

**Research Article**

**SELF REGARD STUDY ABOUT EFFECTIVENESS OF KNOWLEDGE-BEHAVIOURAL TEACHING IN GROUP WAY ON SELF REGARD INCREASE FOR DAUGHTER STUDENT IN FIRST YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL IN RAMHORMOZ IN 2010-2011 BY OUT CONTROL SOURCE**

**\*Layla Gholami Poor**

*Masters Degree in Counseling, Lecturer Islamic Azad University, Ramhormoz Branch, Iran*

*\*Author for Correspondence*

**ABSTRACT**

Present project studies about effectiveness of knowledge-behavioural teaching in group way on self regard increase by out control source. In this project, statistical society has 240 students of first year of high school in Ramhormoz in 2010-2011, and among them 30 students after equalizing were selected randomly in two group as test group and proof group and independent study variable (group knowledge-behaviour teaching) during 12 meeting (by two times in a week each time 90 minutes) was performed on test group. Measuring tool in pre-test stages and after test stages, was Poup-self regard questionnaire and Ratter-(outside, inside) control source. Results shows that knowledge-behavioural teaching in group way cause increase in girl students' self regard on three area (social, physical and general self regard (and) decrease control source. Four assumptions (related to general, physical and social self regard and depression) were confirmed in significant level  $P < 0.05$  and two assumptions (related to family and educational self regard) were not confirmed.

**Keywords:** *General Self Regard, Physical, Social, Family, Control Source, Knowledge Behavioural Teaching*

**INTRODUCTION**

Self regard, out control, behavioural knowledge group is some of concepts which have attracted much attention by many psychologists and students. Self respect and self regard concepts are most essential growing desired factors on kids and children. Enjoyment for will, decision and novation, creativity, thinking health and psychological health are proportional to amount and way of self regard and self respect sense.

Self respect as control side is one of character dimension. According to Esmi 1967, self regard is one's assessment about him/her and judge about his/her value. In other word, self regard is a value about information in self-taught about person and this is due to one's beliefs about all features and adjective which is inside him/her (Shafei, 1997). In other definition self regard is sense of being value, this sense includes taught, senses, emotions, and our experiences during our life: we think we are stupid or clever, we sense that we are friendly or hateful. We love ourselves or not. Thousands of interpretations or assessments or experience which we have about ourselves make us satisfy or please our self or reversely cause hate or sense of inadequacy (Colms, translated by Alipour, 2004).

Self regard means one's assessment about his/her character. If some one senses positive and fairly good, he/she has psychological health and if there is a negative and bad self taught, then he/she is considered to be psychological sick (Nejad, 1992).

Today, experts try to cure many Personality and behavioural disorders such as: diffidence, Schizoid, pertinacity, ruff, inaction, slow footedness and in general hypochondria as first step or most important step to assess and training self regard sense, self trust fortify and social and individual skills. For children and kids to use their mental skill and potential abilities in maximum extent, they should have a positive view about himself or around environment an high rich motivation for attention. There is no doubt that kids who have considerable self regard and self respect, respect to other kids in similar condition, show

### **Research Article**

more educational advance and effectiveness. And high self regard and self respect is most outstanding feature for creative people (Esmaili, 2001).

Kid's prod and sausioin, making them habitant to successful behavior models, fortify social skills, and avoiding them from any punishment or humiliating behavior and at last teaching them appropriate way to overcome life difficulties, are most important steps to help kids (Afrouz, 1992).

Rojers1951, American psychologist says: People with high self respect, in comparison to people with low self regard, accept other more likely (Satir, 1976).

Consider self regard as most important human feature and consider it as criteria for acceptance or rejection of strength and weakness point by someone. Branden 1992 defines self respect in this way: One's self respect is assessed by one's success divided by his/her deserve.

Mazlow (1954) explain self regard in this way: All people (except few psychotic) need to a constant and usually proper self assessment. According to his viewpoint, satisfaction for such needs, lead to positive and formative senses such as self regard, self resepect, fruitful being in society. But ignoring such needs, lead to senses such as humility, inability, and Frustration.

((Self respect is not the same as self taught, self taught is a set of believes for someone about him/herself based on a description than a judgment wheras self regard is positive /negative assements about him/herself)) (Masen *et al.*, 1991). Self respect refers to amount of adaption of perceived features by someone respect to ideal self taught) (Muretti and Higgins, 1990). People who experienced such as: parent death, Bedridden for one of them, or remarriage for one of them, will have lower self regard. Positive events such as advance, marriage affect negatively on people with low self respect (Macgail, 1989).

Knowledge cure, in group way as a set of principle and theoretical techniques has application in cure for neurosis and adult depression during considerable time.

Foundamental assumption of knowledge cure is that knowledge affect on behavior and emotions. In addition, it is believed that people respond to knowledge feedback of event than event itself, knowledge garble also leads to believes and viewpoints which are imaginary or misleaden (Freeman, 1983).

Beck& Elis, two honorable pioneers in knowledge-cure believe that most of disorders are caused by defective knowledge or are processed by defective knowledge and it is possible to cure them through correction- activities. Their both cure-form are based on correcting such defective knowledge process (Clark and Ferbon, 1997).

Knowledge cure method is an organized form of psycho-treatment which is designed to help sick people for learning effective methods to face with problems which make him/her unhappy. Beck Knowledge cure initially was used for depression (Beck, 1976). But today, more studies and researches in knowledge cure shows that for many of psycho disorders, such as stress, freak, self regard, etc. it is possible to use knowledge cure. According to Beck (1974), disorder taught is a mental quality which affects on someone in facing with life problems and violates his/her inside order and produces inappropriate behavior reactions (Beck, 1973).

Generally, knowledge cure include three aspects:

Teaching, behavior and knowledge aspects. Teaching aspects include, knowledge triangles, mistaken logic and models, therapist should explain to patient that they set some assumptions and wil try it during the experiments. Knowledge cure requires complete explanation of relation between depression and thinking, emotion and behavioiur and also all cure aspect philosophy. Such explanation is in complete contrast with analyzer psycho-treatments which require low explanation.

Knowledge techniques include four processes: 1. Automatic taught detection, 2. Automatica taught tests 3. Hidden non-accomodation identifying 4. Non-accomodation validity tests (Bern and Davidson, translated by Jani, 1995).

Behavioural treatment aspects include application of calm-training, organizedstress relief, gradual task, sport etc (Bechk *et al.*, translated by Gudarzi, Nilin 2002).

### **Research Article**

Maybe first the all- knowledge oriented which motivates researchers is self-training teaching by Meichenbaum (1957). More complex knowledge cure which was introduced by Beck (1976, 1970), and it was in many aspects so similar to motional- rational cure By Alice (1962), was accepted so slower than the first viewpoint. But today, it is considered as most important knowledge cure (Hofton *et al.*, translated by Qasemzadeh, 2003).

People are divided in two types according to responsibilities: 1. People with out control source, 2 People with inside control. In out control source ,which is used in this project, All successes and fails for someone is attributed to outside factors and chance and accidence is believed. This person is not responsible and does not trust to himself. Many researches show that people with low self regard or average one, are significantly outside control sources (Kohandel, 1995; Biabangard, 2001).

In recent years, there is a spearding interest due to social reasons on halter place. Few scientists and thinkers have viewpoints about halter place. Adler (1939) believes that domination control of inability sense and supremacy is considered as way to reaching to the aim 1949 considers control as self alienation sense or inability. White (1919) defines deserve as control, Wikenson (1985) says control is need to promotion. This word has two meaning according to psychologists: first one, experimental control is a type of scientific methodology and it is restricted to scientific experiments. Second one, control is a behavior area or clearly it is ability to affecting and changing the environment, but control concept root should be surveyed in Ruther social learning theory (Far, 2000; Quotation by Soheili, 1999). This theory, study social behavior and conditions which affect on behavior. Ruther theory not only uses Hall fortify theory and Tolman expectation thory, but also it is a combination between Adler, Lewin *et al.*, but it certainly has major effect on Ruther social learning theory (1954). Ruther, Hochreich (1979) believe that human behavior mean is due to fortify condition effects. Ruther 1979 believe that behavior in especial situation is a function of fortify exception and/or absence of fortify and its avalue. According to Ruther, people either considers fortify in self control or consider it in outside control. Rasmussen and Charman (1995), believe that the mre knowledge viewpoint and motional, inside control source is increased too. Wolfe&Show, in their project illustrate although halter place is constant during the time like other personal characteristics, but it changes under special conditions. Forcing self control on events is such condition which cause person look inside. Reversely, more people are unable to force control on events, and more harsh experiences in his/her life, causes person look outside more. About the relation between giving autonomy to children and the place of halter, some researches show that the more autonomy is given to the children by parents and ask them to make decision about some of their problems and force them to do somethings personally, lead them to be more inside control persons in future. Generally, amount of education in the project by Mirowsk1995, and age in project by Lefcurt (1982), are considered as effective factors in halter places (Quotation by Bronmand-nasab, 2003).

Group consult in projects by Khodai (2006) and Ostadian (2007), Knowledge cure in project by Bris (2004), are considered as effective factors on self regard increase.

Mahdavian (1995), in his study on 900 people of students (girls and boys) in third year of high school in Mash-had city,conclude that boys in comparison to girls, have more inside control center and more self regard sense. Biabangard (1991), in relation between control source, self respect and educational promotion in third year students shows that there is a positive significant relation between control source, self regard and educational promotion.

Gordon Ronaldo found in his project (1994) that high self regard and inside control source directly relates to education success (According to Poudat, 1996).

Einger *et al.*, (1993), in a project on Negro kids, obtained average correlation between outside control source and high self regard.

Lung (1989), conclude in his research that there is a correlation between self taught, high self regard and inside control source in both types.

### **Research Article**

Research results by Kernis *et al.*, (1989) shows that students who have lower educational performance have low self regard and outside control source (Kohandel, 2008).

Barens and Richard 1986 in their study found that as successful experiences increases, self regard also increases (Beris, 2004).

In this study project, students with out control source and low self regard will be studied. Therefore, in this project, Beck knowledge cure method, since it is frequently used in depression cure and since its effectiveness on depression cure is proved, is considered. According to the aim and project history, following assumptions are codified and considered.

1. Group knowledge-behaviour teaching among girl students with outside control increases self regard.
- 1.1 Group knowledge-behaviour teaching among girl students with outside control increases social self regard.
- 1.2 Group knowledge-behaviour teaching among girl students with outside control increases educational self regard.
- 1.3 Group knowledge-behaviour teaching among girl students with outside control increases family self regard.
- 1.4 Group knowledge-behaviour teaching among girl students with outside control increases physical self regard.
- 1.5 Group knowledge-behaviour teaching among girl students with outside control increases general self regard.

Statistical society in this project, include all girl students of first year in high school in Ramhormoz city in 89-90. Whole of studied society were 960 students in seven high schools. For this project, 240 students randomly selected for Ruther outside-inside control test and Poup self regard test. Among students with outside control and low self regard, 60 students were selected randomly. These students were divided to two group as test group and proof group each one includes 30 students. It is needed to explain that in this project students who were considered as outside control and low self regard were those who had higher standard deviation than average in Ruther outside control test and lower standard deviation than average in Poup test.

#### **Measuring Tools:**

##### **1. Ruther outside Control Questionnaire:**

In this project, to measure students' control center, Ruther 1966 outside control questionnaire was used. IE is compromised by factor analysis statistic method to measure control source by Julian Ruther and it is translated by Poudat (1364) to Persian. This scale has 29 items each item have two sentences and 6 questions are neutral which include 1, 8, 14, 19, 24 and 27. Which make aim of test to be obscure for testers? Ranking the test in this way, for those question which show inside control and are specified by A and B, score 1 is given, and total score is obtained by summing them. Total sum for each person shows degree and level of control. More score be higher than 9 score, shows more inside control and more score lower than 9 score shows outside control source. Validity Ruther control source data was studied for inside stability in two projects. In a project which was performed by Nowiki and Strikeland (1973), on two samples of students, Ruther scale was correlated by Nowiki Strikelan. First sample include 76 number which 0.61 was calculated as correlation coefficient. Frankline (1996) has calculated average scale stability coefficient ruther inside control source by application of Richardson Kouder method which was 0.70 in many projects. Stability coefficient of such scale was announced to be in 1 and 2 distance by re-test method. Movafaq (1996) calculate this scale for students by Kodre richarson method and average of such coefficient is calculated to be about 0.7. Qavam (1991), reports ruther scale coefficient in university student as 0.65 and in students as 0.73. Test-test correlation in students is obtained as 0.73.

Questionnaire stability coefficient of outside-inside control in Ruther test for girl students in this project is calculated as between 0.69 and 0.74 which suggests mentioned questionnaire stability.

##### **2. Poup Self Regard (PSI) Questionnaire:**

**Research Article**

This scale is formed to test children self regard by Poup *et al.*, (1989).

Poup questionnaire include 60 questions and it has 5 minor-scale of general, education, physical, family and social one and in addition it has a pathometry scale.

Score way in this test include:

Almost always 2, often 1 and never 0.

Notice: Obtaining no 2 in 4 item or more in pathometry items shows that child tries to answer in social-oriented and therefore self regard validity may be impeachable. Qafari and Ramezani 1993, to measure validity and stability of Poup self regard test, performed it on 1056 students among girl and boy high school students. To study the validity of thest, internal homogeny method and factor analysis was used and to study its stability, halve and Kronbach alpha method were used. And in another famous method called as Loop (elimination of question and calculation of stability scale) also was used to assess questions. Stability coefficient in test was obtained as 0.86. Question analysis by internal homogeny method and factor analysis and loop method, lead to elimination of questions 15, 18, 20. Norm-detection in the test shows that pathometry criteria in Iran is higher than suggested criteria by test-maker. According to test-maker, if test score in pathometry is higher than 8, other scores are also non-real but norm-detection in Tehran shows that it's better to select score 10 as criteria. In present project, self regard questionnaire coefficient was calculated and measured by Kronbach alpha method which for whole scale is according to the table 2.3

**Table 2.3: Self regard stability coefficient**

Stability	Coefficient	Scale	Statistical Index
description	Kronbach alpha		
./89	./81	Total scale	
./80	./75	Education self regard	
./79	./78	Physical self regard	
./81	./69	Family self regard	
./81	./80	Social self regard	

As it can be seen in table 2.3, self regard stability coefficient swings between 0.69 and 0.89

**Study Results:**

**Table 4.1: Average, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of control source for test group and proof group before test stages after test and subtraction (before test- after test)**

Number	Max score	Min score	Std deviation	Average	Statistical index	Stage	Variable
Group							
30	16	6	54.2	65.11	test	pretest	
30	16	7	54.2	50.11	proof		
30	13	4	20.2	7.09	test	After test	Control source
30	13	6	52.1	61.9	proof		
30	1	-11	3.02	-46.6	test	Subtraction	
30	3	-6	90.2	-1.88	proof	(after-before)	

As it can be seen in table 4.1, before test, average, standard deviation, of control source in test group are 65.11 and 54.2 and in proof test are 50.11 and 54.2 respectively. Also after test, average, standard deviation, of control source in test group are 7.19 and 20.2 and in proof test are 61.9 and 52.1 respectively.

**Research Article**

In addition, subtraction score (after test-before test), average, standard deviation, of control source in test group are -46.6and 3.02and in proof test are -1.88 and 90.2 respectively.

**Table 4.2: Average, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of self regard for test group and proof group in pre test stages after test and subtraction (Pre test- after test)**

Number	Max score	Min score	Std deviation	Average	Statistical index	Stage	Variable
Group							
30	80	36	80.10	69.63	test	pretest	
30	86	48	12.11	15.66	proof		Self regard
30	98	46	69.11	19.69	test	After test	
30	88	44	70.11	67	proof		
30	28	-11	30.9	50.5	test	Subtraction	
30	12	-17	5.43	84.0	proof	(after-before)	

**Table 4.3: Average, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of social self regard for test group and proof group before test stages, after test and subtraction(before test- after test)**

Number	Max score	Min score	Std deviation	Average	Statistical index	Stage	Variable
Group							
30	16	6	74.2	34.10	test	pretest	
30	14	8	92.1	10.53	proof		Social self regard
30	16	7	56.2	19.11	test	After test	
30	15	7	1.87	30.10	proof		
30	6	-3	2.23	84.0	test	Subtraction	
30	3	-3	39.1	-0.23	proof	(after-before)	

**Table 4.4: Average, Standard deviation ,minimum and maximum score of social self regard for test group and proof group before test stages, after test and subtraction(before test- after test)**

Number	Max score	Min score	Std deviation	Average	Statistic index	Stage	Variable
Group							
30	13	5	2.53	46.9	test	pretest	
30	15	8	4	50.9	proof		Educational Self regard
30	18	5	3.22	10.38	test	After test	
30	20	5	4.03	30.10	proof		
30	7	-6	89.2	92.0	test	Subtraction	
30	11	-3	72.2	80.0	proof	(after-before)	

As it can be seen in table 4.2, before test, average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 69.63 and 80.10 and in proof test are 15.66 and 12.11 respectively. Also after test, average, standard deviation of self regard in test group is 19.69 and 69.11 and in proof test are 67 and 70.11 respectively. In addition, subtraction score (after test-before test), average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 50.5and 3.09 and in proof test are 84.0 and5.43 respectively.

**Research Article**

As it can be seen in table 4.3, before test, average, standard deviation, of social self regard in test group are 34.10 and 74.2 and in proof test are 10.53 and 92.1 respectively. Also after test, average, standard deviation, of social self regard in test group are 19.11 and 56.2 and in proof test are 30.10 and 1.87 respectively. In addition, subtraction score (after test-before test), average, standard deviation, of social self regard in test group are 84.0 and 2.23 and in proof test are -0.23 and 39.1 respectively.

As it can be seen in table 4.4, before test, average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 46.9 and 2.53 and in proof test are 50.9 and 3 respectively. Also after test, average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 10.38 and 3.22 and in proof test are 30.10 and 4.03 respectively. In addition, subtraction score (after test-before test), average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 92.0 and 89.2 and in proof test are 80.0 and 72.2 respectively.

**Table 4.5: Average, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of family social self regard for test group and proof group before test stages, after test and subtraction (before test- after test)**

Number	Max score	Min score	Std deviation	Average	Statistic index	Stage	Variable
<b>Group</b>							
30	18	5	3.65	26.11	test	pretest	
30	18	6	3.22	80.11	proof		
30	18	7	94.2	26.12	test	After test	Educational
30	18	6	3.41	96.11	proof		Self regard
30	8	-5	3.07	1	test	Subtraction	
30	7	-5	2.03	15.0	proof	(after-before)	

As it can be seen in table 4.5, before test, average, standard deviation, of family self regard in test group are 26.11 and 3.65 and in proof test are 80.11 and 3.22 respectively. Also after test, average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 26.12 and 94.2 and in proof test are 96.11 and 3.41 respectively. In addition, subtraction score (after test-before test), average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 1 and 3.07 and in proof test are 15.0 and 2.03 respectively.

**Table 4.6: Average, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of physical social self regard for test group and proof group before test stages, after test and subtraction (before test- after test)**

Number	Max score	Min score	Std deviation	Average	Statistic index	Stage	Variable
<b>Group</b>							
30	16	5	64.2	30.11	test	pretest	
30	18	6	3.44	46.12	proof		
30	18	6	96.2	65.12	test	After test	Educational
30	17	6	3.48	19.12	proof		Self regard
30	8	-5	3.04	34.1	test	Subtraction	
30	5	-5	75.1	-36.0	proof	(after-before)	

As it can be seen in table 4.6, before test, average, standard deviation, of physical self regard in test group are 30.11 and 64.2 and in proof test are 46.12 and 3.44 respectively. Also after test, average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 65.12 and 96.2 and in proof test are 19.12 and 3.48 respectively. In addition, subtraction score (after test-before test), average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 3.41 and 3.04 in proof test are -26.0 and 75.1 respectively.

**Research Article**

**Table 4.7: Average, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of general self regard for test group and proof group before test stages, after test and subtraction(before test- after test)**

Number	Max score	Min score	Std deviation	Average	Statistic index	Stage	Variable
30	16	4	90.2	46.10	test	pretest	
30	17	3	3.15	30.11	proof		
30	17	5	72.2	34.12	test	After test	Educational
30	17	2	4.08	96.10	proof		Self regard
30	7	-5	2.97	1.88	test	Subtraction	
30	11	-3	52.2	-34.0	proof	(after-before)	

As it can be seen in table 4.7, before test, average, standard deviation, of family self regard in test group are 46.10 and 9.02 and in proof test are 30.11 and 3.15 respectively. Also after test, average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 34.12 and 72.2 and in proof test are 96.10 and 4.4 respectively. In addition, subtraction score (after test-before test), average, standard deviation, of self regard in test group are 1.88 and 2.97 and in proof test are -34 and 52.2 respectively.

B) Founds related to study assumptions:

1. Group knowledge-behaviour teaching among girl students by out control source which increase self regard:

**Table 4.9: Results of variance analysis and multi-variable on self regard score in two group of test and proof (by subtraction score before-after test)**

Significance Level p	Error Freedom degree	Assumption Freedom degree	F ratio	Effect amount	Statistical index tests
002.0	49	2	7.318	230.0	Pillai Effect
002.0	49	2	7.318	770.0	Wilkze Lambda
002.0	49	2	7.318	299	Hetling effect
002.0	49	2	7.318	299	Max root

As it can be seen in table 4-9 significance level in all test allow application of Manova. This suggests that there is a significant difference at least among one of dependent variable between control and test student groups.

**Table 4.10: Results of one-variable variance analysis on self regard score and depression among two groups of test and proof (by subtraction score before and after test)**

Significance Level P	F ratio	Squares average	Freedom degree	Sum squares	Statistical index variable
0.03	84.4	281.558	1	281.558	Self regard

As it can be seen in table 4-10, there is a significant difference between proof and test student groups considering self regard ( $p < 0.03$  and  $F = 84.4$ ). Therefore first assumption is confirmed. In other word, among test student groups whom were assessed after group knowledge-behaviour training, in comparison with control group whom were not trained, there is a significant difference in self regard.



**Research Article**

**Table 4.11: Manova( multi variable) variance analysis results on score of minor-scale of self regard(Social ,educational, family, physical and general self regard) in two group of proof and test(By using subtraction score before and after test)**

Significancy Level p	Error Freedom degree	Assumption Freedom degree	F ratio	Effect amount	Statistical index tests
05.0	46	5	34.02	0.203	Pillai Effect
05.0	46	5	34.02	0.797	Wilkze Lambda
05.0	46	5	34.02	254	Hetling effect
05.0	46	5	34.02	254	Max root

As it can be seen in table 4-11, significancy level of all test allow using Manova ability. This suggests that there is a significant difference at least among one of dependent variable between control and test student groups.

**Table 4.12: Results of one-variable variance analysis on minor scale (social, educational, family, physical and general self regard) score among two group of test and proof (by subtraction score before and after test)**

Significancy Level P	F ratio	Squares average	Freedom degree	Sum squares	Statistical index variable
04.0	4.33	15.07	1	15.07	Social self regard
0.88	02.0	0.173	1	0.173	Educational self regard
24.0	1.37	30.9	1	30.9	Family self regard
02.0	5.48	33.92	1	33.92	Physical self regard
005.0	8.5	69.64	1	69.64	General self regard

As it can be seen in table 4-12, there is a significant difference between test group and proof control group considering social self regard( $P < 0.34$ ,  $F = 4.33$ ). Therefore, assumption 1-1 is confirmed. In other word, among proof control group students, whom were assessed after group behavior-knowledge test in comparison with control group whom were not trained, there is significant difference considering social self regard.

As it can be seen in table 4-12, there is no significant difference between test group and proof control group considering educational self regard( $P < 0.88$ ,  $F = 02.0$ ). So assumption 2-1 is not confirmed. In other word, among proof control group students, whom were assessed after group behavior-knowledge test in comparison with control group whom were not trained, there is significant difference considering educational self regard.

As it can be seen in table 4-12, there is no significant difference between test group and proof control group considering family self regard( $P < 24.0$ ,  $F = 1.37$ ). So assumption 3-1 is not confirmed. In other word, among proof control group students, whom were assessed after group behavior-knowledge test in comparison with control group whom were not trained, there is significant difference considering family self regard.

As it can be seen in table 4-12, there is a significant difference between test group and proof control group considering social physical self regard( $P < 02.0$ ,  $F = 5.48$ ). Therefore, assumption 4-1 is confirmed. In other word, among proof control group students, whom were assessed after group behavior-knowledge

### **Research Article**

test in comparison with control group whom were not trained, there is significant difference considering physical self regard.

As it can be seen in table 4-12, there is a significant difference between test group and proof control group considering general physical self regard ( $P < 0.05$ ,  $F = 8.5$ ). Therefore, assumption 4-1 is confirmed. In other word, among proof control group students, whom were assessed after group behavior-knowledge test in comparison with control group whom were not trained, there is significant difference considering general self regard.

About effectiveness of knowledge cure in group way on self regard increase, Z primary assumption and 5 subsidiary assumptions were tested.

In first assumption of study:

1. Knowledge cure in group method increases girl students' self regard with out control source in comparison with proof group.

2. Behaviour knowledge teaching in group method increases girl students' self regard with out control source in comparison with proof group. In first assumption it was said that behavior knowledge in group way increases self regard for girl students with out control source in comparison with proof group. Multiple variables (MANOVA) variance analysis test showed that behavior knowledge in group method significantly increases self regard for test student group in comparison with proof student group. Therefore first assumption is confirmed. These founds with founds by researches performed by Aslaee, Hashemian, Lotfi Kashani and Mirzaee 2003, with the subject of ((knowledge cure effect on self regard increase for patients stricken by PTSD, and Adib (1995), Khodae (2006) and Ostadian (2007) match with the subject of effectiveness of group consult in mental-motional method of Alice for self regard increase and their founds are confirmed. In knowledge viewpoint, assumption is tha human knowledge affects on his/her emotions and behaviours and it is taught that people respond to feed back of such event more than event itself.

Knowledge mutilations also implicate on believes or viewpoints which are based on negative taught or mutilated taught. Probable explanation is that motivating for youth, social skill fortify and avoiding from punishment and humiliation behavior and teaching to overcome difficulties, are most important stages which help person to gain positive assessment and as a result high self regard.

1.1- behaviour knowledge teaching in group way increases social self regard in girl studens with outside control source in comparison with proof group. As it was mentioned in found-section, multiple variable variance analysis results (MANOVA) suggested that knowledge cure in group way increases social self regard. Therefore assumption 1.1 is confirmed. Founds of such study match with results performed by Adib, Khodae and Ostadian and confirm their results.

1.2- Behaviour knowledge teaching in group way increases educational self regard among gril students with outside control test group in comparison with proof group. Multiple variance analysis results (MANOVA) suggested that Knowledge-cure in group way doesnot significantly increase educational self regard among girl students in test group in comparison with control group. Therefore assumption 1.2 is not confirmed.

1.3- Behaviour knowledge group teaching increases family self regard among gril students with out control source in comparison with proof group. Multiple variable variance analysis results showed that behavior knowledge group does not significantly increase family self regard among test group in comparison with proof group. So assumption 1.3 is not confirmed. These results mathc with founds by Adib (1994), Khodae (2006) and Ostaian (2007) and confirm their study results.

1.4- Knowledge cure teaching in group way increases physical self regard among girl students with outside control source in comparison with proof group.

Multiple variable variance analysis results (MANOVA) suggested that knowledge cure in group way increases physical self regard. So assumption 1.4 is confirmed. Founds of such study match with results performed by Adib, Khodae and Ostadian and confirm their results.

### **Research Article**

1.5- Behaviour knowledge teaching in group way increases general social self regard in girl studens with outside control source in comparison with proof group. As it was mentioned in found-section, multiple variable variance analysis results (MANOVA) suggested that knowledge cure in group way increases general social self regard. Therefore assumption 1.5 is confirmed. Founds of such study match with results performed by Adib, Khodae and Ostadian and confirm their results.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adib N (1995).** Role in enhancing the self-esteem of adolescent group counseling, Master's thesis, Allameh Tabatabai University.
- Afroz GH (1992).** Depression Drnvjvanan (methods of treatment). *Tehran: a Monthly Journal of Education - Educational links* 271 and 272.
- Askari M (1996).** Normalization of scale internal locus of control - external Nvyky, Strickland on secondary school students in Tehran, master's thesis, University of Allameh Tabatabai.
- Beck A (1993).** Cognitive therapy of depression: A personal reflection.
- Beck AT, Emery G and Greenberg R (1985).** Anxiety disorders and phobias: a cognitive perspective (Basic books), NewYork.
- Beck AT, Rush AJ, Shaw BF and Emery G (1979).** Cognitive therapy of depression (Guilford press), NewYork.
- Aaron T Beck (1996).** Cognitive Therapy Drug Addiction translator Mohammad Ali Goudarzi (2003) (publication Rahgoshah), Shiraz.
- Aaron T Beck (1988).** Love is Hrgzkafy translation Qrachh hot M. (1992) (Arian publishing work) Tehran.
- Aaron T Beck (2003).** Cognitive therapy and psychological problems, translated by Qrachh hot M (Dorsa), Tehran.
- Judith S Beck (1974).** Cognitive therapy step by step guide, translated by Mohammad Reza Abedi Dvrahky I (2003). Isfahan Kosar, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Beris L (2003).** The effectiveness of cognitive therapy as a way to boost the self-esteem of girls with external locus of control. Master's thesis, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Tehran.
- Beyabangard E (1998).** The relationship between concepts, locus of control, self-esteem and academic achievement in third year high school students of Tehran, Allameh Tabatabai University.
- Black Burn IM and Dvidson KM (1990).** Cognitive therapy for depression and Anxiety (Black well scientific publication), London.
- Blackburn, Mary and Kate Davidson (1996).** Cognitive therapy of depression and anxiety, translated by Jani (publisher Astan Quds Razavi), Mashhad.
- Boroumand Nasab M (2003).** Evaluation of simple and multiple relationships Socio economic, achievement motivation, creativity, adventure, Locus of Control, creativity and self-esteem (as Pyshayndhay potential entrepreneurs) with entrepreneurship martyr Chamran University, Dissertation Ph.D., martyr Chamran University.
- Brendgen Jane (2002).** Overcoming low self esteem (A Cognitive behaviaural Approach). *Stress news* 14(3).
- Burns David (1980).** Azhal bad to good (cognitive therapy), translated by M. Qrachh hot (1999) (Press the arrows), Tehran.
- Clarke David M and Christopher J (1997).** Knowledge and application of techniques of cognitive behavioral therapy, translated by Hossein Kaviani (2001) (Persian publication), Tehran.
- Cooper Smith S (1967).** The antecedents of self-steem. San Francisco: freeman counseling chines. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, New York.

**Research Article**

- Ellis Albert and Colleagues (1996).** Couples therapy and emotional - rational, translate, Virginia Tech Fdry and SA Yazdi (1996) (Publication of the Covenant), Tehran.
- Enger and Others (1993).** Problems in assessing student attitude in science aducation: A partical solution, science education **72** 575 -584.
- Esmaeili M (2001).** Effects of parenting style Drtaml Vzsh life skills lessons on self-esteem of students in Ardabil province, *Journal of Consulting Message*.
- Freeman A (1983).** Cognitive Therapy with Couples and Groups (Plenum), New York.
- Havtovn Kate (1989).** Cognitive behavioral therapy. Translation: Ahmad Qasem Zadeh (2001). Tehran: Arjmand Publications Implications and Theory, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kelmz Harris and Colleagues (2002).** Ways to boost self-esteem in adolescents, translated Parvin **Alipour (2002).** (Press Razavi), Mashhad.
- Kohandel B (1999).** Locus of control with regard to gender role models and their impact on the selection of courses by students. Master's thesis, Allameh Tabatabai University.
- Mahdavian A (1995).** Check the status of the relationship between academic achievement and self-control in third year high school students of Mashhad. MS Thesis, Tehran University.
- Maslow AH (1954).** Motivation ang personality (Harper and Row), N.Y.
- Mason, Paul Henry, Jerome Kagan, John and Jane, he Kanjr Ltakarvl Houston (1991).** Child development and personality, translating Mahshid Yasayy (Markaz Publication, Tehran).
- Meichenbaum DH (1974).** Cognitive Behavior Modification Morristown.
- Niilin Yii (2002).** *The application of cognitive –behavioral therapy to NJ: general Learning Press of psychiatry.* Volume the philadel phia, USA, Seventh edition.
- Ostadi (1995).** Examined the relationship between irrational beliefs and self-esteem in fourth year high school students of Tehran, MSc thesis. Allameh Tabatabai University.
- Ostadian M (2007).** The effect of group counseling, emotional, rational manner - Ellis behavior of test anxiety and self-esteem in grade PA students in the academic year 2006-2007. MS Thesis, University and Research Branch, Iran.
- Pope Ellis (1988).** Increased respect for their children, translated manifested P (1994) (Roshd Publication), Tehran.
- Pvdat N (1996).** Compared to the control center depressed students with normal students. MS Thesis, Tehran, Roozbeh Hospital. reinforcement. *Journal of Conculting and Clinical Psychology* **43**(56) 53-57.
- Rogers CR (1951).** *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice.*
- Rotter JB (1975).** *Som problems and internal versus external control.*
- Sadock Benjamin J and Sadock Virginia A (2000).** Comperhensive textbook.
- Satir V (1972).** peoplmaking. palo Alto: Science and Behavioral Books Scottish cultural Press, Aberdeen.
- Shoari AA (1996).** *General Psychology*, 1 (Tous), Tehran **56**(1) 46 13.