

T
676
ed

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF GROUP
COUNSELLING ON APTITUDINALLY SUPERIOR
BUT ACADEMICALLY UNDERACHIEVING
COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

C. Stuart Dawson, Jr.

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
of Degree of Master of Arts in the Psychology
Department of the American University of Beirut.

Beirut, Lebanon

February, 1965

PREFACE

The thesis which follows is an attempt to assess experimentally the effect of group counselling on academic achievement. For that reason the reader who is expecting to find himself immersed in absorbing case histories annotated with insightful remarks will be disappointed. While a paper of that sort might be more enjoyable to read and certainly more pleasant to write, one could hardly call it a scientific work. To the end of making this thesis more scientific an attempt has been made to treat a clinical subject experimentally. Although the approach is not original, it is little more than a decade ago that it was first applied to group counselling.¹ In this area as in many others a rapprochement between clinicians on the one hand and the experimentalists on the other is needed.² This is simply one more piece of research which attempts to bridge the gap.

The study has two main purposes. The first is to test experimentally specific hypotheses in a relatively new area of research. These hypotheses relate to the effectiveness of group counselling in improving the academic performance, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment of college students

¹Gorlow, L., Hoch, E. L., Telschow, E. F. The nature of nondirective group psychotherapy. New York: Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1952, p. vii.

²Gundlach, R.H. Group psychotherapy; New clinical and experimental approaches. In L.E. Abt and B.F. Reiss (Eds.), Progress in clinical psychology. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1960, p. 163.

whose aptitudes indicated that they should be performing academically better than they were.

The second purpose is to allow the writer to become familiar with the use of certain techniques for measuring changes in achievement and adjustment. As he intends to pursue research of the nature included herein, the writer will benefit in the future from the experience he will gain from this research. Thus this thesis is a means as well as an end.

The writer wishes to express his deep gratitude to Mr. Michael Shamma'a, Freshman Advisor at the American University of Beirut, for his help in arranging to have the Subjects take part in this study and to Dr. Fuad Ashkar, Psychiatrist and Student Health Consultant to the American University of Beirut, for his effort and time spent in the weekly counselling sessions.

In addition, I wish to state my appreciation to my Thesis Advisor, Dr. Levon Melikian, and to his co-members on my Thesis Committee, Drs. E. Terry Prothro and E.C.D. Alford, all of the Psychology Department of the American University of Beirut, for their assistance with the organization, methodology, and presentation of this thesis.

Last, I wish to thank my wife, Tootie, for the help and moral support she has given me during the writing of this paper.

*Inadvertently omitted was my expression of thanks to my typist, Mrs. Alan Metnick, without whose conscientiousness the deadline for this thesis would never have been met.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
II. SUBJECT AND METHOD	13
III. RESULTS	26
IV. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	43
V. SUMMARY	50
Appendices	
I. Q-SORT DIRECTIONS AND STATEMENTS	53
II. SUMMARIES OF COUNSELLING SESSIONS.....	59
III. PROTOCOL OF COUNSELLING SESSION II	73
IV. STUDY HABIT QUESTIONNAIRE	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Entrance Examination Scores and First Semester Grade Averages	16
2. Topics in Different Sessions	23
3. The Grades of Experimental and Control Groups Before and After Group Counselling	27
4. Pre-Counselling Grades of the Experimental and Control Groups	28
5. Scores on the Achievement Scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule of Experimental and Control Groups Before and After Counselling	31
6. Pre-Counselling Achievement Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups.....	32
7. Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations Between Self-Ideal Q-Sorts of Experimental and Control Groups Before and After Counselling.....	34
8. Pre-Counselling Self-Ideal Correlations of the Experimental and Control Groups.....	36
9. Changes in Grades and Achievement Scores	37
10. Changes in Grades and Self-Ideal Correlations of the Experimental and Control Groups	39
11. Changes in Achievement Scores and Self-Ideal Correlations of Experimental and Control Groups.....	40
12. Spearman's Rho Correlation Between Changes in Pairs of Dependent Variables.....	41

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The case of a student who arrives at a campus in the fall of his Freshman year with high entrance examination scores and good prospects for success and who ends the first semester with near failing grades is an all too common one. Moreover, it seems fair to say that almost all universities are unhappy when such a situation arises. Evidence for this is the policy of most institutions of providing advisors and counsellors for the students in the hope that these members of the administration or faculty will help the student remove whatever obstacle or obstacles are preventing him from achieving as his aptitude suggests he should.

Do counsellors and advisors really help these underachievers or do some students simply "outgrow" their problems and adjust to university life? There is no conclusive evidence one way or the other, for the question is rarely attacked in a controlled experimental manner.

This study does not attempt to answer such a broad question as that posed above. However, it does attempt to answer with experimentally derived evidence a more circumscribed one - namely, can group counselling help an underachieving student adapt himself to campus life? Adaption in this case would be indicated by better grades, higher motivation, and greater personal adjustment.

The attempt to review adequately in a single chapter the literature devoted to group counselling and therapy alone would be a Herculean task. To give in addition a thoroughgoing account of the research in the area of scholastic underachievement would be foolhardy. The amount written annually in the two fields simply precludes a full view of both. Instead, the writer has elected first to survey briefly the literature in each field, mentioning some of the more important references in each. Then he has presented a more nearly complete review of the literature of the narrower and more pertinent topic of the effect of group counselling on academic underachievement.

Counselling and Psychotherapy

The term psychotherapy has been defined as "the treatment of mental illness and mild adjustment problems by means of psychological techniques."¹

Counselling on the other hand has been termed "the giving of advice and assistance to individuals with vocational or personal problems, often involving some psychotherapy."²

From the above definitions two things become apparent. One is that counselling may or may not involve psychotherapy. The other is that the word counselling may connote a less "serious" form of assistance.

In general then it can be said that psychotherapy deals with more severe problems of adjustment. However, this distinction is not always made. Carl Rogers says that there is no difference between psychotherapy and counselling since any relationship that modifies a patient's behaviour and enables the client to perceive his needs more clearly is therapeutic.³ For the rest of this paper Rogers' view will be subscribed to and the terms used interchangeably.

Corsini discusses the many types of psychotherapy and has evolved a scheme for classifying a particular type along three dimensions - the directive-nondirective, the verbal-actional, and the superficial-depth.⁴

¹Morgan, Clifford T. Introduction to psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961, p. 685.

²Ibid., p. 669.

³Mullan, H. and Rosenbaum, M. Group psychotherapy: Theory and practice. New York: Macmillan, 1962, p. 13.

⁴Corsini, Raymond J. Methods of group psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957, pp. 57-82.

Although each of these three dimensions is in fact a continuum, it will be described as a dichotomy for the sake of simplicity. First, a method may be directive or nondirective. In the former the therapist often leads the discussion, interprets, and focuses the attention of the client on matters he deems important. In the latter, the therapist attempts to keep his interpretations to a minimum. Psychoanalysts tend to adopt a directive method, while Rogerians prefer a nondirective method.

Second, a method may be either verbal or actional. A method in which the patients simply sit and talk would be classified as verbal. A method such as psychodrama and sociodrama in which the emphasis is on spontaneous acting out would be designated as actional.

Third, therapy may either be deep or superficial. Deep therapies attempt to change the underlying basic aspects of personality. In this method a patient is encouraged to talk about his emotional problems, not day-to-day trivia. Most therapies dealing with neurotics are deep. Superficial therapies do not attempt to explore "beneath the surface." Their purpose is mainly to make the existing personality function better in the present environment. Examples of superficial therapy are participation in social clubs and the Alcoholics Anonymous.

Since a particular therapy can be classified in the above three ways, eight types of therapy are therefore theoretically possible: Directive-Verbal-Deep, Directive-Actional-Superficial, etc.¹

In addition to the above three dimensions, a fourth can readily be added. On the basis of the number of clients a therapist or counsellor sees at

¹Ibid., p. 57.

one time, a therapy can be dichotomized into two types - individual and group. In the individual type as the name implies the therapist sees one client at a time while in the group type one or sometimes two therapists meet with more than one individual at one time. There is no agreement^{as} to the best size of the group, but several sources suggest a maximum of eight or ten members.^{1, 2, 3} The basic difference between group therapy and the "one-to-one" (one patient - one therapist) form of therapy is thus obvious, but the number of clients is far from the only difference between the types.

There are qualitative as well as quantitative differences between individual and group therapy. Mullan and Rosenbaum discuss these and point to many advantages of group therapy.⁴ Among those which they state are these: group therapy is more spontaneous than individual therapy; group therapy has less stigma attached to it; group therapy is more liable to elicit inherent creativity.

While agreeing with Mullan and Rosenbaum that the above are advantages of group therapy, the writer feels that the principle reasons for its increasing popularity are two. First, with the number of people needing counselling greatly exceeding the number of counselling hours available, group counselling is able to provide simultaneous counselling for relatively large groups of individuals. Second, a very limited part of an individual's every-

¹ Corsini, loc. cit.

² Johnson, James A., Jr. Group therapy: A practical approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, p. 84.

³ Mullan and Rosenbaum, loc. cit., p. 128.

⁴ Ibid., pp. vii-viii.

day interaction is on a one-to-one basis while a much greater part is in groups. Thus it seems desirable that a mode of counselling be adopted which more nearly approximates the real life situation.

The effect of the above two advantages on the interest in group therapy is expressed by Klopfer in his following quotation:

It seems obvious to this reviewer from both a reading of the current clinical literature and observations of practice, that this is coming to be the decade of group psychotherapy. There seems to be a growing lack of faith in the efficacy of individual psychotherapy as a panacea and a growing recognition of the realistic and economical processes for the treatment of emotional disorders.¹

To indicate more precisely the increased interest in group psychotherapy over the past ten to fifteen years, Mullan and Rosenbaum quoted as follows:

In 1953 one careful researcher was able to unearth twelve hundred papers in the field of group psychotherapy. At the end of 1955 the group psychotherapy literature consisted of seventeen hundred items. The present annual rate is about two hundred books, articles, and theses - double the rate of 1950.²

The counselling used in this study was group rather than individual. In addition it could be classified perhaps as an attempt at semi-directive, verbal, semi-deep counselling. Unless otherwise indicated the terms counselling and therapy, when used in this thesis hereafter, refer to that form of group counselling.

¹Klopfer, W. Review of Group psychotherapy: Theory and practice, by H. Mullan and M. Rosenbaum, Contemporary Psychology, 1964, 9, pp. 116-118.

²Mullan and Rosenbaum, loc. cit., p. 16.

Underachievement and Factors Producing It

One may be said to exhibit underachievement in any situation if he fails to perform to the best of his ability.

In this study one form of underachievement, academic underachievement, is focused upon. A student whose achievement, as measured by grades, is less than the independent measures of aptitude indicate it should be, is termed an "underachiever." Until perfect predictors of future achievement are devised, every campus will have its share of these underachieving students.

Undoubtably there are many causes of academic underachievement, but three can be singled out readily - poor study habits, anxiety, and lack of motivation.

First, poor study habits can interfere with the achievement of the most highly motivated and well-balanced individual. What is generally considered to constitute good and bad study habits has been dealt with extensively elsewhere (e.g., Mace), so the topic will not be dealt with further here.¹

Second, anxiety may produce underachievement. A dispute of long standing has evolved between Taylor and Sarason as to the exact relation between anxiety and achievement. Taylor believes that a general anxiety (one which is not specific to a student's academic involvements) interferes with academic performance (and learning), while Sarason posits a "test anxiety" which arises when a student is faced with an examination.² Lynn has even

¹Mace, C.A. The psychology of study. London: Pelican Books, 1962, pp. 9-114.

²Hallworth, H.J. Anxiety and school examinations. Ed. Review, 1964, 16, 210-217.

suggested that anxiety enhances performance; however, Little finds no evidence to this affect and French finds no relationship at all between anxiety and performance.¹ Since some believe anxiety reduces performance, others that it enhances performance, and another that the two are not related, it seems fair to say that no general agreement exists as to the precise effect of anxiety on performance.

Lack of motivation as a cause for underachievement would in general receive support. McClelland's work in this area is well known² but he deals with a need to achieve which is a rather enduring aspect or, as Rosen has said, a personality characteristic of the individual.² However, some writers feel that over- and underachieving students differ less on their enduring "intrinsic" motivations than on immediate motives.³ In other words they feel that some students are not motivated to do well in school. It is possible that either or both factors may operate. However, to the extent that underachievement is a function of lack of scholastic motivation rather than lack of intrinsic motivation, it might be dealt with a great deal more easily.

In this study the counselling sessions focus on topics which relate to these three factors of study habits, anxiety, and motivation.

¹Ibid.

²Rosen, B.C. The achievement syndrome: A psychocultural dimension of social stratification. In J.W. Atkinson (Ed.), Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958, p. 496.

³Beard, R.M., Levy, P.M., Maddox, H. Academic performance at university. Ed. Review, 1964, 16, 163-174.

The Effect of Group Counselling on Academic Achievement

Very little research has been done on this topic and only three relevant articles could be found locally. These are reviewed below in some detail.

In 1960 Broedel et al. found that group counselling of two groups of gifted underachieving adolescents led to greater gains in self acceptance than were found in non-counselled control groups.¹ However, group counselling did not result in better performance as measured by grade-point ratios. Broedel et al. suggest that the above-mentioned improvement in personal adjustment may have laid the foundation for future gains in achievement.

Second, Keppers and Caplan selected twenty-eight underachieving tenth grade male high school students who had IQ's of 110 or better on the California Test of Mental Maturity, and a grade point average of 2.0 (C average) or less on their first two six-weeks report cards for the academic year 1960-1961.² These students were randomly placed in four groups. In Group I only the boys were counselled. Only the parents of the boys in Group II were counselled. Both Group III boys and their parents were counselled (in separate groups). Group IV, the control, received no special counselling. All counselling was on a group basis.

Fifty self-referent phrases describing various aspects of the self in school were sorted by all the Subjects using the Q-technique. Both self- and ideal-sorts were made before and after counselling by each student.

¹Broedel, J. et al. The effects of group counselling on gifted underachieving adolescents. J. Counsel. Psychol., 1960, 7, 163-170 (Abstract).

²Keppers, G.L., and Caplan, S.W. Group counselling with academically able underachieving students. N. Mex. Soc. Stud. educ. res. Bull., 1962, 1, 12-17.

The counselling sessions were conducted in a permissive atmosphere. Each of the three experimental groups was seen for twelve sixty-minute sessions. Attendance was reported as being irregular.

The counselling was performed by the experimenters who knew the hypotheses and the Q-sort statements. Hence, they were in a position to influence (consciously or unconsciously) the outcome of the sort without bringing about real changes in the personalities of the subjects.

Results indicated that there was no statistically significant change in grades for any of the four groups. Two groups showed an appreciable gain in self-ideal congruence (correlation). The gain in Group I (in which only the boys were counselled) was not significant at the five percent level, although the gain in Group II (the parent counselled group) was significant at the one percent level.

In the third study reviewed, Winborn and Schmidt selected a group of 135 potentially superior academically underachieving college freshmen at the University of Indiana.¹ Each student had scored at least at the 80th percentile on the American Council on Education Psychological Examination and had made a first semester grade-point average of 1.50 or below (half D's and half F's). A random sample of sixty-eight students was drawn as the experimental group, and the remainder were assigned to the control group.

The sixty-eight experimental students were randomly assigned to six sub groups, small enough to undergo group counselling.

¹Winborn, B., and Schmidt, L.G. The effectiveness of short-term group counselling upon the academic achievement of potentially superior but underachieving college freshmen. *J. educ. Res.*, 1962, 55, 169-173.

The California Psychological Inventory was presented to both Experimental and Control Groups before and after counselling. Each sub-group met for six one-hour counselling sessions over a period of two months. The group counselling was unstructured. No mention of attendance was made in their report.

Results showed that scores made on three selected scales of the California Personality Inventory¹ which the experimenters felt were associated with achievement did not reflect any significant differences between the experimental and control groups. However, the control (non-counselled) group made a higher grade-point ratio than the experimental (counselled group). This difference, opposite in direction to that hypothesized, was significant at the five-percent level.

In summary two points can be made. First, very little research has been done in this area. Each article reviewed stresses the need for more research on this problem. Second, the results are not encouraging. Academic performance is shown to be unaffected by group counselling in two studies and decreased relative to an uncounselled group in another. Self-acceptance was shown to increase significantly in three of the counselled groups in another. Achievement related scores on a well-known inventory, the California Personality Inventory, did not improve significantly during counselling.

It must be mentioned, however, that the number of sessions were few - twelve in the Keppers and Caplan study and six in the Winborn and Schmidt study. It must be further mentioned that the results of these studies are not

¹The three scales are the Achievement via Conformity Scale, the Achievement via Independence Scale, and the Intellectual Efficiency Scale.

comparable, since the techniques, number of sessions, and analysis of results were not identical.

Hypotheses of This Study

From the thesis that group counselled underachievers would show a greater improvement in grades, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment than would non-counselled underachievers, were derived the following three hypotheses:

Hypothesis I. - Underachieving college students who attend group counselling sessions will show greater academic improvement as measured by grades than will a matched group of underachievers who do not attend the sessions.

Hypothesis II. - The same group of underachieving college students who attend group counselling sessions will show a greater increase in achievement motivation as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule than will a control group of underachievers.

Hypothesis III. - The same group of underachieving college students who attend group counselling sessions will show a greater increase in personal adjustment as measured by the Q-sort technique than a matched group of non-attending underachievers. An increase in personal adjustment will be defined as a demonstration of greater congruence between an individual's actual-self and ideal-self after the period in which the former group was counselled than before.

Thus, in the study the independent variable is group counselling while the dependent variables are grades, achievement motivation and personal adjustment.

CHAPTER II

SUBJECTS AND METHOD

This chapter is divided into three sections. In the first is discussed the procedure followed in the selection of the subjects of the study and their assignment to the Experimental and Control Groups. In the second section the dependent variables - academic achievement, academic motivation, and adjustment - and the instrument used to measure each are dealt with. In the last section is a discussion of the independent variable, the group counselling, which is followed by a short summary.

Subjects

Fourteen underachieving students in the 1963-1964 freshman class at the American University of Beirut were the subjects in the study. Their selection was based on the following criteria:

- 1) Demonstration of high academic aptitude. The criterion of aptitude was an equally weighted combination of scores on the American University's English and Mathematics Entrance Examinations. For the Freshman Class of 1963-1964, the correlation between the English Examination scores and grades in Freshman English was .70, and between Mathematics Examination scores and grades in Freshman Science was also .70. The correlation between English Examination scores and over-

all grades (excluding Arabic) was .46, but it was the opinion of Dr. Korf of the American University's Office of Tests and Measurements that the proposed combination of scores was an adequate predictor of overall performance. In any case it was the best that could be found. A student whose score was at least 600 (one standard deviation above the mean of 500) was deemed to exhibit high aptitude. The equally weighted combination score on the English and Mathematics Examinations of nine subjects was above 600. The other five subjects had taken only one of the two entrance examinations and were selected on the basis of high performance (600 or over) in that particular examination.

- 2) Receipt of an overall average during the first semester of the 1963-1964 academic year of sixty-five or less (excluding courses in Arabic).

Actual selection of the subjects was made in the following manner.

From the files of the Office of Tests and Measurements of the American University of Beirut, a list was made of all students whose scores on Mathematics and English Entrance Examinations averaged 600 or more. Of these, all students who on the Mid-Year Grade Reports for Freshman Arts and Freshman Sciences (prepared by the office of the Dean of Freshmen) were shown to have an overall first semester average of sixty-five or less, were selected. Sixteen subjects met all three criteria.

Two groups - an Experimental Group and a Control Group - were then formed in the following manner. Subjects were paired on the basis of entrance

examination scores and first semester grades. One member of each pair was then assigned to an Experimental Group, and the other to a Control Group. Assignment was not performed randomly, for it seemed wise to exclude females from the Experimental Group to avoid the possible inhibiting factor of their presence. An attempt was made to assign members to pairs so that in half of the cases the member with the greatest disparity between aptitude and performance was assigned to the Control Group and in the other half of the cases to the Experimental Group.

Each subject was interviewed by Mr. Michael Shamma¹, Freshman Advisor at the American University of Beirut, and all but one expressed willingness to take part in the study. Therefore, that student (who had been assigned to the Experimental Group) and his counterpart in the Control Group were dropped from the study. Each student was told only that he would be asked to take several tests and that he might be asked to take part in weekly discussions which would center around the problem of poor academic performance. As all the students were on academic probation, one may assume that they realized that their selection was based on low grades. However, nothing was mentioned to the student about his high scores on the Entrance Examination or underachievement in general.

The pairs were then ranked from highest to lowest on average Entrance Examination scores and assigned identifying letters from A to G. In the course of the thesis, when the group to which the subject belongs is obvious, only the letter designating the pair of which he is a member will be presented. The Entrance Examination scores and first semester averages are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

ENTRANCE EXAMINATION SCORES AND FIRST SEMESTER GRADE AVERAGES

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Exam		Grade	Exam		Grade
	Eng.	Math.		Eng.	Math.	
A	766	*	63.5	723	*	65
B	693	608	55	676	*	55
C	641	664	59.5	723	612	55
D	624	642	64.5	693	630	60.5
E	577	653	52.5	547	675	47
F	607	*	65	650	564	59.7
G	641	564	65	607	*	64

*Exam not taken

The sample was composed of one female and thirteen male subjects, ranging in age from sixteen to twenty-three. Their nationalities were as follows: Lebanese - 7; Saudi - 2; Cypriot - 1; Iranian - 1; Jordanian - 1; Kenyan - 1; Syrian - 1. The fourteen had the following religious affiliations: Armenian Gregorian - 4; Moslem Sunni - 3; Protestant - 3; Greek Orthodox - 2; Druze - 1; Maronite - 1. Eight of the subjects were Science majors; the other six were majoring in Arts.

Dependent Variables

The three dependent variables are: academic achievement, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment. These variables were measured

by grades, the achievement scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and correlations between self-ideal Q-sorts respectively.

Two measures were obtained from each subject on each of the above instruments - one before the counselling of the Experimental Group began and the other afterwards.

Academic Achievement

The measure of a Subject's academic achievement prior to counselling was his overall average for all courses (excluding Arabic) for the first semester of the academic year 1963-1964. His post-counselling achievement was his second semester average.

Grades are the most widely used measure of academic achievement and have been used as the external criteria for the validation of many tests (eg. tests in the Scholastic Achievement Series).¹ Although the reliability and validity of grades have been questioned², grades were used in this study because of their convenience and widespread popularity as a measure of achievement.

Achievement Motivation

Because Hypothesis II was that the counselled group would show a greater increase in achievement motivation than the group not so counselled, some measure of achievement motivation was necessary. The choice seemed to be between the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and a projective technique devised by McClelland primarily to measure the need to achieve

¹Buros, O.K. The fifth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1957, p.23.

²Guilford, J.P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956, p. 464.

("nAch"). The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was chosen because scoring of the Edwards is not open to personal interpretation as is scoring of McClelland's test.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule is a two-hundred twenty-five item forced choice inventory.¹ Each item consists of a pair of statements approximately equal in their social desirability so that the subject's choice will be minimally influenced by that factor. The Schedule was designed to provide a measure of fifteen relatively independent variables having their origin in a list of manifest needs presented by H. A. Murray.

The achievement scale of this test measures, according to Edwards, an individual's need "to do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play."²

With regard to the reliability of the achievement scale, Edwards found it to have an internal consistency of .74 (by the split-half method) and to have a ~~stability correlation~~ of also .74 (the test and retest having a one-week interval between them).³

As for the scale's validity Gebhart and Hoyt found that a group of under-achieving students made significantly lower scores on the achievement scale

¹Edwards, A.L. Edwards personal preference schedule manual. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1954, pp. 1-17.

²Edwards, loc. cit., p. 5.

³Ibid., p. 12.

than did a group of overachievers.¹

Because of its reasonably high reliability, its ability to distinguish between over- and underachievers, and the fact that it could be objectively scored, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was used in this study. However, several articles questioning the validity of the Schedule have appeared in journals. Reference to these articles is made in a later chapter in which the topic of validity is more thoroughly discussed.

Personal Adjustment

The self-ideal Q-sort was used in this thesis to determine whether or not group counselling would favorably affect the personal adjustment of a group of academic underachievers. The rationale for using the self-ideal Q-sort is based on Rogers' assumption that self-ideal discrepancies are a product of experiences which indicate that the self-organization is unsatisfactory. Reduction of the self-ideal discrepancies is a consequence of the self-concept and the ideal concept coming to rest on a broader base than before.² In a word this means to Rogers better personal adjustment.

In the self-ideal Q-sort a subject sorts a number of statements (in this case one hundred) into a number of piles (in this case nine). The piles are numbered, and the subject is instructed to place the statements in the piles representing a continuum. The number of statements to be placed in each pile may be unspecified or fixed (in this case the number was specified as follows: Pile I-1; Pile II-4; Pile III-11; Pile IV-21; Pile V-26; Pile VI-21;

¹Gebhart, G., and Hoyt, D. Personality needs of under- and over-achieving freshmen. J. appl. Psychol., 1958, 29, 125-128.

²Rogers, C. R., and Dymond, R. F. Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954, p. 58.

Pile VII-11; Pile VIII-4; and Pile IX-1). The literature is divided in its preference for fixed (forced) sort or unspecified (unforced) sort.

In the self-sort the Subject was instructed to place in Pile I the statement which represented himself most as he saw himself. In Pile II he was to put the four statements which next best represented himself and so on. In Pile IX he was instructed to place the statement which least represented himself as he saw himself. In Pile VIII he was to put the four statements which were next least like him and so forth. Each subject was told to sort all one hundred statements.

Instructions for the ideal-sort were exactly the same except that this time the subject was to sort the same statements in terms of how he would like to be. All one hundred statements were again to be sorted.

The particular statements sorted were for the most part those used in an earlier study by Rogers and Dymond.¹ Six statements were added by the writer to make an even hundred. These hundred statements together with the complete instructions given to the students, comprise Appendix I.

In the Keppers and Caplan study mentioned earlier the set of Q-sort statements included many school-oriented self-referent phrases.² Rogers' statements were chosen because of a need to show changes in personal adjustment which transcended the strictly academic related aspects of the subject's personality.

Also in the Keppers and Caplan study the counselling was performed by the experimenters who knew the hypotheses and Q-sort statements. Hence,

¹Rogers and Dymond, loc. cit., p. 79.

²Keppers and Caplan, loc. cit.

they were in a position to influence (consciously or unconsciously) the outcome of the sort without bringing about real changes in the personality of the subjects. To avoid this the counsellor in this study was not informed specifically of the hypotheses and never saw the Q-sort statements.

The sorts were then analyzed by a method called the Q-technique described by Stephenson.¹ This technique was designed to handle many types of analyses of which the self-ideal Q-sort is only one. The Q-sort simply refers to the sorting of the statements into piles along some continuum; however, the Q-technique refers in this case to a correlation technique which allows one to find the correlation (using Pearson's Product Moment, r) between a subject's self-concept (as represented by the self-sort) and his ideal (as represented by his ideal-sort). In general, though, the Q-technique is a method under which people can be factored out as a group or conditions under which a single individual operates can be analyzed to ascertain what factors are involved. The Q-technique is distinguished from its predecessor the R-technique in that in the latter traits are factored out from a large group of individuals. The latter may also be regarded as the conventional factor analytic method.

In this study each subject sorted one hundred items in a self-sort and then the same hundred items in an ideal-sort. The congruence (correlation) between the two sorts was used as a measure of adjustment.

The limitations of this method will be discussed in Chapter IV.

Summary

The three dependent variables and the instruments used to measure

¹Stephenson, William. The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, pp. 8-30.

them have been described above. To measure academic achievement grades were used; to measure achievement motivation, the achievement scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule; and to measure personal adjustment the self-ideal Q-sort. Each subject was measured with each instrument before and after the counselling period.

Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study was group counselling. The Experimental Group underwent ten fifty-minute sessions of what might be described as semi-directive, verbal, semi-deep counselling. The Control Subjects were not so counselled. Members of both groups were free to seek individual counselling and therapy during the course of the experiment and hence were equal in this respect. However, to the writer's knowledge, no member of either group availed himself of such counselling during this period.

The sessions took place in a classroom in the Humanities Building of the American University of Beirut. Thursday evening at six o'clock was found to be convenient for all members, and sessions were held then on a weekly basis.

Dr. Fuad Ashkar, Lebanese Psychiatrist and Student Health Service Consultant to the American University, acted as the counsellor in all sessions. The role of the writer during the sessions was strictly that of an observer.

At each session Dr. Ashkar arrived early and at about six o'clock the members began to file in - often in groups of two or three. Chairs were arranged in a circle, but seats were not assigned. Seating patterns during each session are presented in Appendix II.

Counselling was semi-directive in that the counsellor introduced topics

decided on by the writer and him beforehand. However, within the framework suggested, the members were free to discuss anything they liked.

The topics were chosen primarily on the basis of the counsellor's past experience with academic underachievers. However, he naturally took into consideration interests expressed in previous sessions. The topics introduced by the counsellor in each session are summarized below in Table 2.

TABLE 2
TOPICS IN DIFFERENT SESSIONS

Session	Themes
I	Study Habits
II	Study Conflicts
III	Career and Aspirations, and First Semester Adjustment
IV	First Semester Adjustment
V	Motivation
VI	Agression
VII	Sex
VIII	Sex, and Religion
IX	Relationship with Parents
X	Relationship with Parents

Each session was tape recorded and summaries of each appear in Appendix II. In order to show the vital dynamics of the group process, one protocol of an entire session is presented as Appendix III.

Originally more than ten sessions had been planned. Ends and Page have found that doubling the number of sessions from fifteen to thirty without increasing the total lapsed time in treatments resulted in significantly greater

therapeutic gain.¹ Moreover, they found that the adjustment as measured by self-ideal congruence showed a positive acceleration after the fifteenth session. This led the writer to a decision to hold two sessions a week for fifteen weeks. Unfortunately, sessions were cut back to one a week because the counsellor could not meet with the group more often, and in the end, because of holidays and examinations, only ten sessions were held.

Attendance at the counselling sessions was sometimes perfect (Sessions I and VI), at other times poor (Sessions IV and V - four absences each), and at the remaining sessions satisfactory (Sessions II, III, VIII, and IX - one absence each; Session X - two absences; Session VII three absences). Over all sessions the average attendance was seventy-eight percent.

After the fourth and fifth sessions, at each of which only three members appeared, Mr. Shamma' a (Freshman Advisor at the American University of Beirut) sent each member of the Experimental Group a note requesting that he attend the remaining sessions. Because a note was necessary and because after the following session several members complained about the time they were devoting to attending the counselling meetings, it seems that at least some of the members felt they were being cajoled into participating in the study.

Summary

Fourteen underachieving college freshmen were divided into an Experimental and a Control Group, each containing seven subjects. The Experimental Group was then given group counselling for ten sessions. The Control

¹Ends, E. J., and Page, C. W. Group psychotherapy and concomitant psychological change. Psych. Monographs, 1959, 73, No. 480.

Group received no such counselling. Before and after the counselling of the Experimental Group, the academic achievement, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment of each subject was measured. Changes in the above were noted and tested for significance.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter presents an analysis of the results of the study and is divided into two sections. In the first section results pertinent to each hypothesis are presented in turn. In the second section the relationships between the dependent variables -- grades, achievement scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and self-ideal correlations -- are examined. Although this examination is not specifically called for by the hypotheses, it is undertaken in the hope of shedding further light upon the topic under investigation.

Results Pertaining to the Hypotheses

The thesis of this study was that group counselled underachievers would show a greater improvement in grades, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment, than would the non-counselled underachievers. From this thesis were developed the three hypotheses to be dealt with below.

Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis was that a group of underachieving college students who attended group counselling sessions would show greater academic improvement as measured by grades than would a matched control group of underachievers who did not attend the sessions.

Table 3 shows the pre- and post-counselling grade averages of all

courses (excluding Arabic) of the Experimental and Control Subjects, and any changes which took place.

TABLE 3
THE GRADES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS
BEFORE AND AFTER GROUP COUNSELLING

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Before Couns.	After Couns.	Changes	Before Couns.	After Couns.	Changes
A	63.5	74.2	+8.7	65.0	69.3	+4.3
B	55.0	60.4	+5.4	55.0	57.0	+2.0
C	55.0	65.5	+10.5	59.5	62.3	+2.8
D	64.5	62.3	-2.2	60.5	61.3	+0.8
E	52.5	57.8	+5.3	47.0	59.3	+12.3
F	57.5	63.2	+5.7	59.7	67.5	+7.8
G	65.7	64.5	-1.2	64.0	73.5	+9.5

The difference between grade changes in the Experimental and Control Groups was not significant ($p > .05$) when tested by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. Hence, it cannot be said that group counselling led to a significant improvement in academic performance as measured by grades.

Although this hypothesis was not found tenable it is worthwhile to explore the data further. First, had the groups been substantially different in their academic performance (not underachievement, for it can be assumed that the pairing of the individuals and subsequent assignment to groups mini-

mizes group differences in underachievement), one might have argued that the treatment (group counselling) might be effective on subjects whose pre-counselling grades lay within a certain range but not on subjects whose grades did not lie within this range. With this in mind, the Experimental and Control Groups were examined for differences in the pre-counselling grades presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4
PRE-COUNSELLING GRADES OF THE
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL
GROUPS

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group	Control Group	Differences
A	63.5	65.0	-1.5
B	55.0	55.0	0.0
C	55.0	59.5	-4.5
D	64.5	60.5	+4.0
E	52.5	47.0	+5.5
F	57.5	59.7	-2.2
G	65.7	64.0	+1.7

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test revealed no significant difference ($p > .05$). Hence it is extremely unlikely that the results are due to an artifact produced by group differences in pre-counselling achievement.

The logic of the above analysis applies also to analyses presented after each of the other two hypotheses to test whether either pre-counselling

need achievement scores or self-ideal correlations for the two groups were significantly different. This is mentioned since the reason for this type of analysis will not be repeated in detail later.

Next the possibility that both groups might have demonstrated significant gains in achievement (ie. increase in grades) with the gain of one group not being significantly different from that of the other group was explored. Differences in grades before and after the counselling period have been presented in Table 3. Null hypotheses that each group would demonstrate significant changes in grades during the counselling period were tested separately for each by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. It was found that although there was no significant change in grades of the Experimental Group, those of the Control Group did improve significantly ($p > .05$).

One is thus faced with a situation in which the groups show no significant difference in improvement, yet when considered alone, the Control Group was found to exhibit a significant amount of improvement while the Experimental Group did not. This may seem contradictory; however, it is not. The main hypothesis was tested by comparing the improvements of the subjects in each pair. When the groups were tested separately for significant improvement, only the pre- and post-counselling grades of each subject were compared. Now if every member of one group improved (as was the case of the Control Group), that group would show a significant improvement when tested by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. On the other hand if only five out of seven members of another group improved (as was the case in the Experimental Group), the group would not exhibit a significant improvement. But if, say, three of the members of the non-improved group improved more than their counterparts in the improved group, we would have a situation in which

the greatest improvement within pairs was exhibited by one group in four instances and by the other group in three instances.

Table 3 shows that just this type of results were obtained. Testing these differences in changes (by the Wilcoxon Test) of course did not lead to the conclusion that one group improved more than the other.

Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis was that the same group of underachieving college students will show a greater increase in achievement motivation as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule than will a matched group of underachievers not so attending.

An alternative statement of this is that the improvement in achievement scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (before and after the period of counselling of the Experimental Group) would be greater for the Experimental Group than for the Control Group.

Table 5 shows the scores for the Experimental and Control Groups on the achievement scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The hypothesis was tested using the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. The results showed there to be no significant difference between the groups ($p > .05$). Therefore, it cannot be concluded that group counselling led to any significant improvement as evidenced by achievement scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The same reasoning presented earlier in this chapter for comparing pre-counselling grades led to a comparison of achievement scores. These scores appear below in Table 6.

TABLE 5

SCORES ON THE ACHIEVEMENT SCALE OF THE EDWARDS
PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE OF EXPERIMENTAL
AND CONTROL GROUPS BEFORE AND AFTER
GROUP COUNSELLING

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Before Couns. (1)	After Couns. (2)	Change (3)-(2-1)	Before Couns. (4)	After Couns. (5)	Change (6)-(5-4)
A	13	20	+7	16	19	+3
B	17	19	+2	10	15	+5
C	16	18	+2	10	12	+2
D	19	20	+1	19	21	+2
E	21	17	-4	14	19	+5
F	12	20	+8	15	19	+4
G	11	12	+1	13	10	-3

TABLE 6
PRE-COUNSELLING ACHIEVEMENT
SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL
AND CONTROL GROUPS

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group	Control Group	Differences
A	13	16	-3
B	17	10	+7
C	16	10	+6
D	19	19	0
E	21	14	+7
F	12	15	-3
G	11	13	-2

Using the same Wilcoxon Test, the null hypothesis that no significant difference between achievement scores of the two groups existed prior to counselling was accepted. Therefore, the failure to substantiate the second hypothesis is shown not to have resulted from differences in pre-counselling achievement motivation (as reflected by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule).

A separate analysis of changes in each group was again called for. These changes, presented in Table 5, were not significantly different ($p > .05$) on the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. The null hypothesis that the achievement scores of the Experimental Group before and after therapy were not significantly different was accepted ($p > .05$). The results of the Wilcoxon Test of the other null hypothesis, that scores of the Control Group did not change, were also not significant ($p > .05$).

Inspection of individual scores (Table 5) shows that six members of each group improved while one member of each group scored lower after the counselling period than before.

Thus, testing both groups separately and inspecting individuals within the groups tend to substantiate the finding that group counselling did not increase motivation as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule for either group.

Hypothesis III

The third and last hypothesis was that the same group of underachieving college students who attend group counselling sessions would show a greater increase in personal adjustment as measured by the Q-sort technique than would a matched group of non-counselled underachievers. An increase in

personal adjustment in this case would be a demonstration of greater congruence between an individual's actual-self and ideal-self after than before counselling.

According to this hypothesis the pre- and post-counselling difference in congruence (as measured by a Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation between values assigned to statements under the self-sort and ideal-sort) will be greater for the Experimental Group than for the Control Group. These correlations are presented below in Table 7.

TABLE 7
PEARSON'S PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS
BETWEEN SELF-IDEAL Q-SORTS OF
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL
GROUPS BEFORE AND AFTER
COUNSELLING

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Before Couns.	After Couns.	Change	Before Couns.	After Couns.	Change
A	-.03	.27	+.30	.67	.67	0
B	.48	.46	-.02	.64	.64	0
C	.25	.65	+.40	.41	.57	+.16
D	.21	.23	+.02	.42	.52	+.10
E	.27	.57	+.30	-.13	.34	+.47
F	.72	.53	-.19	.80	.65	-.15
G	.39	.34	-.05	.80	.77	-.03

To make before and after counselling correlations comparable r's were converted to Z's by Fisher's Transformation. The resulting Z's

were tested using the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. The results did not show a significant difference ($p > .05$). Hence it cannot be concluded that group counselling leads to a significant increase in personal adjustment of underachievers.

In line with the reason expressed earlier in this chapter, the pre-counselling adjustment of the group was compared (see Table 8). The null hypothesis was that there would be no pre-counselling differences between the two groups. When this was tested by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test, the results were not significant. However, one might note the direction of the results by inspection of the scores of the members of each pair. In six out of seven pairs the Control Group members showed the higher pre-counselling adjustment. It may be further mentioned that had it not been for the poor (negative) adjustment of member "E" of the Control Group, the pre-counselling adjustment of that group would have been significantly greater than that of the Experimental Group.

The groups were then tested separately to see if either exhibited a significant change in congruence. The null hypothesis which was tested by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was that the change in r (correlation between self- and ideal-sorts) would not be significant. The change of neither group was found to be significant.

These findings like those presented earlier are discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

In the next section the relationship between the dependent variables will be explored.

TABLE 8

PRE-COUNSELLING SELF-IDEAL
CORRELATIONS OF THE
EXPERIMENTAL AND
CONTROL GROUPS

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group	Control Group	Differences
A	-.03	.67	-.70
B	.48	.64	-.16
C	.25	.41	-.16
D	.21	.42	-.21
E	.27	-.13	+.40
F	.72	.80	-.08
G	.39	.80	-.41

Relationship Between Dependent Variables

As stated at the beginning of the chapter, the investigation of the relationships between the dependent variables was not specifically called for by the hypotheses. However, the thesis was that group counselling would improve grades, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment, and it is possible that they are related in some manner. To explore any possible relationship that might exist between the dependent variables, the results were analyzed to see if changes in any two of the above were correlated.

Each of the relationships were examined for all fourteen Subjects, for the Experimental Group alone, and for the Control Group alone.

Grades and Achievement

Table 9 shows the changes in grades and need achievement. The correlation between changes in these two variables for all subjects was not significant, Rho being .33. The correlation between changes for the Control Group was only .19 which was not significant ($p > .05$). Although a Rho of .61 for the Experimental Group was significant at the five percent level, the difference between the correlations in the groups was not significant ($z = .73$)

TABLE 9

CHANGES IN GRADES AND ACHIEVEMENT SCORES

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Grade Changes	Ach. Score Changes	Grade Changes	Ach. Score Changes
A	+ 8.7	+7	+4.33	+3
B	+ 5.4	+2	+2.0	+5
C	+10.5	+2	+2.8	+2
D	- 2.2	+1	+ .8	+2
E	+ 5.3	-4	+12.5	+5
F	+ 5.7	+8	+7.8	+5
G	- 1.2	+1	+9.5	-3

*Positive signs indicate higher grades or achievement scores after than before the counselling period.

A number of interpretations might be made of the above. However, it seems that the positive correlation indicates some relationship between grade improvement and increase in need achievement. Although the relationship for

all the subjects was not significant, this lack of significance may have been due to the small sample size. The effect of the small sample size on the experiment as a whole will be dealt with in the following chapter.

Second, the differences between the correlation in the Experimental Group (Rho .61) and in the Control Group (Rho .19) are not significant (z equals .73). But had the difference in r s been significant, could one then attribute the greater correlation between grade changes and achievement motivation changes to the group counselling that the Experimental Group had undergone? It seems that the design of the study was such that no such statement could be made.

On the other hand, it might have raised a question such as this. If group counselling were to increase grades and if this change were correlated with changes in achievement motivation, did the counselling increase both independently or did counselling increase motivation which increased achievement? Had the increase in grades been due to better study habits, it might have been possible for achievement motivation to have increased and yet not be responsible for the increase in grades.

Grades and Adjustment

Next were analyzed the changes in grades and adjustment presented in Table 10. For all fourteen subjects, the Rho between grade and adjustment changes was .24 which is not significant at the .05 level. The correlations between the changes of the same variables were not significant when the Experimental and Control Groups were considered separately. (Experimental Group Rho was .36; Control Group Rho was $-.06$). The difference between these correlations for the two groups was not significant either, z being

equal to .64. From the preceding statement one must conclude that the results failed to indicate any significant relationship between changes in grades and changes in adjustment.

TABLE 10
CHANGES IN GRADES AND SELF-IDEAL
CORRELATIONS OF THE
EXPERIMENTAL AND
CONTROL GROUPS

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Grade Changes	Self-Ideal r Changes	Grade Changes	Self-Ideal r Changes
A	+ 8.7	+.2292	+4.3	0
B	+ 5.4	-.0172	+ 2.0	0
C	+10.5	+.4102	+ 2.8	+.1624
D	- 2.2	+.0214	+ .8	+.0941
E	+ 5.3	+.3034	+12.3	+.4743
F	+ 5.7	-.1881	+ 7.8	-.1496
G	- 1.2	-.0513	+ 9.5	-.0256

*Positive signs indicate higher grades or self-ideal correlations after than before counselling.

Achievement and Adjustment

An analysis similar to the above was made for the changes between achievement motivation and personal adjustment. The changes are summarized below in Table 11.

The correlation for all subjects, regardless of group, was found to be a slightly negative one (Rho -.08).

TABLE 11

CHANGES IN ACHIEVEMENT SCORES AND
SELF-IDEAL CORRELATIONS OF
EXPERIMENTAL AND
CONTROL GROUPS

Pairs of Ss	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Ach. Score Changes	Self-Ideal r Changes	Ach. Score Changes	Self-Ideal r Changes
A	+7	+.2992	+3	—
B	+2	-.0172	+5	—
C	+2	+.4102	+2	+.1624
D	+1	+.0214	+2	+.0941
E	-4	+.3034	+5	+.4743
F	+8	-.1881	+5	-.1496
G	+1	-.0513	-3	-.0256

*Positive signs indicate higher achievement score or self-ideal correlations after than before the counselling period.

Correlations between the two variables for the two groups separately were not significant, Rho being $-.38$ and $-.04$ respectively. The difference between these two correlations was not significant either, z being equal to $.51$.

From the above one cannot conclude that a relationship exists between the changes in achievement motivation and personal adjustment.

Summary

Results of the prededing investigations of the relationships between the dependent variables are summarized below in Table 12.

Table 12 shows the only significant correlation between the Experimen-

tal Subjects' changes in grades and their changes in achievement motivation. None of the other differences between Experimental and Control correlations was significant.

TABLE 12
SPEARMAN'S RHO CORRELATION BETWEEN CHANGES
IN PAIRS OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variables	All Subjects (N equals 14)	Experimental Subjects (N equals 7)	Control Subjects (N equals 7)
Grades-Achievement	+ .33	+ .61*	+ .19
Grades-Adjustment	+ .24	+ .36	- .06
Achievement-Adjustment	- .08	- .38	- .04

*Significant at the five percent level.

Summary

In the first section of this chapter were presented results pertaining to the three main hypotheses. It had been hypothesized that an Experimental Group undergoing group counselling would show a greater improvement in grades (Hypothesis I), achievement motivation (Hypothesis II), and personal adjustment (Hypothesis III) than a Control Group not so counselled. None of these hypotheses were found tenable.

Further analysis of the data related to each hypothesis tended to substantiate the principle findings. When the groups were tested separately for improvement, the Control Group showed a significant increase in grades, while the Experimental Group showed a non-significant increase. This did not contradict the finding that the groups did not show a significant difference in grade improvement but does indicate the direction of the results. Separate

analyses of the groups yielded no other significant findings.

Pre-counselling group differences in neither grades, achievement motivation, nor personal adjustment were found significant.

In the last section relationships between changes (before and after counselling) in the three dependent variables were also examined. No significant correlations were found except between changes in the grades and achievement scores of the Experimental Group.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In this chapter the results presented in the preceding pages will be discussed. Following this discussion a number of suggestions for future research in the area covered by this study will be made.

In Chapter III it was shown that neither grades, achievement motivation, nor personal adjustment were significantly improved by group counselling. Since there are a number of factors which may have influenced almost every finding, the discussion below is organized around these factors rather than around each separate finding.

These factors seem to fall into three categories--those relating to the sample, those relating to the counselling, and those relating to the instruments used to measure the dependent variables.

Factor of Small Sample Size

The small size of the sample in this study cannot escape mention. Because the Experimental and Control Groups were each composed of only seven subjects, a non-parametric technique (the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test) was used to test the significance of results. With the Wilcoxon Test it would be possible to detect differences which are significant at the five-percent level. However, the power of the test, as with most tests, is greatly reduced when N is small (eg. seven) unless the variability in the scores is negligible.

With the difficulty of obtaining significant results pointed out, one might ask why so few subjects were used. The reasons were these. First, the counsellor was able to devote only one hour per week to the study. This meant that only one group could be counselled. Second, the writer was forced to make the criteria of underachievement less stringent than he had originally planned to get the number of subjects he did. Third, even if the criteria had been relaxed even more, the counsellor could have properly handled only one or two more subjects at best. Thus the criteria were adhered to and only eight pairs were selected (of which one had to be dropped).

Counselling Related Factors

Many things might be said about the counselling itself. However, three counselling related factors in particular should be mentioned. These are the number of counselling sessions, the nature of these sessions, and poor attendance.

First, the number of sessions - ten - was probably too few to lead to the types of changes hypothesized. Ends and Page stated that fifteen sessions should be minimum and showed that their subjects' improvement showed positive acceleration as the sessions were increased to thirty.¹ As explained in Chapter II, the number of sessions in the study was to have been fifteen. However, the number was later reduced to ten so as not to interfere with the subjects' preparation for final examinations.

The second factor was the nature of the sessions. There is evidence that some of the subjects may not have viewed their participation in the study as entirely voluntary. As stated earlier a number of complaints were made

¹Ends and Page, loc. cit.

about the time the subjects were devoting to the counselling sessions. These complaints came mostly after Session VI. A few days preceding that meeting the Freshman Advisor had called in the members of the Experimental Group and requested that they improve their attendance at the few remaining sessions. Moreover, since all the subjects were on academic probation, some might have felt reluctant not to have participated in the study in the first place.

It has been stated elsewhere that therapy is more effective if the client volunteers to be counselled (eg. by Strang).¹ Had enough subjects met the criteria set for underachievement, one might have found a number seriously interested in participating. These volunteers could then have been assigned to groups.

The third factor related to the counselling was the rather poor attendance. On ^{the} average, counselling session attendance was seventy-eight per cent. However, this figure does not tell the whole story, first, because only two of the sessions were perfectly attended, and second, because two sessions were very poorly attended and during them, the counselling process broke down completely.

Thus it has been suggested that the limited number of sessions, the poor attendance, and the perhaps involuntary participation in the study may have interfered with the improvement that might have taken place had involved subjects undergone a longer period of counselling.

Factors Relating to the Measurement of the Dependent Variables

The preceding factors have been such that their influence was pro-

¹Strang, R. Counselling technics in college and secondary school. New York: Harper, 1949, p. 123.

bably not focused more on any one of the dependent variables than on any other. In this section on the other hand, the factors presented each relate to the measurement of a specific dependent variable.

The first hypothesis tested was not substantiated. The customary unreliability and questionable validity of grades commented upon by Guilford and mentioned earlier in Chapter II, may have influenced the results of the hypothesis that group counselling would lead to an improvement in academic achievement.

Neither did the second hypothesis prove tenable. Achievement motivation as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule did not improve as a result of group counselling. One point needs mention here. The subjects (none of whom had English as a first language) experienced some difficulty in taking the test. Evidence for this was the great number of times the administrator was called upon to define terms. Thus, the language and culture barriers probably served to reduce somewhat the validity of the instrument. That several recently published studies have questioned the validity of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was mentioned earlier.^{1,2}

The third hypothesis derived from the thesis was that personal adjustment as measured by the Q-sort would be increased by group counselling. This was not supported by the data. Again, it should be mentioned that the subjects experienced great difficulty with the Q-sort when it was first administered. They took about two hours on an average to sort the items and asked

¹Heilbrun, Alfred B., Jr. Social desirability and the relative validities of achievement scales. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1962, 26, 383-386.

²Shaw, Merville. Need achievement scales as predictors of academic success. *J. educ. Psychol.*, 1961, 52, 282-285.

many questions about the meaning of words. When they repeated the task at the end of the counselling period, they took less time, but some gave the administrator the impression that they were either careless or preoccupied with exams. All these factors could have reduced the reliability of the scores of some subjects.

The implication of the preceding remarks about the reliability and the validity of the instruments used in this study is not that a change in the variables actually took place, which was not detected, but that a change might have taken place and yet have escaped detection.

In addition, a complication is introduced by the design of the experiment. In each case an hypothesis was tested by comparing changes in a particular variable. McNemar has pointed out that even when an instrument is reliable, the reliability of a difference between two scores (ie. the change) will be low.¹

It may be noted in passing that there seems to be a tendency for changes in the dependent variables to be positive (ie. for the subject to improve, regardless of the group to which he belonged). For example, the grades of twelve of fourteen subjects were higher for the second semester than the first. Moreover, twelve of fourteen scored higher on the achievement scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule the second time the exam was administered. The reasons for these statistically significant improvements will not be explored here; however, they may offer a fruitful lead for future research.

On the other hand self-ideal correlations increased in seven instances, decreased in five, and did not change in two others. This was easily a chance phenomenon.

¹McNemar, Quinn. Psychological statistics. New York: John Wiley, 1962, pp. 153-158.

Summary and Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study should be viewed with an extremely critical eye. Aside from the difficulties stemming from the instruments used and the experimental design, the sample size was too small. Moreover, the counselling sessions were too few and attendance was not always good. The greater than chance number of positive changes on the variables measured was commented upon.

A number of recommendations for future research are implied in the above. First, a larger sample should be used. Perhaps fifty subjects, composing four experimental groups and a control group would not be unreasonable. Second, the subjects should be selected from among those interested in being counselled. Third, the number of sessions per week should be doubled (ie. two), and the counselling period should be made to extend over a minimum of fifteen weeks. These changes in the intensity and duration of counselling would be in accord with the recommendations of Ends and Page. Fourth, the possibility of using other instruments should be investigated. Grades, even with their inherent problems, probably cannot be improved upon as a measure of achievement except by using subjects all graded by the same professor or taking courses in which grades are based on standardized, objective exams. In view of the difficulties experienced, it is possible that both the Edwards and the Q-sort might be improved upon as measures of achievement and personal adjustment respectively.

In essence what can be said about this study is that the particular form of counselling used on a particular group of subjects did not yield the hypothesized changes in grades, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment measured by the instruments used. Extrapolation of these findings

should be made with caution. In general, however, the finding is in accord with the existing literature.

It might be mentioned in closing that group therapy has been found successful in a number of fields.¹ That it has not proved successful with underachievers may more reflect weaknesses in the methodology than in the counselling method itself.

¹Gundlach, loc. cit., pp. 149-163.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The thesis that group counselled underachievers would show a greater improvement in grades, achievement motivation, and personal adjustment than non group counselled underachievers was studied in the following manner.

Fourteen underachieving subjects having a first semester average of sixty-five or less and a combined score on the American University of Beirut Entrance Examination of six hundred or more were chosen. The subjects were paired on the basis of grades and entrance examination scores and then assigned to either an experimental or control group.

Each subject was given the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and both self and ideal Q-sorts at the beginning and at the end of the study.

The Experimental Group underwent ten semi-directed group counselling sessions. The Control Group was not counselled. Members of both groups had access to regular counselling facilities provided by the University, but as far as is known, did not use them.

From the above mentioned thesis three hypothesis were derived. The first hypothesis, that underachieving college students who attended group counselling sessions would show greater academic improvement as measured by grades than would a matched group of underachievers who do not attend the sessions, was rejected. In fact more members of the Control Group than of the Experimental Group improved in their grades. This

difference however, was not significant. Failure of the Experimental Group to show greater improvement may have been due to uncontrolled factors.

The second hypothesis, that the same group of underachieving college students who attend group counselling sessions would show a greater increase in achievement motivation as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule than would a matched Control Group of underachievers, was also rejected.

The third hypothesis was that the same group of underachieving college students who attend group counselling sessions would show greater increase in personal adjustment as measured by the Q-technique than a matched group of non-attending underachievers. An increase in personal adjustment was defined as a demonstration of greater congruence between an individual's actual-self and ideal-self after the period in which the former group was counselled than before. This hypothesis did not prove tenable either.

Thus, none of the three hypotheses were supported by the data in this study.

A number of factors which may have influenced the outcome of the study were discussed. Of these, the chief ones were the small sample size, the number of counselling sessions, the questionable validity of the instruments used to measure changes in academic achievement, achievement motivation and personal adjustment.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Q-SORT DIRECTIONS AND STATEMENTS

Self-Sort Directions

PURPOSE: The purpose of the experiment is to indicate how you feel about yourself.

MATERIALS: You have been presented with 100 slips of paper. On each slip you will find a different typed statement. The number on the back is there to let the experimenter keep track of the items. You need not concern yourself with these numbers.

You have also been presented 9 envelopes. Each has a yellow Roman numeral in the upper left hand corner and a red one or two digit Arabic numeral in the center.

PROCEDURE: You are to sort the slips to describe yourself as you see yourself today, from those that are least like you to those that are most like you.

Thus the envelopes are arranged before you in a sequence from I to IX (in yellow Roman numerals). You are to sort the slips into 9 piles (one pile per envelope). In Pile IX goes the statement which is most like you. In Pile VIII go the statements which are next most like you, etc. Pile I should then contain the statement which you think is least like you are today.

However, a certain number of slips must go into each pile. The number in red on an envelope tells how many slips should be sorted into that particular pile.

For example, in Pile I you should place one slip, in Pile IV you should place 21 slips, in Pile VII you should place 11 slips.

You are free to move a slip to other piles as many times as you like,

BUT PLEASE CHECK AND SEE THAT YOU END UP WITH THE CORRECT NUMBER OF SLIPS IN EACH PILE.

If there are any questions, please call one of the experimenters. When you have finished sorting the items, please raise your hand. It should take about 30 minutes to sort these items.

Ideal-Sort Directions

You have just sorted the 100 items on the basis of how you see yourself today. Now please sort them to describe your IDEAL person, the person you would most like to be. Therefore, this sort is to express how you would like to be not how you feel you are.

Otherwise, your directions are the same as in the first experiment. If you have any questions, please raise your hand. When you have finished, please raise your hand. This sort should take about 30 minutes.

Q-Sort Statements

1. I am impulsive.
2. I am a rational person.
3. I am tolerant.
4. I have an attractive personality.
5. I am ambitious.
6. I have initiative.
7. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
8. I am assertive.
9. I am satisfied with myself.
10. I am likeable.
11. My personality is attractive to the opposite sex.
12. I am relaxed, nothing really bothers me.
13. I am a hard worker.
14. I feel emotionally mature.
15. I am intelligent.
16. I am self-reliant.
17. I am different from others.
18. I understand myself.
19. I am a good mixer.
20. I feel adequate.
21. I feel uncomfortable while talking with someone.
22. I am just sort of stubborn.
23. I am a competitive person.
24. I need somebody else to push me through on things.
25. I am a submissive person.
26. I am inhibited.
27. I am an aloof, reserved person.
28. I live largely by other peoples' values and standards.
29. I put on a false front.

30. I often feel humiliated.
31. I doubt my sexual powers.
32. I have a feeling of hopelessness.
33. I have few values and standards of my own.
34. It is difficult to control my aggression.
35. I want to give up trying to cope with the world.
36. My decisions are not my own.
37. I usually feel driven.
38. I am sullen.
39. I tend to be on my guard with people who are somewhat more friendly than I had expected.
40. I am a hostile person.
41. I am disorganized.
42. I feel apathetic.
43. I don't trust my emotions.
44. It's pretty tough to be me.
45. I have the feeling that I am just not facing things.
46. I try not to think about my problems.
47. I am shy.
48. I am no one. Nothing seems to be me.
49. I despise myself.
50. I shrink from facing a crisis or difficulty.
51. I just don't respect myself.
52. I can't seem to make up my mind one way or another.
53. I am confused.
54. I am a failure.
55. I am afraid of sex.
56. I feel hopeless.
57. I am afraid of a full-fledged disagreement with a person.
58. I really am disturbed.

59. I have a horror of failing in anything I want to accomplish.
60. All you have to do is just insist with me, and I will give in.
61. I feel insecure with myself.
62. I have to protect myself with excuses, with rationalizing.
63. I feel hopeless.
64. I am unreliable.
65. I am worthless.
66. I dislike my own sexuality.
67. I make strong demands of myself.
68. I often kick myself for the things I do.
69. I have a warm emotional relationship with others.
70. I am responsible for my troubles.
71. I am a responsible person.
72. I can accept most social values and standards.
73. Self-control is no problem to me.
74. I usually like people.
75. I express my emotions freely.
76. I can usually live comfortably with the people around me.
77. My hardest battles are with myself.
78. I am optimistic.
79. I am liked by most people who know me.
80. I am sexually attractive.
81. I can usually make up my mind and stick to it.
82. I am contented.
83. I am poised.
84. I am often down in the dumps.
85. I am really self-centered.
86. Usually in a mob of people I feel a little bit alone.

87. I am critical of people.
88. I have a hard time controlling my sexual desires.
89. I often feel guilty.
90. I often feel resentful.
91. I feel inferior.
92. I am afraid of what other people think about me.
93. I am sometimes absent-minded.
94. I am thrifty and careful about making loans.
95. I like school.
96. I am in good health.
97. I am sentimental.
98. I am not very quiet.
99. I like parties and socials.
100. I am a good athlete.

APPENDIX II

SUMMARIES OF COUNSELLING SESSIONS

Meeting I - Summary

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise from counsellor): Observer, C, D, F, E, A, B, and G.

Absent: None.

The session opened with the counsellor briefly explaining that the purpose of the group was to bring to light factors which affect academic performance. The subjects were also told that meetings would be held once a week for ten weeks. They had been apprised of these facts by the Freshman Advisor and although they were not told attendance was mandatory, this was implied.

After these introductory comments, the counsellor remarked that the only purpose of the tape recorder was to assist the observer and assured the subjects of the confidentiality of the meetings. The counsellor then presented each subject with a seventeen-item questionnaire about study habits. This questionnaire, which is presented in Appendix IV, was taken from Munn and served mainly to focus the group on the topic of study habits.¹

Each member filled out his questionnaire answering each item true or false. The answers given by Munn to be indicative of good study habits were then read to the subjects who were asked to comment on any of the items.

"F" opened by referring to item 17 on the questionnaire: In prepara-

¹Munn, Norman L. Students' manual to accompany introduction to psychology. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1962, p. vi.

tion for a test, do you try to memorize the text? He said he felt that one should memorize every line of the text for a quiz because one might even be asked the meaning of a word. "E" stated that he felt memorizing was a poor way to study. "C" felt it was best to memorize details, but not everything in the book. Others basically agreed with "C", but "F" still maintained that it was necessary to memorize. He said:

On examinations you mean to pass. You need the exact word. On a quiz I can explain exactly what is asked, but in Biology, if you miss the exact word, you lose credit. I remember once the question read: 'fill in the blank seeds germinate.' I said living, but the answer was vi-able. A seed has to live to germinate, so understanding was no good. I was supposed to know the exact word.

The counsellor explained that because it was sometimes necessary to memorize facts this did not mean one had to memorize everything in the text.

Referring to the first item on the questionnaire, "E" asked why it was necessary to study every day in the same place. This generated a lively discussion. "F" stated he felt studying in the same place was good because one got into the habit of becoming serious when he arrived at his place of study.

"E" disagreed, saying that the place of study should be convenient, but that he found it was too monotonous to study in the same place all the time.

"C" stated he could not study in the same place for a long period of time and would have to go outside "to change the mood."

"F" commented that the others were avoiding study and that their habits were harmful to concentration.

At this point the counsellor summarized the opinions expressed on the appropriate place to study and asked the members to be thinking about

whether or not they were satisfied with how they studied. He then adjourned the meeting.

Meeting II - Summary

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise from the counsellor): Observer, C, D, G, E, B, and A.

Absent: F.

The counsellor began with a brief discussion of the preceding week's meeting. He then brought up the related topic of study conflict - the conflict which having to study engendered in some students.

"A" spoke at length of his academic difficulties. He had had trouble in a number of schools in Lebanon and had gone to England after finishing high-school. He told of his conflict in England. He tried to study, he said, but would daydream. A great many comments were made to "A" by group members. Most were attempts to interpret his situation.

Dr. Ashkar then asked if anyone had similar difficulties. "G" stated his conflict was due to having too little time to study. He then admitted he had never learned how to study and that he had a hard time getting started. Once he could make himself start, he said, it was not so bad.

"A" seemed anxious to talk and elaborated on the conflict he had mentioned earlier. He told of Sundays in England when he would not go out. He would stay home to study, yet he would only stare at his book. Yet when he did go out for pleasure, he felt guilty about not studying and did not enjoy himself.

"E" began slowly but then talked excitedly and at length of his study conflict. He had wanted to go to the United States, as he was not happy in the

Middle East. Just as it seemed he might be able to go, his brother told him that he was planning to go to Australia. He convinced "E" that he had no choice but to go with him to Australia. The emigration did not take place and "E" lost his opportunity to go to the United States. He had not wanted to come to the American University in the first place and now, every time he picked up a book thoughts of his frustrated plans came to his mind. He could not study. Now he was flunking and was about to lose his scholarship. He could not afford to continue without financial assistance and his chances of getting into a university in the United States were being greatly diminished by his poor academic performance. He said he realized all this but still could not study.

"E" said he did not blame his brother for upsetting his plans. But then he repeated several times statements that he was "down" and that people kept trying to push him further down.

Dr. Ashkar asked "E" what he was going to do if he lost his scholarship. "E" replied that he was so worried about losing it that he could not study. The counsellor then pointed out that the worrying and hence not studying might in fact be the cause of the loss of the scholarship.

At this point "E" repeated statements about being "down" and no one wanting to help. On this note the meeting ended.

Meeting III - Summary

Group Seating (semicircle, facing counsellor; from left to right): Observer, C, G, D, E, B, and A.

Absent: F.

The meeting opened with the counsellor's attempt to elicit a discussion about career aspirations. As things appeared to be getting off to a slow

start, he asked each member in turn what his plans were for the future.

"B" stated that he was planning to go into business, for his father owned a factory in Cyprus. He added that the conflict in Cyprus had been worrying him a lot, but he hoped he would study more now that things were quieting down.

"E" said he had wanted to be an engineer but that he was changing his mind because his roommate, who was an engineer, worked too hard. He said he was now interested in business because it took less time and effort. He added, "I'm not very interested in business, but then I'm not very interested in anything." He went on to say that on some days he thought about business, on others about engineering, and at times even about political science. He concluded by saying that his real reason for changing his career plans was his low marks and the amount of work in engineering.

"D" said very shyly that he wanted to be an electrical engineer. He liked that field and so did his family. He stated, "I couldn't sit down and study. I didn't have the desire." "I know what was bothering me," adding a bit cryptically, "It's still there, but it doesn't bother me anymore."

"G" stated he wanted to go into medicine where he felt he could do his best and help others. He added, "Anyway, I'm shy and couldn't sell."

"C" stated he couldn't decide between pharmacy and engineering. His father owned a pharmacy and encouraged him in that direction, but he felt that he could not get very far as a pharmacist.

"A" said he did not know what he wanted to do. He then commented as follows: "My first year in England I was active. I was President of the Student Union. I was outspoken...then it suddenly came to me. I saw myself as rash and thoughtless. I went into myself completely. Next year I couldn't

take part in discussions. I felt that way until this year but now I'm coming out of it."

The counsellor then asked how the members found adjusting to their environment.

"E" stated that he had had no problem in adjusting. Everything was much the same as during the previous year, except that at A.U.B. he had very few friends and those had come from his previous school. He admitted that competition was greater and felt one should study to keep up, not to be "the best." Smiling, he told of having been suspended from his previous school for smoking and yet now that he was free to smoke at A.U.B. he had given up the habit.

"D" stated he thought that A.U.B. was going to be easy but that he had not found it so. "G" said he had been accepted only at the last moment and was very happy to have come. However, he was puzzled by the routine.

"C" said, "I hated it at first. I thought it was going to be easy, but when the grades came back, I was totally discouraged. I hated A.U.B. A.U.B. is disorganized. In high school everything is planned."

"A" felt that everyone seemed very young. People who had been years behind him were now ahead of him. The worst thing about A.U.B. had been having to answer the same questions (about what he had been doing) over and over. He said at last he had gotten used to it and had made the story shorter and shorter.

Meeting IV - Summary

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise from the counsellor): Observer,

D, A, and C.

Absent: B, E, F, G.

This session was not well attended, as a number of the members went home early for spring vacation.

The topic for discussion was first semester adjustment. The counsellor introduced the topic as usual, but the spirit of the group was not present (probably due in part to the missing members and in part to preoccupation with the forthcoming holiday). The meeting became quite informal and took on the atmosphere of a "bull session." Members present discussed facts relating to first semester adjustment, but little feeling was displayed. The topic at times got far afield and became quite irrelevant.

The session ended early with the members present being told that the next meeting would be on the Thursday following the end of spring holidays.

Meeting V - Summary

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise from counsellor): Observer, D, G, E.

Absent: A, B, C, F.

Again in this session attendance was low and those present complained about the hour a week they were devoting to being counselled. They wanted to know how many more sessions were involved and were told only five.

The counsellor opened the session by discussing motivation. He attempted to elicit discussion, but little was forthcoming. He mentioned motivation as it pertained to study.

Due to the limited participation this session evolved as more of a lecture than a discussion.

One thing became evident to the observer. If attendance was not increased, the counselling would have to stop. At this point Mr. Shamma's assistance was solicited and through his efforts attendance improved.

Meeting VI - Summary

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise): Counsellor, Observer, C, G, F, E, B, D, and A.

Absent: None.

The counsellor opened the meeting by informing the counsellees that there would be four more sessions after this one. He then introduced the theme of aggression.

"A" and "B" began discussing the reasons for the conflict in Cyprus. Revenge was mentioned as one reason and the subject swung to revenge in general. "C" stated that revenge was necessary because of the honor of the family. "E" then said that revenge was necessary. He said, "People laugh at a person that is cursed. A person that is cursed may feel that the one who is cursing loses credit, if they are in the eyes of intelligent people. But it is the one who gets cursed that is humiliated."

The counsellor then asked each member why he got angry and what he did when he was angry.

"A" said he got angry whenever anything did not coincide with his ideas, and if his anger arose suddenly, he would shout his head off. Now, however, he was usually able to think out the problem and not react so violently.

"D" said, if one made him angry, he would hit him, if he could. If he could not, the anger remained in him and he felt inferior. However, the next time he was with the individual, he might forgive him.

"E" stated that he usually exploded and threw or tore something. Afterward he felt bad and admitted that his anger did not help the situation. He stated that he was trying to control himself better.

"F" said that when he got angry, he did not feel peace until he apologized. Even if the other person was wrong, he would sometimes apologize because it was better than staying with the anger in him. To help himself, he said, he would try to come to an understanding.

"C" said that he was very easy to provoke and sometimes fought with his friends.

The counsellor then led the group into a discussion of the merits of expressing aggression rather than holding back the anger.

"F" told of his lack of ability to pass Sociology. He said he hated the subject and so refused to study it.

"E" told of an experience with his English teacher in which she had acted very indifferently to him during the first class of the semester. He went on as follows:

"I went to speak to her after a class about a paper. She said: 'You know my office hours. You can speak to me then. Come tomorrow.' I said that if I could I would. I came at eight o'clock the next day. I felt she didn't want to see me. I said, 'Good morning.' She didn't answer. I said that I wanted to know what was wrong with me that I keep on getting F's. She said, 'I always put comments on the papers. Go and read them.' 'I have said all I have to say.' After discussing one question for a while she said: 'I think you are somewhat hostile toward me.' I think she just touched a point when she said

that. When I heard that I got angry, and I took my book and told her, 'I think everybody misunderstands me for shouting.' I left the office without saying good-bye. Since that incident, I haven't changed, but the situation has changed, so she must have changed."

"E" went on to say he had heard lots of bad things about the teacher before the semester began.

"C" asked him if he had not been prejudiced against the teacher. He added: "All students ask their friends about a teacher, and if they hear his grades are low, they don't like the teacher."

"E" replied by saying that things were better now because the teacher had changed her attitude toward him.

The counsellor asked if the improvement might not have resulted from a change in "E's" attitude as well.

"E" vehemently objected to the possibility that he might have changed. He ended the meeting by saying: "We are now good friends, but I haven't changed, she has."

Meeting VII - Summary

Group Seating (semi-circle, facing counsellor; from left to right): F, A, G, E, Observer.

Absent: B, C, D.

After a few introductory remarks the counsellor turned the topic to religion. In turn, he asked each member if he observed his religious rites (ie. went to church or mosque). The members answered perfunctorily and exhibited little interest in pursuing the topic of religion. Therefore, the counsellor turned to the other topic on the agenda -- sex.

As might be expected, a lively discussion ensued. However, members

seemed to prefer not to bring up problems they had in this area (if indeed they had any), but to ask a great number of factual questions regarding intercourse, masturbation, nocturnal emissions, and homosexuality.

As the nature of the questions was factual rather than personal, the writer sees no need in spelling out precisely what was discussed. However, suffice it to say, the questions showed a great deal of ignorance about sex on the part of the members.

Meeting VIII - Summary

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise from counsellor): Observer, B, E, D, G, C, and F.

Absent: A.

The counsellor began by asking the members who had been absent the previous time several questions about sex. Dr. Ashkar asked how frequently they had nocturnal emissions and how prevalent in the society each thought masturbation was.

One member then brought up the topic of homosexuality, and the counsellor clarified several points on which the students were hazy.

Throughout almost the entire session, as in the previous one, the conversation was clinical in nature, and not until the counsellor asked from whom each had learned about sex, did the discussion become personal.

Only one member had learned of sex from his parents. Most felt that it was a topic which parents would not discuss with their children. The Armenian members of the group felt that they could not ask their parents about sex. One Armenian member stated that he felt Armenian parents loved their children very much, but that shyness and conservatism kept the children from

asking questions on this topic.

The meeting was adjourned at this point.

Meeting IX - Summary

Group Seating (semi-circle facing counsellor; from left to right): ^{Observer} B, D, F, C, E, and G.

Absent: A.

Dr. Ashkar opened the meeting by asking for comments on such topics as ethics and personal standards.

One member immediately turned the discussion to sex. He wanted to know how women felt when they got excited and how they felt when they had an orgasm. These questions the counsellor answered, but then he turned the conversation to the subject of the family.

"E" told of how his mother used to coach him. He did well in school then, he said, but when he grew older, he refused her help. Since then he said he has never done very well in school. He mentioned that his mother's help had affected him so that now he much preferred to study with others rather than alone.

The counsellor then asked which members raised questions in class. "F" said that he asked questions in some classes but not in others. He did not feel free to ask, sometimes because of the teachers, sometimes because of the students, and at other times because of the subject. "G" stated that he asked questions in English and Arabic, but not in Mathematics and Science. "D" said that he seldom asked.

Dr. Ashkar then asked to what extent the members' parents had influenced their going to college. "F" said that he had made the decision although

his mother did not much want him to leave home. However, she had not forbidden him to come to Lebanon, but had she, he would have obeyed her and stayed home.

At this point the counsellor asked who would do something against his parents' wishes. Several members said they would go against their parents' wishes if the matter were important. "G", however, said that his parents had sacrificed so much for him that he would sacrifice a great deal for them. He indicated that he doubted if he would oppose his parents.

Meeting X - Summary

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise from counsellor): Observer, C, G, E, B, and A.

Absent: D, and F.

Again an attempt was made to channel the discussion in the direction of sex. Again Dr. Ashkar, after answering the opening questions, turned the subject to the predetermined topic.

"A" discussed at length his relations with his parents. He had been spoilt when he was young. He said his parents had never taught him to have any initiative. He could not make himself do such things as go to the store. Yet when people went for him, he resented it.

"A" continued, telling how his father had made him go to the site of the family's new home on the morning of the meeting. He had planned to go to the beach and had been furious with his father for thwarting his plans. "A" said that he "had finally gotten over it."

The group then discussed their responsibilities to their parents. "A" mentioned obedience, show of affection, appreciation, and helping "take loads off their backs."

"G" said one should, in gratitude, try to make his parents happy. Another responsibility was to let them enjoy their children's company.

"C" mentioned respect. He added children should help their parents and back them up.

"A" added, more personally, that he should help his mother in her old age, care for the needs of the family, and show her how responsible he is.

At this point Dr. Ashkar asked "A" about his earlier comment that one of one's main responsibilities to one's parents was "to show affection."

"A" replied: "Maybe I love them, but I don't like them. I respect them, but there isn't much communication. I guess I'm very selfish."

On that note the last session ended.

APPENDIX III

PROTOCOL OF COUNSELLING SESSION II

Group Seating (circle, counter-clockwise from counsellor): Observer, C, D, G, E, B, and A.

Absent: F.

Counsellor: Have any of you had thoughts, ideas or anything about what you discussed last time? It isn't a necessity that we should have them. . . . What seems to be the theme of the discussion the other day? The main theme? . . . What about the atmosphere? . . . The mood? . . . Your course of study? Seems to me the main problems were of concentration. When you sit down to study, can you keep your mind on it? . . . Do you study because you want to or you know your father will shoot you if you don't?

A: As far as motivation is concerned with me, I have accepted the idea that I have to study. I came back to Beirut with the idea of doing this. It's a little bit easier.

Counsellor: You had a two years break?

A: I worked in a bank.

Counsellor: When you finished high school, had you wanted to go on to college?

A: I had been to almost every school in Lebanon. Yes, I wanted a college career - after high school I went to London for four years.

Counsellor: Oh, after high school you were in college and then came back here. How old are you?

A: Twenty-three. I was eighteen when I finished high school.

Counsellor: What were you studying in London?

A: Economics, constitution. I got nowhere.

Counsellor: You got nowhere? . . . In other words you could not study. Whose idea was it that you go to London?

- A: The first year I studied, then I went back to my old standards, then I worked in the bank. I made no effort. I am always dreaming of something else. It's easy to be distracted. You might find that you could sit down to read a novel, but when you pick up a text book, you find you get hungry, you want to go to the toilet or anything.
- Counsellor: What he said may seem like a contradiction -- I don't say that it is, but it might. What do you think?
- G: As he said, he has been to schools all over Lebanon, and he left the country to study but even then he does not study, and I don't know...he does not try to do what he should or wants. This seems like a contradiction.
- Counsellor: Yes, it seems like a contradiction, but he said something else. He does not try to do what he should do. Why shouldn't he?
- G: Well, if he has chosen something there are some other things he should do, if he had planned to be a businessman, well, you should do things...follow the ways not just dreaming. It might seem he had the inspiration to be something, but since he did not follow the regular ways, he won't reach his goal.
- Counsellor: Let's put it this way, he has not found it easy, maybe, to do what he thinks is the best to achieve his goal.
- G: Yes, also he has difficulties from things he has started and has not finished.
- Counsellor: Have any of you had the same kind of experience... wanting something and not being able to do it? I'm not talking about physical limitations, I mean something that it is possible for you to do...you might describe a certain situation. I'm just wondering if any of you have had a similar experience. It doesn't have to be identical, but the same sort of thing, where you planned to do something and when it came to doing it, you couldn't.
- G: I have. Sometimes I say to myself, I should study more, but I'm very very tired at night and have only three hours to study.
- Counsellor: So in a way you feel the same sort of thing in your own personal way. You face your problems and then you find out that you can't carry through.

- G: He is different because he can study before 8:00 p.m. That's earlier than I can study. Taking a look at my schedule, I have five classes four days a week, and I have to go up to the mountain, and that would take about an hour and then one hour for supper.
- Counsellor: We have got two aspects of conflict; are there any other you would care to make?
- G: Well now my problem is to get to it; I can study, but the thing to do is get down to it, open my book and put my mind to it; if I can, I can get two or three hours of good work.
- Counsellor: Why can't you do that?
- G: Well, to begin with I have never taught myself to study. I really don't study very well.
- Counsellor: You mean high school studies as well. . . . How did you get along in high school?
- G: I got along okay until the fourth year, after that I started failing.
- (Pause)
- Counsellor: What are the things you would rather do than study?
- A: Well, nothing really. One year, for example, I never went out on Sunday. I would sit all day with my book open, staring. It became a sort of natural rehearsal, I couldn't work.
- Counsellor: Were you interested in any of the subjects you were taking?
- A: Politics and Economics.
- Counsellor: Because it seems that the answer to your question is to try to find out what are the things that take precedence, you might know that you should sit down and study, but when you can't there must be a pretty strong feeling, somewhere, which stops your thinking and that controls you. . . . What are the things on Sunday that would make you not read a novel, but not study either? Some of the others might tell us some of their distractions. Someone told us that he gets tired, and I wonder if when he's reading a story can he control this, or if he's with a bunch of friends he gets tired at 10:30. The rest of you should think of things that interfere with you that way that keep you from concentrating. What kinds of

- thoughts, feelings, daydreams, or anything.
- A: Well, when ever I feel that way...for example, going out to a movie, boating, whatever it is... there is always the nagging of studying in the back of my mind.
- Counsellor: If you had been studying, could you have been at the movies, boating, or going out with a girl?
- A: When I did do these things, I always had this feeling. It distracted me very much.
- Counsellor: You mean when you went out you would feel that you could be studying. In other words, you had the feeling of guilt that you had done something wrong or hadn't done something useful that you should have done.
- A: It was always there. Why should I do it and yet I've got to do it.
- Counsellor: Well, if you had this feeling, why didn't you study?
- A: I'd reached the point that I couldn't study. This feeling was with me all the time.
- Counsellor: Does that strike you as being unusual?
- Other Members: Yes, unusual . . . yes.
- A: The more one thinks about it, the more it gets into him. When having fun, you think of duties, and when doing duties, you think of having fun, so I don't enjoy either of them nor do either win out.
- Counsellor: But the question is if you're out on a picnic after you've done your work, so your mind is rested, do you enjoy it then or not? If you've got to visit your grandmother in the hospital and you go to the movies instead, you might think, I should be at the hospital.
- E: But the point is even if he thinks so and feels responsible, when it comes to really studying and preparing he doesn't prepare. That's the point. You feel like doing it, and you can't do it; you can't sit still and study.
- Counsellor: Have any of you any idea what causes it? I gather that you have this feeling sometimes.
- E: Yes, I have it sometimes.

- Counsellor: What causes you to be unable to concentrate?
- E: Something I want and can't have. Not sexual. Anything I want and can't have makes me leave everything. For example, I studied in high school . . . at the beginning I planned to go to the States and continue my education there. I wrote letters to schools and both state and private organizations from which I thought I could get financial help because my financial situation is low. Anyway, I wrote and was on my way to being accepted, but something in my family happened. My brother tells me he is going to Australia the next year, maybe, and he told me he'd rather me stay here and study at A.U.B. instead of going to the States, and then he will bring me to Australia, even then I didn't like the idea, but I thought it's better to do as he says because it make sense with your brother in another country instead of being alone, 'cause in Australia they have schools, where I can continue, so he left, and I'm waiting, and then my brother did not go to Australia and I lost my chance of going to the States, and I came to the A. U. B. as if I came to the movie -- just to have fun. I came here not because of the university, but because of my finances. Anyway, I could arrange and could get a scholarship and get through, only it doesn't make sense but even then after this I should study and work, so the first semester I just couldn't study. I used to go to my room, open my book, and there comes the U.S. I used to enjoy math, but I could not even pass it. I failed mathematics.
- Counsellor: You say it doesn't make sense?
- E: It doesn't make sense to me because you see I am somewhat ambitious . . . when I want something, I want to have it. . . when it's impossible, it's okay. Then I think, if I had been in the States, this semester, I would be doing a good job there. I would have good grades.
- Counsellor: Do any of you have any idea what the cause of his problem is? He said it, I want to see if you can get it.
- C: Frustration, keeping him from going on.
- Counsellor: This is one of them definitely. You noticed when he was talking about going to Australia he was giving reasons, now how convinced were you of those reasons.
- E: Well, you see I had some obligations to my family and well, when my brother told me, I thought it was a good

idea not only for him, but for me. And I thought I can't live the way I would in the States in Australia, even then I think because the most important thing for me was to get an education and the education I could get in the U.S., I could get in Australia, not the same, but at least it would do, so I accepted.

- Counsellor: Well, tell me why you want to go to the States?
- E: Maybe because some of my friends did go to the States, i don't know.
- Counsellor: But could you imagine something that you expected to get?
- E: Yes, maybe because I thought in the States the studying would be easier and it would be fun studying for an education. I thought in the States it would be easier to get an education. There I know the students work and can get money. I made a big quarrel with my brother. I was shocked. I thought the idea was gone, but not really, it comes back. I don't have money.
- A: Scholarships?
- E: I can't get it in the middle of the year and with my grades; I don't like the East. I'm from Damascus, but during my vacations I don't usually go home. Beirut is more western and I like it better.
- Counsellor: Do you ever have a feeling of frustration and like paying your brother back?
- E: I don't think so. I haven't tried to take revenge. I think my brother is looking out for my good. He likes me.
- Counsellor: But you don't like his looking out for you?
- E: Hmmmm...
- A: Are you getting resigned to staying here?
- E: No, maybe I'll even leave the University. My grades are too bad for scholarships, and I don't have money.
- A: What if you make good grades?
- E: Even so, it doesn't pay enough. This year I needed 3,500 L.L. Scholarships pay a thousand, family a

thousand, and I paid the rest through work scholarships. Now I've lost it through poor grades. In this University, once you are down, it is very difficult to get back up again. [Repeats about being down.]

- Counsellor: You sound pretty hopeless.
- E: I don't think there is much hope. [Repeats about being down.] . . . Here everyone wants you to go even lower.
- G: Aren't you willing to try?
- E: I'm trying this semester. Studying better, I used to be first in my classes. In secondary school I began decelerating, but my grades were still on top.
- G: Did it occur to you that you might be a little more fortunate than many other students?
- E: Yes, I guess, but I'm not worth it.
- G: That's a point to think about.
- Counsellor: I know it wasn't easy to say this . . . you know some people worry about a scholarship and grades so much they can't study, so they don't get the grades, the grades go lower and they lose the scholarship.
- E: Yes, I know and some people are lucky and don't have to worry about a scholarship.
- Counsellor: But many who have money still don't really study, so it's not all this.
- E: I guess you're right, but in my case this is a large part of the problem.
- Counsellor: Well, I think the time is about up. We shall keep on the track, and we hope you will be thinking about what was said by others in the session.
- E: I know it's bad, I'd just like to say when you are up everyone wants to help you, but when you are down, everyone wants to kick you lower.
- G: Counsellor: Not everyone.
- E: About ninety percent. No one thinks this man used to be great once. Now that he's down, they just forget about him.

- A: That's what you are thinking.
- E: No, that's what other think.
- Counsellor: People sometimes ask people to kick them. Make it possible to be kicked.
- E: As long as you let people, they will kick you. You must resist.
- Counsellor: Not just resist - don't help them. Well, goodnight.

APPENDIX IV

STUDY HABIT QUESTIONNAIRE

A Survey of Study Habits

True, False: Put a circle around T if you think your statement is correct or around F if you think the contrary.

- T F 1. Do you usually study every day in the same place?
- T F 2. Do you usually know in the morning just how you are going to spend your day?
- T F 3. Does your desk have anything on it that might distract you from work?
- T F 4. When studying do you frequently skip the graphs or tables in your textbooks?
- T F 5. Do you frequently make simple charts or diagrams to represent points in your reading?
- T F 6. When you find a word in your reading that you do not know do you usually look it up in the dictionary?
- T F 7. Do you usually skim over a chapter before reading it in detail?
- T F 8. Do you usually glance through a chapter looking at the paragraph headings before reading it in detail?
- T F 9. Do you usually read the summary at the end of a chapter before reading the chapter?
- T F 10. Do you keep your notes for one subject all together?
- T F 11. Do you usually take your notes in class just as rapidly as you can write?
- T F 12. Do you usually take your notes in lecture in outline form?
- T F 13. Do you usually take your notes on reading in outline form?
- T F 14. Do you usually try to summarize your readings in a sentence or short paragraph?
- T F 15. After you have read a chapter and taken notes on it do you usually write a summary of the chapter as a whole?

- T F 16. Do you sit up late the night before an exam studying?
- T F 17. In preparing for an examination do you try to memorize the text?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beard, R. M., Levy, P. M., and Maddox, H. Academic performance at university. Ed. Review, 1964, 16, 163-174.
- Broedel, J. et al. The effects of group counselling on gifted underachieving adolescents. J. Counsel. Psychol., 1960, 7, 163-170 (Abstract).
- Buros, O. K. The fifth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1957.
- Corsini, Raymond J. Methods of group psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.
- Edwards, A. L. Edwards personal preference schedule manual. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1954.
- Ends, E. J., and Page, C. W. Group psychotherapy and concomitant psychological change. Psych. Monographs, 1959, 73, No. 480.
- Gebhart, G., and Hoyt, D. Personality needs of under- and overachieving freshmen. J. appl. Psychol., 1958, 29, 125-128.
- Gorlow, L., Hoch, E. L., and Telschow, E. F. The nature of nondirective group psychotherapy. New York: Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1952.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Grundlach, R. H. Group psychotherapy: New clinical and experimental approaches. In L. E. Abt and B. F. Reiss (Eds.), Progress in clinical psychology. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1960.
- Hallworth, H. J. Anxiety and school examinations. Ed. Review, 1964, 16, 210-217.
- Heilbrun, Alfred B., Jr. Social desirability and the relative validities of achievement scales. J. consult. Psychol., 1962, 26, 383-386.
- Johnson, James A., Jr. Group therapy: A practical approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Keppers, G. L., and Caplan, S. W. Group counselling with academically able underachieving students. N. Mex. Soc. Stud. educ. res. Bull., 1962, 1, 12-17.
- Klopfner, W. Review of Group psychotherapy: Theory and practice, by H. Mullan and M. Rosenbaum, Contemporary Psychology, 1964, 9, pp. 116-118.

- Mace, C. A. The psychology of study. London: Pelican Books, 1962.
- McNemar, Quinn. Psychological statistics. New York: John Wiley, 1962.
- Morgan, Clifford T. Introduction to psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Mullan, H., and Rosenbaum, M. Group psychotherapy: Theory and practice. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Munn, Norman L. Students' manual to accompany introduction to psychology. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962.
- Rogers, C. R., and Dymond, R. F. Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Rosen, B. C. The achievement syndrome: A psychocultural dimension of social stratification. In J. W. Atkinson (Ed.), Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Shaw, Merville. Need achievement scales as predictors of academic success. J. educ. Psychol., 1961, 52, 282-285.
- Stephenson, William. The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Strang, R. Counselling techniques in college and secondary school. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Winborn, B., and Schmidt, L. G. The effectiveness of short-term group counselling upon the academic achievement of potentially superior but underachieving college freshmen. J. educ. Res., 1962, 55, 169-173.