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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The feeling of the Board of Education of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as stated in their published bulletin called the Announcement of Program, is that "Personal guidance, both in and out of the classroom, has been emphasized as one of the major responsibilities of Seminary teachers."¹

On the even numbered years the Board of Education of the Church spends a great amount of money and time in having every teacher in the Seminary System come into the Brigham Young University to be instructed and to find more effective methods of teaching seminary and of counseling with the students both in and out of the classroom. There is a constant need for research of new teaching methods which will provide better teaching techniques for subject matter and for the improvement of student personal and social adjustment to life as a whole.

Students with personal problems seek help from their seminary teachers yet the typical seminary teacher has a heavy teaching load and other assignments which leaves him very little time for individual attention to students' personal problems. Because of the time element involved, the problem of providing adequate guidance services for students with personal and social adjustment needs is a basic problem.

in the seminary program. Any effective techniques that will shed light on this problem are worthy of experimental investigation.

Statement of the Problem

With personal guidance as one of the major responsibilities of the seminary teacher and with the limited time for individual counseling, the investigator was trying to determine if the classroom setting could be effective in reducing, if not solving, the problems of students.

The purpose of this project, then, is to determine if there is a difference between the two methods of teaching seminary: (1) the traditional, authoritative, teacher-centered method, and (2) the group-guidance, student-centered method, with regard to changing the students religious outlook and to solving their problems.

In carrying out this study, the following questions will be investigated:

1. Will there be a reduction of the students' problems in the experimental group during the experimental period by the use of the group guidance techniques?

2. Will there be a reduction in the problems of the students in the control group in which there are no group guidance techniques used during the experimental period?

3. Will there be, with the use of the group-guidance method, a reduction of students' problems without having an effect on their achievement and comprehension relative to subject matter?

4. Will the traditional teaching method tend to increase problems with the students and will it have any effect on their
religious outlook?

5. Will the use of group-guidance techniques blend well into the seminary subject matter outline?

6. Will the group-guidance teaching method tend to increase or decrease the demand for personal counseling?

7. Which of the two methods will be more effective in reaching the desired goal?

Need for the Study

The Board of Education for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints places great importance on the counseling and guidance work in the Seminary system.

The basic philosophy underlying this trend is that subject matter has value only insofar as it affects the faith, attitude, conduct, and life of the student; the center of interest, therefore, is the student himself. The educational process begins with the student. Material from books, teachers, and the students' own experiences serve to promote the process of learning. Biblical and other sacred scriptures are the basic source materials used to guide the students in meeting life's problems.1

It is evident that the seminary classroom is where most of the guidance work is to take place, aside from the personal counseling that the teacher may have time for. But with the growing pressures of time on most seminary teachers, there is very little time for such counseling. Therefore, there seems to be a great need for critical evaluation of "Classroom guidance" and its effectiveness in preparing the students to meet life's problems. Although some evaluation has been made in this area in regular secondary schools, very little has been done to date in the seminary setting with the exception of two studies.

1Ibid., p. 33.
The first of these studies to evaluate current guidance opportunities and practices in the seminary system was made by John James Glenn. He recommended that "...further effective study be given to the possibilities of a more frequent and effective utilization of group guidance techniques in the Seminary program." The other study was by Charles R. Hobbs who made a study of selected group-guidance techniques in the seminary classroom. He found that "very little research has been done relating to guidance practices in the seminary program or in classroom guidance methods in general education." Hobbs did not have comparative control and experimental groups as this project has. He also recommended that "...future research of group guidance techniques be conducted in the seminary classroom."

With the enrollment increase in the seminars, more student problems arise and the need for counseling increases. During the school year 1949-50 the total student enrollment in the seminars throughout the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints numbered 26,488. During the school year 1958-59, the total enrollment in the seminars reached 51,707. This is an increase of 25,219 in less than ten years, and the future outlook seems to indicate an even greater enrollment increase.

In view of this increased enrollment do the group-guidance techniques...


3Ibid., p. 68.

meet the need of the Seminary System goals better than the traditional type teaching? This is a vital question which the investigator hopes to answer in this project.

**Delimitations of the Study**

Because of the large number of uncontrollable variables this study is, of necessity, limited to the investigator's own classes. This included a total of 122 students in four classes. Two classes of fifty-three students in the control group and two classes numbering sixty-nine students in the experimental group. The study does not attempt to include classes of other teachers. One of the weaknesses of this study is, no doubt, that of the investigator attempting to play the role of the traditional teacher-centered teacher, and the student-centered group-guidance teacher at the same time. To change teaching personalities completely is most difficult.

No attempt will be made in this study to compare the letter grades of students in the two groups, nor to determine the likes or dislikes of the two types of teaching from the students' point of view.

**Definition of Terms**

The term "Otis" is used in this study to refer to the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test, Gamma Test Form C, for senior high school and colleges.

The term "N.T. Survey" is used in this study to refer to the L. D.S. Department of Education New Testament Survey Examination.

"M.C.I." refers to the Minnesota Counseling Inventory Test, written by Ralph F. Berdie and Wilbur L. Layton of the University of Minnesota and published by the Psychological Corporation, New York, N.Y.,
copyrighted in 1953.

The term "Department" as used in this study refers to the Department of Education of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The "Church" as used in this study will always refer to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

"Control Group" will refer to a both male and female group of fifty-three students in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades, attending the Provo L.D.S. Seminary during the 1958-59 school year.

"Experimental Group" refers to a total of sixty-nine male and female students in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades attending the Provo L.D.S. Seminary during the 1958-59 school year. The Provo L.D.S. Seminary is adjacent to the Provo High School, Provo, Utah.

The term "guidance" as used in this study refers in a broad way to the process of helping young people successfully understand and solve their everyday problems to the end that they might achieve a satisfactory and happy life adjustment.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter will be to present a review of literature dealing with the philosophy of personal guidance practices within the seminary program; studies that have been done in this area of guidance in the seminary system; and literature dealing with group guidance in the classroom on the secondary level.

The Philosophy of Personal Guidance Within
The Seminary System

"Men are that they might have joy."¹ This is the basic philosophy of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as "revealed" to them by God. Every organization within the Church has this same goal—to help man achieve happiness.

In outlining The Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Elder John A. Widtsoe, a member of the Twelve Apostles of the Church, said, "The aim of the Church, organized for human good, is to make men happy."² Thus the seminary system of the Church has a greater responsibility in carrying out this objective than any other organization in the Church. Whereas, the other organizations in the Church meet on the average of once a week, the seminary has the youth of the Church on an average of one hour a day, five days a week, nine months a year. With

¹II Nephi 2:25; Book of Mormon.

²John A. Widtsoe, Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1937) p. 17.
this great responsibility the Department has listed the purpose of the Church Educational Program as follows:

Thus the ultimate purpose of the system of the Church schools is to provide a program of secular and religious education that will promote man's utmost well-being--his joy and happiness--not only during his mortal life but for the eternities of immortality as well.¹

The above is the most recent statement made in their Announcement of Program in the year 1959-60. In 1949, in the same booklet, it stated:

The objectives of the educational program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are broad in scope. While embracing all that is universally recognized as good in vocational training and in character development, the Church program goes further to establish basic religious convictions as the foundation of the Christ-like life.²

This points out that the goal of the Church Educational System is to help man reach a well-adjusted life. This is the goal of guidance.

In the Seminary Handbook published in 1949 by the Department, the following is given under the title of Guidance:

The importance of guidance is being recognized as a necessary part of education. The time element is the one hurdle to overcome.

Value of Guidance. Young people come out of all types of homes. Many of them are blocked in their desires for achievement and if these barriers are not removed, personality maladjustments may arise. Students need to be released from these frustrations so they can find peace from within. Guidance will assist the student to remove the barriers that block their progress and assist them to find expression to their highest desire. Students may stumble along for years before they finally find themselves. A good guidance program will help them make new discoveries and overcome their handicaps.³

And again from the same book:

The art of guidance is important. The student should be permitted to draw his own constructive solution and not be dogmatically pushed into it by the teacher. Students should learn the art of making wise decisions. With the confidence of a good teacher they can hurdle many barriers...

Group Guidance. Effective guidance can be done in the group with certain problems. For example if a student is timid she may not be helped only in the group. Activities may be created to assist her in overcoming her timidity. Lack of confidence in social activities can only be strengthened by social participation. There are many such problems that can be solved in the group.

An alert teacher can recognize many needs in his students and with the assistance of the group help guide them into more constructive ways of living. The whole seminary program is designed for that very purpose.\(^1\)

It is evident from the above statement that the department has always placed great importance on guidance in the seminary program, even though this information was written for the average teacher who may have had no training in guidance. There were 138 men observed in the study by Glenn and he stated: "On the whole, the Seminary teachers are not extensively trained in the professional fields of personnel and guidance work."\(^2\)

Guidance is an important and necessary part of education, but the "time element is the one hurdle to overcome." If it is possible to prove by this study that this "hurdle" can at least, in part, be overcome by the use of group-guidance in the classroom, it will prove invaluable to the seminary system in reaching the desired goal.

President William E. Berrett, Vice President in charge of Religious Education—who has spent years as a teacher in the seminary system and is now its head—has stated:

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 49.

It has been my observation, over many years of association in the seminary system of the Church, that next to classroom instruction the most important work for the Seminary teacher is counseling of students upon the many problems which they bring in confidence to him. Accordingly, from the standpoint of the Administration of the Church School System, it is desirable that Seminary teachers be chosen on the basis not alone on their ability to teach and their faith in the Gospel, but also on their possibility as successful counselors. It is to be regretted that more of our Seminary teachers have not had counseling training, and it is my hope that those who prepare to enter the Church Educational System will obtain some course work in this field.1

This shows that guidance in the Seminary program is a very important part of the program, and because of the limited time of the Seminary teacher in his heavy teaching load, group guidance in the classroom setting seems to be the most favored method at this time.

**Studies Completed in the Area of Guidance In The Seminary System**

Group guidance in the Seminary system is still a virgin area, but there have been a few "pioneers". The first big study in the seminary system was that of John James Glenn, who in the year 1956 completed "A Study of Guidance Opportunities and Practices in the Seminary System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." He found that it was indeed a virgin area. He discovered the Seminary teacher was rated by the students to be in a favored situation for counseling: In some cases the teacher was rated next to a close friend, parents, and brother and sister, as the person students would like to approach with their problems.

1 Letter to John James Glenn from William E. Berrett, Vice President of Religious Education, Department of Education, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (unpublished Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1956), p. 21. (Glenn emphasized that the viewpoints expressed in the above statement were those of President Berrett alone, and that it was not an "official" pronouncement issued by the Department of Education, p. 21.)
He found also that very few men in the seminary system had any formal training in personnel and guidance work. Four of his sixteen recommendations are given here:

1. It is recommended that every seminary teacher give active recognition to student guidance as one of the four major functions of the seminary program.

2. It is recommended that each seminary teacher become personally aware of the need for constant evaluation of and improvement in his guidance practices and techniques, particularly those involved in the counseling process.

10. It is recommended that a more extensive and consistent inservice training program be carried out in guidance work by the Department, utilizing such resources as special summer courses, monthly study group discussions, and distribution of printed information and materials.

11. It is recommended that a consideration of at least the basic guidance and counseling concepts be included as part of the professional preparation of prospective seminary teachers.1

It is the writer's desire that through this study more evidence will be brought forth to add to the above recommendations. About the same time Glenn was doing his study, James Wallace Johnson was doing "A comparison of Self-Perceived Religious Problems of Ninth and Twelfth Grade Seminary Students." He constructed a special L.D.S. Inventory to measure the problems of the students.2 Johnson discovered the same thing that Glenn found—that the seminary teacher was ranked very high as a confidant in helping the students solve their problems. Johnson further noted that the students of Davis School District preferred to talk to mother, seminary teacher, and bishop, in the order given.

1Glenn, op. cit., pp. 139-140.

In 1957 Wilson Kay Anderson completed "A Study of General and Religious Personal Problems of Tenth, Eleventh and Twelfth Grade Seminary Students." He used the high school form of the Mooney Problem Check List to measure the self-perceived general problems. A special check list developed by Anderson was used to measure self-perceived religious problems of students attending Provo L.D.S. Seminary during 1954-55 and 1955-56 school years. He observed that over half the students tested had a desire to talk to someone about their personal problems.1

In 1958 Charles R. Hobbs completed a study, "An Experimental Study of Selected Group Guidance Techniques in the Seminary Classroom", at the Provo L.D.S. Seminary. Not using a control group he took a group of eighty-three Old Testament students and for nine weeks used selected group-guidance techniques with a test-retest experiment to determine if the techniques would lower or greatly reduce the problems of the students. He used the high school form of the Mooney Problem Check List, and the California Test of Personality. He stated that:

1. There was a significant decrease in those problems indicated by the circled scores of the Mooney Problem Check List which troubled students most over the experimental period.

2. A significant decrease in problems troubling students over the nine-week period was found in the Totaled Scores of the Mooney Problem Check List.

3. The Personal Adjustment, Social Adjustment, and Total Adjustment scores of the California Test of Personality tended to fall in the direction of decrease in student problems during the experimental period, although no level of significance was manifest in the final analysis.

4. The guidance techniques used in the present study were effective in assisting students in the seminary classroom to solve personal and social adjustment problems.

5. The practice of group guidance in the seminary classroom resulted in an increase of student self-referrals for individual counseling.¹

Hobbs recommended that "...future research of group guidance techniques be conducted in the seminary classroom." and, "...group guidance techniques in the classroom setting be introduced to all seminary teachers, and the instructions of such methods be included in the seminary in-service training program."²

The above shows a greater need for study in this area, even though there has been a little work done it is still a virgin area of study. We also see an indication that more group guidance teaching techniques could be used in the seminary classroom to help overcome the time element problem of the guidance program goal desired by the Department.

**Literature Dealing With Group-Guidance In The Classroom**

When talking about educating children through "need-meeting activity", Hebert A. Thalen states, "The purpose of the classroom is to change people as a result of their own experiences."³ The writer reached this conclusion after having been in the classroom over a period of years as a teacher; thus planting the seed for this project.

Dugald S. Arbuckle, putting forth the idea that every teacher

---

²Ibid., p. 67
should become aware of the need of guidance among educators, states:

These teachers are changing, and are no longer thinking of themselves as being judges, moralists, disciplinarians, sentimentalists, and givers of advice. Instead, they are concentrating on creating an atmosphere of understanding and permissiveness in which the child may feel free to express his true feelings; they are concerning themselves with the individual child rather than with the problem itself; they are concerned with causes at least as much as with effects; they are beginning to see that the child lives by his emotions as well as by his intellect; and they are realizing the importance of understanding the feeling content of the child's statements. They are, in short, becoming counselors, both in techniques and in ideology, and they are beginning to concentrate on helping the child to help himself in making decisions and in solving problems.\(^1\)

From the information of the studies presented in the chapter to this point and in accordance with the desires of the Department the investigator hopes this study will help the type of teacher described above achieve the desired goal in the seminary system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In the seminary classrooms throughout the system there are too many teachers of the old lecture type; thus, neither the teacher nor the student sees the desired results in their classes.

In describing his ideal classroom, Arbuckle says:

There will be freedom, but not license; permissiveness but not chaos; tolerance and understanding but not necessarily agreement; remedial action rather than punishment; and concern with causes as well as effect... Obviously there are many occasions when the teacher must act as the instructor, but the emphasis should always be on activity by the pupil rather than by the teacher... Sometimes the room will be noisy; sometimes it will be quiet. Always there will be activity and the air of excitement that permeates a group when all members feel that things

are being done and each individual member can say, "I am getting things done, too." ¹

Bennett, in writing about the effects of group judgment on individual behavior, states that a number of studies designed to shed light on this problem have been carried out and that:

Uniformly, the experiments established that group discussion is a more effective instrument for influencing attitudes than the lecture method... No matter how competently and persuasively a lecture is presented, it seems to have little effect on changing habitual responses of the listeners. In a group discussion, on the other hand, as the information is disseminated and evaluated by the members of the group, there is a tendency to convert it into the basis for a decision. The decision, arrived at by the group, has great carry-over for the individuals in their subsequent behavior...

Most people tend to adhere to the standards of the group they belong to. A change in group standards will contribute materially toward breaking down the resistance to change within the individual.

Before an existing pattern of behavior can be "unfrozen" to clear the way for a new pattern, it is often necessary for the individual to be purged of emotional "sets" which block him from changing. This type of catharsis can frequently be affected through group discussions.²

Hare agrees with Bennett, for in his study of interaction and consensus he found that if an individual has a chance to present his ideas, even though they may be wrong and not accepted, he is generally satisfied with the results of the group discussion.³

As stated, the young people in the seminary classroom come from all types of homes and backgrounds with happy and some unhappy patterns of life. If the goals of the Department are to be achieved, the above

¹Dugald S. Artuckle, Guidance and Counseling in the Classroom, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1957), p. 199.


information would be worthy of consideration. There has been very little change in the attitude of any person through the lecture method, or in the "all give" from the teacher and "all take" from the students. True learning must be a giving and working through the problems on the part of the student. As Bennett states again:

In the group discussions, there is a greater degree of involvement on the part of the individual than there is in a lecture situation, and consequently the greater likelihood of dislodging existing patterns of response and making way for exposure to new patterns.

Although members participated in a discussion as components of a group, the decision in the experiments which were conducted did not involve group action. Rather, the members were deciding through the group process how they were going to act as individuals.

The changes in attitudes brought about through group discussion are not achieved by the application of outside pressure, but through the removing of counterforces within the individual.¹

The seminary teacher is faced with the problem of helping students feel that the teachings of Jesus Christ are principles by which they govern their everyday lives. A good example is the law of Moses as compared with the higher law—"Eye for eye and tooth for a tooth"; against the teaching—"love your enemies, do good to them that hate you and despitefully use you." This principle is a real problem, for most people find it almost instinctive to live more by the law of Moses than by the higher teachings of Jesus Christ. However, if people are to change, then the group guidance method in the classroom seems to be the best approach to this problem.

Joseph Jackson, shares the same opinion:

Conventional classroom procedure, no matter what its organizational plan, will contribute very little

to the emotional wants of the students unless an effort is made to delve into the individual and group dynamics of the situation.¹

There have been a number of studies conducted to attempt to determine the most effective way of getting people in groups to change their behavior. Levine and Butler studied twenty-nine factory supervisors who were overrating the performance of highly-skilled workers on high job grades and underrating workers on lower job grades. These twenty-nine supervisors were divided into three groups; one group was used as a control group, the second group was given a lecture of the prejudiced ratings with a reminder of the old system they were use to, and then their group was turned over to the group for discussion. The lecture had no significant effect on the prejudiced ratings, and the only group where the prejudical rating improved significantly was the discussion group. The authors concluded that acquisition of knowledge does not lead to action and suggested that group decision was a sufficient motivating force to overcome the habitual ways of thinking and acting.²

Working with psychology students, Asch, taught three sections according to the way he felt most college courses were normally taught; these sections he used as his control group. Asch then taught one section, his experimental group, according to the following criteria:

1. They were free to choose their own goals and their own reading material.

2. They were to write weekly reaction reports based


on their feelings about any of the pertinent experiences they had had during the week.

3. They provided their own class discussion.

4. They graded themselves.

At the end of the experimental period an objective final examination was given to both groups. However, the exam did not affect the grades of the experimental group.

He concluded that the control groups did significantly better on the objective test, but a more subjective supplementary evaluation indicated that the experimental group had gained a greater knowledge of diversified subject matter and did more independent thinking and reading about Psychology. The experimental group achieved more in emotional adjustment as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic-Personality Inventory.¹

To employ individual and group dynamics would be a little hard to do with the old idea of lecture method. S. R. Slavson ² points out that observations seem to conclude that the more inter-discussion that occurs, the more the "patients" will change. They can accept censure, suggestions, interpretation and guidance from each other with less disturbance and hostility than from the leader.

Preston and Heintz found that groups in which the leader acted as a participant were more effective than groups in which the leader merely supervised and directed the discussion in effecting changes in attitudes, and that subjects were more likely to withstand the impact


of group opinion under supervisory leadership, probably indicating that no strong group opinion is formed under this condition.\(^1\)

Many teachers may feel that if you begin to use guidance in the classroom you will not be an effective teacher. This is not the case at all, as will be brought out in this study later. About this, Arbuckle says:

\[\ldots \text{One of the major findings of the past few years is evidence to indicate that the teacher can function as a guidance worker, is in many schools functioning as a guidance worker, and, to be completely effective, must function as a guidance worker…} \]

A perusal of the literature makes it quite clear that the teacher has been accepted as a guidance worker, and many articles, often based on the writers' personal experiences, have indicated the need for teachers in guidance.\(^2\)

There need be no fear about the teacher becoming a "guidance worker" in the classroom, for only in this way can the goals of the seminary program be completely reached. Developing student's behavior patterns and changing attitudes toward a happier life should be the goal of all teachers.

In teaching a graduate course in education, Rasmussen, conducted one as a student-centered class and one as an instructor-centered class. Through questionnaires and check-lists the student-centered group felt they had learned more of practical value; that more positive attitude change had occurred; that more desirable behavioral change had occurred and felt that the course was more interesting. He found that there was


no significant difference on achievement tests between the two groups.\textsuperscript{1}

In a similar study to that above, Robert E. Bills, found that students taking an Educational Psychology Course had no significant difference in the text-learned material, but there was a more positive attitude in the student-centered group.\textsuperscript{2}

A study was conducted in an Education Psychology class at the University of Illinois, by Roy H. Simpson. He concluded that it was possible to set up a class in which each member of the class voluntarily brought his intelligence to bear upon setting up goals and purposes, deciding on courses of actions and attempting a continuous evaluation of the work as it proceeds; that the student produces a custom-tailored set of learning experiences with the guidance of the teacher; that goals and other factors in the management of teaching-learning situation are kept flexible enough to give considerable attention to the development of learner judgment; and that learning for the student consists of a combination of individual, small-group and whole-class activities which are planned by those most concerned.\textsuperscript{3}

Because of the emphasis placed in guidance and counseling by the Department and because the guidance function in the seminary program is almost completely the responsibility of the classroom teacher, all

\textsuperscript{1}Glen R. Rasmussen, "An Evaluation of a Student-Centered and Instructor-Centered Method of Conducting a Graduate Course in Education," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVII (1956), 449-461.


teachers in the Seminary system should be aware of the opportunities they have as teachers in the guidance program. Erickson gives some of these:

1. Teachers, as teachers, are primarily concerned with the problems, and needs of their pupils.

2. Teachers are the first line of detection of the emerging maladjustments of pupils.

3. Teachers have an opportunity to provide most of the school situations for maximum pupil development.

4. Teachers have an opportunity to implement many of the decisions made as a result of the pupils' contacts with counselors.

5. Teachers have an opportunity to provide many group therapy activities.

6. Teachers have an opportunity to provide many instructional services closely related to the need and problems of pupils.

7. Teachers have an opportunity to acquire much information and many insights about pupils and their experiences.

8. Teachers develop many effective contacts with parents and community agencies. These contacts have important possibilities in the complete guidance program.

9. Teachers have many personal contacts with pupils. These "rapport" relationships place them in an extremely strategic position to help the child.¹

There is no one in the whole school system, seminary as well as public school system, that is in a better place to have all of the opportunities to help the student than the teacher. Few teachers have as good a subject for using group guidance as the seminary teacher, by reason of the subject taught.

The literature points out that most sincere teachers with a little training can and should use the guidance techniques in the classroom and do a successful job of counseling the students, unless they involve serious and severe emotional disturbances, whereupon the teacher should be so informed as to know when the students may be referred for assistance to a trained specialist. Many problems that are not too serious and yet become serious later in life could be avoided, if each teacher would become more aware of the guidance program and its possibilities.

The research in this area of group guidance in the classroom indicates that when groups are allowed to openly discuss problems and plan their own actions, there is a much greater chance of improved behavior in students. Also, in groups in which the leader participates with the group in a democratic manner and provides some direction and guidance, there is more apt to be the achievement of desired goals.

Most researchers find that student-centered classes were preferred by the students and that there is some indication of a more positive attitude among the students in such classes. It is evident, however, that more research is needed in these areas.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN—METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Location and Selection of the Two Groups

Inasmuch as the investigator was a teacher, and because of the availability of the classes and students, the Provo L.D.S. Seminary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was selected for this study. The Provo Seminary is adjacent to the Provo High School, Provo, Utah. The investigator at the time of the research was teaching five classes—one Church History and Doctrine, and four New Testament. The four New Testament classes made for an ideal study group. These four classes will be referred to here by their period number. All four periods met daily for a fifty-five minute class period, Monday thru Friday. Their schedule is as follows:

3rd Period—10:30 to 11:25 a.m.
Lunch Period—11:30 to 12:15
4th Period—12:20 to 1:15 p.m.
5th Period—1:20 to 2:15 p.m.
6th Period—2:20 to 3:15 p.m.

There were a total of 132 students in the above four classes at the beginning of the study, however, ten students had to be eliminated from the study for the following reasons:

3rd Period—one boy because of excessive absences and incompleted tests.
4th Period—three girls because of excessive absences and incompleted test, marriage and withdrawal from high school—low grades.
5th Period—two girls because of excessive absences and incompleted tests, and withdrawal from high school—low grades.
6th Period—three girls and one boy—one girl and the boy
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eliminated because of marriage, other two girls because of excessive absences and incompletely tested.

These withdrawals left a total of 122 students studied. It should be noted that Provo High School does not have a policy that demands withdrawal from school upon marriage. The above enumerated students withdrew from school of their own choice just before or shortly after the marriage.

Table I gives the breakdown of the classes before the ten students were removed from the study as stated above. It shows the number of students in each class period and in each grade. It was desired in the selection of the control and experimental groups to have, as near as possible, an equal number of students in each group. This being impossible, the investigator felt it would be better to have the larger number of students in the experimental group. Such a group would give a better sample in the use of group-guidance techniques.

On this basis, the selection was made in such a way as to have the third and fifth periods as the control group, with the sixth period as the experimental group. By so doing, there was a total of fifty-three students in the control group and sixty-nine in the experimental group. There was some indication at the beginning of the experimental period that two students in the sixth period were going to get married. This would mean that that number of students in the fifth and sixth periods would be equal.

Table II gives us the number of students in each of the groups that completed the experimental period—a total of fifty-three in the control group and sixty-nine in the experimental group.
TABLE I
A BREAKDOWN BY GRADES OF THE CLASSES TO BE STUDIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>10th Grade</th>
<th>11th Grade</th>
<th>12th Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
A COMPARISON OF THE STUDENTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>10th Grade</th>
<th>11th Grade</th>
<th>12th Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of the Instruments Used

There were three instruments used in making this study: (1) the Otis quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test, (2) the L.D.S. Department of Education New Testament Survey Examination, and (3) the Minnesota Counseling Inventory Test.

Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test. The Otis was used to determine if there was any significant difference in the intelligence of the two groups. The reasons for the selection of this test over other intelligence tests are as follows: (1) In checking with the Provo High School records, the investigator found that a large number of the students in the study had taken the Otis within the last year and a half and the scores were available. This saved the cost and time of administering the test again to all of the students; (2) the Otis is easy to administer and to score; (3) the price of the Otis is reasonable; and (4) the validity and reliability of the test is highly recognized.

...the Journal of Experimental Education for March, 1937, Alphonse Chaparis, of Connecticut State College, describes an experiment in which the validity of each item of the High Examination was investigated by finding the biserial coefficient of correlation between the item and the total score in the test. Although the scores of only 100 adults of each sex were used in the experiment, the coefficients for the items were without exception positive for both sexes, having a median value of +.61. This experiment indicates that all the items of the High Examination have real validity in the mental ability test.1 The correlation between the Gamma Test and the Higher Examination for the 1007 students tested in New York was found to be .86.

The reliability of the Gamma Test was investigated by correlating the odd-numbered and even-numbered items of the test papers of 257 students in Grades 10, 11, and 12. The coefficients were found to be .82, .85, and .73 respectively for all three grades.\textsuperscript{1}

The test was administered to those students who had not taken the Otis within the last eighteen months. For a breakdown of these scores and a comparison of the two groups see Table III, Chapter IV.

\textbf{L.D.S. Department of Education New Testament Survey.}\textsuperscript{2} This examination is made by and used only by the Department to determine to what degree the students are learning about the New Testament, which specifically deals with Jesus Christ and His life.

It is comprised of seventy-five multiple choice questions. From the instructions, appearing on the first page of the test, the following is taken:

Select the best answer to each question and indicate your choice by blackening the corresponding space on the answer sheet with the special pencil provided. Be sure to answer each item. Each question is intended to represent an important point in the New Testament Course of study. Remember that more than one answer may be a good one but choose the best answer of the three given. You will not be penalized for guessing, but all unanswered questions will be counted as incorrect.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 6-7

\textsuperscript{2}Special permission to use this examination was granted to the writer by Boyd K. Packer, General Supervisor of the Department of Education, with provision that all copies be returned to the Department and that the exam would not be reproduced in any degree. The writer is grateful to Brother Packer and the Department for the use of this examination.

This was the only known test in this area of the New Testament that the investigator could find, and it was felt that it would give an indication as to which of the two groups would be learning more about the course of New Testament, which was the desire of the Department in making up the test. However, the investigator feels that this was the weakest instrument used. ¹ It was imperative for an effective study that some test be given to determine which of the two groups, control or experimental, had learned the most about the subject matter being taught. This was the purpose of the N.T. Survey.

Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI). This test was first published in 1957. It was authored by Ralph F. Bardié and Wilbur L. Layton, both of the University of Minnesota. It was patterned after the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Minnesota Personality Scale, for use with high school students grades nine through twelve.

A statement from the manual is as follows:

For the validation study of the MCI, the authors prepared descriptions of behavior one may expect to be associated with high and low scores on each of the seven diagnostic scales. Since the MCI was derived from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Minnesota Personality Scale, the research articles on the two parent inventories and the Atlas for the Clinical Use of the MMPI were studied for clues to behavior typical of persons at various score levels on those tests. On the

¹There are no studies on the validity or reliability of the test, and from the apparent high means score found on the pre-test, it was felt that this instrument was not as strong for the desired use of determining if there was any significant difference in the learning of the subject matter of New Testament between the experimental and control groups. It can not be stated with any certainty that the evidence shown in this study from this test is valid proof, the writer used this test as a guide which helped to determine which of the two groups had learned more during the experimental period and because there was no other instrument available in this field.
basis of this survey and clinical experience, the authors independently wrote behavior descriptions for high and low scores on the MCI. After conferences among the authors and their colleagues, the descriptive statements were refined and rephrased in behavioral rather than in trait terms for use in the validation studies. Teachers and counselors were asked to select students whose behavior was described by the statements. The MCI scores of different groups were then compared. Future research may result in modification of some of the behavior descriptions. In the meantime, they are presented below as aids in interpreting MCI scores.¹

There are nine scores to be obtained from the Inventory. They are listed below in abbreviated form. For a complete statement and interpretation on each scale of the MCI see Appendix I.

Interpretation of scores:

1. **Question Score (Q).** This is the number of items left blank.

2. **Validity Score (V).** This represents the degree of defensiveness of the student. It may reflect a naive attempt on the part of the student to "look good". A raw score as high as six should make one suspect the validity of the profile.

3. **Family Relationships (FR).** This refers to the relationships between the student and his family. It tells he has a friendly and healthy relationship with parents and brothers and sisters, likes to be at home; or has difficulties with parents or brothers and sisters, feels that his parents are unreasonably strict, expresses a desire to leave home.

4. **Social Relationships (SR).** This refers to the nature of the students' relations with other people and tells: if he is

gregarious, socially mature, happy and comfortable when with
groups, socially inept, under-socialized, unhappy and uncom-
fortable when with groups, likely to attend school functions,
and unlikely to answer questions in class when called upon
even if he knows the answer.

5. **Emotional Stability (ES)**. Indicates the emotionally stable
person, the type that seldom worries, self-conscious or self-
confident, capable of making their own decisions; frequently
unhappy, emotionally unstable, moody or irritable, often
tense or anxious and tearful under stress, quick-tempered.

6. **Conformity (C)**. This indicates the type of adjustment a
student makes in situations requiring conforming or responsible
behavior.

7. **Adjustment to Reality (R)**. This refers to the student’s way
of dealing with reality—whether he approaches threatening
situations in order to master them or withdraws from them in
order to avoid them.

8. **Mood (M)**. This indicates a student’s usual mood or emotional
state.

9. **Leadership (L)**. This related to those personality character-
stics reflected in Leadership behavior.

The MCI is a test containing 355 questions to which the person
taking the test answers either true or false—true if the statement
applies to him and false if the statement does not apply to him.

The reason this instrument was chosen over the tests is given
in part in the statement from the manual in the introduction, which states:
The Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MEI) provides a means whereby teachers, counselors, and other working with high school age youth can acquire information about the personality dynamics, personality structure, and personality problems of young people. Although the Inventory is useful to persons working in community clinics, youth centers, and other non-school settings, it has been designed primarily for students in grades 9-12. It can be administered in about 50 minutes.

The concepts underlying the development of the MEI are based on the needs of the adolescent and the educator in the school setting. More specifically, the purposes of the Inventory can be listed:
1. To sensitize teachers and counselors to relevant personality characteristics differentiating students.
2. To identify students in need of therapeutic attention.
3. To assist in understanding students as they attempt to achieve more mature self-understanding and integration between themselves and their environment.
4. To provide a means for determining the effects of educational experiences upon relevant personality characteristics.1

The MEI was developed primarily for secondary students, and it provides a means of determining the effects of educational experiences upon relevant personality characteristics, as well as helping the students to gain a more mature self-understanding. It is for these reasons that this instrument was selected.

In Burks Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook Frederic Kuder, Professor of Psychology at Duke University, makes the following statement about this instrument:

The extensive data given in the Manual reveal both favorable and unfavorable features of the development of the Inventory. Both split-half and retest reliabilities are mainly satisfactory. Standard score norms...are based on adequate methods and numbers. The manuals' suggestions for interpretation

1Berdie and Layton, op. cit., p. 3
are explicit and appropriately modest. One weakness is revealed by the data on validities and inter-correlations. Validities of entire scales reported in terms of the CIs of differences between the scores of random samples of pupils and of extreme cases nominated by teacher and school administrators. There is no indication of item analysis against a criterion. Some scales, such as SR, differentiate well, but others, such as R (sc), fail to do so. The tables of inter-correlations show that most r's run from .35 to .60 but that the correlations between SR and L, and between ES and R, are as high as the scale's reliabilities. The authors might well have refined the scales further by item analysis, or at least might have warned users that the evidence points to five interpretable scores, not seven. Even so, the Inventory is a serviceable instrument for counselors whose knowledge of test construction permits them to be aware of its limitations.¹

It is evident from the above, as well as the evidence given in the manual, that the validity and reliability of the MCI is rated high.

**Methods and Procedures**

It was impossible to begin the experimental period without first knowing which classes were going to be in the control group and which were going to be in the experimental group. After this was determined and everything was ready, the first pre-test was given on February 11, 1959. The N.T. Survey was first given and the following day the MCI was administered, followed by the experimental period. The outlines listed below were followed for a period of fourteen weeks, February 11 through May 20. This short period is one of the weaknesses of this study.

After the groups had been determined and the pre-tests administered, the research design was administered in the following way:

Control Group. The traditional teaching methods were used in this group with the teacher-centered, classroom setting where the emphasis was on the subject matter more than the problems of the students. The only problems that the students had were being tardy and absent. Other than these, all students in the same class were the same in the eyes of the teacher. The class was taught as nearly as possible with the traditional teacher-centered teaching methods as follows:

1. There was very little class discussion, only as it arose from the course outline and it was centered around the same. The teacher did most of the talking in lecture form.

2. There was very little problem-solving, only as the students solved the problems of the character that arose out of lessons, and wrote the answers in their note-books.

3. The only role-playing used was the dramatization of some of the stories and incidents out of the New Testament lessons, such as Jesus calling Lazarus from the tomb, etc. This was very limited and had no reference to students' problems, except the point the lesson covered.

4. The case method was not used, except as some of the cases of the characters from the New Testament lessons were brought out. This was centered around the lessons objective and not the students.

5. "What does this mean to you?" was put forth in the sense that, "This is what the Bible states," or "This is the doctrine of the Church". Such statements were always made in the authoritative way.
6. The outline and lessons that were covered were the choice of the teacher. The students had no choice in the matter.
In every possible way the teacher tried to make the classroom setting teacher-centered, more directive and authoritative.
The investigator found it more difficult to motivate the students and had a great problem with discipline with the control group.

Experimental Group. The group guidance techniques were used in the classroom setting. The teacher established, as much as possible, a student-centered setting, where the feeling of "We-ness" existed and where all felt free to discuss their problems in a permissive atmosphere. The class was taught as nearly as possible with the following group guidance techniques:

1. The Discussion Technique. This technique was used as far as possible with a common set of problems based on a common set of data, materials, and experiences, drawn mostly from the students as they would fit into the material and lessons being covered.

2. The Problem Solving Technique. This is the process by which the students evaluated changes in themselves and their environment, such as making new choices, decisions, or adjustments in harmony with life's goals and values, based on the teachings of Jesus Christ.

3. The Role-Playing Technique. With this technique the student acted out, in part, the situations which paralleled real-life problems; such as dating, parent-child relationships, church attitudes, etc.
4. The Case Method Technique. Cases were brought into the classroom and reviewed. The teacher avoided any moralising, and encouraged free expressions by the students of their feelings regarding the situation. The teacher tried to guide the class discussions toward some kind of group consensus or judgement using cases where some judgement or solution was needed. He would ask questions, then call for class discussion about the problem.

5. The "What Does This Mean to Me or So What" Technique. The teacher in teaching the class would not merely give the information out as a matter of fact, but would ask the class: what does this mean to you? Does this seem right to you? Is it the desirable thing for you? Or is there a "so what" approach to many of the lessons?

6. The Course Outline Technique. In order to be uniform with the control group, the course outline was the same (that put out by the Department.) However, the students were given a choice about what areas they wanted to spend more time on or what lessons were to be omitted. They were also able to choose their own topics for group discussion. The teacher then tried to avoid answering any questions directly, but let the class answer them. In every possible way, the teacher tried to make the classroom setting permissive and student-centered.

Inasmuch as the experimental period was conducted during the later part of the school year, the question naturally arises, "To what type of teaching were the two groups accustomed prior to the experimental
period?" The investigator tried to conduct the classes, as nearly as possible on a medium between the two types of teaching methods. In this way each group, both the experimental and control group had the same degree of adjustment to make to the new type of teaching when the experimental period started.

The investigator found very little difficulty with motivation and discipline in the two experimental classes. He also found that the morale was very high.

Procedure for Answering the Questions

At the end of the fourteen week experimental period, the N.T. Survey and the MCI were again administered.\(^1\) After the collection of the data, a statistical analysis was run, by computing the mean-gain scores, then using a t-test on, first, the N.T. Survey to determine whether there was any significant difference in the knowledge of the subject matter learned between the control and experimental groups, and second, the MCI seven scales to determine whether there was any significant difference in the student's adjustment during the experimental period of the two groups. This was done by comparing the males of the two groups, and comparing the females of the two groups, then comparing the total, both male and female of the control group with the experimental group.

Classroom Procedures

At the beginning of each year the investigator has his classes organized with a president, vice-president, and secretary over each class.

\(^1\)A complete picture of the comparisons of these two tests is given in Chapter IV.
These officers are changed at the end of every nine weeks of school or a school quarter and are elected by class members. It is their responsibility for the daily devotionals, usually comprising a song or recording, scriptural reading and prayer. Once a week, usually on Wednesday, the classes have a "special devotional", which follows the usual pattern with a special musical number and talk. However, this is left entirely to the class officers, and help is given only when it is asked for.

It was desired that the students know that they were being studied. Therefore, when the experimental period came, there was very little change from the above. Such knowledge was possessed by both the control and experimental classes during the experimental period.

Because of the educational background of the investigator, his type of teaching, for the most part, follows the lines of the experimental group. Knowing that he was going to run this study, he had less use for group guidance in the regular classroom prior to the experimental period than there would have been other years, and inasmuch as this was the first year for the investigator to teach at the Provo Seminary, he was not known by the students.

If there were any noticed change after the experimental period started, it would have been more noticeable in the control group. One or two students made the comment: "We just don't seem to get as much enjoyment out of this class now, as we did at the first of the year." Therefore the change had to be a gradual one for both groups. After about two weeks, however, the complete change for both groups had been reached. In the experimental group the investigator tried for group cohesiveness—
that of working together for the common goals, cooperation rather than
competition, a strong feeling of friendliness. Care was taken to avoid
unpleasant experiences of any kind or any group frustrations, other than
the usual on examination day.

In the control group, by the use of the grade, a spirit of strong
competition was fostered, an air of a lot of work. Nothing was done to
encourage friendly relationships, only as the students would do so on
their own.

In the experimental group there was a feeling of free expression
with self-control, whereas in the control group there was the feeling
that you were only to speak when you raised your hand and when called
upon.

From the beginning of the year there was a question box for
each class. It was understood that, unless the schedule would not allow,
half of the period every Friday would be devoted to answering and dis-
cussing the questions that had been placed there during the week on any
of the material that had been covered rather hurriedly. Occasionally a
question was raised in the mind of the students. These questions were to
be left anonymous, unless personal help was wanted, and would be read
to the class for class discussion and answer. It is interesting to note
that after the experimental period had started, the teacher would give
the answer and there was very little discussion from the class. There
was a marked decrease in the use of the question box in the control group,
but in the experimental group there was a slight increase.

The class discussion method as defined by Bloom\(^1\) was put into

\(^1\)E.S. Bloom. "Research on Teaching by Discussion," College and
University Bulletin. VI, No. 8, (February 1 and 15, 1954), cited by
Bennett, op. cit., p. 109.
the experimental group. The teacher would try to help the class focus on the problem and if needed extend and deepen the problem, but the solution was the responsibility of the group. The teacher tried to help and serve the group, not to dominate or to manipulate it.

There were case studies presented to the classes for discussion as they were brought out of the subject matter lessons. In the experimental group, these case studies were given with thought-provoking questions, that would as nearly as possible apply to their own real life situations, and require a solution. They were worked on and discussed as a group. However, in the control group, they were greatly modified to deal mainly with the lesson, and deal very little with real-life situations. These were never covered by class discussion, but answered in note-books.

There was a little role playing used in both groups, but differed greatly. In the control group, the role playing was limited to the subject matter, in such a manner as acting out certain stories from the life of Christ. In the experimental group, this was also done, but the stories were applied to everyday problems that the students had such as asking for the car, asking for a date, parent-child relationship, going steady problems, dancing all night with the same girl, etc. This proved to be most interesting in the experimental group and the investigator feels that more students looked at things in a different light than before; whereas in the control group, there was no noticeable change in attitude.

Other than the exceptions noted above, the class work of the two groups remained about the same. The same subject matter was covered by both groups, the same examinations were given to both groups, and they were graded on the same basis.
There was a noticeable change in the general attitude of the students in the control group, in interest lagging, and not as much interest in the class as a whole. The question box was not used as much and questions were often off the subject, whereas with the experimental group, the situation was just the opposite.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF SCORES

Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Test

Before checking the results of the instruments used in this re-
search, which will determine the amount of knowledge gained by the stud-
ents and the adjustment in certain areas, it is important to look at the
results of the Otis test first. Table III shows a comparison between the
males and females of both the control and experimental groups. It will
be noted that there is a slight difference between the groups, more so
with the control female with a mean I.Q. of 101.3 as compared to the mean
I.Q. of 104.5 for the experimental female, but the difference is not
significant as indicated by the t-score of .98.

Comparing the total groups, one will notice that there is a
t-score of .86, which establishes that there is no significant difference
between the I.Q. or the mental ability of the two groups. If there had
been a difference between the two groups, control and experimental, no
doubt the use of analysis of covariance would had to have been employed,
instead of the t-ratio, to determine the difference between each of the
other instruments used in this study. The complete breakdown as shown in
Table III shows that by comparing the male and female students within the
group, by comparing students of the same sex from each of the groups, and
by analyzing the total control and experimental groups, there is no sig-
nificant difference between any of these groups compared.
TABLE III
A COMPARISON OF t- RATIO SCORES OF THE OTIS QUICK SCORING MENTAL ABILITY TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group &amp; Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>t. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Control (M&amp;F)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Exper. (M&amp;F)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Control Group (both M&amp;F)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experimental Group (both M&amp;F)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Testament Survey

This test was used to determine whether or not with the use of group guidance techniques in the classroom, there would be less actual learning of the subject matter. From the review of studies that have been done in this area, there is an indication that in many cases the control-group or teacher-centered group retained and learned more than the student-centered or experimental group.

Table IV shows that both groups did slightly better on the post test than they did on the first test given, and that the experimental group had a higher gain score than the control group by a comparative
score of 1.27 as compared to 1.19. However, a closer look at the Table shows that there is very little difference between the pre and post mean scores as indicated by the low gain scores all below 2.00. The highest possible score on this test is seventy-five points, thus the two mean scores, both pre and post, for the large number of students was rather high, especially for the pre test.

TABLE IV
A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MEANS Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.67</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59.43</td>
<td>60.67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59.04</td>
<td>60.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60.64</td>
<td>61.95</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Control (Both M&amp;F)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>60.04</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total Experimental (Both M&F) | 69 | 60.12 | 61.39 | 1.27 | 5.35 | .08 | .08 | ...

There may be some answers as to why there was no great difference between the pre and post scores. Most of the questions on this test dealt with the life of Jesus Christ, therefore had the test been given at the beginning of the school year no doubt the scores would have been much lower. But in February the students had been studying the life of Jesus for sometime; then before taking the post test, they had been studying the Acts of the Apostles and the life of Paul for about two months, and could have had forgotten many of the points covered in the test—thus the close mean scores of the pre and post tests.
The only finding we can attest to with any certainty is that according to the instrument used there was no significant difference in the learning of the life of Jesus Christ between the control and experimental groups.

**Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI)**

The scores on this test will be broken down by each of the seven scales. It should be noted that the lower the score the better adjusted was the individual. No attempt will be made here to give the results of the question score nor the validity score, inasmuch as all were within the safe range and were valid to use.

**Family Relationship (FR)** The score on this scale refers to the relationship between the student and his family. Low scores indicate a friendly, healthy relationship with parent, brothers and sisters. High scores indicate conflicts or maladjustments in the family relationships.

Table V shows there is no significant difference according to the t-test, between the two groups. It does show, however, that there was a slight increase, or less adjustment with the control males with a gain score of 1.04 as compared to -.47 for the experimental males, but the difference was not statistically significant. With the females the control group had a little better adjustment than did the experimental with a gain score of -.57 as compared with the experimental females score of -.43. The overall picture of the two groups shows that the experimental group had a little better adjustment of the FR scale with a -.45 compared with the control group of .25. It would appear, however, that very little

---

1 For a more complete interpretation of each of the grades on the M.C.I. the reader is referred to Chapter III or appendix I.
could be done with the total adjustment of family relations in the classroom. Only as the students' understanding of their parents' problems become more apparent through the class discussion and role playing by students of the parents roles did they gain insight into the problems of family relations. Were it not for the reduction in gain score of the control female group, Table V might indicate that the group-guidance techniques do help students with their problems of family relations. Such is not evidenced by the facts given here. It would be safe to state that, as indicated on the FR scale of the MCI, teaching methods employed in the classroom have very little, if any, effect on adjustments in family relations. No significant difference existed between the two groups.

**TABLE V**

**A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES FROM THE M.C.I. FAMILY RELATIONS SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MEANS Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Control (M+F)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experimental (M+F)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Relations (SR).** The scores on this scale refer to the nature of the students' relations with other people. Low scores often indicate the gregarious, socially mature individual. High scores are likely to indicate the socially inept or under-socialized student.

There is a significant difference, as shown in Table VI, between the experimental and the control group males, at the .05 level of
confidence. It also shows that comparing the females of the two groups, one can observe that the control group had a gain score of 1.12 as compared to the score of the experimental group of -1.48. Comparing the two groups, the Table shows a very significant difference at the .01 level of confidence. This indicates that the group-guidance teaching techniques or student-centered teaching helps the student become more socially adjusted, whereas there is no change in the teacher-centered type of teaching. As shown in Table VI there was a reduction on the scale or a better adjustment for both male and female in the experimental group, as compared to the increased score for the control group.

**TABLE VI**

**A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES FROM THE M.C.T. SOCIAL RELATIONS SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MEAN S Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Males</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group (both M/F)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group (both M/F)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note the rather high gain score for the control male of 2.35, as compared to the gain score of 1.12 for the females of the same group. Also that the females of the experimental group made a better adjustment with a gain score of -1.48 compared with the gain score of 1.07 for the males of the same group. This would indicate that male students have a harder time making a good social adjustment even in
the student-centered classroom, and that in the teacher-centered classroom
the female students do fair, but still show an increase, but that the male
students show a greater maladjustment in such a classroom.

It can be stated from the above information that the student-
centered classroom greatly helps the high school student with his social
relations.

Emotional Stability (ES). The score on this scale refers to the
emotional stability of the person, just as the title suggest. Low scores
characterize emotionally stable students who seldom worry and have self-
confidence. High scores characterize students who frequently are unhappy
and generally appear emotionally unstable, who often over-react emotionally
to what appears to be a rather trivial situation and who are often moody
or irritable.

It is noted that in Table VII, there is a lowering of the scores
for the experimental group, whereas the control group has a rather high
score in the gain score column. The control males have a gain score of
.96 compared to the experimental males of -.07, (very little difference).
However, the control female has a gain score of 1.12 compared to the
experimental female of -1.28. These facts show a significant difference
at the .05 level of confidence. The total control group compared with the
total experimental group is also significant at the .05 level of confidence.

It is apparent from the above information that through the
student-centered teaching methods students, through working together on
common problems, through expressions of their own feelings, through
gaining insight from other students their own age about things they may
or may not agree with, can gain self-confidence, and can become capable
of making their own decisions. They overcome fear of strange situations and they become more emotionally stable.

TABLE VII

A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES FROM THE M.C.T. EMOTIONAL STABILITY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MEANS Pre</th>
<th>MEANS Post</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group (both MSF)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group (both MSF)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conformity (C). The score on this scale indicates the type of adjustment a student makes in situations requiring conformity or responsible behavior. Low scores indicate a reliable and responsible student, conforming to rules and codes of behavior even though he may not agree with the rules. High scores will likely show the irresponsible, impulsive, and rebellious student. There is a close relationship between the score on this scale and the score on the FR scale. A low score on the FR scale will likely bring a low score on the C scale. A high score on the FR scale will likely show a high score on the C scale.

A close examination of Table VIII shows a close relationship with Table V. One would hypothesize that most students would conform to the rules of most average classrooms regardless of whether the class is student or teacher-centered. Conformity is indicated here, with a gain score of -.32 for the total control group and -.44 for the total
experimental group. However, it is interesting to note that the control females made a slightly better adjustment with a gain score of -1.11 compared to the -0.69 for the experimental females. Table VIII also shows a slight increase in this adjustment for the control males with a gain score of 0.45, compared with the experimental males of -0.10. It is noted that there is no significant difference between the total groups on the C scale. It is evident from the above information that the student or teacher-centered type of teaching has very little effect on the students' conformity.

**TABLE VIII**

**A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES FROM THE M.C.T. CONFORMITY SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MEANS Pre</th>
<th>MEANS Post</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both M &amp; F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both M &amp; F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjustment to Reality (R).** This scale refers to a student's way of dealing with reality—whether he approaches threatening situations in order to master them or withdraws from them in order to avoid them. Low scores show that students with good ability deal rather effectively with reality. High scores indicate students who have difficulty making friends and establishing relationships with groups, and in general has a hard time effectively dealing with reality.
The results as shown in Table IX show the control males with a gain score of 1.00 compared with the experimental males with -1.20 gain score. This is not significant but does show a trend toward a better adjustment. The control females have a gain score of .80 as compared to -2.90 for the experimental females. This is significant at the .05 level.

**TABLE IX**

A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES FROM THE MCT ADJUSTMENT TO REALITY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>M E A N S</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>2.20 1.39 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>3.70 2.34 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group (both M &amp; F)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>3.07 2.79 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group (both M &amp; F)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total control group gain score of .91 compared to the experimental group of -2.16 shows a great difference. The difference is made significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The adjustment of the experimental group is no doubt because of their ability to express themselves in class and to work through realistic problems, whereas the students in the control group do not have this experience. The ability to be able to adjust to reality is most essential to every student for a happy-well adjusted life. It is evident from the above information that the student-centered type of teaching will help the students achieve this.
Mood (M). This scale indicates a student's usual mood or emotional state. Low scores indicate students who generally maintain good or appropriate morale. This student is cheerful most of the time, self-confident and optimistic. High scores usually show students with poor morale, depression ("Blue" most of the time,) lack self-confidence, and lack hope in the future.

As indicated in Table X, the two types of teaching (student-centered and teacher-centered) have very little effect on helping or changing the students outlook in this regard. It should be noted that both male groups made a little adjustment with gain scores of -.04 for the control males and -.67 for the experimental males, but that the females of the two groups make no decrease in gain scores, but rather a slight increase. However, the total control group has a gain score of .23 compared with the experimental group of -.24. There is no significant difference in any of the compared groups as shown in Table X.

**TABLE X**

A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES
FROM THE M.C.T: MOOD SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t- Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.60...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.61...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Both Male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Both Male &amp; Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the information given above it is evident that mood as measured by the MCI is not affected greatly by the teacher-centered or the student-centered teaching methods.

Leadership (L). The scores on this scale are related to the students personality characteristics reflected in leadership behavior. However, the authors of the MCI are rather uncertain as to the total meaning of the high scores on this scale, as they state in their manual: "Although low scores indicate leadership qualities, high scores do not indicate successful 'followership.' Students with high scores on the Leadership scale are often inept in social situations and are likely to avoid participation in groups. Pending further studies, high scores should be understood as merely indicating lack of leadership qualities."  

Therefore the high scores on this test can only mean, with some reservations, what is stated above. The low scores, however, indicate students who often have outstanding leadership skills and in general know how to work well with others.

It would first be supposed that the student-centered teaching method would no doubt help develop leadership qualities in many of the students. However, there is no strong evidence of this indicated in Table XI. There is a slight difference in the total gain scores of the control group with a gain score of 1.06 compared with the experimental group of -.21, which brings rather a high t-score of 1.74, but not significantly. The comparison of the females of the two groups brings a greater difference with the control females gain score of .73 compared with the experimental females of -.90, and with a t-ratio of 1.94. This

---

1-Berdie and Layton, op. cit., p. 12.
is close to being significant at the .05 level, but not quite close enough.
There is no evidence at all that the two teachings had any effect on the L scale in the comparison of the males of the two groups with a t-ratio of .57.

**TABLE XI**

**A t-RATIO COMPARISON OF STUDENT GAIN SCORES FROM THE M.C.T. LEADERSHIP SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group and Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both MSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both MSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there is a little evidence (more so with the females than with the males) that the student-centered type of teaching helps to develop leadership characteristics, there is no strong evidence to support this.

**MCI Total Summary**

The investigator feels that many areas, such as the SR, ES, and the R scales tested in the MCI could be helped through the classroom but some areas, such as the FR, and M can not be affected through the classroom teaching. The C scale can be helped a little, but this is usually covered early in the students school life. The L scale would have to be left with a question mark by it.
A close look at the gain scores as shown in Table XII show a slight increase in the scores of the control group with one exception—that of conformity, with a decrease score of -.32. All other scores are positive, or indicating less adjustment.

TABLE XII
A COMPARISON OF THE TOTAL GROUPS CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL BOTH MALE AND FEMALE ON ALL OF THE MCI SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCI Scale for Total Group</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Diff. Btw. Gain Score</th>
<th>t- Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationship &quot;FR&quot; Control</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationship &quot;FR&quot; Experimental</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship &quot;SR&quot; Control</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship &quot;SR&quot; Experimental</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability &quot;ES&quot; Control</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability &quot;ES&quot; Experimental</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity &quot;C&quot; Control</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity &quot;C&quot; Experimental</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Reality &quot;R&quot; Control</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Reality &quot;R&quot; Experimental</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood &quot;M&quot; Control</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood &quot;M&quot; Experimental</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &quot;L&quot; Control</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &quot;L&quot; Experimental</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experimental group, however, shows a decrease gain score on every scale without exception. Some show more decrease than others, but all have a decrease score which indicates more of an adjustment during the experimental period.

It should be noted, also, that three of the seven scales were significant—the Social Relationship and the Adjustment of Reality at the .01 level of confidence, and the Emotional Stability at the .05 level of confidence, with Leadership showing a definite trend, but not
significantly.

For the Tables showing a t-ratio comparisons of the control and experimental males, and the control and experimental females, the reader is referred to appendix II.

Students Opinion Summary. At the end of the experimental period both the control and the experimental group were asked to react to the following statement: "This New Testament class has helped or has not helped me, in changing my life or my outlook on life, to make it better."

On the day this question was administered some of the students were not in class and because of the pressure of time near the end of school, the investigator was unable to receive a statement from all of the students. The investigator received a total of forty-nine reactions from the control group and sixty-eight from the experimental group.

To the above question the investigator places the responses in three answered groups--yes, somewhat, and no. The following is the break-down of the replies given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above gives indication that the students felt they received more from the experimental group class or the student-centered teaching method than the control group felt they received from their teacher-centered teaching method.

There is an indication in reading through all of the replies, that the student-centered teaching method is perhaps a more effective way to teach seminary, because most of the replies from the experimental
group were very favorable, but the replies from the control group were rather indifferent and not too favorable in many cases. The reader should turn to appendix III to read a random sample of the replies from both the experimental and control groups.

Summary

1. The experimental group showed a trend toward a better adjustment on all scales measured by the MCI, and significantly so on the SR and R scales at the .01 level of confidence and the ES scale at the .05 level of confidence.

2. The control group showed a slight increase on all scales tested with one exception— that of conformity. This does not infer, however, that the teacher-centered teaching method increased the students' problems.

3. According to the New Testament Survey, there was no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in learning the subject matter taught in the New Testament course.

4. According to the statements made by the students on the question asked near the end of the school year, the control group had less favorable religious outlook than did the experimental group. The experimental group seemed to feel much better toward the teachings of Jesus and toward the Church.

5. The evidence produced in this study points to the fact that group-guidance techniques can and do blend well into the seminary subject matter outline.

6. The use of group-guidance techniques in the seminary classroom resulted in an increase of student self-referrals for personal
counseling—thirty-nine students from the experimental group, eleven from the control group.

7. It is evident that the utilization of student-centered teaching method in the seminary classroom was found to be more effective and practicable in teaching the subject matter, and at the same time helpful to the students in reaching an improved condition in their personal and social adjustments.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Need for the Study. The Department of Education of the Church has always placed great importance on guidance in the seminary program and lists this as one of the important responsibilities of the seminary teacher. To date, very little research has been done to determine how effective group-guidance techniques, used in a student-centered seminary classroom, are in helping the students social and personal adjustment, as compared to the traditional teacher-centered classroom.

Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this project was to determine if there was a difference between the two methods of teaching seminary: (1) the traditional, authoritative, teacher-centered method, and (2) the group-guidance, student-centered method, with regard to helping the students in solving their problems and becoming better adjusted in their personal and social problems.

Methods and Procedures. Four New Testament classes at the Provo L.D.S. Seminary were used in this study. These four classes were divided into two groups: the control group which numbered 53 students, and the experimental group which numbered 69 students, making a total number of 122 students in the study. Prior to the experimental period the scores from the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test were used to determine if there was any significant difference in the I.Q. or mental ability of the
two groups, by the use of the t-ratio.

The New Testament Survey was administered to each of the groups as a pre-test, along with the Minnesota Counseling Inventory. The New Testament Survey and the Minnesota Counseling Inventory were administered to each group as a pre-test to the experimental period. The experimental period was fourteen weeks. At the termination of the experimental period, the New Testament Survey and the Minnesota Counseling Inventory were administered again to the two groups.

The raw scores of the pre-test and post-test of the New Testament Survey were compared in terms of mean scores and the differences were tested by the t-ratio to determine which of the two groups had learned more of the subject matter during the experimental period. The raw scores of the pre-test and post-test of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory were compared in terms of mean scores and tested by the t-ratio to determine if there were any significant differences between the two groups relative to a better adjustment on personal and social problems as measured by the MCI.

During the fourteen week experimental period, the two classes in the control group were taught in a very authoritative, traditional, teacher-centered way. The investigator tried to make the classroom setting similar to most of the traditional teacher-centered type of classes. The experimental group, however, during the same period, was taught with certain selected group guidance techniques, making the classroom student-centered. This permitted the students to participate in discussion, problem-solving, role-playing, case method, and "what does this mean to me or so what," techniques of group-guidance.
After the experimental period and near the end of the school year the students were asked to write a reaction to the following statement: "This New Testament class has helped or not helped me to change my life or outlook on life, to make it better." The students were informed that their statement would have no effect on their grades and would not be read until school was terminated. These responses were placed into three groups of yes, somewhat and no.

There was a total of fifty self-referal interviews - eleven from the control group and thirty-nine from the experimental group for personal counseling during the experimental period.

**Delimitations.** Several delimitations were recognized in this study; first, it did not include other teachers, it was limited to the investigator's own classes; second, the study was limited to 122 students in four New Testament classes--53 students in the control group and 69 students in the experimental group; third, the study was limited to the investigators' ability to play two teaching roles--the authoritative, teacher-centered role; and the student-centered teaching role; fourth, no attempt was made to compare the letter grades of the students in the two groups, nor to determine the likes or dislikes of the two types of teaching from the student's point of view; and finally, the study was limited to a fourteen week experimental period.

**Findings**

The findings of this study can best be presented by answering the eight questions listed in the "Statement of the Problem" as found in Chapter I.

1. Will there be a reduction of the students' problems in the
experimential group during the experimental period by the use of the group-guidance techniques?

According to the MCI, the experimental group showed a trend toward a better adjustment than that of the control group, and significantly so on the SR, ES and R scales, at the .01 and .05 level of confidence.

2. Will there be a reduction in the problems of the students in the control group in which there are no group-guidance techniques used during the experimental period?

According to the MCI, the control group showed a slight increase, as compared to the experimental group, on all scales tested with one exception—that of conformity. This does not conclude, therefore, that the teacher-centered teaching method increased the students problems.

3. Will there be, with the use of the group-guidance method, a reduction of students' problems without having an effect on their achievement and comprehension relative to subject matter?

According to the New Testament Survey, there was no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in learning the subject matter taught in the New Testament course.

4. Will the student-centered teaching method tend to have any effect on their religious outlook?

According to the statements made by the students on the question asked near the end of the school year, more students in the experimental group stated that the New Testament class had helped them improve their outlook on life toward the teachings of Jesus Christ and the Church, than did the students in the control group.
5. Will the use of group-guidance techniques blend well into the seminary subject-matter outline?

According to the New Testament Survey, as well as the investigators experience in the classroom, there was some evidence that group-guidance techniques can blend well into the seminary subject-matter outline.

6. Will the group-guidance teaching method tend to increase or decrease the demand for personal counseling?

From the evidence of the NCI, the students in the experimental group became better adjusted, but at the same time became more aware of some of their problems. The investigator had a total of eleven students for personal counseling sessions from the control group, two males and nine females. From the experimental group there were thirty-nine students that sought personal counseling, nine males and thirty females. But the investigator does not feel that the evidence from this study is sufficient to make a conclusive statement to this question.

7. Which of the two methods will be more effective in reaching the desired goal?

From the evidence presented in this chapter, there was some indication that the utilization of the student-centered teaching method in the seminary classroom was found to be as effective and practicable as the teacher-centered teaching method in teaching the subject matter and at the same time helpful to the students in reaching an improved condition in their personal and social adjustments.

Conclusions

1. There have been no formal studies made in the area of group-
guidance techniques in the seminary classroom, with the use of the control and experimental groups.

2. The present study would seem to indicate that group-guidance techniques are effective in helping the students reach a better adjustment with their personal and social problems, and at the same time contributed to the students motivation for learning. There was no indication that the use of group-guidance techniques in the seminary classroom retarded the students in their learning subject matter.

3. Through the student-centered classroom the students became aware of their personal problems and received a desire to work with them. The use of group-guidance techniques seemed not only effective in helping the students with their problems, but also blends well into the seminary subject-matter outline.

4. At the present time there appears to be no classes or uniform way for all seminary teachers to become familiar with the use of group-guidance techniques for classroom use throughout the seminary system of the Church.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the present study it is recommended:

1. That further research be done with other groups and in other subjects being taught in the seminary system to see if group-guidance techniques can be used effectively.

2. That further research be done in this same area with a longer experimental period.

3. That further research be designed to determine which teaching method gives the students longer retention.
4. That a practical course of instruction be given to all prospective seminary teachers and teachers now in the system in the use of group-guidance techniques for classroom use.

5. That each seminary teacher be given instructions in guidance practice and techniques, particularly those involved in the individual counseling process.

6. That each seminary teacher not trained in the area of personnel and guidance be aware of his limitations in the counseling field and, above all, know how to make referrals.

7. That the Department of Education publish a list of effective group-guidance techniques and use them in a wide area to determine their effectiveness with teachers not necessarily trained in the guidance field.

8. That the Department of Education publish a handbook in the field of group-guidance and personal counseling for issue to all seminary teachers.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX I

INTERPRETATION OF SCORES ON THE MCI

For the validation study of the MCI, the authors prepared descriptions of behavior one may expect to be associated with high and low scores on each of the seven diagnostic scales. Since the MCI was derived from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Minnesota Personality Scale, the research articles on the two parent inventories and the Atlas for the Clinical Use of the MMPI were studied for clues to behavior typical of persons at various score levels on those tests. On the basis of this survey and clinical experience, the authors independently wrote behavior descriptions for high and low scores on the MCI. After conferences among the authors and their colleagues, the descriptive statements were refined and rephrased in behavioral rather than in trait terms for use in the validation studies. Teachers and counselors were asked to select students whose behavior was described by the statements. The MCI scores of different groups were then compared. Future research may result in modification of some of the behavior descriptions. In the meantime, they are presented below as aids in interpreting MCI scores.

Question Score (?)

The question score (?) is the number of items left blank. As indicated in the section on scoring, if 26-50 items have been omitted an attempt may be made to have the student answer omitted items, although the validity of the ensuing profile may be suspect. If a student omitted more than 50 items, it is best to discuss the situation with him and to retest at a later date. Fewer than 3 per cent of students omit as many as 50 items.

Validity Score (V)

The V scale yields a validating score which represents the degree of defensiveness of the student. High scores are obtained by those attempting to choose responses that are socially acceptable. Occasionally, individuals may actually think and behave as ideally as is implied by high V scores. It is more likely that such a score reflects a naive attempt on the part of the student to "look good" on the Inventory. A raw score as high as 6 should make one suspect the validity of the profile; raw scores of 8 or higher on the V scale invalidate the meaning of the other scales and such answer sheets need not be scored further. Approximately 2 per cent of students have a raw score of 8 or higher.
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1. Family Relationships (FR)

The score on this scale refers to the relationships between the student and his family. Students with low scores are most likely to have friendly and healthy relationships with parents, and with brothers and sisters. They probably receive much affection in the home and feel much affection toward members of their families. Such persons usually regard their parents as making reasonable demands on them and granting them a reasonable amount of independence. They spend much time at home and participate in activities with their families.

High scores suggest conflicts or maladjustments in family relationships. Such score are most frequently obtained by students who have difficulties with their parents or brothers and sisters. These students usually feel that their parents are unreasonably strict and demand too much of them. Such students avoid spending more time at home than is absolutely necessary and often express a desire to leave home.

2. Social Relationships (SR)

Scores on this scale refer to the nature of the students' relations with other people. Low scores are often characteristic of gregarious, socially mature individuals. Students with low scores usually appear to be happy and comfortable when with groups of students or adults. They appear to enjoy talking with others and are interested in what others say. In groups, these students are frequently the ones who introduce people to one another. Such students seem to have a genuine liking for others and are well-liked by them. In general, they have good social skills, converse easily and well, have acceptable manners, and conduct themselves appropriately in social situations.

Students with high scores are likely to be socially inept or under-socialized persons. They often seem to be unhappy and uncomfortable when with groups of students or adults; they do not enjoy talking or associating with others. Other people, in turn, derive no great satisfaction from being with them. These students may refuse to attend school functions. They may not answer questions in class when called upon even if they know the answers.

3. Emotional Stability (ES)

Low scores characterize emotionally stable individuals. Such students seldom worry; are not likely to be self-conscious or lacking in self-confidence; tend to be calm and relaxed most of the time. Rarely asking advice, they are capable of making their own decisions. They do not show fear in new or strange situations and usually behave efficiently in emergencies.
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High scores characterize students who frequently are unhappy and, in general, appear to be emotionally unstable. These students often overreact emotionally to what appear to be trivial situations. They may lose their tempers easily and frequently be mood or irritable; they often appear tense or anxious and weep under stress. In new situations they may be either fearful and timid or overly aggressive.

4. Conformity (C)

The scores on this scale indicate the type of adjustment a student makes in situations requiring conforming or responsible behavior. Students with low scores are usually reliable and responsible, conforming to rules and behavior codes even when they may not agree with them. Instead of rebelling against such regulations, these students attempt to have them changed through orderly procedures. They ordinarily show respect to persons in authority. Although not necessarily docile nor overly submissive, they understand the need for social organization. Such students cause little disturbance in school, seldom have unexcused absences or tardinesses, practically never repeat an offense, and usually complete assignments on time.

Students with high scores are likely to be irresponsible, impulsive, and rebellious. They may appear to learn little from experience, committing the same offense repeatedly even though verbally acknowledging it to be wrong. These students are individualistic and self-centered. They may frequently be sent to the principal, cause disturbances in class, have unexcused absences, and fail to complete assignments. Some of these students have juvenile court records. High scores, in conjunction with unfavorable family background, may suggest the need for counseling to avoid future delinquent behavior.

5. Adjustment to Reality (R)

This scale refers to a student's way of dealing with reality--whether he approaches threatening situations in order to master them or withdraws from them in order to avoid them. Students with low scores seem to deal rather effectively with reality. They are able to make friends and establish satisfactory relationships with groups. They have little difficult communicating with others and do not fear sharing their emotional experiences. They frequently welcome competition. In general, their behavior appears to be quite predictable.

Students with high scores on the R scale have difficulty making friends and establishing relationships with groups. They are often secretive, withdraw, shy, sensitive, and easily embarrassed. However, they usually reveal little emotion. In speaking, they may ramble and introduce irrelevant details. They may write odd themes, or work on peculiar inventions or hobbies. Although they daydream of "success"
they shun competition. To others they seem odd and distant. Such students are very often the ones who escape the counselor's or teacher's attention because their withdrawing behavior is inconspicuous and causes little trouble for anyone else.

6. Mood (M)

This scale indicates a student's usual mood or emotional state. Low scores characterize students who maintain good or appropriate morale. These students are cheerful most of the time. When depressed or discouraged, they quickly recover. They frequently smile and laugh and are enthusiastic about subjects, friends, and activities. Being self-confident, they regard the future optimistically and make long-range plans. Furthermore, they are enthusiastic and optimistic about the plans of others.

High scores are usually obtained by students with poor morale. Such students seem to be depressed and "blue" most of the time. Classmates may regard them as "wet blankets." Students with high scores on the M scale lack self-confidence and frequently feel useless. Moreover, they lack hope in the future and complain of the hopelessness of trying to do things. Such students become easily discouraged and distracted and consequently may not persevere with scholastic tasks very long.

7. Leadership (L)

The scores on the L scale are related to those personality characteristics reflected in leadership behavior. Students with low scores often have outstanding leadership skills and in general know how to work well with others. They readily assume responsibilities in groups to which they belong and show initiative in developing and carrying out ideas. Other students frequently recognize such qualities, placing these students in positions of leadership, such as school and activity offices.

Although low scores indicate leadership qualities, high scores do not indicate successful "followership." Students with high scores on the leadership scale are often inept in social situations and likely to avoid participation in groups. Pending further studies, high scores should be understood as merely indicating lack of leadership qualities.
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#### TABLE XIII

**A COMPARISON OF THE CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL MALE STUDENTS ON ALL OF THE SCALES OF THE MCI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCI Scale and Group</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>Diff. Between Gain Scores</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationship FR Control</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationship FR Experimental</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship SR Control</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship SR Experimental</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability ES Control</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability ES Experimental</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity C Control</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity C Experimental</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Reality R Control</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Reality R Experimental</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood M Control</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood M Experimental</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership L Control</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership L Experimental</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF THE CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL FEMALE STUDENTS ON ALL OF THE SCALES OF THE MCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCI Scale and Group</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>Diff. Between Gain Scores</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationship FR Control</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationship FR Experimental</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship SR Control</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship SR Experimental</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability ES Control</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability ES Experimental</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity C Control</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity C Experimental</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Reality R Control</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Reality R Experimental</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood M Control</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood M Experimental</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership L Control</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership L Experimental</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX III

A RANDOM SAMPLE OF THE STUDENTS' REPLIES TO THE QUESTION: "THIS NEW TESTAMENT CLASS HAS HELPED OR HAS NOT HELPED ME, IN CHANGING MY LIFE OR OUTLOOK ON LIFE, TO MAKE IT BETTER." THE QUOTED STATEMENTS BELOW ARE TAKEN IN THEIR ENTIRITY AND VERBATIM AND ALL ERRORS ARE AS THE STUDENTS WROTE THEM.

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

1. This has been the best seminary class that I have taken and by that I mean I have really learned more. My outlook on life has changed and I understand many more things about the Church that always seemed mixed up and crazy. I appreciate our Church more and wish my boy friend were a member of it.

2. It helped very much with my life now and in the future. Before I took this course I did not have a testimony of Jesus and now I have a firm one. It has inspired my life greatly. I have learned more this year than I ever have before.

3. This class has really helped my outlook on life in many ways. I have really learned a lot. I have been able to clear up many misunderstanding that I have had.

4. Yes it has. I have never thought about life much (especially Church) until this year. I think I have started to realize that there is a real need for a belief in God and Jesus. I have never thought about Jesus, the beatitudes, baptism, repentance, etc. until I took this class.

CONTROL GROUP

1. It hasn't had an effect one way or the other except that I met some cute kids in the class.

2. It has helped me to understand more fully what Christ has done for us by coming to Earth.

3. It has help me to be able to realize some of the things I did wrong before. It has help strengthen my faith.

4. It hasn't changed my outlook on life at all.
### APPENDIX III--CONTINUED

#### EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

5. During this year, between this class and my<br>bride-to-be, I have quit smoking and drinking<br>and realized that I am in bad need of this Church.<br>Before I thought that it was just something to<br>go to, not necessarily.

6. At the first of the school year, I did not<br>enjoy it because I didn't try to enjoy it. But<br>this class above all other classes has increased<br>my knowledge and love toward Jesus Christ. But<br>above all I have learned basic things in life<br>such how to really, sincerely love people who<br>have hard feelings against. I have learned,<br>honestly that no one in this world is better<br>than I and I should love them.

7. It strengthened my testimony. Helped me to<br>understand the purpose of life. This class gave<br>me a true love for Jesus Christ, and helped me<br>understand why he died for us. My attitude<br>toward life and people has changed greatly.

8. I have never really thought about religion<br>very much until I took Seminary classes. This<br>past year I have though about religion more than<br>I have all my life. I still have a lot to learn<br>and study and there are many questions but I've<br>made a start.

9. This class has helped me very much. It has<br>given me a better understanding of the life of<br>Christ. It gives me a reason for doing my best

#### CONTROL GROUP

5. It has made a better guy out of me. I've<br>been a lot better guy this year.

6. It has helped me because I am always aware<br>that there is a God, and I think twice before<br>doing anything. This class has helped me<br>build my testimony.

7. It has quite a lot. I have learned things<br>that are sort of hard to understand. But it<br>helped me understand a lot of things.

8. It has helped me know and understand more<br>fully our purpose of being on earth.

9. Yes, I think this class has helped me make<br>up my mind to what I want to be like and it has<br>helped me much in find out why I am here and
on this earth so that I can return to my Father in Heaven. I have truly enjoyed this class.

10. This class has helped me very much, I understand the fundamentals of our gospel a lot better, and I do feel like now I can say, and mean, this is the true Church. I have appreciated the special help I have received from you, it has helped me a great deal. I really and truly enjoyed coming to this class, it was interesting and fun at the same time. It hasn't changed my life to much, but it has sure helped me from going backwards. It has helped me uphold the ideals I have.

11. Yes, this class has helped me greatly. The main help has been to give me a better understanding of what our gospel is and how I can live it better. It has given me a better understanding of Christ and his great love for us. It has made me want to love my friends and even enemies more. I hope that I may become a better person and inspire others as you have inspired me.

12. This course has helped me in general to become a better person I think. I have learned very much although I didn't put forth to much effort. In many ways this class has changed my philosophy of life. This class has been most enjoyable.

13. This class has helped me tremendously this year. It has truthfully been an enjoyable class.

and what I am to do while I am here on earth.

10. I don't think I've changed much from taking this class. I've taken two other Seminary classes and I liked them much better as far as the lesson outline and general teaching throughout the year. The way the material is put over and test. I'm not saying that these classes are easy by any means. But do it in a way you can remember.

11. This class has really made me think twice before I do anything I shouldn't. This is my second year in New Testament and last year (Name) and I learned nothing--probably our own fault. One thing I learned for sure was not to sluff Monsoms class.

12. It help me in knowledge of the Savior and it has not change me I still are the same.

13. Yes, this New Test. class has helped me in many ways--it has mainly taught me not to sluff.
**APPENDIX III—Continued**

**EXPERIMENTAL GROUP**

I like the way you put over things. To me it is much more interesting to discuss things as we do in this class, than to be let loose with the Bible. I have a hard time reading and understanding the Bible, so you have helped me in this way. Thanks a lot for such a good year.

14. This class has really changed my outlook, but: the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak.

15. Before taking this class I didn't really have a testimony of God, now I do. Before taking this class I would have got drunk, or smoked, or probably committed adultery, if I had a chance. But now I know I wouldn't. The thing that changed this is your sermons on how much you believe in God and what can happen if you do or do not believe in God and do the things he said.

16. Yes, this class had helped me greatly in my outlook on life! I have a much better and more clear understanding of the gospel. This class has also greatly strengthened my testimony of which I am very thankful. I feel every go on a mission I feel this has laid a good background for it. If I do not I feel this class will help greatly when I teach my own children.

**CONTROL GROUP**

14. I don't really think it has changed my outlook on life. It has helped it though. It made me realize more deeply the meaning of life.

15. I have learned a lot more than I knew about the life of Christ and many other things during this course.

16. This class has helped me a little but not too much, the reasons is cause I haven't had enough of what it takes to get on the ball. I could have really learned a lot if I would of tried. In my experience at this class I've learned that the only person your helping is yourself. I used to think that you was doing things for the teacher but now I know I was wrong. I hope to in the future to learn more about the N.T.
### APPENDIX III--Continued

#### EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

17. I don't think so. I feel about the same way I did before I took it.

18. This class has very much helped me. Many things which I thought were the least important in my life have become very realistic and very important. I have appreciated your help and sincere desire to teach. I feel this is my most successful class of the year.

19. It has really helped me to change my outlook on life. I have stated to attend my Church meeting which I didn't do before. It has been the most inspirational class I have ever taken.

20. This class has really helped me. Before I came to this class I didn't feel as strongly about getting into the Celestial kingdom and being married in the temple. But now I am and will try to do my best so that I may be married in the temple and enter the Celestial kingdom. You have made me want these things.

21. It has helped me greatly in my opinion of the Church and it's teachings. I have gained a testimony since taking this class that I never had before. I realize more fully what the Church is trying to teach and why it is so important. Thanks to you, I admire and love the Church and it's teachings more than I ever have in my life.

#### CONTROL GROUP

17. True, to know the gospel better and strengthen my testimony.

18. It has not changed my outlook on life but it has helped me very much in understanding the Gospel of the Church.

19. I have learned nearly all of it before and I thought it was just a good review.

20. It has helped me in this way. I used to get made and really take it out on someone who had nothing to do with it at all. I am beginning to understand more about the gospel, but I still don't know all I would like.

21. I have really gained a lot out of this class. My knowledge of the Gospel has been increased greatly. There is a lot different feeling here from that of the high school.
APPENDIX III—Continued

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

22. It has helped me to understand better the purpose in life for man. It has bettered my life in the areas of knowledge of the gospel, understanding the purpose and life of Christ. I feel this year my testimony has grown more than all the rest of my life put together. But it still has a lot of work left.

23. It has helped me in wanting to do everything possible to make my life full of accomplishments and a more spiritual outlook. I’ve learned what a great deal religion has in life. No one is really happy without it.

24. I feel that this class has helped me more for my father years mainly the part about being married in the temple. I have never wanted to be married in the temple until we had the lesson on it and it has made me so much to want to be married in the temple and live up to it.

25. This class has helped me tremendously. I have learned more from this class than I have learned about Church all my life. I have just loved this class. I like the techniques you use in your teaching. I feel that this class and you have helped me tremendously.

26. Yes, this has helped me a lot more than any class I have ever taken as far as my life plans are concerned, and leaning of Christ.

CONTROL GROUP

22. New Testament has helped me because when I first came into this class I didn’t have much of a testimony but now I feel opposite of that. There is still a lot of questions to be answered but through life I hope to find the answers.

23. It has helped me because I have learned better the right way to live. I gained a better understanding of Christ and His teachings and the blessings which come from living good lives. I learned about repentance; the importance of it and the steps of repentance.

24. Yes, I have come to know and love Jesus Christ. I better understand the gospel and want to learn more about it.

25. I feel that this class has been very worthwhile. My Old Testament class last year was much easier and I learned about as much but not quite.

26. Yes, in many ways, especially on repentance, so that I will know in my life, what to do. I also learned more about Jesus, to help me under-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>stand him and the gospel. And just what the Lord expects of us and what to do, to make our life better and prepare for the life after death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this project was to determine if there was a difference between two methods of teaching seminary: (1) the traditional, authoritative, teacher-centered method, and (2) the group-guidance, student-centered method, with regard to helping the students in solving their problems and becoming better adjusted in their personal and social problems.

Procedure

The study was limited to the investigator's four New Testament classes at the Provo L.D.S. Seminary. These classes were divided into two groups: two classes were teacher-centered and made up the control group numbering 53 students; two classes were student-centered, and made up the experimental group numbering 69 students. This made a total of 122 students. The experimental period extended over a four month period.

There were three instruments used in the study. The Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test, Gamma form, was used to determine if there was any significant difference in the I.Q. or mental ability of the two groups. The results of the tests showed no significant difference in the I.Q. or mental ability of the students in the two groups. The New Testament Survey was used to determine which group learned more of the subject matter during the experimental period. The Minnesota Counseling Inventory was used as the main instrument, in an attempt to determine
which group reached a better adjustment with their personal and social problems during the experimental period. The mean scores of the pre and post tests of the New Testament Survey and the Minnesota Counseling Inventory were tested by means of a t-ratio to determine any significant difference between the two groups.

Findings and Conclusion

1. The experimental group showed a trend toward a better adjustment on the majority of all of the scales measured by the MCI, and significantly so on the SS and R scales at the .01 level and the ES scale at the .05 level of confidence.

2. The control group showed a slight increase on all scales with exception of the conformity scale. This does not infer, however, that the teacher-centered teaching method increased the students' problems.

3. According to the New Testament Survey, there was no significant difference between the control and experimental groups in learning the subject matter.

4. More students in the experimental group stated that the New Testament class had helped them to improve their outlook on life toward the teachings of Jesus Christ and the Church, than did the students in the control group.

5. The evidence produced in this study points to the fact that group-guidance techniques may blend well into the seminary subject-matter outline.

6. The use of group-guidance techniques in the seminary classroom resulted in an increase of student self-referrals for personal counseling—thirty-nine students from the experimental group, eleven from
the control group.

7. The study indicated that the utilization of group-guidance, student-centered teaching methods in the seminary setting was effective and practicable in teaching subject matter, and at the same time helpful to the students in reaching an improved condition in their personal and social adjustments.

In conclusion it would seem logical to suggest that the use of group-guidance techniques can be used effectively in the seminary setting, but there is a need for further research in this area with a longer experimental period. Further research designed to determine which teaching method gives the students longer retention is also needed.
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