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ABSTRACT

Educators are beginning to realize that the apparent lack of "motivation" observed in many students may be due to a poor self-concept. The benefits of a positive self-concept are apparent in many different areas of a child's education ranging from attendance and behavior to interpersonal relations.

While numerous studies support the need for a positive self-concept, the majority of leadership and motivation programs currently in existence are designed for the adult market. The "ASPIRE!" program, designed by the researcher, has been conducted in a number of secondary schools and is apparently meeting the motivational needs of the students. But, no statistical data existed to support this.

The present study was undertaken to determine if the "ASPIRE!" program had any effect on helping selected secondary school students to develop a more positive self-concept and become more "internalized" in their locus-of-control.

240 students were involved in the study consisting of an equal number of male and female subjects as well as Anglo and Mexican-American subjects.
The variables in this study were self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and locus-of-control as measured by the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale. Demographic data was also collected.

Significant differences were discovered on the measures of self-concept and locus-of-control for all subjects. It was found that the self-concept improved for all groups of students at the completion of the "ASPIRE!" program. The subjects also became more "internalized" in their locus-of-control.

It was also discovered that there were no differences between males and females and Anglos and Mexican-Americans in developing a more positive self-concept. However, it was found that high socioeconomic status students and first or second born children or children from small families tended to have a more positive self-concept and be more internalized in their locus of control than other students.

The findings suggest that the "ASPIRE!" program may be a useful tool in helping to improve the self-concept of junior and senior high school students.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Counselors, instructors and school administrators are beginning to realize that apparent lack of "motivation" observed in many students may be due to an attitude on the student's part that he is not in control of his life and has a poor self-concept. Glasser (1965) states that a trend toward helping young persons develop a greater self-directedness is increasingly evident in many of the newer approaches to counseling. This includes behavior modification and emphasizing responsibility for one's own actions.

Because one's self image tends to be influenced by one's attitude, the indications seem to be that an individual who is treated or perceived in either a negative or positive manner will act accordingly. Thus a child's perception of how others react to him or treat him can be related to his perception of himself, and therefore, might be construed as an extension of his self-concept.

Background of the Study

An examination of current literature on education and behavior indicates that many studies are being conducted on self-concept. Notable among these studies is Bloom's
work entitled Human Characteristics and School Learning (Bloom, 1976). Buck (1977) refers to this book as "a work that is likely to be regarded as one of this century's major contributions to education."

Harvey and Horton (1977) in describing characteristics common among children entering school for the first time state:

"Bloom defines affective entry characteristics as the extent to which the student is or can be motivated to engage in the learning process. He asserts that individuals vary in what they are emotionally prepared to learn as expressed in their interests, attitudes and self-concept."

Improvement of a student's self-concept is a valuable educational outcome in and of itself. Gill (1970) in his study of self-concept said, "Teachers should consider self-concept as a vital and important aspect of learning and development which the school throughout its educational process should foster in every child."

The benefits of a positive self-concept are apparent in many different areas of a child's education ranging from attendance and behavior to interpersonal relations. Purkey's (1970) research also affirms that there is a persistent and significant relationship between self-concept and academic achievement.
Statement of the Problem

In recent years there has been a growing interest among many adults to improve their self-concept and become more motivated at their place of employment, at home with family, and among friends. Each year millions of dollars are being invested on self-help seminars, motivational tapes and cassettes, and on hundreds of books written to develop a more positive self-concept and motivation. There tends to be a need among many adults in this country to improve their self-concept or the way they feel about "living" as is evidenced by the large numbers of workshops being conducted on this topic.

It further seems that these adults that have been motivated by such self-help leaders as Robert Schuller, Norman Vincent Peale, Paul Harvey, and Zig Ziglar, are often having difficulty dealing with their children who are not as motivated as they are. As a counselor working with many young people whose parents have become "motivated", it appeared that these children were having a hard time accepting their parents new "self-concept." Part of the problem in this situation is that the majority of self-help "motivators" primarily worked with the adult market.

In 1977, Robert Huebner, a researcher in child development, conducted a study among a number of educators.
He surveyed the variables believed to be the most significant for the maximal development of children. In ranking the top ten, he found them to be:

1) **Self-concept** (learning related to self-worth, self acceptance, self-significance, and acceptability).

2) **Self-confidence** (learning related to competence and potency as opposed to helplessness and apathy).

3) **Sensitivity to others** (ability to sense and accept love, trust, affection and other feelings).

4) **Positive responses to others** (learning to love, trust, accept others - freedom from prejudice toward others).

5) **Clarity of values** (development of a belief system, goals, moral development, finding meaning in life).

6) **Assumption of responsibility for behaviors** (learning to accept credit for blame, does not blame others for one's faults or failures).

7) **Autonomy** (learning to think for oneself, provide for oneself, i.e., resourcefulness).

8) **Social interaction skills** (interpersonal skills, roles in peer groups, relating to people of all ages).

9) **Sense of humor**.

10) **Positive task orientation** (perseverance, task persistence).

Many of these characteristics are primary elements of the "ASPIRE!" Program, a positive image-building and leadership program developed by the author in 1979. At some time during the "ASPIRE!" program, participants are exposed to the following topics:
1) **Winning** - learning how to discover the winner in oneself and to feel like a "winner" in all that you do.

2) **Excellence** - learning how to achieve the best you can by doing the best you can.

3) **Creativity** - examining how "originality" can be a fun way of life.

4) **Humor** - discovering how using your ability to laugh can lead to a happier and more fulfilling life.

5) **Criticism and mistakes** - exploring how dealing with the negative messages we receive can help us learn to send more positive ones.

6) **Goal-setting** - studying the critical aspects of achieving success by determining what you want to do, one step at a time.

7) **Friendship** - finding out how sharing your life with others will make yours more rewarding.

8) **Leadership** - presenting techniques to help you feel in control of your life and others' lives.

9) **Maturity** - developing a sense of respect for yourself and others through inner growth.

10) **Listening and Communication Skills** - exploring proven methods needed to make others understand you better and to help you understand yourself better.

11) **Assertiveness** - learning how to positively affirm your rights, often in the face of opposition.

12) **Public Speaking** - acquiring techniques useful in speaking before others in a positive manner.

The "ASPIRE!" program has been conducted in many different schools and youth church groups throughout the southwest, particularly the Tucson metropolitan area during the past several years. As more and more students become exposed to the "ASPIRE!" program, the author is invited to give lectures and workshops demonstrating the content and format of the program to educators, counseling and guidance
personnel, and regional conferences of business groups. The students receive invitations as well to speak to service clubs, such as the Kiwanis and Rotary, and at various types of "in-service" programs.

Apparently, the "ASPIRE!" program is meeting with success as evidenced by the feedback shared in conversations with members of the audience as well as by the "standing ovations" given to the students. Positive publicity about "ASPIRE!" also resulted in a demand for "ASPIRE!" programs to be started in other school districts around the country.

When students completed the "ASPIRE!" program, which consists of lectures, cassette tapes and guest speakers, they appeared to have a more positive self-concept and be more internally controlled than when they started the program. However, no data existed to substantiate this observation.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the "ASPIRE!" program with specific emphasis on discovering if:

1) Completion of the "ASPIRE!" program improved the self-concept of those who participated.

2) Completion of the "ASPIRE!" program changed the locus-of-control of the student participant from an external control to a more internal control.
3) Completion of the "ASPIRE!" program varied among male students and female students in their perception of self-concept and their locus-of-control.

4) Completion of the "ASPIRE!" program varied between Anglo students and Mexican-American students in their self-concept and their locus-of-control.

5) Correlations existed between positive self-concept and internal locus-of-control, ethnicity, sex identity, and birth order among participants who completed the "ASPIRE!" program.

**Importance of the Problem**

Since most of the self-help programs and materials are primarily developed for the adult market, little research has been done on programs that would work with students in school. Should the "ASPIRE!" program prove to help students develop a more positive self-concept and become more internally controlled, the program may be useful to teachers, counselors, and administrators as an aid in instructional planning. They may be able to utilize the program to help their students become more motivated in the classroom and among their family and peers. It may also be used as an "in-service" program in which the faculty and staff could learn the "ASPIRE!" techniques and methodology for use in their classrooms.
Research Hypotheses and Questions

The major research hypotheses investigated in this study were:

Hypotheses 1 - Upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program, student participants will have a more positive self-concept than they had before enrolling in the program as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Hypotheses 2 - Upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program, student participants will have a more positive perception of themselves and their environment than they had before enrolling in the program as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential.

Hypotheses 3 - The locus-of-control of the student participants will show a positive relationship toward an "internal" locus-of-control after completion of the "ASPIRE!" program than before as measured by the Rotter Internal-External Locus-Of-Control Scale.

Hypotheses 4 - Anglo students will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and Osgood Semantic Differential Scale as well as lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale than Mexican-American students both at the beginning of the program and at the completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.
Hypotheses 5 - Higher socioeconomic status students will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale indicating a more positive self-concept, and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale, than lower socioeconomic students both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

Hypotheses 6 - Male students will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale than female students both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

Hypotheses 7 - Students who score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale will score lower, or be more "internalized" on the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

In addition to the major research hypotheses, the following sub-problems were investigated:

Question 1 - Is there a relationship between birth order and self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale?
**Question 2** - Is there a relationship between birth order and self-concept as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale?

**Question 3** - Is there a relationship between birth order and whether or not a student sees himself more internally or externally controlled as measured by the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale?

**Question 4** - Is there a relationship between family size and self-concept?

**Assumptions**

The research data collected for this study was based on the following assumptions:

1) The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and the Rotter Internal-External Locus-Of-Control Scale are valid instruments for assessing self-concept and locus-of-control with the population selected for this research. (Appendix B-D)

2) Accurate information can be secured on socioeconomic status, birth order, and family size through school records and the Student Background Interview Schedule completed by each participant in the "ASPIRE!" program. (Appendix A, page 106).
3) The students have not participated in any other kind of leadership or motivation program other than the "ASPIRE!" program.

4) Negative feelings can be changed in students through an intervention program such as "ASPIRE!".

5) The responses given by the student participants are valid and reliable.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study were limited by the following factors:

1) The students in the study were required to participate as part of a class assignment. No voluntary groups were studied.

2) The influence of peer group and school climate were not studied.

3) The study did not account for subjects who might have moved into or away from a school.

4) The study was limited to junior and senior high school students in grades 7 through 12.

5) The research was limited to studying the relationship between student self-concept, locus-of-control, and participation in the "ASPIRE!" program.

6) The influence of religion on self-concept was not measured.
7) Student participants only attended public schools. No non-public school students were tested.
8) The influence of urban schools versus rural schools in the area of self-concept and locus-of-control was not measured.
9) The only instruments used in the study were the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale; the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale; the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale; a Student Background Interview Schedule; and a Program Evaluation.
10) The students were all instructed in the "ASPIRE!" program by the same facilitator.
11) Students came from classes where the teacher volunteered to be included in the study and had the "ASPIRE!" program as part of his regular curriculum.
12) Grade-point average and its effect on self-concept and locus-of-control was not measured.

Overview of the Study

The data for this study was obtained from 240 students at various junior and senior high schools in the Tucson metropolitan area during the 1980-1982 school years. There were two groups in the study. Group A consisted of 120 students in junior high school, grades 7 and 8. Group B consisted of 120 students in high school grades 9 through
12. All attended schools on closed campuses and none of the schools shared a campus with any other school.

Both Group A and Group B were evenly divided into male and female subjects as well as Anglo subjects and Mexican-American subjects. Therefore, both groups had 30 male-Anglo subjects and 30 female-Anglo subjects as well as 30 male-Mexican-American subjects and 30 female-Mexican-American subjects.

All the subjects in the study were selected according to the following criteria: 1) no previous exposure to the "ASPIRE!" program; 2) age; 3) sex; 4) national origin; 5) year in school; 6) socioeconomic status; and 7) parent permission.

The researcher administered the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale; the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale; and the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale both at the start of the program and upon completion of the program to all the students. Groups A and B were not intermixed at anytime.

A Student Background Interview Schedule was prepared for this study and administered to all subjects during the initial meeting of each group. A Program Evaluation, (Appendix E), was also prepared for this study and administered to each subject at the last meeting of each group. Each item on the Student Background Interview
Schedule and the Program Evaluation was explained to the students. All the instruments were administered in English. If a student left out an answer on the Student Background Interview Schedule or the Program Evaluation, an attempt was made to obtain the information through an individual interview of the student or from school records to which the researcher had access during the entire study.

The data from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale was compiled and evaluated as well as the demographic data from the Student Background Interview Schedule and the Program Evaluation.

**Definitions**

The following terms are defined in relation to their use within this study:

**Anglo** - For the purpose of this study, defined as a person of Caucasian race (white) who does not identify with any other race as determined through school records or interview with the student.

**Locus-of-Control** - The way in which an individual's life is controlled whether it be internal forces or external forces as measured by the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale.

**Mexican-American** - For the purpose of this study, Mexican-Americans are those students who respond on the
demographic questionnaire or are identified on school cumulative records as being of Mexican origin or having a Spanish surname.

**Self-Concept** - used synonymously with "self-esteem" as defined by LaBenne and Green (1969), "The person's total appraisal of his appearance, background origins, abilities and resources, attitudes and feelings which culminate as a directing force in behavior."

**Self-reported self-concept** - Refers to those things which the individual is willing to divulge about himself to someone else as measured by the scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. According to Strong and Feder (1961) "every evaluative statement that a person makes concerning himself can be considered a sample of his self-concept from which inferences may then be made about the various properties of the self-concept."

**Semantic Differential** - A testing instrument designed by Charles Osgood which requests the respondent to respond to multiple simultaneous stimuli. The person must rank an object or concept on a numerical scale which gives bipolar self-esteem adjectives to describe the object. The respondent not only indicates which adjective is preferred but also how much it is preferred. Usually the scale consists of seven points. Osgood (1957) postulated that
people cannot consistently discriminate their feelings beyond a seven point classification.

**Socioeconomic Status** - Income, level of education completed, and occupation of the parent who supports the family are the principal indicators of socioeconomic status (Reiss, Duncan, Hatt and North - 1961).

**Summary**

Research findings concerning the concept of "motivation" and self-concept have been numerous. It has been shown that improvement of a student's self-concept is correlated to positive educational gains. The benefits of a positive self-concept are apparent in many different areas of a child's education ranging from attendance and behavior to interpersonal relations. There is also evidence that there is a persistent and significant relationship between self-concept and academic achievement. It is believed that if a student is treated in a positive manner, he will act accordingly.

The purpose of this study was to determine if the "ASPIRE!" program, developed by the researcher, had a positive influence on the self-concept of junior and senior high school students. Whether or not the student participants changed their locus-of-control from an external control to an internal control was also part of this study.
The differences between male and female students as well as the differences between Anglo students and Mexican-American students was also explored.

Several areas considered to be important to the development of a young person were identified in this study. For this reason, it may benefit administrators, counselors, teachers, and parents as an aid in instructional planning and helping to prepare students for the many challenges which await them. It will also establish if the same methods work for motivating Anglo students and Mexican-American students.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

An extensive review of the literature revealed a number of studies directly related to self-concept. This review of related literature will include (1) Self-Concept; (2) Conditions Producing Positive Self-Concept; (3) Effect of Ethnic Background on Self-Concept; (4) Differences in Male and Female Self-Concept; (5) Locus-of-Control: Internal v. External; (6) Educational Implications of Positive Self-Concept and (7) A Summary of the Review. For the purpose of this study, self-concept and self-esteem will be used interchangeably.

Self-Concept Defined

In studying the literature, three characteristics of self-concept emerge as significant. First, man's basic need is for adequacy. Combs and Snygg (1959) speak of the great driving force in each of us by which we are continually seeking to more adequately cope with life. They define self-concept as "only those perceptions about self which seem most vital or important to the individual himself." Combs
(1962) believes that people are always motivated to maintain and enhance the perceived self.

Secondly, Purkey (1970) asserts that the self strives for consistency - that because it is organized it demands order, harmony and stability. Closely held beliefs about oneself are difficult to change. "A student who considers himself a failure at school will reject or distort evidence which contradicts his perceived self, no matter how flattering the information may be or how helpful it may appear from another person's point of view" (Purkey, 1970, p. 11). Purkey (1970) quotes Jersild, "The child is active in the maintenance of self-picture even if by misfortune the picture is a false and unhealthy one" (p.11). Students who did poorly but expected to do so were more satisfied and contented than those who did well but had not expected to do so. Therefore, the self resists change as much as possible in order to enjoy a consistent, organized world. Combs and Snygg (1959), speak of this self-consistency as a goal in itself; an individual will seek the type of experience which confirms and supports the unified attitude.

Thirdly, the self is learned. It is the product of our social interactions with others. People develop feelings that they are liked, wanted, acceptable, and able from having been liked, wanted and accepted and from having
been successful (Combs, 1962). If the self is learned, a positive self is teachable. What is learned can be taught. Such teaching in order to influence students must be done by a significant other in their lives according to Brookover, Hamachek and LePere (1966). This significant other often tends to be teachers since Karnes and Zehrback (1975) claim that many parents do not have the experience or know-how to help their children develop and "maintain a positive self-concept."

Kelley (1962) has defined self as consisting of the accumulated experiential background of an individual. Every person has a unique self. The self is built almost entirely within the framework of relationships to others. This means there must be constant interchange between the individual and his social environment. Self-concept is then how the person sees himself, and how he perceives others see him.

Gergen (1971) wrote that although the problem of the individual and his identity could fill a volume, there are several basic concerns. In his definition, self-concept is composed of (1) man's concern with self-evaluation; (2) the basic conflict between self and society; and (3) the restrictions and limitations imposed on an individual by his perception of himself.
LaBenne and Greene (1969) have written:

By way of a formal definition, self-concept is a total appraisal of his appearance, background and origins, abilities and resources, attitudes and feelings which culminate as a directing force in behavior (pp. 10-11).

Janis, Mahl, Kagan and Holt (1969) wrote that a child's self-concept consists partly of how he views his own attributes with the attributes the culture has labelled as desirable. In Western culture, for example, attribute values are virtue, honesty, strength, size, attractiveness, intelligence, autonomy, wealth and power. Levy (1956) goes on to suggest that the self-concept is not an isolated phenomenon; rather it extends to all phases of life. He claims that the individual sees his town, church and school in much the same way he sees himself. McNiel (1969) maintains that an individual perceives the world in very selective terms, interprets it in a biased way and reacts to it accordingly. Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper (1971, p. 48) point out that an individual:

Acts, thinks, feels in response to his world in accordance with how he experiences or perceives it, and the way in which he experiences or perceives his world is to him reality. What actually happens to the individual is not as important as how he interprets it.
In conceptualizing the self-concept Perkins (1957, p. 82) states that:

The individual's self-concept consists not of a single perception of self: it consists of the persisting ways he sees himself in many life situations that he faces or might face. It includes not only his bodily features and characteristics, but also his identification with people, culture, ideas and values. His perceptions of himself in many situations together with objects, people, ideas and values which he views as part or characteristics of himself constitute his self-concept. This self-concept emerged through the process of taking over responses of others toward himself and incorporating these into perceptions of himself. People with whom the child interacts - parents, siblings, teachers and peers - exert a pervasive influence on the formation of the self-concept.

Rogers (1951) suggested that a child's experiencing others' reactions and awareness of him, his behavior and his being, are responsible for differentiating the child's experience into two categories: (1) that which I am, and (2) that which others expect me to be.

Combs and Snygg (1959) in Individual Behavior give three major characteristics of persons with high self-esteem:

1. They perceive themselves in generally positive ways.
2. They are capable of accepting perception into themselves.
3. They are capable of wide identification of selves with others.

Holt (1970) stated that the self-concept is the sum of one's experiences and one's feelings about them. "We find our identity by choosing, by trying things out, by finding out through experiences what we can do (pp. 44-45)."

Aronfreed (1971) stated that self-esteem is "the amount and quality of the regard that a person has toward himself (p. 561)."

Goble (1970) has written on Abraham Maslow's concept of the true self. "Maslow viewed the true self as the result of an actualization process. This process resulted in self-actualization or the discovery of the true self and the development of latent potentialities (p. 69)."

Perls (1969) defined a healthy self-concept as one having no "holes", that is, one which enables a person to take a realistic look at himself, recognize his strengths and his weaknesses and live comfortably with them. Perls wrote, "I am what I am, and at this moment I cannot possibly be different from what I am (p. 3)."

Hammerschlag (1970) indicated that development of self-concept is closely related to an individual's environment. "When the societal matrix is perceived as
inconsistent, stifling and unstable it must lead to a greater vulnerability of individual ego structure (p. 657)."

Conditions Producing Positive Self-Concept

Coopersmith (1967) in his introduction to Antecedents of Self-Esteem synthesizes the ideas of previous theorists and investigations into four main factors which contribute to the development of self-concept:

1. The amount of respectful, accepting and concerned treatment that an individual receives from significant others - we value ourselves as we are valued.

2. The history of success and the position we currently hold in the world.

3. The ability to live up to aspirations in areas the individual regards as personally significant.

4. The manner in which the individual responds to devaluation.

In his comprehensive study of several hundred boys in the Connecticut public schools, Coopersmith (1967) discussed in a general statement about the antecedents of self-esteem in terms of conditions:

... total or nearly total acceptance of the children by their parents; clearly defined and enforced limits; and respect and latitude for individual action existing
within the defined limits. In effect, we can conclude that the parents of children with high self-esteem are concerned and attentive toward their children, that they structure the worlds of their children along lines they believe to be proper and appropriate and that they permit relatively great freedom within the structures they have established (p. 236).

Should teachers take over the parent's job when the parents are failing? Ashley Montagu (cited by Howes, 1970) says:

"Without question and in bounded duty. The one thing the developing human being must not be failed in is the sustenance and support he expects and has a right to inherit. This requires teachers who are themselves able to love—for it is by being loved that one learns to love, just as one learns to speak by being spoken to (p. 22)."

Teachers need to value themselves and have the ability to love; it is their function to enable the individual to negotiate successfully the journey in search of self (Howes, 1970). Maslow (in Rubin, 1973) says: "The best helpers of other people are the most highly evolved, healthiest, strongest, most fully developed people (p. 168)."

The most important factor in producing positive self-image is success. Rubin (1973) quotes Maslow as saying, "School must provide the child limitless chances to survive the failure until success materializes—'unrestricted time and opportunity to actualize' "(p. 168).
individual's perception as his adequacy in school learning to the development of related interests, attitudes and self-concept. Continued evidence of success or failure has a major effect on the individual's personality and mental health. Glasser (1971) examines how an individual arrives at an "I am a success" identification. He speaks of two basic pathways called success-need pathways:

The upper pathway leading to positive identity is the pathway of love. Practically everyone whose identity is a success has someone who cares for him, someone who loves him. Equally important he has an ability to care for someone else (p. 53).

Coopersmith's (1967) studies of aspiration indicated that the low and high esteem children were equally desirous of success. The person with low esteem is as likely to set lofty goals as high esteem persons, but the high esteem subjects expect to accomplish the goals. He goes on to cite Rosenberg's research in which persons of low self-esteem were shown to be as desirous of success but were far less likely to believe that success would actually occur. Pessimism increases the likelihood of aborted, half-hearted efforts. William James' formula for success supports these ideas (Coopersmith, 1967):

$$\text{Success} = \frac{\text{Success}}{\text{Expectations}} \quad \text{rather than} \quad \frac{\text{Success}}{\text{Pretentions}}.$$
Effect of Ethnic Background on Self-Concept

The effect of ethnic background on the self-concept is primarily limited to studies between Blacks and Anglos. It has only been in the past 15 years that studies were done on the self-concept of Mexican-American youths. Hishiki (1969) in her study of self-concept stated that no systematic studies had been done relating to the self-concept of Mexican-Americans and until recently, Mexican-American youth were classified as "Anglos" and not a minority in their own right.

Studies of minority children have been based on ethnicity as well as socioeconomic status. Ausubel and Ausubel (1963) proposed that low self-concepts for minority groups are based on "ethnic caste" and socio-economic status. Anderson and Safar (1967) in their study dealing with ethnic-concept instead of self-concept revealed negative perceptions of Mexican-Americans among Anglos and Mexican-American significant others. They theorized that there might be a possible internalization of such attitudes into Mexican-American youth's self-concept. Coleman (1966) however indicated that the self-concepts of Mexican-American children are significantly lower than those of Anglo and black children as measured on the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress. Palomares (1968) reported in his
study, using the tests of the California Tests of Personality, that Mexican-American children saw themselves negatively. Hishiki (1969) also found evidence that Mexican-American children saw themselves negatively.

The survey of the literature has indicated a lack of agreement as to the presence or absence of a negative self-concept in minority-group children. Gordon (1965) stated that low self-concepts are usually associated with the economically disadvantaged. Goodman (1956) has written of the economically disadvantaged in the United States:

> Unless he is capable of a different, inventive or community culture altogether, a poor person can afford little recreation. His poverty tends to degenerate into stupidity. He cannot afford presentable shoes for the kids to go to school; they are ashamed and won't go (p. 56).

Dodson (1971) reported that inner city pupils need to have more successful identity models. In areas where there are few educational and vocational models to emulate, disadvantaged children will tend to have a negative self-concept.

On the other hand, other research has revealed that the self-concept of minority youths do not differ significantly from the self-concept of their Anglo counterparts. Soares and Soares (1971) studies are consistent with the
literature describing that both economically disadvantaged and advantaged students as having a positive self-concept. They wrote "Economically disadvantaged children view themselves and think that others (i.e., - their classmates, teachers, and parents) look at them more positively than do advantaged children (p. 428)." When disadvantaged children move into an integrated school setting, their self-concept diminishes. However, disadvantagement does not seem to influence the expression of negative self-concept.

**Differences in Female and Male Self-Concepts**

In considering dimensions of self-concept relevant to behavior as females or males, one should look at achievement motivation which can be examined by measures of aspirations, expectations and attitudes about success or failure.

Studies of children's aspirations report consistently that males strive for a higher educational level than females and that both sexes aspire to traditionally sex-stereotyped occupations (Marini, 1978). Aspirations as well as expectations for educational attainment among adolescents were found to be unrealistically high, especially for females in comparison to their occupational goals.

Expectations regarding academic performance have been shown to be lower for females than males, even though
females usually receive higher grades than males and have comparable levels of self-esteem. In a comprehensive review of studies Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) report this inconsistency regarding female's expectations and performance abilities. When asked to predict their performance on a specific task, males predicted higher performance levels than females and often overestimated their performance while females underestimated their future performance (Crandall, 1969). It may be females lack confidence in their own abilities and this deficiency is evident at all age levels through college (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974; Block, 1976).

Fink (1965) confirmed the hypothesis that a relationship exists between adequacy of self-concept and the level of academic achievement. The relationship appeared to be much stronger for males than for females. Canfield and Wells (1976) also affirm that self-concept is related to academic achievement and that relationship is strong with males.

Safilios-Rothschild (1979) also examined the differences between females and males in the ways they explain success. It is hypothesized that these explanations influence expectations for success and failure as well as task persistence, regardless of behavioral outcomes (Safilios-Rothschild, 1979). Her studies show that males with high
achievement motivation explained success as a result of high ability and effort while failure as a result of a lack of effort. In contrast females were more likely to explain success as a result of luck rather than ability (Safilios-Rothschild, 1979). Therefore high achievement-motivated males can feel proud of success and try harder if they fail whereas females have less reason to be proud or feel confident of repeating success.

Recent studies have not supported the original finding of a more frequent occurrence of fear of success in females than in males or in high achieving versus non-achieving females (Condry and Dyer, 1976). It is further suggested that the variable is a situational one rather than a personality trait. Condry and Dyer (1977) measured fear of success across age levels by obtaining measures of fantasy of fear of success and also measures of intellectual performance in a mixed-sex competitive situation. They found no sex differences in the fantasy responses but there was an abatement in fear of success for females from grades five to seven.

The predominant theoretical view is that young people develop their self-concepts about sex role orientation at a very early age and are most influenced by parental socialization practices (Kagan, 1964). However,
Katz (1979) suggests that this development occurs in stages in such a way that affects females and males differently according to the developmental task relevant at each stage.

Research on curriculum intervention projects indicates that programs are more effective in changing notions about appropriate sex role behavior with adults than with children (Hahn, 1978). Among studies that have been done with school-age pupils, two trends emerge. First, the self-concepts of females are more easily changed than those of males (Guttentag and Bray, 1976). Second, children at a younger grade level seem more affected than those at higher grade levels.

Locus of Control - Internal versus External

In a summary of typical findings for the Internal-External Locus-of-Control Scale, Rotter's studies (1966) supported the hypothesis that the person who has a strong belief that he can control his own destiny is likely to: (a) be more attentive to those aspects of the environment which might provide him with information useful for future behavior, (b) take steps to improve his environmental condition, (c) place greater value on skill or achievement, and (d) be resistive to influence attempts.

A trend toward helping persons develop a greater self-directedness is increasingly evident in many of the
newer approaches to counseling and behavior modification (Glasser, 1965; Goldfriend and Merbaum, 1973). These studies emphasize responsibility for one's own behavior. Mahoney and Thoresen (1974) state that, "A free person is one who guides and directs his own actions. He is the master of himself and his environment." This concern with the individual taking control of his own life indicates that a person's belief in his own control is of maximum importance to the healthy functioning of his personality.

In relation to locus-of-control, in Rotter's (1966) terminology, an internal is a person who perceives that an event or reinforcement is contingent upon his behavior or his own characteristics; an external is a person who does not perceive the contingencies between his own behavior and outcomes.

An extremely large volume of research has been produced verifying validity of Rotter's construct. Several major reviews, Joe (1971), Lefcourt (1966), and Rotter (1966) of the concept-related research show that it operates across a wide diversity of people and situations. In general, being "internal" is a more positive personality trait than is being "external." (Rotter, 1966)

Nowicki and Duke (1978) and Powell and Vega (1972) give us a profile of internals: they have a higher
self-concept and are generally better adjusted; more independent; more achieving; more realistic in their aspirations; more open to new learning; more creative; more flexible; more self-reliant; show more initiative and effort in controlling the environment; are less anxious; have higher grades; and show more interest in intellectual and achievement matters. The external is on the less positive side of these variables.

Educational Implications of Positive Self-Concept

Because adolescence is such a critical stage for the development of self-concept, teachers, counselors and significant others can play a major role in the child's self-concept.

LaBenne and Green (1969) comment upon this importance when they mention the countless testimonials given each year by people who see their teacher as having been the most significant person in their lives.

Glasser (1969) states that classrooms are full of children who desperately need attention and love. Many teachers do not know how to react to this. Affection and attention are also needed from their peers. Glasser reinforced this concept as he said:

"When children do not learn to be responsible for each other, to care for each other and to help each other, not only for the sake of others, but for their own sake, love becomes a weak and limited concept (p. 14)."
Combs, Avila and Purkey (1971) viewed good teachers as people who perceive others as able, friendly, worthy, internally motivated, dependable and helpful. These authors went on to suggest that good teachers perceive themselves differently from poor teachers. Good teachers see themselves as more adequate, trustworthy, wanted and identified with others. Their beliefs about themselves, their self-concepts, are more adequate than those of poor teachers.

Teacher expectation of students has been researched and reported over the years. The following studies support the evidence that pupils will perform at about the level of expectation of the teacher.

Paterson (1973) felt this was especially true of economically disadvantaged Anglos and Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and the American Indians. Some teachers have expected little, required little, and have gotten little.

Meyer (1974) says schools must become more humane institutions if they are to be successful. When measuring a school's humaneness, one should recognize the importance of educating the "whole person." In addition to stimulating cognitive development, the school should be concerned with the affective domain. It should help the child to accept himself-herself as a worthy human being and to understand himself-herself psychologically and emotionally.
Wilhelms (1971) mentions three ways teachers can assist their students in their development of self-concept. These included: (1) helping a youngster toward personal insights, greater openness and sensitivity with others; (2) perceiving many ways of looking at life; (3) indicating the styles of living and the values which guide the living of it.

Thomas (1976) believed schools must become satisfying places in which to work and learn. Students must come in contact with people who have a positive view of themselves.

Wilson (1977) commenting on educational goals stated: "As an administrator, I call for a value-oriented, humanistic, value-laden school whose ultimate purpose is the fulfillment of the growth needs of human beings."

Gordon (1969) said: "What is needed is education so designed that parents can provide children not only with an effective climate which tells them that they are loved and worthy but also with a cognitive climate that allows the child to be competent as well as feel loved. Adequate self-esteem requires this combination (p. 378)."

**Summary**

An examination of the literature related to the broad area of self-concept, conditions producing a positive
self-concept, the relation of ethnic background on self-concept, locus-of-control, and educational implications of positive self-concept indicated the following:

1. Self-concept theory has been widely investigated. Many definitions have been stated. However, some authors believe it is difficult to give an accurate definition of self-concept. The development of self-concept begins early and continues through life. Family and teachers play important roles in the development of a child's self-concept.

2. Academic achievement and self-concept seem to relate closely with each other.

3. Education has a vital role to play in the development of positive self-concept in children. Teachers who perceive themselves as persons of worth and who are positive people, appear to have a significant influence in the self-concept of their students.

4. More and more studies are focusing on the relations of ethnic background and self-concept as well as male and female differences in self-concept.

Theoretical Basis of the Study

The basis for developing a theory of the self-concept lies within two philosophies, phenomenology and existentialism. These philosophies occur in many fields of
education and are basically concerned with individuals and the way they perform within their environment. An attempt is being made to combine these two philosophies because they both view the individual as an individual and how he interacts with others in his world. That world includes the classroom in which the student and teacher both must function.

Many definitions exist on phenomenology and little agreement exists among them. Spiegelberg (1972) said the question, "What is phenomenology?" cannot be answered since:

.. .for better or worse, the underlying assumption of a unified philosophy subscribed to by all so-called phenomenologists is an illusion.

Macleod (1959) states that "phenomenology is more than just sympathy or empathy, more than just putting oneself in the other person's shoes." He attempted a definition of the phenomenological method by writing:

It is the attempt to view the phenomena in their entirety and without prejudice, to distinguish the essential from the non-essential, to let the phenomena themselves dictate the conceptual framework and the further course of inquiry (p. 176).

Combs and Snygg (1959) suggest that the phenomenal self is the individual's basic frame of reference. It is the only self he knows. Whether other persons would agree with his self definition or not, the phenomenal self has
the feeling of complete reality to the individual. It is himself from his own point of view. Wherever he is, whatever he does, the maintenance and enhancement of this self is the prime objective of his existence.

"People learn who they are and what they are from the ways in which they have been treated by those who surround them in the process of growing up" (Combs, 1962, p. 53).

Combs and Snygg (1959) further postulate:

What effects might we be able to produce by providing experiences that build adequate concepts of self in children and adults? What difference in the richness and variety of perception might result from a generation of people with "I can" rather than "I can't" conceptions of themselves? What possibilities of increased perceptions and hence increased intelligence might accrue to such a program (p. 225).

Existentialism is just as difficult to define with there being no consensus among philosophers. This tends to be true because existentialism is primarily concerned with the individual and with his unique existence in the world.

Morris (1966) said, "Existentialism is a theory of individual meaning. It asks each man to ponder the reason for existing."

In this research, the writer is concerned phenomenologically with the subjective world of the indivi-
dual, with the way in which he perceives his environment and with how he relates to other beings. This existential phenomenology can be looked at as the study of man's subjective existence and how he may or may not interact with others in his environment. The way he sees himself and the way he interacts with others will determine the self-concept which he develops.

Teachers, by their very position, are forced to interact with others on a rather intimate level. How that interaction takes place and how each of the participants views the others involved will, to a great extent, determine the efficacy of the interaction process.

It appears that in order to achieve a degree of interaction with others, each of the parties in the interaction must have a relatively firm grasp on his own "self." Our own "self" is the prime-self against which we judge all other selves and make final evaluations of both our own self and the other self. We are always the center of our particular life space as it appears at the moment and all other parts of that environment revolve around our prime-self. Even if, at the moment, some other being or some object is occupying our attention, it does not change the position of the prime-self. If it appears that some other force is controlling the activities in our life
space, it does not change the fact that the prime-self is still the main thing by which we judge all others.

This does not mean that the prime-self is always considered inherently better. The individual's self-concept may be very poor and he may see himself as being of less value or less worth than the other member of the interaction. However, even if the individual's self-concept is seen as qualitatively less worthy, that same self-concept is seen as occupying a position of greater importance. Nothing is more important to or necessary for the individual than his own self-concept, no matter whether that concept is positive or negative, realistic or unrealistic. It is from the prime-self that all judgments are made. This prime-self also determines what level of interaction we achieve.

Therefore, it is possible to perceive of an individual as one who is capable of exercising a great deal of control over his environment and his own development, and ultimately his own self-concept.

The educative process is seen as being the most effective and the most desirable when the individual is provided with an atmosphere which allows him the greatest opportunity to develop himself in his own self image.
The school should provide a setting conducive to:

(a) Introspection and extrospection
(b) Individual participation within a group
(c) Meaningful interaction among peers, authority figures and significant others
(d) Successful experiences
(e) Non-successful experiences which are used as learning experiences.

From these experiences the individual is able to formulate a private, realistic self-concept which is responsible for the way in which he copes with his environment.

Education has a vital role to play in the development of positive self-concept in children. A program where students learn social interaction skills and develop a positive self-concept can be regarded as an important part of the process of learning. It makes learning, the process of accomplishing desirable changes in behavior or developing a positive self-concept, a guided experience.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The research variables concerning the self-concept and the locus-of-control of students who participated in the "ASPIRE!" program were described and explained in the first chapter and identified the following questions which formed the basis of this study:

Will a student become more internally controlled as a result of participation in a leadership-motivation program like "ASPIRE!"?

Will participation in the "ASPIRE!" program result in a more positive self-concept?

Will participation in the "ASPIRE!" program result in different outcomes for males and females, and Anglos and Mexican-Americans?

Related research and theoretical orientations which influenced the formulation of this research were discussed in the second chapter. In this chapter, the research design selected to investigate the problem is presented.

The Research Model

Two groups of secondary school students comprised this study. One group of junior high students (grades 7-8)
and another group consisting of senior high school students (grades 9-12). Each group of students participated in the "ASPIRE!" program which consisted of 12 hours of instruction in which the students were exposed to self-motivation strategies as described previously.

At the start of the program, students were administered instruments to measure their self-concept and locus-of-control as well as be required to complete a demographic questionnaire and a program evaluation at the end of the program.

Each group consisted of 120 students (n=120).

**Group A:** consisted of 120 Junior High School students;

**Group B:** consisted of 120 Senior High School students.

Each of these groups were evenly divided among males and females. Approximately 50% Anglo students and 50% Mexican-American students were represented within each of these subgroups.

The following, Model 1, is a design of the research.
Model 1 Research Design of Dependent and Independent Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Low SES</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle SES</th>
<th></th>
<th>High SES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang MA</td>
<td>Ang MA</td>
<td>Ang MA</td>
<td>Ang MA</td>
<td>Ang MA</td>
<td>Ang MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=120

Tennessee Self Concept
Pre-Test
Post-Test
Rotter Locus-of-Control
Pre-Test
Post-Test
Osgood Semantic Differential
Pre-Test
Post-Test
Student Background Interview Schedule
Program Evaluation

Ang= Anglo  MA= Mexican-American
(The same model was used for both the junior high group and the senior high group)
All students in the study were closely equivalent in relation to age, sex, national origin, years in school and socioeconomic status.

**Sample**

The sample population selected for this study is described as follows:

**Group A** - Consisted of 120 junior high students in grades 7 and 8. They attended junior high schools in the Tucson metropolitan area on campuses that are not attached to a high school or elementary school. Within this group of 120 students, 60 were female subjects and 60 were male subjects. Each of these groups of 60 students were divided into two groups consisting of 30 Anglo students and 30 Mexican-American students.

**Group B** - Consisted of 120 senior high school students in grades 9 through 12. They attended public high schools in the Tucson metropolitan area. Within this group of 120 students, 60 of them were female subjects and 60 of them were male subjects. Within each of these groups of 60, 30 of the students were Anglo students and 30 were Mexican-American students.

For both Group A and Group B, the students were selected from schools and individual classes which most closely met the criteria of the research design. They had
no previous exposure to the "ASPIRE!" program. They were also selected and grouped according to age, sex, national origin, year in school and socioeconomic status. The parents also gave them permission to participate.

Secondary students were used because of the researcher's familiarity with this educational level and the availability of school contacts who agreed to make the "ASPIRE!" program available to their students. It was also felt that some of the concepts and ideas presented in the "ASPIRE!" program would be difficult to understand for students in the elementary grades 1 to 6.

Students of ethnicities other than Anglo and Mexican-American were not studied because a large enough statistically significant sample could not be found in the Tucson area.

The decision to use both junior and senior high school students was based on a number of considerations. First, they met the criteria of the research design. Second, the researcher wanted to discover if the age and or maturity level of the student produced different findings. Third, students in the Tucson public schools are taught on separate campuses with junior high students, grades 7 and 8, attending classes often several miles from senior high students, grades 9 to 12. Lastly, student responses and performance might be more reliable if the
students were among their own peers of the same approximate age rather than mixed together.

The students for this study came from classes or youth groups in which permission was granted to conduct the "ASPIRE!" program. Approximately 600 students in grades 7 through 12 participated in the "ASPIRE!" program.

Students in the schools found out about the program through the use of announcements in the school newspaper or in daily announcements read over the school's public address system.

Before a class was chosen to participate in the "ASPIRE!" program, the researcher met with the teacher and explained the program and the research aspects of it. The teachers were informed that the program would involve 8-10 hours of their regular class time and they would be expected to remain in the classroom the entire time.

After a teacher was selected, the researcher made a brief presentation to the students in the class explaining about the program and answering any questions the students might have about the program. Students were also advised to tell their parents of participation in the program and that if anyone objected, they could choose to participate in an independent study outside of the class while the rest of the class had an "ASPIRE!" session. It was the individual teacher's responsibility to inform the parents
of the students chosen to participate in the study as well as receive their permission to participate in the program.

After the "ASPIRE!" program was completed, the students who took part in the program were classified into categories based on their socioeconomic status; their school status, junior high or senior high school; and their ethnicity, Anglo or Mexican-American.

From these classifications of the student participants, the necessary number needed for the study were selected. As an example, fifty-eight junior high Anglo boys completed the program. Thirty boys, consisting of 10 students classified as low socioeconomic status, middle socioeconomic status, and high socioeconomic status, were needed. After each of the boys was classified according to his socioeconomic status, the necessary number was chosen indiscriminately from each group until 10 were selected.

This same procedure of selecting the students to be statistically analyzed as part of the study was followed for each of the other groups: Mexican-American junior high males; Mexican-American junior high females; Mexican-American senior high males; Mexican-American senior high females; Anglo junior high females; Anglo senior high males; and Anglo senior high females.
This method of selecting the sample was possible for all the groups except the Anglo senior high girls in which there was not a sufficient number of "low socioeconomic" students. The final breakdown of the sample by grade level, sex, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status is presented in Table 1.

**Instruments**

At the start of the program and upon completion of the program the researcher administered the following instruments to all subjects who participated in this study:

1) The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale to determine the level of self-concept of an individual.

2) The Rotter Internal-External Locus-Of-Control Scale to determine if a person is more internally controlled or externally controlled.

3) The Osgood Semantic Differential Scale to determine how an individual perceives himself and his environment.

4) A Demographic Questionnaire (Student Background Interview Schedule) containing personal information which was gathered for comparison.

5) A Program Evaluation given at the end of the program surveying the subject's opinions on the "ASPIRE!" program and its various topics.
Table 1. Composition of the "ASPIRE!" Program Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A more detailed explanation of each scale follows:

**Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts 1965)** measures self-concept on a scale designed to be simple for the subject, widely applicable, well standardized, and multi-dimensional in its description of the self-concept. The scale consists of 100 self-descriptive statements which the subject uses to portray his own picture of himself. The student responds to one of five answers which might apply to them. The scoring results in several different scales which can be interpreted individually for each student. The standardization group from which the test norms were developed came from a broad sample of 626 people. The sample included people from various parts of the country, and included ages ranging from 12 to 68.

**Osgood Semantic Differential Scale (Osgood 1957)**—A highly generalizable technique of measurement of self-concept. The test-taker must respond to multiple simultaneous stimuli. The person must rank an object or concept on a numerical scale which gives bi-polar self-esteem adjectives to describe the object. The respondent not only indicates which adjective is preferred but also how much it is preferred. The scale used in this study consists of 20 questions each consisting of a seven-point classification. Osgood postulated that people cannot
consistently discriminate their feelings beyond a seven-point classification.

Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale (Rotter 1966). Locus of control is a personality variable developed from Rotter's Social Learning Theory. The locus-of-control variable is expressed on a continuum from external (control over pay-offs is seen by the learner to be outside of his control) to internal (the learner believes that through his behavior he can control pay-offs in his life). The scale purports to measure the degree to which a person subscribes to the generalized expectancy that an individual's reinforcements are contingent upon his own behavior. The scale consists of twenty-three forced choice items plus six filler items. It was derived from the initial Likert-type scale which was constructed by Phares (1957).

Student Background Interview Schedule. A demographic questionnaire was given to each participant at the start of the program. Personal information was gathered and compiled on the following areas:

a) **Birth Order** - number of brothers and sisters in the family and the position of the student participant.

b) **Family Size** - number of members in the immediate family of the student participant including parents.

c) **Family Status** - who the child is living with.
d) **Income** - The socioeconomic status of the student as determined by the income level he checks on this schedule as well as consideration of the education and occupation of the primary parent as determined through conversation with the student or school records.

e) **Religious Affiliation** - which church the student identifies with and how often they attend.

f) **Career Plans** - whether or not the student plans to go to college or trade school.

g) **One Word Description** - one word used to describe the student as he sees himself.

**Program Evaluation.** A questionnaire was given to the students upon completion of the program to determine their opinions on various aspects of the "ASPIRE!" program. Students were asked to identify which topics were their favorite; which topics they did not like; and give an overall evaluation of the program. They were also asked to provide comments on the instructor; how they would change the program; and whether or not they would recommend the program for their friends and other students. The evaluation ended with an "open-ended" question in which the student was asked what "ASPIRE!" was to them.

**Administering the Instruments**

The students completed all three scales, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Rotter Locus-Of-Control
Scale, and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale as well as the Student Background Interview Schedule at the beginning of the "ASPIRE!" program.

When students finished the program, they completed the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale again as well as the Program Evaluation.

The same facilitator (the researcher) conducted all the "ASPIRE!" sessions, thereby assuring that all students were instructed in the same way and any bias of the instructor would be evident in all the groups analyzed.

Data Collection

All the tests were administered during the course of one class period of 50 minutes. Instructions on test directions and questions which the students had difficulty understanding were explained.

Any additional data that was not provided through the tests, such as occupations of the parents and educational training, were secured from the personal cumulative school records of the students which the researcher had access to during the study.

Data Analysis

The data and test results were analyzed in the following ways:
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was hand scored by the instructor using Form C of the scale which is a self-scoring form. A total score was compiled for each student and used in the analysis.

Osgood Semantic Differential Scale was hand scored by the researcher and a total score was compiled for each student and used in the analysis.

Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale was hand-scored by the researcher and a total score was compiled for each student and used in the analysis.

Student Background Interview Schedule data was coded directly from the responses made from the schedule or from cumulative school records of the student. Information was analyzed on birth order and ethnicity as well as sex of the student. Other information was simply collected and reported as "demographic data".

Program Evaluation responses were collected and reported as "evaluation data".

Statistical Processing

The data were recorded on data cards in preparation for statistical analysis. Data processing was carried out by use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al. 1970). The 9.0 version of SPSS was in use at the University of Arizona Computer Center during the period in which the data were analyzed.
For both groups A and B, correlated t-tests and independent t-tests as well as tests of correlation were used to compare the variables of self-concept, locus-of-control, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, birth order, and sex of the student. The level of statistical significance was set at .05.

Summary

This study was conducted at junior and senior high schools in the Tucson metropolitan areas. A sample of 240 students, 120 junior high and 120 senior high, was studied.

The major variables in this study included self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential and locus-of-control as measured by the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale.

Additional variables included sex, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. This information was collated from the Student Background Interview Schedule and the Program Evaluation or from the cumulative school records of each student.

The major hypotheses were analyzed using correlated t-tests and independent t-tests.

Statistical processing was carried out by means of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al. 1970). This statistical package was in use at the Uni-
The research findings were collated and presented in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The data analyzed in this chapter were obtained by the methods and procedures described in Chapter 3. The purpose of this research was to analyze the effect of the "ASPIRE!" program on self-concept and locus-of-control of selected junior and senior high school students. Variables of ethnicity, age, sex, family size, birth order, and socioeconomic status were also analyzed.

Descriptive Statistics

The means, standard deviations, standard error, and minimum and maximum values of all variables under investigation are presented in Appendix F, page 118.

A review of the descriptive statistics indicates that very significant to highly significant gains were made by all subjects in areas of self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale. Subjects also made very significant to highly significant changes in becoming more internalized in their locus-of-control as measured by the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale.
Self-Concept

The first research hypothesis predicted that upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program, student participants will have a more positive self-concept than they had before enrolling in the program as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, both at the beginning of the program and at the completion of the program are presented in Table 2, page 62. The score is represented as a "total positive score" which reflects the overall level of self-concept. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth, see themselves as undesirable, often feel anxious, depressed, unhappy, and have little faith or confidence in themselves. Highly significant differences in group means were found among the subject results indicating that the "ASPIRE!" program may have had a significant effect in helping students develop a more positive self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. This was determined by use of a dependent t-test analysis of the pre-test and post-test results.

In comparing junior high school students to senior high school students, both groups of subjects had significant changes in their scores indicating a more
positive self-concept (Table 2). In comparison to each other, significant differences were measured between junior and senior high school students on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale both at the beginning of the program and at the end of the program. In both cases, senior high students scored higher on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. (Table 2, page 62).

The increase in a more positive self-concept was supported by the results of Hypothesis Two. The second hypothesis predicted that upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program, subjects will have a more positive perception of themselves and their environment than they had before enrolling in the program as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale.

The mean scores of all subjects, both pre-test and post-test are presented in Table 3, page 64. The lower the score on the Osgood Scale indicates a more positive self-concept of one's relation to others and the environment. The table indicates that there was a highly significant difference in the scores indicating that the subjects became more positive in their self-concept and how they viewed their environment.

Table 3 also shows the differences between junior and senior high school students on the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale. Significant differences
Table 2. Pre-test and Post-test Comparisons of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>Pre-test SD</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Post-test SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Dependent S.C.</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>265.63</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>269.92</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior HS Dep t</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>264.01</td>
<td>8.312</td>
<td>268.98</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-5.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior HS Dep t</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>267.25</td>
<td>8.001</td>
<td>270.86</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>-4.53</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent T-test Comparing Junior High with Senior High Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Junior High Subjects</th>
<th>Senior High Subjects</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Pre</td>
<td>264.01 8.13</td>
<td>267.25 8.01</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Post</td>
<td>268.98 7.73</td>
<td>270.86 6.89</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of subjects  
SD = standard deviation  
t = t-value  
r = correlation  
p = 2-tailed probability  
< = "is less than"
were measured between both groups at the beginning of the program and upon completion of the program. Senior high school students scored lower, or more positive both times.

In summary, the first research hypothesis and the second hypothesis were supported by these findings. Students did improve their self-concept after taking the "ASPIRE!" program as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale.

Locus-of-Control

Locus-of-control was measured in this study through the use of the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale. Hypothesis Three predicted that student participants will show a more positive relationship toward an "internal" locus-of-control after completion of the "ASPIRE!" program than before as measured by the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale.

Table 4, page 66, indicates the mean scores of all subjects on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale both at the beginning of the program (pre-test) and at completion of the program (post-test). The lower the score on the Rotter, the more likely a person is to be "internally" controlled. As indicated in these findings, the subjects dropped in their scores. The change was highly signifi-
Table 3. Pre-test and Post-test Comparisons of the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>Dep. t-test</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic-Differential</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior H.S.</td>
<td>Dep. t</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>56.34</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior H.S.</td>
<td>Dep. t</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63.99</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent T-test Comparing Junior and Senior High School Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Junior High Subjects</th>
<th>Senior High Subjects</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>63.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>56.34</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>52.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of subjects
SD = standard deviation
t = t-value
r = correlation
p = 2 tailed probability
< = "is less than"

p < .05 is significant
p < .01 is very significant
p < .001 is highly significant
cant indicating that the subjects became more "internal" after participating in the "ASPIRE!" program. This drop may be attributed to the program.

While there was a significant change for all the subjects from the beginning of the program and at completion, in regards to differences between junior and senior high school students there was significance in results only at the beginning of the program with senior high school students scoring lower than junior high school students. However, at the end of the program, no significant differences existed between the junior and senior high school scores.

Therefore, Hypothesis Three is supported by the findings. Students show a positive direction toward an "internal" locus-of-control after completion of the "ASPIRE!" program than before as measured by the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale.

Ethnicity

Hypothesis Four predicted that Anglo subjects will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale as well as lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale both at the beginning of the program and at the completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.
Table 4. Pre-test and Post-test Comparisons of the Rotter Locus-Of-Control Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>Pre-test SD</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Post-test SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotter LOC Scale</td>
<td>Dependent t</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior HS</td>
<td>Dep. t</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior HS</td>
<td>Dep. t</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent T-test Comparing Junior and Senior High School Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Junior High Subjects</th>
<th>Senior High Subjects</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>Mean 11.50 SD 2.08</td>
<td>Mean 10.87 SD 2.74</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>Mean 7.97 SD 3.04</td>
<td>Mean 8.34 SD 2.85</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of students
SD = standard deviation
p = 2 tailed probability
r = correlation
<= "is less than"

p < .05 is significant
p < .01 is very significant
p < .001 is highly significant
Table 5 shows the comparison between Anglo subjects and Mexican-American subjects on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale as well as the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale both at the beginning of the program and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

The results indicate that only on the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale did Anglo subjects score significantly lower, indicating a more positive self-concept, both at the beginning of the program and upon completion of the program. This is highly significant as the findings indicate, but must be compared along with the results of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale which also measures self-concept. However, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale measures one's self-concept within a person, while the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale measures one's self-concept in relation to others and one's environment.

In summary, while the findings did not support the fact that Anglo subjects score higher (more positive) on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and lower (more internal) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale both at the beginning of the program and at the completion of the program than Mexican-American subjects, the findings did support the fact that Anglo subjects score lower, more positive, than
Table 5. Comparison of Anglo Subjects and Mexican-American Subjects using Independent T-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Anglo Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mexican-American Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee S.C.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>265.85</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>120 265.41</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>269.59</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>120 270.27</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Osgood S.D.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62.45</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>120 68.28</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>-4.79</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>120 57.15</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotter LOC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>120 11.35</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>120 8.46</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N** = Number of Students

**SD** = Standard Deviation

**t** = t-value

**p** = 2-tail probability

< = "is less than"

p < .05 is significant

p < .01 is very significant

p < .001 is highly significant
Mexican-American subjects on the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale both at the start of the program and at the completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

**Socioeconomic Status**

Hypothesis Five predicted that higher socioeconomic status subjects will score more positively (higher) on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale indicating a more positive self-concept, and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale, than lower socioeconomic students both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

An analysis of variance was computed for all three scales, the Tennessee, the Osgood, and the Rotter, comparing them with all three socioeconomic status groups, low, middle, and high. The findings are presented in Table 6, page 71. Significant differences were found on the Rotter pre-test and post-test results; the Osgood pre-test and post-test results; and the Tennessee post-test results.

The Rotter pre-test results show middle socioeconomic status subjects scoring significantly lower than low and high socioeconomic subjects indicating they are more "internalized" than these other two groups. On the Rotter post-test results, this difference changes with the low socioeconomic subjects scoring higher than the middle and
high socioeconomic subjects indicating that at the end of
the program, low socioeconomic subjects tend to be more
external than the other subjects in the study.

On the Osgood pre-test results, high socioeconomic
status subjects scored lower, indicating a more positive
self-concept, than low and middle socioeconomic subjects.
This same difference and significance also occurred with
the Osgood post-test results with the high socioeconomic
subjects scoring lower or more positive than the low and
middle socioeconomic subjects.

The last test in which there was a significant
difference in scores was on the Tennessee post-test. The
low socioeconomic scored lower than the middle and high
socioeconomic status subjects. This indicates that at
the end of the program, lower socioeconomic subjects
tended to have a lower self-concept than the middle and
high socioeconomic subjects.

In summary, the hypothesis was not supported as
presented, but the findings do indicate significant dif­
ferences did exist between the three socioeconomic groups
on the Rotter pre-test and post-test results, the Osgood
pre-test and post-test results, and the Tennessee post­
test results.
Table 6. Comparison of SES Variables with Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale Using an Analysis of Variance of Pre-test and Post-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Grand Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>264.01</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>265.90</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>266.79</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>265.63</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>268.01</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>270.54</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>271.00</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>269.92</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67.41</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.19</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62.67</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51.58</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.44</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.035</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of subjects
SD = standard deviation
F = f-value
p = significance of F
< = "is less than"

p < .05 is significant
p < .01 is very significant
p < .001 is highly significant
Sex Differences

Hypothesis Six predicted that male subjects will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale than female subjects both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

The findings presented in Table 7, page 73, show that there was no significant differences between males and females on any of the scales both at the beginning of the program and upon completion of the program.

In summary, the findings did not support the hypothesis. Male subjects do not score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale than female subjects both at the beginning of the program and upon completion of the program.

Self-Concept and Locus-of-Control

The final hypothesis predicted that subjects who score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale will score lower, or be more "internalized" on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.
Table 7. Comparison of Male Subjects with Female Subjects Using Independent T-tests: Total Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>265.20</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>266.05</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>-.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>270.63</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>269.21</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>65.79</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>64.89</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54.23</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54.65</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of Students
SD = Standard Deviation
p < .05 means Significant
p < .01 means Very Significant
p < .001 means Highly Significant
<= "is less than"
Pearson Correlations were used to analyze Hypothesis Seven. The following information was found. The correlation between the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale (r = -.027) was not significant at the beginning of the program. The correlation coefficient between the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale and the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale was significant (r = .20, p < .05) at the beginning of the program.

At the completion of the program, the correlation between the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale (r = .021) was significant (p = .069). There was a highly significant correlation between the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale and the Rotter Scale (r = .309, p < .001).

In summary, Hypothesis Seven was partially justified. The findings did not support the fact that those subjects who score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale will score lower, or be more internalized on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale at the beginning of the program or upon completion. However, it did support the fact that those subjects who scored more positively on the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale at the beginning of the program and upon completion of the program, also scored lower, or more "internalized" on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale.
Birth Order and Family Size

In addition to the major research hypotheses already explored, several sub-problems having to do with birth order and family size as they relate to self-concept and locus-of-control were also investigated. Pearson Correlation Coefficients were used to analyze each of the questions.

Question One explored if there was any relationship between birth order and self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The findings do not support this question. At the beginning of the program there was no significance \( r = .03, \ p = .598 \) as well as at the end of the program \( r = .02, \ p = .755 \).

Question Two also dealt with self-concept to determine if there was any relationship between birth order and self-concept as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale. The findings did support this question. At the beginning of the program there was no significance \( r = .09, \ p = .151 \), but there was significance at the end of the program \( r = .177, \ p = .006 \). This significance implies that the oldest child or first and second child in a family will have a more positive self-concept than middle children or the youngest child as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale.
Question Three explored the relationship between birth order and whether or not a student sees himself more internally or externally controlled as measured by the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale. While the findings did not support this at the beginning of the program ($r = -0.0176, p = 0.787$), it was significant at the end of the program ($r = 0.1314, p = 0.042$). This seems to imply that at the end of the program, subjects who come from families in which they are the youngest of several children, tend to be more externally controlled than children from smaller families or children who are first and second born in a family. First and second born children tend to be more internally controlled.

The final question explored the relationship between family size and self-concept. This question considered the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale to determine any relationship.

With the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, there was no significance at the beginning of the program ($r = 0.034, p = 0.598$) or at the completion of the program ($r = 0.016, p = 0.803$). The same was true of the Osgood Scale at the beginning ($r = 0.123, p = 0.056$), but at the end of the program it was significant ($r = 0.216, p = 0.001$), suggesting that subjects from smaller families are more likely to improve their self-concept than students from larger families.
In summary, the findings do not support the relationship between self-concept and family size as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale or the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale at the beginning of the program. They do support the relationship between family size and self-concept at the end of the program as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale.

Student Background Interview Schedule

At the beginning of the "ASPIRE!" program, the subjects responded to several questions on the Student Background Interview Schedule. In addition to dealing with birth order, socioeconomic status, and family size which were already discussed in the research hypothesis and questions, the students indicated who they were living with; whether or not they had grandparents living at home; their religious affiliation; whether or not they planned to go to college or a trade school; and to give a one-word descriptor of themselves. The results of that data are presented in Appendix G, page 124.

Program Evaluation

At the completion of the program, students completed a Program Evaluation, Appendix E, page 116. The responses from the various questions presented are as follows:
**Favorite Topic:** With this question, subjects indicated their favorite session of the total "ASPIRE!" program. Many students indicated several choices. They could choose from: Success; Winning; Creativity; Humor; Leadership; Goal Setting; Friendship; Criticism; and "Other". Their responses were tallied and presented in Table 8, page 79. The data indicates that the sessions titled "Friendship", "Humor", and "Goal-Setting" were the most popular sessions.

**Least Favorite Topic:** Subjects were to indicate which topic, if any, did not interest them. Many students did not respond to this question. Of those that did, the results are presented in Table 9, page 80. The session titled "Leadership" was the least favorite by 26 students, or 10.83 percent of the students followed by "Creativity" which was identified by 17 students or 7.08 percent of the total group.

**Comments on the "ASPIRE!" Program:** Subjects were to respond to the question: "What did you think of the "ASPIRE!" program?" No negative comments were expressed by any subjects. Female subjects tended to give the longest and most varied answers, especially those female subjects that were in high school. Since many subjects gave similar answers to other subjects, the most typical comments are listed below by groups.
Table 8. Favorite Topic/Session of the "ASPIRE!" Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Succes</th>
<th>Winning</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Leader Setting</th>
<th>Goal Setting</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total in Study</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking these totals and ranking them from most favorite to least favorite we find:

1. Friendship (154)
2. Humor (105)
3. Goal Setting (99)
4. Success (96)
5. Winning (90)
6. Leadership (42)
7. Creativity (30)
8. Criticism (10)
Table 9. Least Favorite Topic/Session of the "ASPIRE!" Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Winning</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Leadershp</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Junior High

Anglo Boys

--It was okay.
--I liked it.
--Allright!
--I hope that I can be in it in high school.
--It was very interesting and fun.
--It was pretty fun.
--It was a good learning experience.
--It was pretty good and helped me a lot.
--It was fun.

Mexican Boys

--It was very good. I like it very much.
--I think it was a good program.
--It helped me to feel more sure of myself.
--It was interesting.
--I liked it a lot.
--It was pretty good.

Anglo Girls

--I think the program helped me a great deal.
--It's a winner!
--I thought it was really good.
--I thought it was fun to have.
--I thought it was very interesting and I got a lot out of it.
--It was fun working with Mr. Welch.

Mexican Girls

--I liked it very much.
--I wish we could do it another time.
--It's interesting.
--I liked the program.
--It helped me a lot.
--I think it's really, really sharp (good)!
Senior High

Anglo Boys

--I thought the program was interesting and worthwhile.
--It was very interesting and fun.
--I liked it a lot because it taught me a lot about myself.
--It was great.
--It was a good program and I learned a lot.

Mexican Boys

--It was okay.
--Great.
--I liked it.
--Would like to continue in it.

Anglo Girls

--I thought it was a very good program.
--I thought the whole program was great because it helped me.
--It was pretty good.
--I enjoyed it a lot.
--It was excellent.
--I enjoyed the program but thought I'd get more out of it.
--I thought it was interesting and helpful.
--I think it was neat, fun, and helped me with stuff.
--I think I learned some things from the program.
--Very interesting.
--I think it's great! I hope it ends up in schools all across the country.
--I thought the program was excellent.
--Very helpful. I think it would be good to give to juvenile delinquents and other misfortunate people.

Mexican Girls

--I thought it was very helpful to me in finding out who I am and what I can do.
--I think the program was alright and taught me a lot of things.
--I think it was wonderful for me.
--I liked it a lot.
--I learned a lot of interesting things.
--It was very interesting and I learned some different viewpoints.
--It was inspiring and I enjoyed it.
--I thought it was interesting because you learn more.
--I think it was pretty good. You got to know more about yourself.

Comments on the Instructor - Since all the subjects in the program were instructed by the same individual (the researcher) it was important to see if there were any problems in his presentation that might affect the outcome of the results. It was an open-ended question which the students did not have to answer. Of those that did, some of the most common responses were:

Junior High

Anglo Boys

--He is very nice and a good friend.
--He was pretty neat.
--He was great.
--He did pretty good.

Mexican Boys

--I'd like to learn more from him.
--He should be more humorous.
--I think he did a very good job.

Anglo Girls

--I think he's a real neat guy and has a good way of life.
--He is really nice and is a winner.
--He's a good instructor.
--He was a good persuader.
--He's a winner.
Mexican Girls
--He's a winner.
--He knows what he is doing.
--He was very nice and open with what we talked about.

Senior High

Anglo Boys
--He is a very friendly and easy to get along with person.
--He's a super person.
--He was calm all the time.
--I felt he did an excellent job condensing the program.

Mexican Boys
--He's an allright guy.
--He was terrific.
--He showed me how I look at myself.

Anglo Girls
--Nothing about the instructor bothered me.
--Nice and friendly.
--Put on ASPIRE! well.
--He's cool.
--He made the student feel comfortable. A good quality.
--I think he is a good example of a winner.
--I think he handled it very well.
--I thought he explained the program in a good straight forward way.
--Very positive, nice person.

Mexican Girls
--He was nice in explaining.
--He has been very helpful in making things clear to me.
--Was very good. Taught me a lot.
--He made some of us talk more.

Program Recommendation - Students were asked if they would recommend this program to their friends or other stu-
students. All the students responded to this question. Their responses are shown in Table 10, page 86. Out of 240 students, 226 responded that they would recommend the program to other students.

Program Changes - In this question, students were asked to identify ways they would change the program if they could and if they wanted to. While the majority of the students said they would not change the program, a few in each group did offer some suggestions for change. Those comments by groups are as follows:

Junior High

Anglo Boys

--Have more sessions.
--Make it more fun so others would want to come.

Mexican Boys

--I would put in more topics.
--Put more into it.
--Give more humor and comments.

Anglo Girls

--Make it longer.
--I would talk more about how you spend your time.

Mexican Girls

--I would give refreshments to the ones who really listen and give prizes.
--I would extend the time limit.
Table 10. Number of Students that would Recommend the "ASPIRE!" Program to other Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Study</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senior High

Anglo Boys

All said they would not change it.

Mexican Boys

--I would make groups for activities.

Anglo Girls

--Try to get group more involved so they could learn things on their own thinking, instead of lecture. A review of things I've already learned.
--I would spend more time on each subject.
Make it not so rushed.
--I would make it more fun.
--Make it shorter, but have each session longer--perhaps an ASPIRE! weekend.

Mexican Girls

--Have students talk more often.
--Add a little more fun.

What was ASPIRE! to You? - The last question on the program evaluation was another open-ended question in which the students were asked to identify "what ASPIRE! was to them". Many students left this answer blank. Of those that did respond, the female students of all groups gave the longest responses. The responses are as follows:

Junior High

Anglo Boys

--It was learning about myself.
--Fun and interesting.
Mexican Boys

--Learning new things.
--A way to let out what you want to say.
--It was fun.
--It helped me a lot.
--How to be successful in life.
--It was learning something new.

Anglo Girls

--ASPIRE! was like a friend.
--A way you can face life.
--It was an encouragement.
--Interesting.
--A program to make you feel better about yourself.
--A fun class.
--It was telling me more things about life.

Mexican Girls

--A program to teach you how to be a winner.
--A way of learning to achieve certain goals.

Senior High

Anglo Boys

--ASPIRE! was something to look forward to each week.
--Learning about yourself.
--Learning to feel good about yourself.
--Learning how to be a better person.
--It was an inspiration.

Mexican Boys

--Learn how you feel about other people.
--It made me feel like a winner.
--It was alright.

Anglo Girls

--Being a success and a winner.
--ASPIRE! was great to me.
--It was self-improvement.
--Be a Winner!
--A learning experience that improved my outlook on a lot of things.
--It gave me a more positive attitude about everything.
--A program that helps you relate to others.
--A program that teaches you how to feel good about yourself.
--Bringing your thoughts out.
--It's the type of program I've always wanted to learn about.
--Super fantastic!!!
--Motivational time--time to look at myself and see the good things in myself.

Mexican Girls

--Learning who I am and what I can do or be.
--"ASPIRE!" is to help a person feel more positive about themselves and to help them fulfill their goals.
--It's being a winner.
--To me its a wonderful thing. You learn more things.
--A learning experience.
--An awakening.
--It was interesting and more outcoming.
--Feeling better in yourself.

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to determine if the "ASPIRE!" program had any effect on the self-concept and locus-of-control of students in junior and senior high school.

Significant differences were found in both measures of self-concept, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, as well as in the measure for locus-of-control, the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale. The findings support an improvement in self-concept for all junior and senior high school students as well as a change toward a more internal locus-of-
control. This significance may be attributed to the "ASPIRE!" program.

However, the findings did not support any significant differences between male and female subjects and Anglo and Mexican-American subjects. There were significant differences between socioeconomic status of subjects on the Osgood pre-test and post-test, the Rotter pre-test and post-test, and the Tennessee post-test.

A secondary purpose of this study was to investigate if there was any relationship between birth order and family size as they relate to self-concept and locus-of-control. Although there was no relationship between birth order and self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, there was a relationship between the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale post-test results and self-concept suggesting that students who are first and second born tend to have a more positive self-concept than the youngest or last child in a family.

There was also a relationship between locus-of-control and birth order at the end of the program suggesting that children from families where they are the oldest or second born tend to be more internally controlled than the last child in a family.
In addition, there was a relationship between self-concept and family size as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale both at the beginning of the program and at the end of the program. This finding suggests that students from smaller families tend to have a better self-concept both at the beginning of the program and at the end of the "ASPIRE!" program as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale.

Additional subjective evaluative data provided by the subjects supports the analytical findings that the "ASPIRE!" program is a beneficial program for junior and senior high school students in relation to sex, ethnicity, and differing socioeconomic backgrounds.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A general summary of this research on self-concept and locus-of-control and the effect of the "ASPIRE!" program on selected junior and senior high school students is presented in this chapter. The conclusions are discussed and recommendations for future study are suggested.

Summary

Glasser (1965) indicates that there is a movement in many of the newer approaches of counseling to help young persons develop a greater self-directedness, including behavior modification and emphasizing responsibility for one's own actions. Because one's self-image tends to be influenced by one's attitude, the indications seem to be that an individual who is treated or perceived in either a negative or positive manner will act accordingly. Thus a child's perception of how others react to him or treat him can be related to his perception of himself, and therefore, might be construed as an extension of his self-concept.
Gill (1970) in his study on self-concept said, "Teachers should consider self-concept as a vital and important aspect of learning and development which the school through its educational process should foster in every child."

In 1981 and 1982, a study was conducted in several Tucson metropolitan junior and senior high schools to determine if the "ASPIRE!" program in leadership and motivation had a significant effect on improving the self-concept of students as well as help them develop a more "internalized" locus-of-control. This study also compared significant differences between males and females, Anglos and Mexican-Americans, and low, middle, and high socioeconomic status students in the areas of self-concept and locus-of-control. Birth order and family size for all subjects was also investigated with correlational analyses.

The sample studied for this research consisted of 120 junior high school students in grades seven and eight, and 120 senior high school students in grades nine through twelve. Each group had an equal number of male and female subjects as well as an equal number of Anglo and Mexican-American subjects. In this study, Group A was the junior high subjects and Group B was senior high.

The categories of variables studied were: (1) measures of self-concept; (2) measures of locus-of-control;
and (3) family background measures. Five instruments were used for data collection. Copies of all the instruments appear in the Appendix.

The subject's self-concept was measured by:

a) **Tennessee Self-Concept Scale** (Fitts 1965)

b) **Osgood Semantic Differential Scale** (Osgood 1957)

The subject's locus-of-control was measured by the **Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale** (Rotter 1966).

Measures of family background variables were recorded on a specially prepared **Student Background Interview Schedule**. The variables studied were:

a) **Birth Order** - number of brothers and sisters in the family, and the birth position, of the subjects used in this study.

b) **Family Size** - number of members in the family, including the subject that participated in the study.

c) **Income** - used to determine the socioeconomic status of the student as determined by the income level checked on the Student Background Interview Schedule as well as consideration of the education attained, and occupation, of the primary parent as determined through an interview with the student or school records.

Additional data concerning religious preference, career plans, and a one-word descriptor were also recorded.
A Program Evaluation provided student opinions on the "ASPIRE!" program content, format of the program, an evaluation of the instructor, and recommendations for future "ASPIRE!" programs.

All five instruments were in English and administered by the same facilitator (the researcher).

Seven research hypotheses were investigated:

1) Upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program, student participants will have a more positive self-concept than they had before enrolling in the program as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

2) Upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program, student participants will have a more positive perception of themselves and their environment than they had before enrolling in the program as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale.

3) The locus-of-control of the student participants will show a positive relationship toward an "internal" locus-of-control after completion of the "ASPIRE!" program than before as measured by the Rotter Internal/External Locus-of-Control Scale.

4) Anglo students will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, indicating a more positive self-
concept, and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale, than lower socioeconomic status students both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

5) Higher socioeconomic status students will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale indicating a more positive self-concept, and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale, than lower socioeconomic students both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

6) Male students will score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale, and lower (more internalized) on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale than female students both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

7) Students who score more positively on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale will score lower, or be more "internalized" on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale both before and upon completion of the "ASPIRE!" program.

In addition to the major research hypotheses, the following sub-problems were investigated:

1) Is there a relationship between order of birth and self-concept?
2) Is there a relationship between birth order and whether or not a student sees himself more internally controlled or externally controlled as measured by the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale?

3) Is there a relationship between birth order and self-concept as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale?

4) Is there a relationship between family size and self-concept?

Hypotheses One, Two, and Three were supported by the evidence in this study. The findings show a significant change to a more positive self-concept and a more "internalized" locus-of-control at the end of the "ASPIRE!" program.

Hypothesis Four was not supported by the findings. There was no significant difference between Anglo subjects and Mexican-American subjects.

Hypothesis Five, dealing with socioeconomic status of the subjects was partially supported. It was found that there was a significant difference in measures of self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale post-test, and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale pre-test and post-test. There was also a significant difference among the socioeconomic groups on the Rotter pre-test and post-test for locus-of-control.
Hypothesis Six was not supported by the findings. There was no significant difference between male subjects and female subjects.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to justify Hypothesis Seven to determine if there were correlations between the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale; between the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale and the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale; between self-concept and birth order, between locus-of-control and birth order, and family size and self-concept.

It was discovered that no significant correlation existed between birth order and self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, but there was a correlation with the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale. This correlation supported the hypothesis that those students who scored more positively on the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale at the beginning of the "ASPIRE!" program and upon completion of the program, also scored lower, or more internalized, on the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale.

Further evidence supported the fact that at the end of the "ASPIRE!" program, there was significance between birth order and locus-of-control as well as between family
size and self-concept as measured by the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale.

In addition to these major hypotheses and questions, additional subjective data provided by the subjects of the study support the findings that the "ASPIRE!" program may have had an influence on helping develop a more positive self-concept.

**Conclusions**

The following general conclusions are made concerning the results of this study of self-concept and locus-of-control and the effect of the "ASPIRE!" program on selected junior and senior high school students:

1) The "ASPIRE!" program may be a successful program for developing a positive self-concept in junior and senior high school students.

2) The "ASPIRE!" program may be a successful program for helping students to become more "internalized" in their locus-of-control.

3) Increasing self-concept is not affected by one's sex or ethnic background.

4) Birth order does not significantly affect one's self-concept prior to taking the "ASPIRE!" program.

5) Birth order does not affect a person's locus-of-control prior to taking the "ASPIRE!" program.
6) Family size has little effect on the development of a person's self-concept.

**Implications to Education**

The review of the literature supported the fact that teachers, counselors, and significant others play a major role in a child's self-concept. Because the "ASPIRE!" program may aid in the development of a positive self-concept, the "ASPIRE!" program has several implications to education.

Glasser (1969) states that classrooms are full of children who desperately need attention and love and that children need to learn to be more responsible for each other and to help each other. By helping a student to improve his self-concept, this not only helps that student but their peers.

It was found that students perform at the level of expectation of their teacher. Therefore, if a group of students have taken the "ASPIRE!" program and improved their self-concept, and a teacher is aware of this, the teacher may have higher expectations for the students which they will attempt to meet.

The "ASPIRE!" program can benefit teachers, too, in the development of their own self-concept. Combs, Avila, Purkey (1971) viewed good teachers as people who
perceive others as able, friendly, worthy, internally motivated, dependable and helpful. These same authors suggest that good teachers perceive themselves as more adequate, trustworthy, wanted, identified with others, and had self-concepts more adequate than those of poor teachers. A program with the "ASPIRE!" components might improve the performance of teachers who need motivation and a more positive self-concept.

Lastly, Wilhelms (1971) suggests that teachers can assist their students in their development of self-concept by helping them develop greater personal insights and more openness and sensitivity to others. The "ASPIRE!" program can aid in that development.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are arranged in two categories: (1) recommendations based on the study of the "ASPIRE!" program and its effect on junior and senior high school students; and (2) recommendations for future study in the areas of self-concept and locus-of-control.

**Recommendations Based on the Study.** Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that educational leaders review their curriculum and instructional program to determine areas in which the content of a program such as "ASPIRE!", or parts of it, can be incorporated. Perhaps starting in the junior high schools, a course outline
could be developed based on the "ASPIRE!" program. This outline would consist of topics to be presented to students in each grade until they graduate from high school.

It is also recommended that if the program cannot be incorporated into other curriculum areas, that it be presented and conducted as a separate course, and that each student be required to take at least one semester of the course before graduating from high school. The program could be expanded into additional sessions and topics so that when a student completes the basic "ASPIRE!" program, they could take "ASPIRE! II" or "ADVANCED ASPIRE!" and so on to meet the needs of the students.

Because of the necessity of a highly motivated individual to conduct a successful "ASPIRE!" program, staff workshops and seminars should be conducted in school districts where the program is scheduled for the schools. These "in-service" programs would allow teachers and staff members to develop the skills and techniques for presenting the "ASPIRE!" material and provide an opportunity for teachers to practice these methods on each other before going into the classroom.

Since this study involved students who had gone through the "ASPIRE!" program during the past year, it would be useful to test these same students after graduat-
ing from high school to determine if any effects of the "ASPIRE!" program are still influential.

It would be useful, too, if this same study was conducted on a "control" group of students who do not go through the "ASPIRE!" program but are tested at the same time as the "ASPIRE!" subjects, both at the beginning of the program and upon completion of the program. The data from both groups could be analyzed to determine if there is any significant difference between the two groups.

Recommendations for Future Study. Nationwide few programs exist to help young people to develop a more positive self-concept. While the "ASPIRE!" program has been shown to significantly improve the self-concept of students, it is only one method. An attempt should be made to compare the "ASPIRE!" methodology with other methods across the country and condense or incorporate the various programs into one uniform motivation program that will be available to students throughout the United States.

Future studies should explore the effect the "ASPIRE!" program has between students who take the program as a part of their regular curriculum and those students who volunteer to participate in the program.

An exploration of how sociometric patterns and peer pressure affect one's self-concept and locus-of-control
would also be beneficial. This may be useful in working with members of "student governments" or "gang leaders".

While the influence of religion on self-concept was not measured, future studies might investigate if there are any differences in self-concept and locus-of-control according to one's religious preference and practices. Related to this is the area of public schools versus private and parochial schools and whether or not significant differences exist.

The influence of urban schools versus rural schools in the area of self-concept and locus-of-control should also be explored in other studies on the "ASPIRE!" program.

Since the facilitator of the "ASPIRE!" program plays an important role in the success of the program, workshops and seminars should be presented by state departments of education as well as colleges of education to train leaders in the area of student motivation and self-concept and the "ASPIRE!" methodology. A study could be conducted to determine if these new "facilitators" support the evidence in this study that one's self-concept may be improved and one becomes more internalized in their locus-of-control after participation in the "ASPIRE!" program.

While many of the topics of the "ASPIRE!" program were helpful and interesting to the students, other topics
were not presented which may also be useful. These additional areas of interest should be considered.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale and the Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale are only some of the instruments available to measure self-concept and locus-of-control. In any further study of self-concept and locus-of-control, specifically as they apply to the "ASPIRE!" program, other instruments should be considered. And while this study considered birth order, family size, sex, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status as related to self-concept and locus-of-control, future studies might consider other variables such as conducting the program in an elementary school or varying the length and number of presentations.

A study should be conducted to analyze the development of a more positive self-concept and internalized locus-of-control in relation to improved academic performance of students.

By having students who take more pride in themselves, they may begin to take more pride in their school and course work. By participation in the "ASPIRE!" program, it may be possible to increase academic performance and improve classroom management and discipline problems. Schools may once again become centers of learning rather than centers of debate.
APPENDIX A

STUDENT BACKGROUND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

ASPIRE! Doctoral Study

General Information

The information on the following sheets is needed for the Doctoral study on the ASPIRE! Program. Response to any question is optional. However, your responses will help provide accurate information for use in the study. If you have any questions, please ask. All information on these forms is confidential and will be used as a group. No individuals will be identified.

Name ____________________________ Age __________ Date of Birth __________

Address:

Street __________________________ City __________ Zip Code __________

Number of Brothers _____ Their names and ages __________________________

Number of Sisters _____ Their names and ages __________________________

Parents: (check one) Married____ Divorced____ Separated____ Remarried____

Who are you living with? _____________________________________________

Any grandparents living with you? Yes____ No____

Which religion do you identify with? ____________________________________

How often do you go to religious services? 

Once a week____ Twice a week____

Several times a week____ Once a month____

Rarely____ Never____

Do you plan to go to college or a trade school? Yes____ No____

Yearly income of your family:

$10,000 or less ________ $10,000 to $25,000 ________ More than $25,000 ________

Write down one word to describe yourself as a person _____________________________
APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE AND ANSWER SHEET
DIRECTIONS: Fill in your name and other information on the separate answer sheet.

The statements in this inventory are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please answer them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Read each item carefully; then select one of the five responses below and fill in the answer space on the separate answer sheet.

Don't skip any items. Answer each one. Use a soft lead pencil. Pens won't work. If you change an answer, you must erase the old answer completely and enter the new one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Completely False</th>
<th>Mostly False</th>
<th>Partly False and Partly True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Completely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PF-PT</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

1. I have a healthy body ........................................ 1
2. I am an attractive person ........................................ 2
3. I consider myself a sloppy person .............................. 3
4. I am a decent sort of person .................................... 4
5. I am an honest person ............................................ 5
6. I am a bad person ................................................ 6
7. I am a cheerful person ........................................... 7
8. I am a calm and easy-going person .............................. 8
9. I am a nobody ..................................................... 9
10. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble ....... 10
11. My friends have no confidence in me .......................... 12
12. I am a friendly person .......................................... 13
13. I am popular with men ........................................... 14
14. I am not interested in what other people do .................. 15
15. I do not always tell the truth .................................. 16
16. I get angry sometimes ........................................... 17
17. I like to look neat and neat all the time ..................... 18
18. I am full of aches and pains .................................... 19
19. I am a sick person .............................................. 20
20. I am a religious person ......................................... 21
21. I am a moral failure ............................................ 22
22. I am a morally weak person .................................... 23
23. I have a lot of self-control .................................... 24
24. I am a hateful person ............................................ 25
25. I am losing my mind ............................................. 26
26. I am an important person to my friends and family .......... 27
27. I am not loved by my family .................................... 28
28. I feel that my family doesn't trust me ....................... 29
29. I am popular with women ....................................... 30
30. I am mad at the whole world ................................... 31
31. I am mad at the world ......................................... 31
32. I am hard to be friendly with .................................. 32
33. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about ...... 33
34. Sometimes when I am not feeling well, I am cross ........... 34
35. I am neither too fat nor too thin ................................ 35
36. I like my looks just the way they are ......................... 36
37. I would like to change some parts of my body ................ 37
38. I am satisfied with my moral behavior ....................... 38
39. I am satisfied with my relationship to God .................. 39
40. I ought to go to church more ................................... 40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I do not like everyone I know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I am satisfied to be just what I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I am as nice as I should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I despise myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my family relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I understand my family as well as I should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I should trust my family more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I am as sociable as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>A try to please others, but I don’t want to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I am not good at all from a social standpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I do not lie about my parents as well as I should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I am too sensitive to things my family say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I should love my family more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I should be more polite to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>I ought to get along better with other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I gossip a little at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I am not as religious as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>I wish I could be more trustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>I don’t tell so many lies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>I am as smart as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>I am not the person I would like to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>I wish I didn’t give up as easily as I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>I treat my parents as well as I should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>I am too sensitive to things my family say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>I should love my family more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>I should be more polite to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>I ought to get along better with other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>I gossip a little at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>I am not as religious as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>I wish I could be more trustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>I don’t tell so many lies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>I am as smart as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>I am not the person I would like to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>I wish I didn’t give up as easily as I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>I treat my parents as well as I should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>I am too sensitive to things my family say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>I should love my family more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>I ought to get along better with other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>I gossip a little at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>I am not as religious as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>I wish I could be more trustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>I don’t tell so many lies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>I am as smart as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>I am not the person I would like to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>I wish I didn’t give up as easily as I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>I treat my parents as well as I should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>I am too sensitive to things my family say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>I should love my family more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>I ought to get along better with other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>I gossip a little at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>I am not as religious as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>I wish I could be more trustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>I don’t tell so many lies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>I am as smart as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>I am not the person I would like to be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
**DIRECTIONS:** Fill in your name and other information on the separate answer sheet.

The statements in this inventory are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please answer them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Read each item carefully; then select one of the five responses below and fill in the answer space on the separate answer sheet.

Don't skip any items. Answer each one. Use a soft lead pencil. Pens won't work. If you change an answer, you must erase the old answer completely and enter the new one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Completely False</th>
<th>Mostly False</th>
<th>Partly False and Partly True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Completely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE**

**INDICATE YOUR SEX HERE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C M M C</td>
<td>F P P T</td>
<td>C M M C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F P P T</td>
<td>C M M C</td>
<td>F P P T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE** (Use same first placed blank)

**STUDENT NUMBER**

**NAME**
APPENDIX C

OSGOOD SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE
Osgood Semantic Differential Scale

Below are different characteristics. For each one of the groups, indicate on the scale where you think you are right now in the particular area. Place an "X" on the line. This is where you think you are right now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a good person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can influence the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends appreciate me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can do anything without anyone else's help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians are working for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should care about each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is good to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close with my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's okay to try different ways to approach a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People need rules to live by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other people can do it, I can too!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being with other people all the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other things more important than money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being famous is not that important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

ROTTER LOCUS-OF-CONTROL SCALE
**ROTTER LOCUS-OF-CONTROL SCALE**

**Instructions for the I-E Scale**

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of choices lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: there are no right or wrong answers.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.  
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.  
   b. People's bad luck is due to the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.  
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world.  
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.  
   b. Most students don't realize how often their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right opportunities, one cannot be an effective leader.  
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.  
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays a major role in determining one's personality.  
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.  
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student, there is rarely if ever a thing as an unfair test.  
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.  
    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.  
    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
   b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
   b. There really is no such thing as "luck".

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
   b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
APPENDIX E

PROGRAM EVALUATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION

With the completion of the ASPIRE! Program, you will be surveyed again with the same tests you took at the beginning of the program. The rules and directions are the same as before. Please respond honestly to all the questions. There are no right or wrong answers.

In addition to the tests, your response to the following questions would be helpful.

Name________________________________________

Did you miss any of the ASPIRE! classes? ____ ____ If so, how many?____

yes no

What topic did you feel was the best one for you?

____ Success ____ Leadership Other_____

____ Winning ____ Goal Setting ______

____ Creativity ____ Friendship ____

____ Humor ____ Criticism ______

Which topic, if any, did not interest you?________________________________________

What did you think of the program?______________________________________________

What comments do you have concerning the instructor?________________________________

Would you recommend this program for others? ____ ____

yes no

If you could change the program, how would you?____________________________________

What was ASPIRE! to YOU?______________________________________________________

"It Takes a Little More to be a Champion!"
APPENDIX F

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS
**BIRTH ORDER**

Order of birth of the 240 student participants in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Birth</th>
<th>Number of Students with this birth order</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (First Child)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


FAMILY SIZE

Number and size of families of all 240 program participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Family (including student)</th>
<th>Number of Students with this size family</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240 Students</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TOTAL GROUP STATISTICS**

Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation, Median, and Variance for Each Variable in the Study for the total group of 240 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>6.167</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td>5.933</td>
<td>3.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.836</td>
<td>2.523</td>
<td>3.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Pre</td>
<td>265.633</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>8.305</td>
<td>266.500</td>
<td>68.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osg Pre</td>
<td>65.342</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>9.871</td>
<td>65.045</td>
<td>97.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rot Pre</td>
<td>11.192</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>2.445</td>
<td>11.295</td>
<td>5.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Post</td>
<td>269.925</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>7.373</td>
<td>271.250</td>
<td>54.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osg Post</td>
<td>54.446</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>10.597</td>
<td>53.773</td>
<td>112.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rot Post</td>
<td>8.158</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>8.426</td>
<td>8.686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

- Grade was classified: 1 = Junior High; 2 = Senior High
- Sex was classified: 1 = Male; 2 = Female
- Ethnicity was classified: 1 = Anglo; 2 = Mexican-American
- SES was classified: 1 = Low SES; 2 = Middle SES; 3 = High SES
- Ten Pre = Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Pretest Scores
- Osg Pre = Osgood Semantic Differential Scale Pretest Scores
- Rot Pre = Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale Pretest Scores
- Ten Post = Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Posttest Scores
- Osg Post = Osgood Semantic Differential Scale Posttest Scores
- Rot Post = Rotter Locus-of-Control Scale Posttest Scores
Pearson Correlation Coefficients of all Variables in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>B Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>r= 1.0</td>
<td>r= 0</td>
<td>r= .0083</td>
<td>r= .0514</td>
<td>r= -.0596</td>
<td>r= -.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= 1.0</td>
<td>P= .898</td>
<td>P= .428</td>
<td>P= .358</td>
<td>P= .779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>r= 0</td>
<td>r= 1.0</td>
<td>r= -.0083</td>
<td>r= .0514</td>
<td>r= .0688</td>
<td>r= .0318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= 1.0</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .898</td>
<td>P= .428</td>
<td>P= .289</td>
<td>P= .624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>r= .0083</td>
<td>r= -.0083</td>
<td>r= 1.0</td>
<td>r= -.0510</td>
<td>r= .3125</td>
<td>r= .1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .898</td>
<td>P= .898</td>
<td>P= .432</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .033</td>
<td>P= .024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>r= .0514</td>
<td>r= .0514</td>
<td>r= -.0510</td>
<td>r= 1.0</td>
<td>r= -.1376</td>
<td>r= -.1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .428</td>
<td>P= .428</td>
<td>P= .432</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .033</td>
<td>P= .022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>r= -.0596</td>
<td>r= .0688</td>
<td>r= .3125</td>
<td>r= -.1376</td>
<td>r= 1.0</td>
<td>r= .7967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>P= .358</td>
<td>P= .289</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .033</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>r= -.0182</td>
<td>r= .0318</td>
<td>r= .1454</td>
<td>r= -.1480</td>
<td>r= .7967</td>
<td>r= 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>P= .779</td>
<td>P= .624</td>
<td>P= .024</td>
<td>P= .022</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>r= .1951</td>
<td>r= .0513</td>
<td>r= .0265</td>
<td>r= .1350</td>
<td>r= .0342</td>
<td>r= .0329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>P= .002</td>
<td>P= .429</td>
<td>P= .683</td>
<td>P= .037</td>
<td>P= .598</td>
<td>P= .612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>r= -.1298</td>
<td>r= -.0956</td>
<td>r= .0655</td>
<td>r= -.0083</td>
<td>r= .0678</td>
<td>r= -.0176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>P= .045</td>
<td>P= .140</td>
<td>P= .312</td>
<td>P= .899</td>
<td>P= .904</td>
<td>P= .787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>r= -.1370</td>
<td>r= -.0457</td>
<td>r= .2964</td>
<td>r= -.1970</td>
<td>r= .1234</td>
<td>r= .0930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>P= .034</td>
<td>P= .481</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .002</td>
<td>P= .056</td>
<td>P= .151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>r= .1280</td>
<td>r= -.0963</td>
<td>r= .0464</td>
<td>r= .1620</td>
<td>r= .0162</td>
<td>r= .0203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>P= .048</td>
<td>P= .137</td>
<td>P= .457</td>
<td>P= .012</td>
<td>P= .803</td>
<td>P= .755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>r= .0632</td>
<td>r= -.0340</td>
<td>r= .1025</td>
<td>r= -.2720</td>
<td>r= .1673</td>
<td>r= .1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>P= .336</td>
<td>P= .600</td>
<td>P= .113</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .009</td>
<td>P= .042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>r= -.1793</td>
<td>r= .0201</td>
<td>r= .2537</td>
<td>r= -.1787</td>
<td>r= .2168</td>
<td>r= .1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>P= .005</td>
<td>P= .757</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .006</td>
<td>P= .001</td>
<td>P= .006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correlation Coefficients: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Tennessee Pretest</th>
<th>Rotter Pretest</th>
<th>Osgood Pretest</th>
<th>Tennessee Posttest</th>
<th>Rotter Posttest</th>
<th>Osgood Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>( r = .1951 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1298 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1370 )</td>
<td>( r = .1280 )</td>
<td>( r = .0623 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1793 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = .002 )</td>
<td>( P = .045 )</td>
<td>( P = .034 )</td>
<td>( P = .048 )</td>
<td>( P = .336 )</td>
<td>( P = .005 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>( r = .0513 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0956 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0457 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0963 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0340 )</td>
<td>( r = .0201 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = .429 )</td>
<td>( P = .140 )</td>
<td>( P = .481 )</td>
<td>( P = .137 )</td>
<td>( P = .600 )</td>
<td>( P = .757 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>( r = -.0265 )</td>
<td>( r = .0655 )</td>
<td>( r = .2964 )</td>
<td>( r = .0464 )</td>
<td>( r = .1025 )</td>
<td>( r = .2537 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = .883 )</td>
<td>( P = .312 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .475 )</td>
<td>( P = .113 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>( r = .1350 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0083 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1970 )</td>
<td>( r = .1620 )</td>
<td>( r = -.2720 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1787 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = .037 )</td>
<td>( P = .899 )</td>
<td>( P = .002 )</td>
<td>( P = .012 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>( r = .0342 )</td>
<td>( r = .0078 )</td>
<td>( r = .1234 )</td>
<td>( r = .0162 )</td>
<td>( r = .1673 )</td>
<td>( r = .2168 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = .598 )</td>
<td>( P = .904 )</td>
<td>( P = .058 )</td>
<td>( P = .803 )</td>
<td>( P = .009 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>( r = .0329 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0176 )</td>
<td>( r = .0930 )</td>
<td>( r = .0203 )</td>
<td>( r = .1314 )</td>
<td>( r = .1771 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = .612 )</td>
<td>( P = .787 )</td>
<td>( P = .151 )</td>
<td>( P = .755 )</td>
<td>( P = .042 )</td>
<td>( P = .006 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>( r = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0272 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0746 )</td>
<td>( r = .2486 )</td>
<td>( r = .0241 )</td>
<td>( r = -.0337 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .675 )</td>
<td>( P = .250 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .710 )</td>
<td>( P = .603 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>( r = -.0272 )</td>
<td>( r = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( r = .2009 )</td>
<td>( r = .0212 )</td>
<td>( r = .4875 )</td>
<td>( r = .1730 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>( P = .675 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .002 )</td>
<td>( P = .744 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .007 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>( r = -.0746 )</td>
<td>( r = .2009 )</td>
<td>( r = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( r = .0059 )</td>
<td>( r = .001 )</td>
<td>( r = .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>( P = .250 )</td>
<td>( P = .002 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .927 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>( r = .2486 )</td>
<td>( r = .0212 )</td>
<td>( r = .0059 )</td>
<td>( r = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1177 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1016 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .744 )</td>
<td>( P = .927 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .069 )</td>
<td>( P = .116 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>( r = .1060 )</td>
<td>( r = .0512 )</td>
<td>( r = .890 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1177 )</td>
<td>( r = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( r = .3091 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>( P = .101 )</td>
<td>( P = .430 )</td>
<td>( P = .169 )</td>
<td>( P = .069 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood</td>
<td>( r = -.0337 )</td>
<td>( r = .1730 )</td>
<td>( r = .5482 )</td>
<td>( r = -.1016 )</td>
<td>( r = .3091 )</td>
<td>( r = 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>( P = .603 )</td>
<td>( P = .007 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .116 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
<td>( P = .001 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

RESULTS OF STUDENT BACKGROUND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
Subjects were asked to identify who they are living with.

The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both Parents</th>
<th>Mom (Divorced)</th>
<th>Dad (Divorced)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Study</strong></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRANDPARENTS AT HOME

Students were asked to indicate if their grandparents were living at home with their family. This question failed to ask if their grandparents were living at all which may have affected their responses.

None of the male subjects indicated that their grandparents were living at home. The female subjects responded differently. None of the Mexican-American junior high subjects had grandparents living at home; however, two of the Anglo junior high females did. In the senior high, four Anglo female subjects and two Mexican-American subjects indicated that their grandparents were living at home with them.
RELGION

The students were asked to identify which religion they practiced, if any, and then indicate how often they attend religious services or functions. Many students did not respond to this. Of those that did, some failed to indicate how often they attended a service, or which religion they practiced. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Baptist</th>
<th>Lutheran</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Study</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subjects were asked to indicate whether or not they planned to go to college or trade school when they graduated from high school. Their responses indicate that over 85.8 percent of the subjects plan to do so. The total results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Boys</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Boys</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Girls</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Girls</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Senior High** |     |     |             |            |
| Anglo Boys      | 27  | 3   |             |            |
| Mexican Boys    | 22  | 4   | 4           |            |
| Anglo Girls     | 30  | 2   |             |            |
| Mexican Girls   | 28  | 2   |             |            |
| **Total**       | 107 | 9   | 4           |            |

**Total in Study** 206  20  9  5

*Those students who checked "Don't Know" wrote in this choice.*
ONE-WORD DESCRIPTORS

This question was one of the most difficult for the subjects to answer. It consisted of having the subject give a one-word descriptor of themselves. They could respond to it in whatever situation the student wanted to perceive themselves. Many subjects chose not to respond to this question while many repeated the same word used by other students. Females responded to this question more than males and their responses were more carefully thought out and unique. Below are the individual groups and the words used by the members of that group. When an answer was repeated, it was counted but not listed each time.

Junior High
Anglo Boys: Cool, Honest, Nice, ?, Pleasant, Athletic
Mexican Boys: Good, Good health, Boy, Nice and Kind, Hyper, Half and Half, a Good Person
Anglo Girls: Strange, Crazy, Cautious, Nice, Caring, Try, Friendly
Mexican Girls: Shy, Considerate, Responsible, Try

Senior High
Anglo Boys: Nice, Humorous, Outgoing
Mexican Boys: A Nice Cool Person, Alright, Happy, Meaningless
Anglo Girls: Good, Caring, Hyper, Friendly, Special, Fair, Communicative, Understanding, Cautious, Unique, Sensitive
Mexican Girls: Different, Reliable, Short, Friendly, Kind, Helpful, Tall
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