixed ability (heterogeneous) class.
8. Children could move around the room without disturbing others.
9. It puts everyone on the same level, and says something about the attitude of the teacher and how she values her class. Some might take objection to this, thinking in this way the teacher loses respect and control. Not so! The teacher must always be in control, and must be respected for his skills and as one in authority. Actually it is easier to have and maintain control of a class with this arrangement. Respect needs to be earned.

I liked to have a few tables outside the square where pupils could use maps or other large equipment, or sit opposite one another to work on cooperative projects.

One would think nine reasons were convincing to any teacher to use such an arrangement. I was surprised to find many teachers could not cope with it. Some even went as far as rearranging the room when they taught there!

TEACHER INVOLVEMENT

This arrangement shows the teacher is involved with the children in the process of education. Such involvement is not easy as it needs enthusiastic leadership from the teacher, but it is richly rewarding. Many teachers are scared of being involved with their pupils, and I admit problems can arise from it. Such involvement can go wrong, and adults can be selfishly emotionally involved, losing the real purpose of that involvement.

Teachers are often warned about involvement with pupils. As my first headmaster admonished me: "There is a gulf fixed between you and your pupils and you must never cross it." My immediate reply was: "I cannot teach in that way." I am very glad I did not heed his advice, although he made me suffer as a consequence.

Teaching is much more than instructing, or filling minds with facts. A literate pupil can find all the facts he needs from books. He needs the teacher to show him how to use such resources, how to study, how to acquire various skills, especially how to get on with other people and how to solve problems.

Many of my pupils had a reputation for being lazy or uncooperative or downright disruptive. I deliberately did not mention the past or their reputations: to me they were irrelevant. Here were new opportunities for everyone. I also did not want to hear excuses from parents or pupils about poor performance. I also learned previous test results gave me no real picture of a pupil's ability. I found often a teacher's attitude to a child and expectations of his progress were colored by such test results.

LACK OF COERCION

Is punishment child-centered? It is centered on the child, but does it benefit the child? Its purpose is to improve the child's behavior for his own benefit or for the benefit of the class as a whole. It is considered also as a deterrent. But does it really work?

Antisocial behavior increases as a community increases in size, alienation is greater and there is less chance of being caught. In this situation recourse is made to more and more severe punishment with no real decrease in criminal behavior. This seems to me to say we should do more about preventing antisocial behavior by changing the environment and conditions under which we work, rather than see punishment as the panacea of our problems.

It is usually overlooked that some children enjoy punishment: at least they are noticed! Often they enjoy a notoriety with their mates. As a child I enjoyed being shouted at, and I remember having a competition with another boy to see who could get the most black marks in a lesson. A group of boys in a secondary school I taught at drove motorcycles recklessly to compete to get endorsements on a license they were as yet too young to have. What stopped it was not punishment, but the careful explanation of the consequences by a teacher who they knew cared about them and whom they trusted. Because you do not punish does not mean you condone. There are non-punitive ways of showing disapproval. In a very tough school I found my practice of keeping offenders behind after class to talk about their behavior more effective than any punishment. They told me they found punishment easier to take, as it was soon over, but my talking asked for a commitment to change, and that was really tough!

The trouble is teachers are expected to punish by both pupils and administrators, so to create a nonpunitive environment is daring and difficult, but success brings a joy and a freer atmosphere to the benefit of all, as stress is lowered and renewed energy is directed into work and learning. With a friendly caring atmosphere, problems can be solved through discussion and counselling.

Sometimes problems come from outside your classroom. One day, my class of 27 boisterous boys of 14-15 years of age burst into my classroom obviously very angry coming from a lesson with a teacher whom they hated and who hated them. I could have proceeded, as I was expected to, with the planned lesson and punished any disruption; but what would that have achieved?

Instead I got them seated and asked what the trouble was. During the discussion, Kevin asked me: "Do you know why we hit people?" I was intrigued. He explained it was because they were afraid, so hit out first. To my great surprise all the boys agreed. I wrote the word 'FEAR' in the center of the blackboard and created a mind map as we spent the next hour discussing all the various aspects of fear and how to deal with it. We all, including myself, learned much more than we would have done from the planned lesson!

There is a problem for the individual teacher trying to make a quality class without coercion if the school has some mandatory punishments. He may have to work within that system until he can bring pressure to bear to change it. His success with his own pupils will be his strongest advocacy. I used this situation to show my pupils there were often situations we may not approve of, but within which we had to work.

MULTI-ABILITY (HETEROGENEOUS) CLASS

Too often we treat the class as the unit instead of the individual pupil.
This can be the result of streaming or banding in an attempt to form homogenous classes. This is a false idea as each child is unique and needs to be treated accordingly. Surely multi-ability (heterogeneous) classes follow logically from the idea of comprehensive schools.

It works best where there is team teaching, and where other teachers and helpers are allowed into the classroom offering their special skills and interests. Working in this situation, I found a delight and a real sense of cooperation, all to the benefit of the children.

We sometimes aim for fairness by treating everyone the same, and give our pupils the idea this is fair and just. We all have the same basic needs but they need fulfillment in different ways. Some children have a greater deficiency in these than others. I remember a discussion with a particular class who accused me of being unfair. They said I favored Alan, a lad who lacked love and ability, and was disruptive. I gave a little more time to him, and allowed him to sit next to me where he worked hard without disturbing anyone else. I pointed out to the class that if I treated them all the same it would be unfair, as Alan's needs were different and greater than theirs. We considered the differing needs they had and how they could be fulfilled. They all could see that this seeming unfairness was in no way unjust but really necessary. The discussion and solution of such problems can be a real and vital part of learning.

A RELEVANT CURRICULUM

If a child is well motivated to learn, seeing the usefulness of what he is learning, having the skills necessary to cope with it, with good parental support and caring teachers, there is usually no problem with discipline or relationships. But a large proportion of our pupils are not in that situation. Many have not even the basic literacy and number skills. For many, school is a world apart from their everyday life with what seems to be an irrelevant curriculum imposed from above.

History is a particular subject that can seem to be irrelevant. I have had the problem of teaching history to less able children in secondary schools. I started my thinking from the point of view of the child and asked myself what would he need history for. He was not going to be interested in dates of particular events or ancient politics, nor was he likely to need it for an examination. This country is rich in historic sites and buildings and large numbers go to visit them, but often they have not the background knowledge to interpret what they are looking at. I decided therefore to base the history syllabus on what was around us. In fact, all the subjects became integrated and started from where the children were. We looked at the history and geography of the school itself, backed up with documents and plans, using mathematical skills to create graphs and other such visual information. We started religious education by analyzing and discussing morning assembly.

Having established principles of study in investigating our school, we moved out to study our century-old town and then villages around of a thousand years. By the end of the year, we were embarked on a cycle tour of the country. We entitled the syllabus 'Pond Ripples' as we started very much from where we were and moved outwards to the unknown, making use of basic skills and principles covering all the basic subjects. Our science was based round the bicycle and how it and the body on it worked. All this needed much cooperation and working together so this was another skill to develop. We learned to live together on tours and in youth hostels.

Most of these children had been labelled as illiterate and difficult, but in this situation the difficulties all but disappeared. Attendance was high, and enthusiasm and sustained effort replaced sullenness and despondency. They became literate and number proficient.

Religious education can easily become remote from everyday life. I made my lessons with secondary fourth and fifth year pupils discussion based, giving them the choice of subject. This gave them the sense of control over what they did. By the end of the year they had discussed all the subjects I would have liked them to have discussed, and sometimes there were some exciting surprises for me! It also gave opportunity to tackle items from the news, making the whole discussion immediate and very relevant. Apart from the religious value, the pupils learned to listen to others, be tolerant of others' ideas, and put their opinions in a coherent, succinct manner.

I also ran courses for less-able school leavers. The syllabus was made relevant in learning skills and knowledge about particular jobs, about relationships, health, etc. It was quite obvious the students enjoyed the courses. They were given a greater control on how they organized their work, and much cooperative work was done in groups. There was a marked improvement in dress and deportment, as well as in academic attainment. In the second year, we were over subscribed! They took a larger part in the life of the school, and were successful in their lives after school. They could see the relevance of their learning, and found fun in much of it.

CONSTRUCTIVE EVALUATION

There is a strong desire for objective evaluation and assessment of a pupil's educational progress. Most of this assessment is in relation to other pupils' ability. This badly needs rethinking. What are we trying to assess? Usually the ability to memorize and regurgitate on demand. Although this is occasionally a useful skill, there are other much more important skills, such as thinking through and solving problems, living amicably with others. Facts can usually be looked up in books and in the real world that is what is done. The essential skill is knowing how to use books effectively, not only being able to read but to do it at speed and use indexes and other aids.

During a lesson, a sixth former looked up at me and said: "You're at it again, sir!" "What am I at?" I asked. "You're making people think." "I thought that was what I was here for!" As I told another class: "If I thought my job was just to fill your heads with knowledge, I would resign. After all you can read and the facts are in books: you do not need a teacher for that." "Then what are you here for?" they asked. That is the real question to answer. Education must be much broader than the acquisition of facts. Knowledge without the wisdom to use it is dangerous. Criminals are not without knowledge; they just use it in antisocial ways.
Can we assess thinking, problem solving or coping with difficult people? Not by grades or marks. So often work is done just to gain a mark or grade, so the teacher's correction of errors is ignored, thus the chances of improvement towards excellence is lost. I endeavored where possible to mark work in the presence of the pupil. Each person needs to measure himself against himself, or against his hero or role-model to use the more modern term. He needs to evaluate his work himself with the aid of caring adults such as a teacher or parent. Encouraging comments from either of these can push forward the frontiers of learning for the child.

ACQUISITION OF SKILLS

It is very important to make sure every pupil has all the skills to deal with life in and out of school. One of the most vital in the modern world is literacy. It is a disgrace the illiteracy rate is so high due entirely to bad teaching methods that come from bad teacher training. If we used phonic systems — and perhaps changed the English spelling — we could have 99% literacy. I had tremendous success using the Initial Teaching Alphabet with children who had failed for years.

There are problems with math skills often because mathematics is taught by people who do not understand the problems for the child. Other skills are how to study and use books of reference, how to use computers and other equipment, how to get on with other people, how to state your point of view and evaluate others, how to solve problems.

THE TEACHER

All this makes great demands upon the teacher because s/he is the real and most valuable resource. S/he will need great skill, much patience and perseverance, but because of change in the classroom atmosphere, s/he will find more energy, satisfaction and joy in the marked progress of all the pupils because their basic needs will be fulfilled.

A pupil feeling s/he is at the center of educational concern, having some freedom to choose, power over his own destiny, a feeling of belonging, and enjoying the fun of it all, is very different from one who feels he has neither power nor freedom, a sense of belonging or fun. I know which I would rather deal with!
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ABSTRACT

Self-evaluation is an integral part of the RT process. Self-evaluation is a skill that must be taught. Children can learn this skill when their teachers move away from evaluating students and become facilitators of students' self-evaluation. One innovative way to foster the self-evaluation concept is the implementation of student-led parent conferences in our schools. Teachers who use student-led parent conferences teach their students to self-evaluate. These students learn to choose behaviors which will lead them to continuously improve and to do quality work.

...we must constantly remind ourselves that the ultimate purpose of evaluation is to enable students to evaluate themselves.

— Arthur L. Costa

As educators examine assessment techniques, there seems to be a new vision of assessment. Much emphasis is placed on meaningful tasks, critical thinking, self-evaluation, and learner outcomes. In keeping with this new vision, I recently made a presentation to a group of teachers on the topic “Student-Led Parent Conferences". The overwhelming plea from my audience of teachers from every level of education was, “tell us how we can implement student-led parent conferences in our classrooms". Some of these teachers are already using this model and find that student-led parent conferences foster student accountability and responsibility. Also, parent-student communication is increased as parents gain a better understanding of what their children do in school. Ultimately, children learn the importance of self-evaluation, which is a skill they will use for life.

After researching the topic further, I made the following plan to help teachers implement student-led parent conferences. The three phases in implementing student-led conferences are: 1) preparation 2) implementation and 3) evaluation.

PREPARATION FOR CONFERENCES

It may be helpful to use a team approach to divide up responsibilities. The team can begin by brainstorming the pros and cons of changing from the traditional parent conferences to student-led parent conferences. After agreeing that this change would benefit students, teachers, and parents, a timeline should be established starting in September through the end of the school year. Careful documentation of the implementation process the first year will be helpful in evaluating progress and making changes for the following year. Visiting schools that use student-led conferences to talk with other teachers using the model is an important first step.
The organizing structure of the conference is the student portfolio. Recent research on portfolios emphasizes student selection in assembling a portfolio (Collins 1992, Goldman 1989, Krest 1990, Reif 1990, Wolfe 1989). Portfolios can be organized around subject areas and the school’s student outcomes requirements. The teacher determines the external criteria for the portfolios and the student determines the internal criteria. For example, the teacher will determine subject areas to be included and, in a particular subject, the number and type of selections required. The student will select particular work samples within that guiding structure. The teacher may require three writing samples in the language arts section of the portfolio. The student will then select which three pieces of work will go into the portfolio. Only a few items would be selected for discussion during the conference, possibly one item per subject area.

Through a series of class sessions, students will be taught that they will do the talking during the conference, and the teacher will be there only for support. Teachers may intervene if students get stuck or if parents try to take over. Students should help to formulate the content of the conference by writing a script to include: introductions, a display of work samples, discussion of units studied, descriptions of favorite projects, an explanation of strengths as well as areas in need of improvement, and a plan outlining goals in each area. Once the script is written, the students will rehearse the script by role playing with classmates. Scripts may be eliminated by using Kingore’s (1993) recommendation to attach caption strips to portfolio items. These strips include a description of the work, an explanation of why the student chose it, and a space for parent response.

The team may choose to compose a letter to parents to communicate information about the new conference format. Brainstorming of other communication ideas is also valuable. To promote parent acceptance of student-led parent conferences, teachers might offer to schedule a private conference after the student-led parent conference at the parents’ request. The students will also communicate with the parents by designing, making, and delivering an invitation to the parent conference.

IMPLEMENTING THE CONFERENCE

On the day of the conference, students might be responsible for providing refreshments for their parents.

Guided by the script, after introductions students will provide their parents with pencil and paper and ask that they hold any questions or comments until the end. This will provide the students with uninterrupted time to make their presentations.

The amount of time slotted for each conference will depend on scheduling restraints within individual schools. Recommended time for each conference would be 20-30 minutes. I am aware of some schools that allow only 10-15 minutes. Guyton and Feilstein (1989) suggest scheduling three student-led conferences simultaneously. This allows for more time in the conference day. However, since this type of scheduling seems more complex, regular one at a time conferences might work better the first year of implementation.

EVALUATING THE CONFERENCE

Finally, the team can learn by evaluating the conferences. Students and teachers should come up with questions to be asked of students, parents, and teachers. Le Countryman and Schroeder (1996) recommend the following questions for student-led parent conferences:

1) What did you like about the student-led parent conference?
2) How did you feel during the conference?
3) What didn’t you like about the conference?
4) If you could change the conference to make it better, what would you do?

A teacher I work with added a nice touch by sending parents a letter requesting they write their child a letter to be placed in the portfolio. He gives the following suggestions for areas to address:

- During our conference, I noticed that. . . .
- During our conference, I felt proud because. . . .
- I am pleased to see your extra effort in. . . .
- I am proud of your improvement in. . . .
- I can help you by. . . .
- I was surprised to hear. . . .

You might also comment on the characteristics for school success that we use — flexibility, reflectivity, persistence, organization, independence, attentiveness, positive attitude, expectation for success, and intention to learn.

Just as there are many ways to plan and conduct the traditional parent conferences, there can be many variations of student-led parent conferences. Research indicates that this model meets the needs of students and increases student-parent communication. After hearing from teachers, students, and parents who have experienced student-led parent conferences, the following outcomes were noted:

1. Teachers reported that their students assumed ownership for their grades and academic progress.
2. Parents enjoyed the interaction with their children during the conference. They felt the conference empowered their children to take ownership for their own learning.
3. Teachers noticed an increase in the academic performance of their students.
4. Parent participation in student-led parent conferences was 100%, and parent response was favorable.
5. Students enjoyed the conference and appreciated the opportunity to be responsible for leading the conference.

Student-led parent conferences provide students, parents, and teachers with a better picture of who the student is, what that student has achieved, and a clear idea of the student’s plans for accomplishing his or her goals.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose is to provide the reader with a tool to help clients learn how they can begin to make new and better choices. The emphasis is on how humans organize behaviors and how to teach clients how they can establish new, and more effective choices.

"Creativity can solve almost any problem. The creative act, the default of habit by originality overcomes everything."

—George Lois

As a counsellor who relies heavily on the work of Glasser, I have found one of the most challenging requirements after clients have identified their present controlling need which is not being fulfilled (effectively), is teaching them the process of learning new, more effective behavior(s). For the purpose of this article, I will assume the client has evaluated this new, more effective behavior(s) as being both acceptable and effective. As Glasser (1996) teaches, for an individual to learn a new behavior, it is imperative he/she see for him/herself the value of the new option. The individual must also be cognitively aware of the value and benefit of the new behavior(s); it must be need(s) fulfilling.

Over the years, while teaching Choice Theory, I have encountered many different paradigms for teaching about basic needs, total behavior, and the Quality World. While using any one of these tools, I have always been fascinated by observing the client as he/she learns Choice Theory, and watching the “bells and whistles” go on as he/she develops new profound knowledge. As a result, the client experiences what Adler (1963) called the “Aha” — the insight that results from recognizing the value of this new information. It is at this point the person becomes capable of introducing the information into his/her behavior system and Quality World. My experience has led me to develop a model that is helpful for teaching the client how we organize new behavior(s), and evaluate when we are ready to choose new behavior(s).

However, before I show my paradigm, it may be of benefit to first consider the following question: “How can I observe and evaluate when a client is ready to choose to organize new behavior(s)?” To address this question I have relied on Prochaska, DiClemente, and Norcross (1992; in Howatt, 1996) who have developed a process of change paradigm (see Figure 1). As these authors show, if the client is not ready to choose to change (i.e., is in
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the Precontemplation Stage), he/she will not change. However, if the client is already thinking about changing (i.e., in the Contemplation Stage), he/she is open to identify what new information he/she will need so he/she might achieve the outcome he/she desires. It is at this stage I have found my “Active Choice Box” useful in teaching how we re-organize or organize behaviors, and what we need to do to learn new and more effective organized behaviors. To demonstrate how I use the Active Choice Box, I will present a brief Case Study.

THE CASE OF “BOB”

Bob came to counselling with an addiction to alcohol. He had tried detox, 28 day programs, out-patient programs, and AA. His history showed a tendency to stay sober for about two to three months, until faced with what he perceived to be a stressor, at which time he would relapse. From a choice theory perspective, the client relapsed because he/she could not organize, at a conscious level, a more effective behavior to meet the demands of the controlling behavior (e.g., drinking). Each relapse would consist of a five to six month drinking episode, at which time he would become either psychologically or physically ill, or both, and would look to resolve his problem. In this case, Bob has been drinking for 20 years and the physiological effects of his alcohol dependency have been showing up in the decline of his general health. Through discussion with Bob, we were able to determine that as he becomes more stressed, his creativity system provided him with different options to consider (e.g., suicide). Bob explained that he would dismiss the alternative options quickly, and proceed to drinking for immediate relief — his panacea for all perceived stresses.

When I saw Bob, he had just completed detox and was skeptical that a treatment plan which involved individual counselling would be of benefit to him. As he would tell everyone “I have seen and heard it all.” After completing both a psychosocial assessment and a needs assessment, the following became very clear: Bob has been in contemplation before, and has tried to take positive action (e.g., AA, etc.); however, he has never had an opportunity to learn the necessary knowledge and skills to develop new and effective behavior(s), nor has anyone helped him to self-evaluate his currently available organized behavior(s). Glasser’s (1984) teachings show that one of the gifts of choice theory is educating the client about the whys of human behavior. If the client does not learn how and why he/she drinks, how can he/she ever learn to choose new, more effective behavior(s)? After I taught Bob the basics of choice theory, I offered the following diagram to help Bob understand his behavior (see Figure 2). The purpose of this graphic (where the client fills in the active choice box) is to provide Bob with a visual representation of the negative feedback loop his behavior system is caught in. As Bob can see, he has a stressful situation which does not fit in his Quality World; as a result, he perceives a difference between what he wants and what he has, and his system becomes frustrated. I propose that we all have organized behavior(s) that function at different levels of perceived stress. This is what I refer to as “stress dependent learning,” which I define as behavior we organize at different levels of perceived stress. For example, when Bob is happy, he organizes behaviors such as walking, socializing, etc.; however, when he perceives he is stressed, he uses different organized behaviors such as isolating, negative self-talk, and drinking. Glasser (1984) teaches all any human can do (whether frustrated or not) is to behave; he/she has no other choice. Glasser also states that all behavior is purposeful. Together, these two statements suggest clients will always choose behaviors that are available to them at the “moment of choice.”
I have found that in cases similar to Bob's, because of a lack of self-evaluation as to the effectiveness of their behavior in relationship to their perception of self, people will usually stay in a vicious loop (cycle) of self-destructive behavior. The frustrating part for many counsellors is the behavior chosen by the client; often, it is chosen at a conscious level with the awareness that the choice is not really effective. However, in cases like Bob's where the client recognizes that he/she has no other effective organized behavior(s) to meet his/her needs, they develop a level of tension which is a motivator and an opportunity to help teach the client new information. As Covey (1990) teaches, our head creates our whole world. No one can evaluate what stress is except the individual experiencing it. Covey also instructs that for change to occur, the individual must evaluate that his/her present behavior(s) are creating a problem.

To address this concern, I would first review and teach Bob what he is doing (as in Figure 2), and ask him: "If you continue to have the same three choices in your active box, what do you think are the chances of living a life without alcohol?" It is imperative that the counsellor provide a safe opportunity for Bob to self-evaluate. Then I ask "Bob, if we could find a way that you could feel better without drinking, would you be interested?" This is to determine if he is in the contemplation stage and ready to make a proactive choice. Because Bob is always controlling his system to meet his basic needs, he will have a difficult time quitting alcohol until he is able to learn a new behavior that is of at least equal value to his system.

I find clients frequently enjoy the concept offered by Covey (1990). He contends that learning any new behavior requires: KNOWLEDGE — the what; SKILL — the how, and, ATTITUDE — the why, much the same way that Glasser (1996) teaches the importance of the client seeing the why, because it demonstrates the value of the new behavior for the client.

Because Bob is in contemplation for change and ready to begin the preparation for change (e.g., learning new knowledge and skills), I have learned from Glasser (1996) that this is where we, as counsellors, must be mindful of "Righteousness." Righteousness, according to Glasser, is what happens when counsellors assign their own meaning to the client's world, and then expect the client to share the same world view. Based on this assumption, counsellors create expectations of what the client will be able to do based on this imposed world view. Even though the counsellor believes he/she is helping the client, he/she could be setting the client up for failure by imposing standards that do not fit the client's own Quality World picture. Glasser hypothesizes this occurs due to the counsellor's expectation that clients are able to organize information the same way he/she does, and perceive the same value in this new behavior. This is seldom the case.

Through further dialogue with Bob, I showed him a model for developing new behavior(s) (see Figure 3) and said, "Bob, I am not asking you to change. I am asking you to consider two choices: old behavior(s) that were once useful and effective, and learning new behavior(s) that have meaning to you now, and feel good." I ask this question because I am not sure we ever change who we are, we only change what we do — thus paradoxically showing ourselves to the world as changed. In other words, Bob will always know that drinking is one choice or option available to him. Even if it is not an effective choice, it is still a choice. Until Bob is able to learn new behavior(s), for the times when his perceived stress level increases, and is in a position to choose these new effective behavior(s) first, he is susceptible to lapse and relapse.

I have found the more effective the behaviors are that Bob has organized, the less his chances are of relapse because, as the client adds more resources, he/she improves his/her chances of succeeding. The key is this: as the client learns new behavior(s), he/she is then able to add it to his/her Active Choice Box. As a counsellor in this process, I must act as a teacher and counsellor and avoid the righteous position of a "fixer."

As Bob and I started to explore new, effective behavior(s) in the Action Stage of Change, we ensure, through Bob's self-evaluation, the knowledge, skill, and attitude required for each new behavior are understood and readily accessible. Once Bob feels he has the new behavior in place, we will write it in his Active Choice Bob. As the process continues, we will add new behaviors one-by-one. I use the Active Choice Bob diagram as part of Bob's Stay Safe Relapse Plan (see Figure 4).

As Bob is able to obtain these new skills, we continue to add new choices, moving the choice to drink further and further down his active choice list. With repetition, like putting on shoes, Bob is able to move away from consistently choosing less effective behaviors, to a point where he is able to choose new effective skills at an automatic level whenever his system perceives a stressor. Bob will, as we all do, need to continue to maintain and self-evaluate the choices in his Active Choice Box for different levels of stress. I recommend the use of a daily journal, which allows clients to keep watch on their behavior system through self-monitoring, thus enabling
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<td>5. Negative self-talk</td>
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<td>6. Alcohol</td>
</tr>
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</table>
them to become aware of any triggers that may lead to a relapse. For continued client success, I believe it is paramount for the counsellor to teach the philosophy of life-long learning. Once the client sees the value of his/her active box, he/she needs to be encouraged to continue practicing and exploring effective behavior(s).

As with the case of Bob, there is sometimes a tremendous amount of knowledge and learning of new skills which need to be in place before the client can make a healthy choice. If he/she has never developed a frame of reference for effective behaviors, it takes time, patience, and an organized plan that allows the client to take small steps to ensure success. The end goal of this process is to enable the client to develop a contract with him/herself to choose a healthier and happier life.

CONCLUSION
The purpose was to demonstrate how I use a model to help clients to
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ABSTRACT

A school is similar to the human body, an orchestra, the solar system, a spider web, or a mobile. Each is a system composed of interdependent parts linked together. A system functions in a healthy manner when the linkages are strong. A school embarks on and continues its voyage to quality when the connections between the units remain strong. This happens when an effective self-monitoring system is in place.

THE SCHOOL AS A SYSTEM: QUALITY LINKAGES

“Our strength is in our linkages...”

Buckminster Fuller

The planet Earth is impacted by the sun and moon. It can be said that to some extent it is controlled by them. Likewise, one function of the human body, e.g., breathing, impacts the circulatory system, the brain, and all other components. When the unit functions according to its design, the various units work together. Similarly, when one member of a family changes behavior, its effect ripples throughout the entire network of family relationships. When one “member” of a mobile is moved, the entire hanging changes positions. When the threads of a fishing net are cut, the entire net is weakened. Then when a weak thread is repaired, the entire net is strengthened.

Why are the above statements true? The answer is that they describe systems. As systems, they are not comprised of isolated independent units working separate from one another. Rather, each component interfaces with every other component and the linkage is as important as the unit itself.

THE SYSTEMIC JOURNEY

If a school is to journey successfully toward genuine quality, it will do so as a system working as a network, not as an aggregate of isolated units. It is more like a ship on the ocean than a collection of automobiles on an expressway. The parts are connected. There are subsystems or alliances. The system as a whole strives for balance. It functions with written rules and unwritten norms. It adapts to change and is characterized by health or dysfunction. At the center of this network of functions is a source of leadership and communication, the purpose of which is to unite the various components.

More specifically, a system is composed of seven linkages which need attention in the quest for quality. Indeed, a system’s strength is in its linkages. And so the energy of the system, i.e., its search for quality lies in the effectiveness of the following seven linkages:

INTERDEPENDENCE

The components of a system interface with one another. When one violin in an orchestra plays off-key, it affects the quality of the entire symphony. In a school when one teacher clings to boss managing, the students are impacted. Their work is shoddy and their behavior is often rebellious. More often than not, this rebellion overflows into other classes. Consequently, the behavior of the boss manager and the resultant rebelliousness contaminates the entire system (Glasser, 1990). On the other hand, when the teachers change their own behavior, they create an atmosphere in which students can make more effective choices (Glasser, 1996).

SUBSYSTEMS

In every large organization there are alliances. The skilled family therapist is adroit at identifying triads; mother, father and oldest son, or grandmother and two children, etc. In schools, there are natural alliances among students because of age, grade, placement, etc. Faculty alliances emerge and become more pronounced; advanced placement teachers, special education departments, coaches, food service, maintenance. Other alliances are based on age, gender, or racial differences.

HOMEOSTASIS

A system seeks to be in balance. The earth travels around the sun in an elliptical orbit and is thus farther away from the sun at times. It then returns and is slightly closer at other times. In a sense, one movement makes up for other movements. The human body keeps in balance by shivering when it is cold and perspiring when it is overly warm. When a family system is thrown off balance, it seeks a compensating balance through various behaviors. An older child is sometimes called upon to cook, wash, etc., when a parent is sick. When the parent recovers, the family members return to their previous roles.

So too, the school officials need to have flexible policies to keep the system functioning. Thus, when the system is disrupted by weather or serious crisis such as a death or suicide, there should be a prearranged plan for helping the system — students, faculty, staff — to return to a normal state of functionality.

ADAPTABILITY AND COHESION

Systems adapt to change. When a part of a mobile is touched, the other parts are impacted and move in varying degrees. When one instrument of an orchestra changes its tune, the sound of the entire orchestra is influenced. The amount of change in the entire system depends on the amount of cohesion among the various components. Similarly, a failure of an entire section of an orchestra is more noticeable than the off-key note of one violin.

Similar to homeostasis, adaptability means that a school can incorporate new faculty, new students, new administrators, new support staff, new ideas. It adapts to change of schedule, change in seasons and unexpected alterations in voter mood. In its search for quality, it continually attempts to establish new adjustments and abandon outdated practices.
Every school needs a structure characterized by rules for students and faculty, as well as guidelines for behaviors. These norms, within which the members of the school community function, can be called boundaries. For faculty and staff, these are ethical principles and legal prescriptions.

Rules, such as the prohibition of sexual contact between adults and children, are clear and precise. The necessity of confidentiality and its limitations are defined in the codes of various professional organizations such as teacher associations, as well as counseling, psychological, and social work associations. In a quality school they are made concrete and relevant with a few simple, clear, and well thought out policies.

Moreover, there are often unwritten norms which place boundaries around school behaviors. These are composed of tacit expectations, such as the appropriateness or inappropriateness of faculty eating lunch with students. There might not be a written rule or guideline regarding such behavior but there could be a quiet expectation requiring one or the other choice.

If the vision of the school searching for quality is a shared one, this common goal has the effect of establishing boundaries regulating behavior in a way which feels aspirational to faculty and students rather than prescriptive and legalistic. “We want to do more and do better” was the comment of one teacher in such a school.

A system can be healthy or dysfunctional as a whole. The high command of Iraq could well be a system which is based on fear, intrigue, suspicion and paranoia. Thus if the goals of a system are destructive, the system can be said to be unhealthy. Furthermore, even a system which has laudable goals can be less than healthy. Merit pay, individual rewards, information hoarding, and many other practices destroy the health of the organization and create a toxic atmosphere. Unhealthy organizations foster anxiety, procrastination, avoidance of responsibility, failure, low quality products, poor performance, sloppy work, creative avoidance, and even rebellion.

On the other hand, treating people in need satisfying ways fosters cooperation, best effort, relevant and useful products as well as public acceptance. (Deming, 1986). In education, such treatment can only help the most powerful “customer,” i.e., parents and voters, to look benignly on the school.

The glue which holds systems together is communication. The leader sets the examples as if he/she were the conductor of an orchestra. The mobile needs a central cord to the ceiling, the web needs a spider, the fishing net needs knots, the human body has a brain and the solar system has a sun. All of these “leaders” set the tone for the entire organization. They impact it for better or for worse in how much or how little they influence the system.

Communication originates with the leader who models open but discreet communication and keeps the components in balance (Weiskorp, 1976). The principal of the school sets the tone by respectful, clear, comprehensive statements. With lead management as the theme, decisiveness, vision, democracy, willingness to listen, and inclusion are the characteristics of the leader (Bennis, 1989).

The quality school works to improve the above systemic components. Because the search is never-ending and because the target continuously moves, no system reaches perfection. The school is an ocean liner which never reaches its destination. But the journey is enjoyable and challenging and so the search goes on. When a degree of success is attained, new challenges emerge. Thus, when faculty are trained they face new systemic issues such as:

- the writing of a curriculum which reflects choice theory as developmental;
- the formulation of criteria for student self-evaluated projects;
- how to find time for class meetings;
- how to make better use of time and space in the building;
- keeping the curricula current;
- updating the library as well as technology;
- staff turnover; and finally,
- the continuation of training for new staff.

In summary, the school is a system like a human body, the solar system, a mobile, an orchestra, a net. The parts are interdependent. They can function in ways which are healthy or unhealthy. Each has an important role to play and contributes to the whole. When the parts work in harmony with effective leadership, the product, though always improvable, is high quality.
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ABSTRACT

With a growing university student population and more demands being placed on students, there is a need for more research in the area of counseling with this population. This need is even greater in Asian universities where counseling based on human psychology is a fairly new concept. Reality therapy, as one of the major counseling theories, has proven highly effective with university students. It has been shown that students possessing a more internal locus of control show greater successes in academics and problem solving than students with a more external locus of control. Thus, the present study investigates the effects of reality therapy and the ideas of choice theory (CT) on locus of control among students in Asian universities. Students are exposed to either CT/RT group counseling sessions or cognitive training in choice theory. Conclusions and implications are drawn from the results.

INTRODUCTION

Counseling based on human psychology is a fairly recent immigrant to Chinese intellectual circles (Bond, 1986; The Executive Committee of the Chinese Psychological Society, 1983; Wu, 1983). Although some empirical data concerning the psychological functioning of the Chinese college students are available, little information exists to summarize and integrate these data. Because of this, there is a void in the area of counseling models for Chinese college students based on psychological data (Barclay & Wu, 1986; Bond, 1986; Chen & Wang, 1989; Cheung, 1986). In addition, Chen and Wang (1989) found that many researchers were concerned about the effectiveness of counseling with college students. Thus, new approaches to counseling are needed since most Asian students find little time to develop the appropriate skills to handle emotional pressures (Miao, 1981).

After comparing reality therapy with other major counseling theories, Treadway (1971) concluded that reality therapy conformed to all of the criteria needed for effective counseling of college students. Parish (1988a) found empirical evidence that reality therapy strategies with college students foster a stronger internal locus of control. However, for counseling to be effective, cultural backgrounds should be considered for college students, and the counselor's strategies should be carefully chosen according to the needs and specific situations of each individual.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Few studies have attempted to use a group counseling setting to help participants gain a more internal locus of control to enhance their choices in daily living. The CT/RT Model has already been shown to be an effective alternative for working with youth (Parish, 1988b). However, there is little information available about its effectiveness with college students (Chen & Wang, 1989). Furthermore, the body of research shrinks even more when considering the effects of reality therapy as applied to the Asian culture. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of choice theory and the process of reality therapy in both group counseling and teaching settings on locus of control with Taiwanese college students.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

HYPOTHESIS

The use of RT and the principles of choice theory will have a positive effect on the locus of control with Taiwanese college students in both group counseling and teaching settings. In other words, Taiwanese college students who participate in RT group counseling sessions or who are taught choice theory principles will exhibit significantly higher levels of internal locus of control as compared to Taiwanese college students who are not exposed to RT and choice theory.

DEPENDENT MEASURE

Glasser (1981) utilized William T. Powers' control theory to explain that human beings are controlled by their desire to fulfill internal needs, not by external stimuli. All of their behaviors are their best attempt to control their own lives (Glasser, 1981; Powers, 1973). College students with an internal locus of control tend to exhibit more success in school as well as demonstrate better problem solving abilities. However, the earliest study on locus of control involving Chinese subjects by Hsieh, Shybut, and Lotsof (1969) found that the Chinese exhibit a stronger external control of reinforcement. Much of this disposition is due, in part, to the cultural background and values of the Chinese.

METHODOLOGY

SUBJECTS

A total of 217 undergraduate students (114 male and 103 female) enrolled in National Tsing-Hua University, National Chiao-Tung University, National Central University, and Chung-Wha Poly Technological Institute volunteered to participate in the study [Demographic information by treatment groups can be seen in Table 1]. The students had a mean age of 21, with most being classified as Juniors (Table 2). The students' mean G.P.A. was 3.0 with no significant difference between males and females.

INSTRUMENT

The Internality-Externality Scale was used to measure locus of control. The Internality-Externality Control Scale is a 29-item scale developed by Rotter in 1966. The popularity of the I-E scale is attested to by the body of research on I-E control, which consists of more than 300 published and unpublished studies. Parish (1988a), using college students, found a significant correlation between internal locus of control and responsibility for their studies after learning basic reality therapy strategies.

DESIGN

The research design consisted of a 2x3 factorial design with gender
De~ographic Information

Subjects were given a pre-test prior to the treatment phase. A post-test was administered at the conclusion of the treatment phase and a follow-up test (male/female) and treatment (RT counseling group, choice theory teaching group, and a control group) constituting the independent variables. The groups were approximately equal in terms of gender. The counseling group received two hours of group counseling sessions per week for eight consecutive weeks using RT. The teaching group received two hour weekly training sessions on choice theory for eight weeks, while the control group received no treatment.

PROCEDURES

Upon completing the pre-test, the subjects were broken into 3 groups (control group = 73; counseling group = 73; teaching group = 71) using random assignment for the treatment phase. The groups were approximately equal in terms of gender. The counseling group received two hours of group counseling sessions per week for eight consecutive weeks using RT. The teaching group received two hour weekly training sessions on choice theory for eight weeks, while the control group received no treatment.

Table 1

Demographic Information by Treatment Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>G1 (n = 73) (%)</th>
<th>G2 (n = 73) (%)</th>
<th>G3 (n = 71) (%)</th>
<th>Total (n = 217) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37 (51%)</td>
<td>39 (54%)</td>
<td>39 (51%)</td>
<td>116 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39 (49%)</td>
<td>34 (46%)</td>
<td>35 (49%)</td>
<td>105 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>21 (29%)</td>
<td>23 (31%)</td>
<td>27 (36%)</td>
<td>66 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>41 (56%)</td>
<td>45 (62%)</td>
<td>47 (62%)</td>
<td>137 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>26 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
<td>21 (29%)</td>
<td>33 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
<td>36 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>39 (53%)</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
<td>25 (35%)</td>
<td>74 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
<td>42 (58%)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>74 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>33 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>55 (75%)</td>
<td>29 (40%)</td>
<td>32 (46%)</td>
<td>116 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>22 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>40 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>28 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
<td>31 (42%)</td>
<td>19 (27%)</td>
<td>61 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>52 (72%)</td>
<td>33 (45%)</td>
<td>42 (59%)</td>
<td>127 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>24 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Marital Statuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>69 (99%)</td>
<td>67 (92%)</td>
<td>62 (87%)</td>
<td>198 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very strong</td>
<td>13 (21%)</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>34 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>35 (48%)</td>
<td>45 (62%)</td>
<td>38 (51%)</td>
<td>118 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>median</td>
<td>19 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
<td>48 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>15 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>28 (39%)</td>
<td>32 (44%)</td>
<td>23 (32%)</td>
<td>83 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
<td>21 (29%)</td>
<td>53 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third</td>
<td>21 (29%)</td>
<td>15 (21%)</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
<td>54 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other(5-9)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only Child</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Control Group (G1) CT/RT Counseling Group (G2) CT Teaching Group (G3)

Table 2

Demographic Data by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>G1 (n = 36)</th>
<th>G2 (n = 34)</th>
<th>G3 (n = 36)</th>
<th>Total (n = 106)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: G1 = NonTreatment group
G2 = CT/RT Counseling group
G3 = CT Teaching group
CT = Stress of Achievement
SA = Stress of Achievement

Table 3

Means/Standard Deviations of Locus of Control at Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.92 (3.05)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.71 (3.76)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.54 (2.90)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14.06 (3.42)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Group (G1) CT/RT Counseling Group (G2) CT Teaching Group (G3)
follow-up test (Table 9). A statistically significant main effect for the treatment, $F(2,208) = 4.72, p < .01$, on the posttest scores of locus of control measures was found (Table 6). However, there was no statistically significant main effect of gender, $F(1,208) = .04, p > .85$. Scheffe’s post-hoc comparison for the treatment effect revealed significant differences between the three groups (Table 8).

**INTERACTION EFFECTS**

The results of the ANCOVA indicated no significant interaction effects between gender and treatment, $F(2,208) = .01, p < .99$, of locus of control with the post-test. Similar findings were observed as well on the follow-up test (Table 7).

Presumably, if students in both the counseling groups and teaching groups learned the CT/RT principles, they would choose more responsible behaviors and move toward an internal locus of control in which they would have effective control of their lives (Glasser, 1995). As expected, no significant differences were found between gender and treatment or between gender and locus of control. Nevertheless, the results do support the findings of Glasser (1984), who reported that the CT/RT principles were an effective model for teaching and counseling college students. The control group tended to have a significantly lower internal locus of control than either treatment group. These findings suggest the notion that subjects exposed to CT and RT, whether in group counseling settings or in training sessions, do maintain more effective control of their lives and adopt a higher internal locus of control.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The control group was significantly higher on external control than were the two treatment groups, but there were no significant differences between the treatment groups. Similar findings were observed as well on the follow-up test (Table 9). A statistically significant main effect for the treatment, $F(2,208) = 4.72, p < .01$, on the posttest scores of locus of control measures was found (Table 6). However, there was no statistically significant main effect of gender, $F(1,208) = .04, p > .85$. Scheffe’s post-hoc comparison for the treatment effect revealed significant differences between the three groups (Table 8).

**ST I T I S T I C AL A N A L Y S E S**

The data collected were analyzed using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to determine the main and interaction effects of the variables by gender and treatment on locus of control. Means and standard deviations for locus of control at pretest, posttest, and follow-test can be seen on Tables 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Pretest scores were used for adjusting pre-existing individual differences between groups. A one-way ANCOVA was followed by interaction effects to investigate the possible simple effect of treatment on different gender groups and the possible simple effect of gender within different treatment groups. When significant, the Scheffe Test was followed as a post hoc comparison for investigation of the adjusted mean of group comparison. Differences were considered significant at the $p < .05$ level. These analyses were performed using the SPSS statistical package.

**Table 4**  
Means/Standard Deviations of Locus of Control at Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.39 (4.59)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.65 (3.05)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.34 (2.71)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.84 (4.04)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Group (G1)  CT/RT Counseling Group (G2)  CT Teaching Group (G3)

**Table 5**  
Means/Standard Deviations of Locus of Control at Follow-Up Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.47 (4.49)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.61 (2.90)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.86 (3.00)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.70 (4.09)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Group (G1)  CT/RT Counseling Group (G2)  CT Teaching Group (G3)

**Table 6**  
ANCOVA with Locus of Control Variable at Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>153.87</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Covariate = Pretest scores of Internality-Externality Scale

**Table 7**  
ANCOVA with Locus of Control Variable at Follow-Up Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.73</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Covariate = Pretest scores of Internality-Externality Scale
**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Simultaneous Lower Difference</th>
<th>Simultaneous Upper Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level

**Note:**
1 = G1 = Nontreatment
2 = G2 = CT/RT counseling
3 = G3 = CT teaching

**Table 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Simultaneous Lower Difference</th>
<th>Simultaneous Upper Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level

**Note:**
1 = G1 = Nontreatment
2 = G2 = CT/RT counseling
3 = G3 = CT teaching

**CONCLUSION**

The results of this study seem to support the notion that reality therapy and CT teaching have positive effects on the locus of control of Taiwanese university students. Information and insight from this study will provide researchers and therapists with baseline data to do additional research utilizing the ideas. Cultural backgrounds and values are also important considerations to be acknowledged when working with college students and this could be an area for further research endeavors as well. It is also important to note that a combined program of CT teaching and RT group counseling sessions may be maximally effective in promoting responsible behaviors to help students take effective control of their lives.
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