

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

ERNEST MAYNARD OGARD, JR. for the Ed. D.  
(Name of student) (Degree)  
in EDUCATION presented on JAN 26 1972  
(Major) (Date)

Title: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF CONCEPT AND  
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy  
Gerald Becker

The purpose of this study was to seek evidence which might lead to the development of more effective ways of dealing with the problem of failure to attend school.

Concept of self has long been considered worthy of consideration in evaluating behavior. It is known that significant experiences in life can modify self concept.

This study selected 58 truant (T) students on the basis of 10 unexcused absences in a 4 week period from school during one academic year and 58 non truant (NT) students randomly selected from a total group of several hundred students electing to participate in a vocational skill training program, and tested the following hypotheses:

- I. There will not be a significant difference between the self concept scores of the student who poses an attendance problem and the student who does not pose an attendance problem as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

- II. Self concept of attendance problem students will not change significantly after being in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester.
- III. After having been in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester there will be no significant differences between the gain scores of the attendance and non-attendance problem student.

Hypothesis I was statistically tested to determine differences in self concept with two tailed unpaired t tests on the 4 mean score areas of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (T) group vs. (NT) group.

Null hypothesis II was statistically tested by comparison of the (T) group pretest vs. (T) group post test scores in the 4 mean score areas of the instrument after one semester of treatment with two tailed paired t tests.

Null hypothesis III was tested by (a) repeating the procedure outlined in Null Hypothesis II for the (NT) group and (b) comparing after treatment the (T) mean gain scores vs. the (NT) group mean gain scores with two tailed unpaired t tests on the 4 score areas of the instrument.

It was concluded that:

1. There is no difference at the .05 statistical significance level in self concept between the truant and non-truant populations

studied as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale score areas. The means of the four self concept score areas of the instrument seem to imply that the truant population had a lower self concept in two of the four score areas than the non-truant population.

2. Rescheduling into the elective vocational skill program used in this study did not improve self concept in any of the 4 score areas at the .05 statistical level of significance for the truant group. The means in three of the four score areas did reveal a trend toward improvement after treatment and there was a favorable change in standard deviation in two of the four score areas.
3. There was no increase at the .05 statistical level of significance in the positive gain scores for the truant population when compared to the non-truant population after treatment as measured by the four self concept score areas of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The non-truant group population means in the 4 score areas revealed a trend toward improvement in self concept in all 4 score areas of the instrument. One area (D), at the .05 statistical level of significance, there was a favorable change in the standard deviation for the non-truant group after treatment in one score area of the four.

The truant population gain means in the 4 self concept

score areas revealed a trend toward larger gain in 3 of the 4 score areas than the non-truant population.

The Relationship Between Self Concept  
and School Attendance

by

Ernest Maynard Ogard, Jr.

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1972

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

---

Associate Professor of Education  
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

---

Dean of School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

---

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented January 26, 1972

Typed by Opal Grossnicklaus for Ernest Maynard Ogard, Jr.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is indebted to a number of people who have made the completion of this study possible. Specifically, the writer thanks:

Dr. Gerald Becker, Associate Professor of Education and Director of the Educational Research Center, whose valuable guidance, encouragement and assistance throughout the writer's doctoral program and thesis study led to their conclusion;

Dr. Pat H. Atteberry, Professor and Head of the Industrial Education Department; Dr. William C. Denison, Associate Professor of Botany and Curator of Mycological Herbarium; Dr. Edward F. Fuller, Assistant Professor of Education; and Dr. J. Granville Jensen, Professor of Geography, for serving on the doctoral committee;

Dr. Edwin L. Anderson, Assistant Professor of Education, who assisted with the statistical analysis; Mr. Durwood Thomas, Mr. Leonard Suchsland, Mr. Emery Huschka, the school district and students, who assisted the writer in that portion of the study concerning the school;

My wife, Joan, whose encouragement and sacrifices have been instrumental in my completing the study.

E. M. O.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	8
Purpose of the Study	9
Significance of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	10
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Self Concept	12
Development and Importance of Self Concept	12
Self Concept, School Achievement and Adjustment	16
Self Concept, School Adjustment, and the Effect of Significant Persons	20
Self Concept and the School Dropout	25
Self Concept of the Delinquent	27
Self Concept Can Be Changed	31
PROCEDURES	34
Theory	34
Hypotheses	34
Null Hypotheses	35
Population and Design	35
Instrument	38
Norms	39
Validity	40
Nature and Meaning of Scores	45
Statistical Procedures	52
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	57
Hypothesis I	58
Hypothesis II	60
Hypothesis III	62
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	66
Summary	66
Conclusions	68
Suggestions for Further Research	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	72
APPENDICES	77

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Pretest Scores (T) Group vs. (NT) Group	59
2.	Pretest vs. Post test Gains for (T) Group	61
3.	Pretest vs. Post test Gains for (NT) Group	63
4.	Gain Scores (T) Group vs. (NT) Group	64

# THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF CONCEPT AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In the United States today and particularly in Oregon there is a problem concerning compulsory school attendance laws which plague both school personnel and the courts. In a 1968 survey of Oregon's 36 counties, in 33 of the 36 there were a total of 839 unofficial referrals to the Juvenile Court and 348 official referrals to the Court for failure to attend school. In one suburban county, during the 1969-1970 school year the two attendance officers in the county received 635 referrals for truancy in which they made 1556 contacts with students, schools, parents, police, courts, and other interested persons (Thomas, 1970). According to this 1968 survey, public school and juvenile court personnel are dissatisfied with present procedures of dealing with the problem of truancy (Triplett, 1968).

This vast number of referrals points to a need for the public school to develop programs to deal with this problem in the school. There are approaches that hold promise for dealing with the problem of truancy in the school. One consideration involves the self concept or the way one perceives oneself.

Research indicates that a favorable self concept of ability is

related to acceptable school adjustment and achievement and that an individual's self concept of his ability is significantly correlated with the images that he perceives significant others to have of his ability.

✓ The importance of favorable self concept development cannot be over-emphasized in planning the curriculum in public schools (Hamachek, 1965). There is evidence that the school dropout has a low self concept when compared to the student who stays in school (Schreiber, 1969). There is also evidence that the delinquent has a low self concept when compared to the non-delinquent (Gluecks, 1950; Reckless, 1967). Present programs in the public school need to be evaluated to determine their effect on self concept and programs developed that are designed to promote a favorable self concept. This approach appears to offer much potential for dealing with students who are attendance problems and is likewise just as important for students who do not present an attendance problem.

Now more than ever before it is necessary for the public school to find effective ways of dealing with children who pose attendance problems in the school since the Juvenile Court is presently unable to fulfill its traditional role in this matter.

Traditional methods of dealing with attendance problems are not feasible in many areas in the State of Oregon because of a recent United States Supreme Court decision in re Winship. Until this decision in 1969 school attendance problems were traditionally a

concern both to the school and to the Juvenile Court. The school maintained attendance records and reported failure to attend school and compulsory attendance laws were enforced by the attendance officer and the Juvenile Court. This procedure has had only limited success and since 1960 it has been recommended and documented that the Juvenile Court be removed from this problem (Triplett, 1968; Morris, 1960). Historically, this procedure began with the passing of compulsory attendance laws and the use of the Juvenile Court to enforce those laws (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967).

The first compulsory attendance law in the United States was passed in colonial Massachusetts in 1642. Select men of each town were required to

have a vigilant eye over their brethren and neighbors, to see that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in any of their families as not to endeavor to teach, by themselves and others, their children and apprentices so much learning as may enable them perfectly to read the English tongue, and a knowledge of the capital laws (USDBOE, 1914, p. 78).

The free public school movement developed from 1820-50, and the movement toward universal compulsory attendance in the United States grew rapidly in strength during the post Civil War period. By 1918 all states had laws regarding compulsory school attendance; however, since 1955 two states, Mississippi and South Carolina, have not had compulsory school attendance laws, and Virginia has made

the adoption of these laws the option of local government ( USDHEW, 1966).

In the State of Oregon in 1889 the first compulsory attendance law was enacted. Through the years there have been many amendments to the initial law, but the essential substance of the bill remains unchanged (East, 1943).

Oregon is presently one of four states (Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon and Utah) in the United States which requires school attendance until the age of 18 years. There are five states that require attendance until the age of 17 years, and the remainder of the states, with the exception of two, require attendance until the age of 16 years (USDHEW, 1966). The present law and exceptions to it are as follows:

339.010 School attendance required; age limits. Except as provided in ORS 339.030, all children between the ages of 7 and 18 years who have not completed the 12th grade are required to attend regularly a public full-time school of the school district in which the child resides.

339.030 Exceptions from compulsory school attendance. In the following cases, children shall not be required to attend public full-time schools.

- (1) Lawfully employed children between the ages of 16 and 18 years who are attending a class or program for employed children under ORS 336.135 for not less than 5 hours per week or 180 hours per year or for an equivalent time unless there is no such class or program in the school district in which he resides.

- (2) Children being taught in a private or parochial school in the courses of study usually taught in grades 1 through 12 in the public schools and in attendance for a period equivalent to that required of children attending public schools.
- (3) Children proving to the satisfaction of the district school board that they have acquired equivalent knowledge to that acquired in the courses of study taught in grades 1 through 12 in the public schools.
- (4) Children who are mentally or physically unable to attend school. The attendance supervisor may require a written certificate of a duly licensed physician certifying that the child is mentally or physically unable to attend school.
- (5) Children between the ages of 7 and 10 years whose parents live more than one and one-half miles, and children over 10 years of age whose parents live more than three miles, by the nearest traveled road, from some public schools and for whom the school district does not provide transportation over the distance specified in this subsection.
- (6) Children being taught for a period equivalent to that required of children attending public schools by a parent or private teacher the courses of study usually taught in grades 1 through 12 in the public school.
  - (a) Before the children are taught by a parent or private teacher, the parent or teacher must receive written permission from the executive officer of the administrative office for the county. The executive officer is authorized to grant permission only in case of necessity. The permission shall not extend beyond the end of the school year in which permission is granted.
  - (b) Children being taught by a parent or private teacher must be examined in the work covered. If the executive officer of the administrative office determines after examination that the children are not being taught properly, he shall order the person having control of the children to send them to school for the remainder of the school year.
- (7) Children excused by the district school board of the district in which the children reside. The district school board has authority to excuse a child from

compulsory attendance if the child has completed the first eight grades and if further attendance would be educationally unprofitable for the child or cause hardship in the family of such child.

- (8) Children excluded from attendance as provided by law (Oregon Revised Statute 1969, sec. 339).

A typical way of dealing with a student who is an attendance problem; i. e., truant, is for the attendance supervisor to contact the attendance secretary at the school and make a list of those students who are developing into attendance problems. A conference is held with the vice-principal (who is assigned the duty of working with and disciplining students), the school nurse, and counseling staff. The student's background is examined. In some cases, the student will have a legitimate reason for not attending school. If not, the attendance supervisor asks the school to discuss the problem with the student and offers assistance and necessary guidance. If this fails, a letter is sent to the parents advising them of their child's attendance problem. If the situation continues then the school will request that one or both parents come to the school for a conference.

If the problem persists after the above steps have been taken by the school, a referral is made to the county school attendance supervisor who then discusses the problem with the student. The student is told what the law requires and the attendance supervisor offers his assistance. If attendance does not improve the parents are again notified and contacted by the attendance officer and once more an effort is made to resolve the situation. If this effort fails

and the attendance supervisor is unable to resolve the problem, the child may be referred to the Juvenile Court (Thomas, 1970).

As noted, some persons question whether or not the Juvenile Court should be involved in matters such as failure to attend school (Tripplett, 1968; Morris, 1960). The recent United States Supreme Court decision in re Winship has partially solved this question. It was the second of two decisions seriously affecting procedure of the Juvenile Court. This decision has made the usual procedure of the Juvenile Court in handling failure to attend school in Oregon illegal (Matter of Gault 387 U. S. 1., 1967; Juvenile Court Digest, 1967; U. S. Law Leek, 1969; Mater of Winship 90 S. Ct. 1068, 1970). These two decisions have so drastically changed procedures of the Juvenile Court that the Oregon Supreme Court in their case State vs. Arenas, which occurred after the 1967 Gault decision and prior to the 1969 Winship decision, stated the following illustrating the seriousness of these decisions to the Juvenile Court:

If the constitution requires that a juvenile cannot come within the jurisdiction of the court unless criminal conduct is proved beyond a reasonable doubt, the great juvenile experiment is over (Oregon Advance Sheets, 1969, p. 351).

The Winship decision which followed stated precisely that conduct for which a juvenile could be institutionalized must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt (Matter of Winship 90 S. Ct. 1068, 1970).

In Oregon children who were referred to the Juvenile Court for failure to attend school prior to the Winship decision were handled under "the preponderance of evidence standard" rather than "the beyond a reasonable doubt standard" (ORS 419.476 C, 1969) and could be committed to a state institution if the court saw fit as provided for by ORS 419.509 (1969).

The Winship decision has made this procedure illegal thus it is now necessary for the school and Juvenile Court to seek alternative ways of dealing with the problem of failure to attend school.

It would behoove the process of education to try to solve the attendance problem in the school by implementing programs that might effectively deal with the school attendance problem. Reliance on the Juvenile Court, would then be unnecessary.

#### Statement of the Problem

School attendance is more important today than ever before since it is a necessity for a person to have a minimum of a high school education to effectively compete in today's modern complex, industrial society. Traditional methods of dealing with this problem have failed and are no longer workable. The Juvenile Court is now unable to function in its usual manner due to limitation placed upon it. The need for new ways of dealing with truancy has been with us

for some time. Over a decade ago the United Nations' delegates wanted the United States and all other nations to turn over to schools the prevention and solution of such behavior problems as truancy (Morris, 1960).

The problem merits immediate attention.

#### Purpose of the Study

The focus of this research was to seek evidence which might lead to the development of more effective ways of dealing with the problem of failure to attend school. If the self concept is a significant factor in behavior and, in fact, can determine behavior then it is a factor worthy of consideration in dealing with the problem of failure to attend school. The purpose of this study was to (1) measure the self concept of high school students who present an attendance problem and those who do not; (2) provide vocational training to both groups; and (3) measure the change, if any, in the self concept of these students.

#### Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is the fact that it provides needed information regarding the relationship between favorable self concept and favorable school attendance. Prior to this study, there had been no research conducted regarding this

relationship. This information and additional studies are necessary to test self concept improving programs and their effectiveness as a means for reducing truant behavior.

#### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarity and consistency, the following definitions will apply whenever the terms appear:

Self Concept: For the purpose of this study the term "self concept" is defined and measured by the four score areas of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

School Attendance Problem: This study is concerned with the student who fails to attend a class, a series of classes, or the total school program, legally referred to as truancy. ORS 339.065 defines irregular attendance as eight unexcused absences in any four-week period school is in session. For the purpose of this study students were defined as attendance problems if they had accumulated ten unexcused absences in any four-week period during the 1970-71 school year.

George Emory High School: This is a fictitious name used in this study to designate the actual high school in which the study was

conducted.

Rescheduling: The process of rescheduling used in this study is the procedure whereby high school students attending George Emory High School are allowed to elect to participate in a vocational skill program starting their junior year. This is made available as an elective partially in lieu of the usual academic program and is conducted at the George Emory School District's Skill Center. Programs such as this are being offered today as an answer to the student who is not college-bound or particularly interested in, or benefiting from, the normal academic school program. The student in this program is at the Skill Center two to three hours per day five days per week.

Pre-Test: Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

Post-Test: Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

Conditions: The students were pre-tested and post tested at the same hour and in the same room with the same persons monitoring the test (four counselors).

Dependent Variable: Self concept.

Independent Variable: Rescheduling into the vocational skill program.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Self Concept

The idea that man possesses a concept of self has been a source of interest to mankind ever since the French mathematician and philosopher, Rene Descartes, first introduced the concept of self in the seventeenth century. As psychology evolved from philosophy as a separate entity, the concept of self developed with it. However, behaviorism swept psychological thinking during the first forty years of this century and the concept of self all but disappeared as a theoretical or empirical construct of any stature (Wylie, 1961; Hamachek, 1971).

In very recent years the tide has turned. Perhaps without being fully aware of the historical situation, many psychologists have commenced to embrace what two decades ago would have been considered a heresy. They have re-introduced self and ego unashamedly and, as if to make up for lost time, have employed ancillary concepts such as self-image, self-actualization, self-affirmation, phenomenal ego, ego-involvement, ego-striving, and many other hyphenated elaborations which to experimental positivism still have a slight flavor of scientific obscenity (Allport, 1955, p. 104).

#### Development and Importance of Self Concept

The self concept develops through a process of evaluation by the infant, child, and adult from the appraisals of those significant persons

in their lives. According to Sachs, self concept arises from the influence adults have upon infants and children and this influence continues throughout life as one's self concept is further molded by one's peers (Sachs, 1966).

The newborn infant does not apparently differentiate between his body and the environment around him. However, the infant soon recognizes that there is a difference between his concept of self and that which is not a part of him. Eventually he begins to recognize the fact that he has various parts and relates those parts to himself as me. This recognition most likely comes about at the point in life when the child begins to distinguish between his feelings and the condition that produces his feelings. For example, at first a child does not realize that when he feels pain, there is a cause for the pain. At the time he recognizes that there is a causal factor that produces his sensations, he recognizes the fact that he is a separate entity, separate from the world around him (Mead, 1934; Hamachek, 1971).

As the child develops further, he relates things to himself. This personal involvement--the selfish, me, mine, my, etc.--leads to an even more extensive development of the idea of self. Thus, the child grows and each passing event in his life leads to an even more firm idea of self. And so the person becomes an individual with a unique self (Hamachek, 1971; Mead, 1934).

Sullivan sees the self as developing from the time an infant is

born. An individual is constantly being appraised as the result of interaction with other persons. As the child assimilates the appraisals he begins to develop an idea of what is expected of him. Positive appraisals lead to a positive self image whereas negative appraisals lead to a negative self image. Sullivan's theory is often referred to as an interpersonal theory of personality development (Sullivan, 1953).

Reckless extends the above ideas concerning development of self during childhood to the adult when he states,

The self is a part of the total person which is most closely related to conformity with social and legal norms or to deviant alternatives and the self consists of an accumulated set of personalized images, perceptions, concepts, and projections (Reckless, 1967, p. 11).

One's self concept shapes his life in every way imaginable. Self concept is indeed the very root of the social and emotional system within a human being. Murphy points out that the self concept is a hypothetical construct allowing the integration of social and emotional development into a single system. The self concept is not a unified structure, but is multi-dimensional, with different aspects of the self system moving, at different age levels, into sharper focus (Murphy, 1947).

Mead states, "The self . . . is essentially a social structure, and it arises in social experience" (Mead, 1964). Mead's idea of self is that self is an object of awareness. He believes that it is

necessary to root the self in social conditions which are of relevance to the individual and to derive the content of the self from an interaction between the individual and his social world. This theory also leads to the idea that the individual has many different selves. For example, he may have a different self at home than he has at school, etc. (Mead, 1934).

Cooley, one of the first social psychologists to consider the idea of self, had a theory similar to that of Mead. He believed that the self developed as a consequence of interpersonal interactions. From this theory the concept of the "looking-glass self" was derived. This concept is best expressed by Cooley himself when he says:

In a very large and interesting class of cases the social reference takes the form of a somewhat definite imagination of how one's self . . . appears in a particular mind, and the kind of self-feeling one has is determined by the attitude toward this attributed to that other mind. A social self might be called the reflected or looking-glass self.

Each to each a looking glass

Reflects the other that doth pass (Cooley, 1902, p. 20)

The self is an abstraction of the essential and distinguishing characteristics of the self that differentiate an individual's "selfhood" from the environment and from other selves. In the course of development, various evaluative attitudes, values, aspirations, motives, and obligations become associated with the self concept (Ausubel, 1958). Self concept is developed through interaction with others which in turn influences one's behavior (Hamachek, 1965; Murphy, 1947).

Consciousness is the center of personality. The self is a system through which a person gives meaning to his experiences. Each person tries to compensate for his inabilities (either real or fancied) by striving for a particular goal in life. The self is a highly personalized and subjective system (Adler, 1924).

Carl Rogers' conceptual ingredients of self-theory are

1. the organism, which is the total person,
2. the phenomenal field, which is the totality of experience, and
3. the self which is a differentiated portion of the phenomenal field and consists of conscious perceptions and values of the "I" or "me" (Rogers, 1951).

The self has numerous features, the most important of which are

1. the self strives for consistency,
2. a person behaves in ways which are consistent with the self,
3. experiences that are not consistent with the self are perceived as threats and are either distorted or denied,
4. the self may change as a result of maturation and learning (Rogers, 1951).

#### Self Concept, School Achievement and Adjustment

Research indicates that a favorable self concept of ability is related to acceptable school adjustment and achievement and that an individual's self concept of his ability is significantly correlated with the images that he perceives significant others to have of his ability (Shaw, 1960, 1963; Hamachek, 1965).

Psychologists and educators are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that a person's idea of himself, or self-concept, is closely connected to how he behaves and learns. Indeed . . . increasing evidence indicates that low performance in basic school subjects, as well as the misdirected motivation and lack of academic involvement characteristics of the under-achiever, the dropout, the culturally disadvantaged, and the failure, may be due in part to negative perceptions of the self. Many students for example, have difficulty in school, because they have learned to consider themselves unable to do academic work (Hamachek, 1971, p. 174).

The effect of the school upon an individual's self concept is enormous. The school dispenses praise and reproof, acceptance and rejection. In addition the great amount of time a person spends in school during the formative years of his life, one must consider the fact that the school contains the severest critics--peers and teachers. Again and again the student is reminded of his "failings and shortcomings or of his strengths and possibilities" (Hamachek, 1971).

One of the first to point out that a student may do poorly because of a poor self concept was Prescott Lecky. He states that low achievement, in many cases, is the result of the student's low opinion of himself rather than an intellectual inability to learn (Lecky, 1945).

There is evidence to suggest that a low or negative self concept can have adverse effects on a child's school performance even at a very young age. Wattenberg and Clifford found that an unfavorable view of self and poor achievement is already established in many

children before they enter school. One hundred twenty-eight kindergarten students were studied in two schools. One school's population was lower-class while the other school's population was from middle-class neighborhoods. Intelligence, self concept, ego-strength, and reading ability were measured for all the students when they were in kindergarten and again when they had completed the second grade. It was found that measure of self concept and ego-strength made at the beginning of kindergarten was more predictive of achievement in reading two and one-half years later than was intelligence measures. It would appear that the intelligence score was a less accurate indication of potential reading skills than the child's self-attitude (Wattenberg and Clifford, 1964).

McCuen reasoned if a child starts with a negative self-image about his ability to do school work, we might expect that the signs of low or poor academic achievement will be apparent during the early elementary years. To check this out they took a group of eleventh and twelfth grade students were selected who had been in the same school system since the first grade and who scored in the upper quarter of an intelligence test administered in the eighth grade and divided them into achiever and under achiever groups, which were separated for males and females: 36 male achievers, 36 male under-achievers, 45 female achievers, and 17 female under-achievers. The mean grade point averages were computed for each group at each grade level. They

found that there were significant differences between male achievers' and under-achievers' grade point average at the third grade. The grade point difference between the two groups increased at each grade level from grade three up to grade ten, where there was a slight decrease. There were no significant differences between female achievers and under-achievers before grade nine, although non-significant differences were apparent in grade six. These differences between the two groups of girls continued to increase through grade eleven. As can be seen by this study, under-achievement for boys can begin as early as the first grade, is definitely present by third grade, and becomes increasingly more serious into the high school years. For girls the problem may exist as early as grade six and is definitely present and of increasing importance from grades nine to eleven (Shaw and McCuen, 1960).

Walsh conducted a study in which twenty elementary boys with IQ's over 120 who were under-achievers were matched with twenty elementary boys who had similar IQ's, but were considered high-achievers. It was found that the low-achievers had more negative feelings about themselves than the high-achievers. She also noted that low-achievers differed from high achievers in feelings of rejection and criticism; in defensive acts through evasion, compliance, or negativism; and in inability to adequately express themselves in

actions and feelings (Walsh, 1956).

Nash found that the most differentiating characteristic between high- and low-achievers was the student's perception of the quality of his academic performance. His study, dealing with junior high students, included three dimensions: (1) the importance of peer relationships, (2) non-conformity, and (3) satisfaction with self (Nash, 1964).

Borislow an investigation of relationships between self-evaluation and academic achievement studied 197 college freshmen. He concluded that under-achievers have a poor concept of themselves academically, while achievers have a good concept of themselves subsequent to their scholastic performance whether or not the initial intention was to strive for scholastic achievement (Borislow, 1962).

#### Self Concept, School Adjustment, and the Effect of Significant Persons

Wilbur Brookover, Shailor Thomas, and Ann Patterson, in a recent study, hypothesized that "an individual's self concept of ability is significantly correlated with the images that he perceives significant others to have of his ability. In this study test administered to both over- and under-achievers to avoid indicating information from only a particular group. It was found that those significant people most frequently mentioned were mother, father, teacher, and peer. Self concept among adolescents appears to be a function of teacher and

peer group appraisal and it appears to develop when self appraisals are consistent with the appraisals of other (Brookover, Thomas, and Patterson, 1964).

When one examines the way self concept may affect a student's attitudes towards his peers, one sees a strong correlation between attitudes and self concept. In a study by Teigland of fourth-grade student, it was found that achievers were chosen by their peers more often than under-achievers. It was also noted that achievers scored higher when tested by means of the California Test of Personality. Not only were under-achievers rejected by their peers in education situations but also in play and social situations (Teigland, 1966).

An investigation by Shaw and his co-workers on bright under-achieving high school students revealed that male achievers feel relatively more positive about themselves than do male under-achievers (Shaw, 1960). Combs, in a similar study conducted, found that under-achieving academically capable high school boys differ significantly from achievers in their perceptions of self and others and in general and emotional efficiency (Combs, 1964).

✓ Reese, while working with fourth, sixth, and eighth-grade students, found that students who had a good feeling towards themselves also liked others. This tends to bear out the idea that students project their feelings about themselves onto other (Reese, 1961).

Williams and Cole found, in a study of sixth graders, that there was a positive relationship between self concept and emotional adjustment. Not only do those students who have high self concepts have a higher social standing, but they also are better adjusted emotionally (Williams and Cole, 1968).

It was found in studies by Fink and Campbell that there was a significant relationship between poor self concept and academic under-achievement and, further, that this relationship between poor self concept and under-achievement was stronger for boys than for girls (Fink, 1962; Campbell, 1966).

In another study conducted by Brookover, it was also learned that "significant" persons in the student's eyes are of utmost importance in the formation of self concept. If significant persons think highly of the student, he tends to think highly of himself (Brookover, 1965).

Significant persons are defined in another study by Brookover to include teachers, parents, and peers. In this study, practically all students in grades seven through twelve identified their parents as being concerned about their progress in school (Brookover, 1967).

Hamachek states that

research suggests that parents who combine caring, acceptance, and high expectations are likely to raise children who think well of themselves and who strive to do as well as they can in school (Hamachek, 1971, p. 194).

He goes on to say that a teacher can have an enormous influence on a student's self-attitudes, especially those related to his feelings about thinking, answering questions, and solving problems. Teachers are quickly identified as significant persons by most students. Sometimes a teacher is so significant he is the only person who has made the student feel he has worth and value. Other teachers are significant because they have the responsibility of evaluating a student's ability to do school work and compete with other students. In short, the teacher evaluates the student for the parents' approval or disapproval. This becomes a kind of circular "significance." Teachers are significant factors in the formation of self concept. Although the parent spends a great deal of time with the student--far more than that of the teacher--the teacher is not only a guide, he is also a recorder of the student's actions. The personality of the teacher is a deciding factor in the student's response to him and in the effect the teacher has on the student (Hamachek, 1971).

In a study done by Hart the following facts were gathered regarding a teacher students liked and a teacher students disliked:

---

Four Most Frequently Mentioned Reasons  
for  
Liking "Teacher A" Best Reported by 3725 High School Seniors

---

1.	Is helpful in school work, explains lessons and assignments clearly and thoroughly, and uses examples in teaching.	50%
2.	Cheerful, happy, good-natured, jolly, has sense of humor and can take a joke.	40%
3.	Human, friendly, companionable, "one of us."	30%
4.	Interested in and understands pupils.	26%

---



---

Four Most Frequently Mentioned Reasons  
for  
Liking "Teacher Z" Least Reported by 3725 High School Seniors

---

1.	Too cross, crabby, grouchy, never smiles, nagging, sarcastic, loses temper, "flies off the handle."	50%
2.	Not helpful with school work, does not explain lessons and assignments, not clear, work not planned.	30%
3.	Partial, has "pets" or favored students, and "picks on certain pupils."	20%
4.	Superior, aloof, haughty, "snooty," overbearing, does not know you out of class.	20%

---

(Hart, 1934)

Jersild, in a similar study done on the elementary level, obtained results similar to those of Hart. Qualities children liked best in a teacher were human qualities as a person; physical appearance, grooming, voice; traits as a disciplinarian or director of the class; participation in activities; performance as a teacher (Jersild, 1940).

Obviously, adjustment to school is a many-faceted problem. Those having a high esteem of self overcome this problem more easily than those who have a low self concept. The literature suggests that one answer is to help the child develop a good self concept by guaranteeing the student helpful, "significant" teachers and thus, helping to develop or improve adjustment to the school situation.

### Self Concept and the School Dropout

Self concept is a major factor in the problem of the truant and the dropout. Prescott Lecky, a pioneer in the area of relating self-consistency to school performance, points out that preserving one's perception of one's self intact is the prime motive in all behavior. Low academic achievement can be related to a student's conception of himself as being unable to learn academic material (Lecky, 1945). For example, in the 1960's, 7.5 million students dropped out of school before they had completed high school, many because of an attitude of "I can't, so why try?" Although this kind of an attitude begins early in life, the attitude does change as time progresses (Hamachek, 1971).

In a study done by Morse (1963) it was found that twelve percent of the third graders tested reacted negatively to a statement such as "I feel pretty sure of myself," whereas 34 percent of the eleventh-grade students tested reacted negatively. Further Morse found that

84 percent of the third graders tested were proud of their work whereas only 53 percent of the eleventh graders were proud of their work (Morse, 1963).

Thus, it can be seen that a negative attitude toward school, which tends to become greater as the years go by, would influence the student's desire to drop out of school. Sachs states that in nearly all studies done on the dropout there are two main factors in common:

1. Tenuous and inadequate relationships with adults, starting with parents and then with teachers;
2. failure in school.

Sachs states that a valuable experiment would be to split a group of students having the above characteristics and administering a remedy for them. He suggests that through a change of attitude by the parents and teachers and building a successful picture of the students' school work would bring about changes in the student (Sachs, 1966).

According to Schreiber dropouts seem to be "loners." They are much more dissatisfied with their social relationships in school than are the stay-ins. They frequently consider themselves poorly treated or unesteemed by teachers and other pupils. They often feel that the teacher is not interested in them or their problems. Too frequently they permit these perceptions to downgrade an already deflated self-image, contributing to a vicious cycle of further failure, nonparticipation, and social withdrawal.

The dropout tends to reject both school and self; he is usually insecure in his school status; he is more rejected than other students by his teachers due to academic inadequacy; he is usually hostile toward other persons; and he has not established adequate goals (Schreiber, 1969).

Cervantes, in his work with dropouts, concluded that the greater number of negative factors in a child's life, the greater the chances of his becoming a dropout and that a favorable attitude toward school could improve attendance behavior (Cervantes, 1969).

Sherif and Sherif found in a study that even though dropouts had left school they still had intentions of finishing school to meet peer group pressure (Sherif and Sherif, 1965). This would indicate that there is a need for the schools to continue to try and reach this population and should develop programs to do so.

#### Self Concept of the Delinquent

There is widespread support for the theory that delinquents have a poor self concept and that, in fact, it is a cause of delinquent behavior. The outstanding proponent of this theory is Walter C. Reckless who has completed much supporting research for this theory. Reckless believes that the self is a part of the total person which is most closely related to conformity with social and legal norms or to deviant alternatives and that the self consists of an accumulated set

of personalized images, perceptions, concepts, and projections (Reckless, 1967).

Reckless and his colleague, Simon Dinitz, attempted to find a self factor that might provide insight into the reasons why most boys in areas of high delinquency rates do not get involved in official delinquency. Toward this end, they made a comparative study of two groups of twelve-year-old white boys who lived in an area with a high rate of delinquency. It was predicted that the boys labeled "good" boys--the first group--would not get into trouble and the boys labeled "bad" boys--the second group--would. All the boys were given the same schedule; their mothers and teachers were interviewed and both groups were interviewed four years later.

It was found as suspected that the first group had already developed a favorable perception of self and were seen this way by their mothers and teachers.

In contrast to the first group, the boys in the second group, as suspected, when first interviewed, had already developed an unfavorable image of self and were also seen this way by their mothers and teachers.

Four years later 39 percent of these "bad" boys had been in Juvenile Court, an average of three times (at least once, and at most seven times) (Reckless, 1967).

In a study of self-perception by Rothstein using a sample of 483

non-delinquent and 166 delinquent, native born, white Protestant boys, three areas of self-perception were tested: images of interpersonal competence, images of authority figures, and images of high social status. In each of the three areas of perception, the differences between delinquent and non-delinquent youth were highly significant (Rothstein, 1961).

In another study of self factors Scarpitti found that there was a small but visible gradient in an unfavorable-favorable direction of self factors when he compared a sample of delinquents committed to a State Training School with groups of non-delinquent lower-class and middle-class ninth-grade boys. The delinquent boys, compared to the other two groups, made an unfavorable showing on the inventories assessing the learnings of the self; the lower-class boys made a slightly more favorable showing, and the middle-class boys made the best showing (Scarpitti, 1962).

John Kinch (1962) made an exploratory study with regard to how 36 delinquent boys perceived themselves. Thirty-six boys at a diagnostic center were the subjects for this research. The information in the case folder enabled him to distinguish three types of delinquent youth: (1) pro-social, (2) antisocial, and (3) asocial. The pro-social type viewed themselves in the most favorable way, the antisocial in a less favorable way, and the asocial in a poor way (Kinch, 1962).

Atchison (1958), using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale

(Counseling Form) found a number of predicted differences in self concept between delinquents and non-delinquents (Atchison, 1958).

A recent study conducted by Walker in 1967 on adult parolees in Oregon showed that most began their criminal careers at a very early age and information they supplied regarding school adjustment revealed low interest in school, truancy, and eventual dropping out of school. Of the 50 only eight completed high school and a total of 40 completed the eighth grade indicating that 32 had dropped out of school after completing their grade school education and prior to completing the twelfth grade. This illustrates that of the 50 persons who started school, only 16 percent completed the twelfth grade and 80 percent completed the eighth grade. Only one person continued his education and obtained a college degree. Twenty-five completed the tenth grade but there was a definite dropout rate the next year; only 13 completed the eleventh grade. Of the 13 that finished the eleventh grade five dropped out, leaving only eight to complete their high school education.

The following reasons were listed for dropping out which reveal some insight into their self concepts:

1. Lost interest in school.
2. Did not like school work.
3. Did not like the teacher.
4. Had to leave school to work.

5. Wanted to make money.
6. Left school to join service.
7. Little or no participation in extra-curricular activities.
8. Low school marks or grades (Walker, 1967).

The Gluecks in an investigation of 1000 boy delinquents who had been brought into the Boston Juvenile Court found that 85 percent of the offenders showed antisocial behavior in school and 64 percent had been truant. The average age of onset of their delinquent behavior was that of the fourth grade (Glueck, 1934).

In a more recent study the Gluecks compared 500 delinquent with 500 non-delinquent boys of similar backgrounds. The delinquents were found to be definitely more retarded academically than were the non-delinquents; they expressed violent dislike of school, resentment of its restriction, and lack of interest in school work. Their school attainment was far below that of the non-delinquents. Again, truancy was the first and most frequent act of delinquency (Glueck, 1950).

#### Self Concept Can Be Changed

The literature indicates that self concept is ever changing and that certain significant persons such as a teacher, peer, or parent influence this change. According to Combs (1959), it is probable that throughout the lifetime of the individual, change is constantly occurring in the self concept as he perceives the reactions of others to

himself. In a sense, this is like learning about self through a mirror. He differentiates aspects new to him concerning self in terms of the reactions of those about him as they respond to his behavior (Combs, 1959).

Gordon (1969), believes that although the family usually reinforces the culture's ideas, the school situation plays its part in modifying a child's self-esteem (Gordon, 1969).

Murphy feels that one's self concept is an ever changing media-- a media which dictates one's reactions to outside social pressures. Other authorities espouse the idea that self is the social and emotional structure within a human being and, like Murphy, suggest that the self concept is open to change by the varying stimuli throughout life (Murphy, 1947).

There seems to be a cyclical pattern in the development of the self concept. First it is based on the body, followed by the appraisals of significant others. These others are expanded in school to include teachers and peers. This suggests that self concept is not fixed, but undergoes modification probably throughout life. The question of "Who am I?" is a continuous, social-emotional one (Gordon, 1969).

In a study done by Lecky he observed that some children made the same number of errors on spelling tests no matter how difficult or how easy the material. Seemingly, a limit of achievement had been

built in these students and they could not, under any circumstances, surpass that limit. These students were sent to a counselor who helped them explore their feelings about spelling. Although none of the children were given any extra instruction in spelling, all of the students improved their spelling scores. Some students achieved higher grades than others, but all became better spellers. Obviously, the students' self concepts in the area of spelling were changed to the better (Lecky, 1945).

Brookover, in his study relating a student's ability to his self concept, realized that it would be of most importance to change one's self concept and thus, change his abilities (Brookover, 1967).

Keeping these studies in mind, it would appear that schools could favorably alter self concept through programs designed to do so by utilizing the factors the literature reveals are already known about concept of self. Namely, it changes throughout lifetime and significant people, including teachers, can influence the changes.

## CHAPTER III

## PROCEDURES

Theory

Favorable school attendance and absence of truant behavior is dependent upon favorable self concept. School programs that change self concept favorably can curb failure to attend school.

Hypotheses

1. High school students who have been identified as attendance problems will have a lower self concept than high school students who do not pose an attendance problem.
2. Rescheduling into the elective vocational program at the George Emory School District Skill Center will measurably improve the self concept of the high school student who poses an attendance problem.
3. The gain in self concept after a semester in the George Emory School District Skill Center will be larger for the student who is an attendance problem than for the student who is not an attendance problem.

### Null Hypotheses

1. There will not be a significant difference between the self concept scores of the student who poses an attendance problem and the student who does not pose an attendance problem as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.
2. Self concept of attendance problem students will not change significantly after being in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester.
3. After having been in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester there will be no significant difference between the gain scores of the attendance and non-attendance problem student.

### Population and Design

One hundred and sixteen (116) male and female students were selected from the total 1970-71 school year sophomore class at George Emory High School during the month of May 1971 in the following manner:

At George Emory High School, sophomores may elect to be scheduled into a program of Vocational Skill Training to commence at the beginning of their junior year. Several hundred in this particular class elected scheduling into this program. The attendance

records of all these students were examined during the spring of 1971. It was learned that 58 of these students had ten unexcused absences from school in a four-week period during the 1970-71 school year. As previously noted, a child is considered an attendance problem; i. e., truant, by law when he or she has eight unexcused absences in any four-week period of an academic year. These 58 students were used to make up the Truant (T) group.

Fifty-eight (58) students who were not truants (NT) were selected from the same population for the study in the following manner:

The students were chosen from the remainder of the sophomore class who were not attendance problems; i. e., truant, electing to participate in the Vocational Skill Training program by the use of a random numbers table from Statistics with Application to the Biological and Health Services by Richard D. Remington and M. Anthony Schork. First, all students were numbered consecutively as they appeared on the class list. It was then decided that the third digit of the number chosen by indiscriminately pointing at a number while not looking at the book would begin the selection--the twenty-fifth (25th) line and the eighteenth (18th) number from the left was chosen.

The second page of the table was chosen in a like manner, moving directly across the page to the right and then down to the next line to the left and so on, as if reading a book. The numbers were

grouped consecutively in groups of three as a guide for the sample.

On preregistration day, September 1, 1971, all of the (T) and (NT) students' files were red-flagged and the students were requested to appear at the school at 8:00 a.m. on September 13, 1971, for the pretest. September 13, 1971, was the first day of the 1971-72 school year; prior to any of the students ever having experienced Vocational Skill Training, both groups were administered the pretest. They were advised that the purpose of the test was to learn more about the scheduling process and their help and assistance was requested. The pretest was given to a total group of 99 (the balance of the 116 had moved or were unable to take the test). The test was administered in the same room at the same time of day with four monitors (all counselors) to assist in instruction and proper use of the instrument. After testing the students reported to the Vocational Skill Training program.

The post-test was given to the group at the same time of day, in the same room with the same monitors on December 16, 1971, at the end of fall semester, but prior to Christmas vacation and final examinations for the fall semester. Seventy-one (71) students appeared for the post-test; the balance of the 97 had moved or were unable to take the test for a variety of reasons including illness, absence from school, and suspension from school.

### Instrument

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was developed by William H. Fitts who began the developmental work of this scale with the Tennessee Department of Mental Health in 1955. The original purpose was to develop a research instrument that might contribute to the difficult criterion problem in mental health research. It has since proved useful for many other purposes.

In the original development of the scale, the first step was to compile a large pool of self-descriptive items. The original pool of items was derived from a number of other self concept measures including those developed by Balester (1956) and Taylor (1953). Items were derived also from written self-descriptions of patients and non-patients. After considerable study, a phenomenological system was developed for classifying items on the basis of what they themselves were saying.

After the items were edited, seven clinical psychologists were employed as judges to classify the items. They also judged each item as to its positive or negative content. The final 90 items utilized in the scale are those items where there was perfect agreement by the judges. The scale has two forms: the counseling form and the clinical and research form (Fitts, 1965). The counseling form was selected as more appropriate for this study.

### Norms

The standardization group from which the norms were developed was a broad sample of 626 people. The sample included people from various parts of the country, and age ranges from 12 to 68. There were approximately equal numbers of both sexes, both Negro and white subjects, representatives of all social, economic, and intellectual levels and educational levels from sixth grade through the Ph. D. degree. Subjects were obtained from high school and college classes, employers at state institutions and various other sources.

Data collected by Sundby (1962) with high school students, by Gividen (1959) with army recruits, by Hall (1964) with teachers, and by Fitts with Negro nursing students show group means and variances which are comparable to those of the norm group. The evidence suggests that there is no need to establish separate norms by age, sex, race, or other variables. However, the norm group does not reflect the population as a whole proportion to its national composition. The norms are overrepresented in number of college students, white subjects, and persons in the 12 to 30 year age bracket (Fitts, 1965).

## Validity

Validation procedures were performed on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale in four areas: (I) content validity, (II) discrimination between groups, (III) correlation with other personality measures, and (IV) personality changes under particular conditions.

### I. Content Validity

To insure that the classification system used for the Row Scores and Column Scores was dependable, analysis was completed by 7 clinical psychologists. An item was retained in the scale only if there was unanimous agreement by the judges that it was classified correctly as positive or negative in content. Thus, it may be assumed that the categories used in the scale are logically meaningful and publicly communicable.

### II. Discrimination Between Groups

Personality theory and research suggest that groups which differ on certain psychological dimensions should differ also in self concept. For example, we should expect differences between psychiatric patients and non-patients; between delinquents and non-delinquents; between the average person and a psychologically integrated person. To determine how the scale differentiates such groups, the following procedure was used:

A. Discrimination on the Basis of Psychological Status

Statistical analyses were performed in which a large group (369) of psychiatric patients were compared with the 626 non-patients of the norm group. This demonstrated highly significant (mostly at the .0001 level) differences between patients and non-patients for almost every score that is utilized on this scale. The few scores that do not differentiate these two broad groups (SC, Col. Total V, D, and the number of "1" responses) do discriminate between more specific diagnostic categories within the patient group. In addition to these data other studies (Condon, 1958; Piety, 1958; Havener, 1961; and Wayne, 1963) demonstrated similar patient vs. non-patient differences.

Fitts also collected data from the other extreme of the psychological health continuum--from people characterized as high in personality integration. The basic hypothesis was that this group (the PI group previously described) would differ from the norm group in a direction opposite from that of the patient group. This hypothesis was substantiated for virtually all scores.

B. Other Evidence Regarding Discrimination between Groups

Self theory indicates that there would be predictable self concept differences in groups whose behavior is different. A number of studies have been completed, or are still underway, which study the relationship between self concept and behavior. Atchison (1958), using the counseling form of the scale, found a number of predicted differences between delinquents and non-delinquents. All variables except SC and D were significantly different in the predicted direction. The delinquents had lower P scores and higher V scores. A study by Lefebvre (1964) found significant differences between juvenile first offenders and repeated offenders. These groups in turn were different from a control group. The differences were in expected directions. The highest spike in the offenders' profiles was on the Personality Disorder Scale, as one would predict.

In a recent study of unwed mothers, Boston and Kew (1964) found predicted differences on virtually every variable of the scale. Gividen (1959) found a number of scores which differentiated soldiers who could weather the stresses of paratrooper training from those who could not. Wells and Bueno (1957) found that a group of

alcoholics had significantly low P scores, high V scores, and more extreme D scores.

Piety (1958) found that total P discriminated patients from non-patients at the .005 level. In a later, more extensive analysis of Piety's data the author was able to make a blind patient-non-patient classification of these data with 72 percent accuracy (P less than .001).

### III. Correlations with Other Measures

The scale was correlated with all profile variable scores on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory based on tests from 102 psychiatric patients (McGee, 1960) which reveals that most of the scores of the scale correlate with MMPI scores in ways one would expect from the nature of the scores.

It was also correlated with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Data collected by Sundby (1962) based on 66 students from three different high schools indicated clear non-linear relationships between scores on the two tests.

### IV. Personality Changes under Particular Conditions

It is logical to expect that certain life experiences would have consequences for the way in which a person sees himself. Psychotherapy or other positive experiences would be expected to result in enhancement of the self concept, while stress or failure would be expected to result in lowered self esteem.

Studies of this kind are reported:

Gividen (1959) sought to evaluate the effects of stress and failure on the self concepts of army paratroop trainees. These trainees were subjected not only to physical dangers but to attitude training in which failure was considered a disgrace. The Pass group and Fail group both showed significant score decreases. The Fail group showed significantly greater decrease in Column A (Physical Self) and significantly greater increase in the T/F ratio. Both groups showed less certainty in self description as evidenced by lower D scores.

In an unpublished study of group therapy with six female patients the author used the scale in predicting changes through therapy. The scale and other tests were administered to each patient before therapy. From the pretest data a number of individual predictions were made with respect to scale changes which should take place. A total of 88 predictions were made. The scale was subsequently readministered after five to eight months. Of the 88 predictions, 60 were correct (P less than .001).

A recent study by Ashcraft and Fitts (1964) is the most thorough work yet completed with the scale on changes through psychotherapy. The design included an experimental group consisting of 30 patients who had been in therapy for an average

of six months and a no-therapy control group of 24 patients who had been waiting for therapy for an average of 6.7 months. All subjects were measured on a test-retest basis with the scale. The therapy group changed significantly and in the expected direction on 18 of the 22 variables studied while the control group changed in 2 variables.

In addition to group predictions, more detailed individual predictions were made. It was predicted that a total of 1110 score changes would occur. Of this total, 765 were correctly predicted. When individual predictions were considered by subjects, a significant proportion of changes was predicted for 25 of the 30 subjects. Of the remaining 5 subjects, 4 were judged independently by their therapists not to have improved in therapy.

In another study, Congdon (1958) sought to evaluate the effects of a tranquilizing drug on the self concept. The patients in this study showed symptomatic and behavioral improvements but no significant change in self concept (though only the Total P and SC scores were used) (Fitts, 1965).

### Nature and Meaning of Scores

#### A. The Self Criticism Score (SC)

This scale is composed of ten (10) items. These are all

mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them. Individuals who deny most of these statements most often are being defensive and making a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of themselves. High scores generally indicate a normal healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism. Extremely high scores (above the 99 percentile) indicate that the individual may be lacking in defenses and may in fact be pathologically undefended. Low scores indicate defensiveness, and suggest that the positive scores are probably artificially elevated by this defensiveness.

B. The Positive Scores (P)

These scores derive directly from the phenomenological classification scheme already mentioned. In the original analysis of the item pool, the statements seemed to be conveying three primary messages: (1) this is what I am, (2) this is how I feel about myself, and (3) this is what I do. On the basis of these three types of statements the three horizontal categories are formed. They appear on the score sheet as Row 1, Row 2, and Row 3, and are hereafter referred to by those labels. The Row Scores thus comprise three sub-scores which, when added, constitute the Total Positive or Total P score. These scores

represent an internal frame of reference within which the individual is describing himself.

Further study of the original items indicated that they also vary considerably in terms of a more external frame of reference. Even within the same row category, the statements may vary widely in content. For example, with Row 1 (the What I am category), the statements refer to what I am physically, morally, socially, etc. Therefore, the pool of these items were sorted again according to these new vertical categories which are the five column scores on the score sheet. Thus, the whole set of items is divided two ways, vertically into columns (external frame of reference and horizontally into rows (internal frame of reference) with each item and each cell contributing to two different scores.

1. Total P Score. This is the most important single score on the Counseling Form. It reflects the overall level of self-esteem. 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,

and unhappy; and have little faith or confidence in themselves.

If the Self Criticism (SC) score is low, high P scores become suspect and are probably the result of defensive distortion. Extremely high scores (generally above the 99 percentile) are deviant and are usually found only in such disturbed people as paranoid schizophrenics who as a group show many extreme scores, both high and low.

On the counseling form, the Positive scores are simply designated as P scores.

2. Row 1 P Score--Identity. These are the "what I am" items. Here the individual is describing his basic identity-- what he is as he sees himself.
3. Row 2 P Score--Self-Satisfaction. This score comes from those items where the individual describes how he feels about the self he perceives. In general, this score reflects the level of self-satisfaction or self-acceptance. An individual may have very high scores on Row 1 and Row 3, yet still

score low on Row 2 because of very high standards and expectations for himself. Or vice versa, he may have a low opinion of himself as indicated by the Row 1 and Row 3 scores yet still have a high Self-Satisfaction Score on Row 2. The sub-scores are therefore best interpreted in comparison with each other and with the Total P Score.

4. Row 3 P Score--Behavior. This score comes from those items that say "this is what I do" or "this is the way I act." Thus, this score measures the individual's perception of his own behavior or the way he functions.
5. Column A--Physical Self. Here the individual is presenting his view of his body, his state of health, his physical appearance, skills, and sexuality.
6. Column B--Moral-Ethical Self. This score describes the self from a moral-ethical frame of reference; i. e., moral worth, relationship to God, feelings of being a "good" or "bad" person, and satisfaction with one's religion or lack of it.
7. Column C--Personal Self. This score reflects the individual's sense of personal worth, his feeling of adequacy as a person and his evaluation of his

personality apart from his body or his relationships to others.

8. Column D--Family Self. This score reflects one's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member. It refers to the individual's perception of self in reference to his closest and most immediate circle of associates.
9. Column E--Social Self. This is another "self as perceived in relation to others" category but pertains to "others" in a more general way. It reflects the person's sense of adequacy and worth in his social interaction with other people in general.

C. The Variability Scores (V)

The V scores provide a simple measure of the amount of variability, or inconsistency, from one area of self-perception to another. High scores mean that the subject is quite variable in this respect while low scores indicate low variability which may even approach rigidity if extremely low (below the first percentile).

1. Total V. This represents the total amount of variability for the entire record. High scores mean that the person's self concept is so variable from one area to another as to reflect little unity or

integration. High scoring persons tend to compartmentalize certain areas of self and view these areas quite apart from the remainder of self. Well integrated people generally score below the mean on these scores but above the first percentile.

2. Column Total V. This score measures and summarizes the variations within the columns.
3. Row Total V. This score is the sum of the variations across the rows.

D. The Distribution Score (D)

This score is a summary score of the way one distributes his answers across the five available choices in responding to the items of the scale. It is also interpreted as a measure of still another aspect of self-perception, certainly about the way one sees himself. High scores indicate that the subject is very definite and certain in what he says about himself while low scores mean just the opposite. Low scores are found also at times with people who are being defensive and guarded. They hedge and avoid really committing themselves by employing "3" responses on the answer sheet.

Extreme scores on this variable are undesirable in either direction and are most often obtained from disturbed

people. For example, schizophrenic patients often use "5" and "1" answers exclusively, thus creating very high D scores. Other disturbed patients are extremely uncertain and noncommittal in their self-descriptions with a predominance of "2," "3," and "4" responses and very low D scores (Fitts, 1965).

### Statistical Procedures

The Tennessee Self Concept Test gives each student four separate scores as follows:

- A. Self-Criticism Score
  - B. Positive Score
  - C. Variability Score
  - D. Distribution Score
1. Test for a significant difference between scores of attendance problem (T) students vs. non-attendance problem (NT) students. A separate unpaired 2 tailed t test will be performed on each test score, A-D.

Notation:  $x_{ijk}$  = score of student on test  
 $\bar{x}_{ij}$  = average of score in particular category

where

$$i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if attendance problem student} \\ 1 & \text{if not attendance problem student} \end{cases}$$

$$j = \begin{cases} \text{A} & \text{Self-Criticism Score} \\ \text{B} & \text{Positive Score} \\ \text{C} & \text{Variability Score} \\ \text{D} & \text{Distribution Score} \end{cases}$$

$k =$  Sequence number of the observations within this category

The four hypotheses will be:

A.  $H_{01}: \mu_{0A} = \mu_{1A}$

$$H_{11}: \mu_{0A} \neq \mu_{1A}$$

B.  $H_{02}: \mu_{0B} = \mu_{1B}$

$$H_{12}: \mu_{0B} \neq \mu_{1B}$$

C.  $H_{03}: \mu_{0C} = \mu_{1C}$

$$H_{13}: \mu_{0C} \neq \mu_{1C}$$

D.  $H_{04}: \mu_{0D} = \mu_{1D}$

$$H_{14}: \mu_{0D} \neq \mu_{1D}$$

Test Procedure (Same in all four hypotheses)

Example: For testing

$$H_{01}: \mu_{0A} = \mu_{1A}$$

$$H_{11}: \mu_{0A} \neq \mu_{1A}$$

Calculate:  $\bar{x}_{0A}$  = average score of T children

$\bar{x}_{1A}$  = average score of NT children

$S_p^2$  = estimator of pooled variance

$$S_D = S_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_0} + \frac{1}{n_1}}$$

Test Statistic

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_{0A} - \bar{X}_{1A}}{S_D}$$

Compare the calculated  $t$  and the critical  $t_{.025}$  with

$(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$  d. f. if

$$(1) \quad |t| > t_{.025}(n_1 + n_2 - 2) \text{ reject } H_{01}$$

$$(2) \quad |t| \leq t_{.025}(n_1 + n_2 - 2) \text{ do not reject } H_{01}$$

2. Test for a significant gain in the mean scores of (T) students, pretest vs. post test. Perform a separate paired 2 tailed  $t$  test on each test score A-D.

A.  $H_{10}: \mu_{Ad} = 0$

$H_{11}: \mu_{Ad} \neq 0$

B.  $H_{20}: \mu_{Bd} = 0$

$H_{21}: \mu_{Bd} \neq 0$

C.  $H_{30}: \mu_{Cd} = 0$

$H_{31}: \mu_{Cd} \neq 0$

D.  $H_{40}: \mu_{Dd} = 0$

$H_{41}: \mu_{Dd} \neq 0$

Test Procedure:

Example (T Students):

$H_{10}: \mu_{Ad} = 0$

$H_{11}: \mu_{Ad} \neq 0$

Notation: Let  $x_{ij}$  = score of  $i^{\text{th}}$  individual on  $j$  test. Where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,  $N$  = total # of attendance problem (T) students.

$$j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if Pretest Score} \\ 2 & \text{if Post Test Score} \end{cases}$$

Calculate:  $d_i = x_{i2} - x_{i1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

$$\bar{d} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d_i$$

$$S_d^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (d_i - \bar{d})^2$$

Test Statistics:

$$t = \frac{\bar{d}}{S_d / \sqrt{N}}$$

Compare the calculated  $t$  and the critical  $t_{.025(N-1)}$  d. f. if

$$(1) \quad |t| > t_{.025(N-1)} \text{ reject } H_{01}$$

$$(2) \quad |t| \leq t_{.025(N-1)} \text{ do not reject } H_{01}$$

3. Test for significantly larger gain in mean scores A-D for (T) group vs. gain in scores A-D (NT) group.
  - a. Repeat procedure number 2 for (NT) group, to obtain mean gain scores A-D and perform separate paired 2 tailed  $t$  tests on each mean test score A D, pretest to post test.

- b. Test for a significant difference between the mean gain scores of the (T) group vs. mean gain scores of (NT) group. Perform a separate unpaired two tailed t test on each gain test score A-D. (Repeat procedure 1 using mean gain scores A-D)

Test Procedure:

Example: For Testing:

$$H_{01}: \mu_{0A} = \mu_{1A}$$

$$H_{11}: \mu_{0A} \neq \mu_{1A}$$

Calculate:  $\bar{x}_{0A}$  = Average gain scores A-D of (T) Group

$\bar{x}_{1A}$  = Average gain scores A-D of (NT) Group

$S_p^2$  = Estimator of Pooled Variance

$$S_D = S_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_0} + \frac{1}{n_1}}$$

Test Statistic: 
$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_{0A} - \bar{x}_{1A}}{S_D}$$

Compare the calculated t and the critical  $t_{.025}(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$

d. f. if

(1)  $|t| > t_{.025}(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$  reject  $H_{01}$

(2)  $|t| \leq t_{.025}(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$  do not reject  $H_{01}$

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to seek evidence which might lead to development in the school of more effective ways to deal with the problem of failure to attend school. If self concept is a significant factor in behavior and, if in fact, can determine behavior then it is a factor worthy of consideration in dealing with the problem of failure to attend school. This study (1) measured for differences between self concept of certain high school students who have been attendance problems and certain students who have not been attendance problems; all had previously elected to participate in a vocational skill training program; (2) allowed them to participate in the elective vocational skill training program; and (3) measured the effect of this treatment on self concept of each group of students (T) and (NT) then compared the gain in self concept between both the (T) and (NT) groups.

The following Null Hypotheses were tested:

1. There will not be a significant difference between the self concept scores of the students who pose an attendance problem and the students who do not pose an attendance problem as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

2. Self concept of attendance problem students will not change significantly after being in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester.
3. After having been in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester, there will be no significant difference between the gain scores of the attendance and non-attendance problem student.

### Hypothesis I

Ninety-nine (99) students of the total 116 were pretested. Forty-five (45) were of the (T) group and fifty-four (54) were of the (NT) group. Ninety-seven (97) of the 99 tests administered were scored; 44 (T) and 53 (NT). Two (2) were incomplete and had to be discarded.

Analysis of the test scores was accomplished by use of two tailed unpaired t tests on the yields of the four score areas of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: (A) The Self Criticism Score (SC); (B) The Positive Score (P); (C) The Variability Score (V); and (D) The Distribution Score (D); (T) group vs. (NT) group. For a detailed explanation of these four score areas, see pages 45-52. The results of the two tailed unpaired t test are tabulated in Table 1.

Table 1. Pretest Scores (T) Group vs. (NT) Group

	(T) Mean	(NT) Mean	Pooled Variance	T Value
(A) Self Criticism Score	35.47	34.62	42.49	-0.64
(B) Positive Score	314.22	318.30	1132.55	.59
(C) Variability Score	51.27	50.79	165.34	-0.18
(D) Distribution Score	106.06	102.71	610.69	-0.66

There was no significant difference found at the .05 significance level on any of the four score areas A-D, (T) group vs. (NT) group. The writer was unable to reject Null Hypothesis I since the data do not contradict it.

While the writer was unable to reject Null Hypothesis I at the statistical .05 significance level, there are several interesting aspects of the pretest data that merit discussion. In examination of the mean pretest score areas A-D, it was noted that while there were 9 less individuals in the (T) group than the (NT) group, the (T) group had higher or larger mean scores in 3 out of 4 Tennessee Self Concept Scale score areas, see Table 1. Those 3 areas were: (A) The Self Criticism Score area where the higher scores are to be viewed as favorable for the (T) group since the higher scores in this area generally indicate a normal, healthy openness and a capacity for self criticism; (C) The Variability Score area where high scores mean that the subject is quite variable or shows more inconsistency, a less

favorable score area for the (T) group; and (D) The Distribution Score area where the higher scores indicate that the subject is very definite and certain in what he says about himself. This may also be viewed as a favorable score area for the (T) group.

The (T) group had a lower mean score than the (NT) group in the (B), The Positive Score area. The (T) groups lower mean score must be viewed unfavorably in this score area which conveys 3 primary messages: (1) This is what I am; (2) This is how I feel about myself; and (3) This is what I do. High scores in the positive score area tends to mean that the subjects like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. For further discussion of these 4 areas, see pages 45-52.

On the basis of these observations, the data in Table 1 seem to imply that the (T) group mean self concept scores were lower than the (NT) group in two of the four score areas of the instrument, (B) Positive Score and (C) Variability, and higher in the other two, (A) Self Criticism and (D) Distribution.

### Hypothesis II

At the end of the 1971 fall semester, but prior to Christmas vacation, seventy-one (71) students were post tested; thirty (30) were of the (T) group and forty-one (41) were of the (NT) group. Analysis

of the test scores to determine if the treatment had positively effected the (T) group at the .05 significance level was accomplished by use of two tailed paired t tests on the yields of the four score areas of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to be reflected as a positive or negative gain in these four score areas A-D. From the pretest to post test, a positive gain was regarded as an increase and a negative gain as a decrease. See Appendices A and B for individual positive and negative gain scores. The results of the two tailed paired t tests, pretest to post test, (T) group, are tabulated in Table 2.

Table 2. Pretest vs. Post Test Gains for (T) Student

		Mean		Standard Deviation		T Value
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
(A)	Self Criticism Score	35.50	35.73	6.43	5.53	-0.24
(B)	Positive Score	315.66	323.23	36.56	35.91	-1.59
(C)	Variability Score	49.16	46.60	11.84	13.95	.94
(D)	Distribution Score	105.70	105.16	25.81	31.13	.11

The writer was unable to reject Null Hypothesis II since the data do not contradict it.

While the writer was unable to reject Null Hypothesis II at the statistical .05 significance level, comparison of pre and post test mean scores for the (T) group students are interesting. In

examination of the data (see Table 2) it should be noted that the (T) group did, in fact, have a favorable mean gain in 3 score areas after treatment; (A) The Self Criticism Score, where the slight increase is favorable; (B) The Positive Score, where the increase is favorable; and (C) The Variability Score, where a decrease is favorable.

The (T) group had an unfavorable mean gain in the fourth score area (D), The Distribution Score, where there was a slight decrease on the post test, indicating less certainty about one says about one-self.

In observing standard deviation in the four score areas (see Table 2), pretest to post test, the (T) group seems to have a favorable change in 2 score areas (A) and (B) where there is smaller standard deviation on the post test than pretest. There seems to be an unfavorable change in the other two score areas (C) and (D) with larger amount of standard deviation on the post test.

### Hypothesis III

3a. In order to determine if there was a larger gain after treatment for the (T) group than for the (NT) group, it was necessary to also obtain the individual gain scores (see Appendices A and B) and the mean gain, positive or negative, in score areas A-D, pretest to post test, for the (NT) group.

The same procedures used in testing hypothesis 2 for the (T) group were performed on the (NT) group, with use of two tailed paired t tests. It should be noted that in so doing, a significant positive gain was found at the .05 significance level in the (D) score area when compared with the two tailed table t value. (See Table 3.) The (D) score area is the distribution score and measures that aspect of self perception regarding certainty about the way one sees himself. See page 51 for a detailed description.

Table 3. Pretest vs. Post test Gains for (NT) Group.

	Mean		Standard Deviation		T Value
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
(A) Self Criticism Score	34.75	34.92	6.69	7.02	-0.24
(B) Positive Score	323.78	330.58	25.74	31.24	-1.62
(C) Variability Score	51.04	49.51	13.68	13.65	.81
(D) Distribution Score	103.21	109.12	23.26	26.00	*-2.40

\*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

3b. Analysis of the gain in test scores was accomplished by comparing mean pretest vs. mean post test scores A-D, (T) group gain vs. (NT) group gain. The gain was tested by use of two tailed unpaired t tests on the gain yields in the four score areas of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The results of the two tailed unpaired t tests are tabulated in Table 4.

Table 4. Gain Scores (T) vs. (NT)

	(T) Mean	(NT) Mean	Pooled Variance	T Value
(A) Self Criticism Score	.23	.17	23.43	.05
(B) Positive Score	7.56	6.80	701.93	.11
(C) Variability Score	-2.56	-1.53	178.13	-0.32
(D) Distribution Score	-0.50	5.90	413.08	-1.31

There was no significant difference in gain scores (T) vs. (NT) found at the statistical .05 significance level on any of the 4 score areas A-D. The writer was unable to reject Null Hypothesis III since the data do not contradict it.

The writer was unable to reject Null Hypothesis III at the statistical .05 significance level. Examination of this data does reveal several aspects of the data that merit discussion. In comparison of the pre and post test mean score areas for the (NT) group, it should be noted that the (NT) mean group scores after treatment (see Table 3) favorably improved in all 4 score areas with a positive mean gain in scores A, B, and D, (mean score area D at the statistical .05 significance level as previously noted) and a loss in mean gain in (C), Variability, which may also be viewed favorably. In fact, all mean changes after treatment for the (NT) group reveal a trend toward a favorable increase in the four self concept score areas.

In observing standard deviation in the four score areas (see Table 3), pretest to post test, the (NT) group seems to have a slight favorable change in one area, the (C) area, (Smaller Standard Deviation figure) with an unfavorable change in the other 3 areas, (A), (B), and (D).

In comparison of the gain scores after treatment (see Table 4), (T) group vs. (NT) group, it should be noted that even though there were 11 less individuals in the (T) group than the (NT) group, the (T) group gains in 3 of the 4 score areas were larger than the (NT) group. These score areas were (A) Self Criticism, (B) Positive Score, and (C) Variability (higher negative scores show less variability). In the fourth area, (D) The Distribution Score, there was larger gain for the (NT) group as previously noted at the .05 statistical significance level.

## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Juvenile courts are now unable to deal with failure to attend school, i. e., truancy, in their traditional manner due to recent Supreme Court decisions. This situation is causing increasing concern to the secondary school since the school is expected to find effective ways of dealing with students who are attendance problems other than referral to the Juvenile Court.

Presently, there is great emphasis being placed upon vocational skill training programs as an answer to the student who is not college bound or particularly interested in or benefiting from the normal academic secondary school program. Vocational skill programs have been offered as a possible solution to the problem of failure to attend school, i. e., truancy.

Concept of self has long been considered a factor worthy of consideration in evaluating general overall behavior and particularly school achievement and school adjustment as well as school dropout and delinquent behavior. It is known that significant persons and certain experiences in life can modify self concept.

It was the purpose of this study to select from a large group of

secondary students who elected to participate in a vocational skill program partially in lieu of the usual academic program, a group of students who had demonstrated truant behavior and a group of students who had not demonstrated truant behavior. To (1) measure at the statistical .05 significance level differences if any in self concept of the truant and non-truant as revealed by a pretest using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale; (2) allow treatment of the elective vocational skill training program for both groups and measure at the .05 statistical significance level positive change in self concept of the truant as revealed by mean score gains pretest to post test using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale at the end of a semester of treatment; (3) measure at the .05 statistical significance level for larger positive gain for the (T) group by comparing the positive or negative gain in self concept in score areas A-D after treatment between the truant and non-truant group. It was hypothesized that:

1. High school students who have been identified as attendance problems will have a lower self concept than high school students who do not pose an attendance problem.
2. Rescheduling into the elective vocational program at the George Emory School District Skill Center will measureably improve the self concept of the high school student who poses an attendance problem.
3. The gain in self concept after a semester in the George Emory

School District Skill Center will be larger for the student who is an attendance problem than for the student who is not an attendance problem.

versus the test or null hypotheses that:

1. There will not be a significant difference between the self concept scores of the student who poses an attendance problem and the student who does not pose an attendance problem as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.
2. Self concept of attendance problem students will not change significantly after being in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester.
3. After having been in the George Emory School District Skill Center for one semester, there will be no significant difference between the gain scores of the attendance and non-attendance problem student.

### Conclusions

The following three conclusions may be drawn from this study:

1. There is no difference at the .05 statistical significance level in self concept between truant and non-truant populations studied as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale score areas. The means of the four self concept score areas of the instrument seem to imply that the truant population had a lower self concept

- in two of the four score areas than the non-truant population.
2. Rescheduling into the elective vocational skill program used in this study did not improve self concept in any of the four score areas at the .05 statistical level of significance for the truant group. The means in three of the four score areas did reveal a trend toward improvement after treatment and there was a favorable change in standard deviation in two of the four score areas.
  3. There was no increase at the .05 statistical level of significance in the positive gain scores for the truant population when compared to the non-truant population after treatment as measured by the four self concept score areas of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The non-truant group population means in the four score areas revealed a trend toward improvement in self concept in all four score areas of the instrument after treatment. One area, (D), at the .05 statistical level of significance. There was a favorable change in standard deviation for the non-truant group after treatment in one score area of the four.

The truant population gain means in the four self concept score areas revealed a trend toward larger gain in 3 of the 4 score areas than the non-truant population after treatment.

On the basis of these conclusions, it is possible but not supported by statistical testing at the .05 level of significance that the

truant population has a lower self concept in some areas than the non-truant population, that vocational skill programs may favorably improve some areas of self concept of truant students and that truant student self concept gains in certain areas may be greater in the vocational skill training program than the non-truant.

### Suggestions for Further Reserach

Further research is needed which would provide long term follow up of truant students to determine the effects of favorable or unfavorable change of Self Concept on truant behavior and behavior in general. Lack of follow up is a shortcoming of this study as well as much other research dealing with self concept. Research is also needed to compare self concept of truants with other categories of the total student population; specifically, the model student, the college bound, the delinquent, and various other student classifications.

Differences in teaching methods and philosophies are areas that also need investigation. Differences in degree of influence by various teacher and counselor personality characteristics, with respect to their impact on the total school population should be explored. For example it would be of interest to evaluate certain teacher and counselor personality types and approaches in terms of their values, their own self concept, and other criteria, especially those for which standardized instruments are available. This effort

could reveal aspects of the influence these different approaches and personality characteristics have on the self concept of students.

Research is also indicated to evaluate the affect and relationship between traditional as well as new special school programs on self concept of the total school population. The importance of outside school influences particularly parents and other significant persons on self concept is an area that also merits attention.

Finally there are numerous previous self concept studies that are worthy of replication with standardized measuring instruments.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, A. 1924. *Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology*.  
Tr. by P. Radin. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World,  
Inc., p. 228, 229.
- Allport, G. W. 1955. *Becoming*. New Haven, Yale University  
Press, p. 104-105.
- Atchison, Calvin. 1956. *A Comparative Study of the Self Concept of  
Behavior Problem and Non Behavior Problem High School Boys*.  
Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis. Vanderbilt University.
- Ausubel, David P. 1958. *Theory and Problems of Child Develop-  
ment*. New York, Grune and Stratton, p. 273-274.
- Borislow, Bernard. 1962. *Self-Evaluation and Academic Achieve-  
ment*. In: *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 9, p. 246-  
254.
- Brookover, W. B.; E. L. Erickson; L. M. Joiner. 1967. *Self-  
Concept of Ability and School Achievement*. In: *Final Report  
of Cooperative Research Project #1636*. Michigan State Uni-  
versity.
- Brookover, W. B.; S. Thomas; and A. Patterson. 1964. *Self-  
Concept of Ability and Academic Achievement*. In: *Sociology  
of Education*, Vol. 37, p. 271-278.
- Campbell, Paul B. 1966. *Self-Concept and Academic Achievement  
in Middle Grade Public School Children*. In: *Dissertation  
Abstracts*, Vol. 27, p. 1535-1536.
- Cervantes, Lucius. 1969. *The Dropout: Causes and Cures*. Ann  
Arbor, University of Michigan Press, p. 194.
- Combs, Arthur W. and Donald Snygg. 1959. *Individual Behavior*.  
New York, Harper and Brothers, p. 126-164.
- Combs, Charles F. 1964. *Self-Perception and Scholastic Under-  
achievement in the Academically Capable*. In: *The Personnel  
and Guidance Journal*, Vol. 42, p. 201-403.

- Compulsory School Attendance in Foreign Countries. Compulsory School Attendance. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1914. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1914, No. 2, p. 78-79.
- Cooley, C. H. 1902. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, p. 20-21.
- East, Allan. 1943. Problems of School Attendance Regulation in Portland, Oregon and in the State at Large. Attempted Control of Truancy and Non-Attendance During the Period 1843-1939, p. 4.
- Fink, Martin B. 1962. Self-Concept as it Relates to Academic Achievement. In: California Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 13, p. 56-62.
- Fitts, William H. 1965. Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Manual). Nashville, Tennessee, Counselor Recordings and Tests, 31 p.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. 1934. One-Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, p. 167.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. 1950. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York, The Commonwealth Fund, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, p. 164.
- Gordon, Ira. 1969. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th Ed., p. 1024.
- Hamachek, Don E. 1971. Encounters with the Self. New York, Hold, Rinehart and Winston, p. 6, 174, 177, 192, 194.
- Hamachek, Don E. 1965. The Self in Growth, Teaching and Learning. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., p. 575.
- Hamachek, Don E. and J. Conley. 1968. An Exploratory Study of Students' Perceptions of School, Teachers' Skills, Self, and Student-Teacher Relations in Grades Six Through Twelve. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, Chicago.
- Hart, F. W. 1934. Teachers and Teaching. New York, The MacMillan Company, p. 131-132, 250-251.

- Jersild, Arthur T. 1940. Characteristics of Teachers who are "Liked Best" and "Disliked Most." In: Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 9, p. 139-151.
- Kinch, John W. 1962. "Self-Conceptions of Types of Delinquents." Sociological Inquiry, 32 (Spring 1962), p. 228-234.
- Lecky, P. 1945. Self-Consistency: A Theory of Personality. New York Island Press, p. 21.
- Matter of Gault. 387 U. S. 1; 87 S. ct. 1428 (1967).
- Matter of Winship. 90 S. ct. 1068 (1970).
- Mead, G. H. 1934. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, p. 178, 140, 227.
- Mead, G. H. 1964. On Social Psychology. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, p. 204-235.
- Morris, Charles V. 1960. Worldwide Concern with Crime. In: Federal Probation, Vol. 24, p. 21-30.
- Morse, William C. 1963. Self Concept Data in the University School Project. In: The University of Michigan School of Education Bulletin, Vol. 34, p. 49-52.
- Murphy, Gardner. 1947. Personality: A Biosocial Approach. Harper, p. 493, 504-522, 525.
- Nash, Ralph J. 1964. A Study of Particular Self Perceptions as Related to High School Age Pupils in a Middle Class Community. In: Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 14, p. 3837-3838.
- National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. 1967. The Gault Decision. In: Juvenile Court Digest. Vol. 1, p. 1-6.
- Oregon Advance Sheets. 1969. Vol. 88, p. 351.
- Oregon Revised Statute. 1969. Sections 339, 339.065, 419.476, 419.509.
- Reckless, Walter C. 1967. The Crime Problem. New York, Meredith Publishing Company, p. 11-12, 444-445.

- Reese, H. W. 1961. Relationships between Self-Acceptance and Sociometric Choices. In: *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 62, p. 472-474.
- Rogers, C. R. 1951. *Client-Centered Therapy*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 483-520.
- Rothstein, Edward. 1961. *An Analysis of Status Images as Perception Variables Between Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Boys*. Ph.D. Thesis. New York University.
- Sachs, Benjamin M. 1966. *Educational Administration: A Behavioral Approach*. New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, p. 63-246, 326.
- Scarpitti, Frank R. 1962. *Differential Socialization; the Delinquent Versus the Non-Delinquent*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Schreiber, Daniel. 1969. Dropout - Causes and Consequences. *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 45th Ed., p. 310.
- Shaw, M. C. and G. J. Aeves. 1963. The Self-Concept of Bright Academic Underachievers: In: *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, Vol. 42, p. 401-403.
- Shaw, M. C.; K. Edson; and H. Bell. 1960. The Self-Concept of Bright Academic Under-Achieving High School Students as Revealed by an Adjective Check List. In: *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, Vol. 34, p. 193-196.
- Shaw, M. C. and J. T. McCuen. 1960. The Onset of Academic Under-Achievement in Bright Children. In: *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 51, p. 103-108.
- Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif. 1965. *Problems of Youth: Transition to Adulthood in a Changing World*. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., p. 301.
- Sullivan, H. S. 1953. *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., p. 168, 169, 170.
- Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. 1967. *Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, 428 p.

- Teigland, John J. and others. 1966. Some Concomitants of Underachievement at the Elementary School Level. In: The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 44, p. 950-955.
- Thomas, Durwood. December 15, 1970. Attendance Officer, Clackamas County. Personal Communication, Monmouth, Oregon.
- Triplett, Dwight C. 1968. Committee on Education, Marion County Republican Central Committee. Truancy and the Compulsory School Attendance Law in Oregon. Salem, Oregon. 12 p.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. 1966. State Law on Compulsory Attendance. By August W. Steinhilber (Legislative Specialist, State and Federal Law and Carl J. Sokolowski, Research Assistant in School Law). Cor. No. 793.
- U. S. Law Week, #38, p. 4253.
- Walker, Desmond K. November 27, 1967. Board of Parole and Probation, Regional Director, Salem Regional Office, Oregon Corrections Division. The School Dropout in Relation to Crime. Unpublished Research, 10 p.
- Walsh, Ann M. 1956. Self Concepts of Bright Boys with Learning Difficulties. New York, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, p. 52.
- Wattenberg, W. W. and C. Clifford. 1964. Relation of Self-Concepts to Beginning Achievement in Reading. In: Child Development, Vol. 35, p. 461-467.
- Williams, Robert L. and S. Cole. 1968. Self-Concept and School Adjustment. In: Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47, p. 478-481.
- Wylie, Ruth C. 1961. The Self-Concept. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, p. 1, 390 p.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TRUANTS (T)

NUMBER	PRETEST				POST TEST				POSITIVE/NEGATIVE GAINS			
	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D
T-1	40	343	43	114	43	340	39	109	+3	-3	-4	-5
T-2	31	267	38	66	30	343	30	99	-1	+76	-8	+33
T-3	30	323	66	121	35	341	63	131	+5	+18	-3	+10
T-4	32	328	29	85	33	291	45	61	+1	-37	+16	-24
T-5	31	310	49	75	39	325	58	91	+8	+15	+9	+16
T-6	41	303	51	102	36	323	73	120	-5	+20	+22	+18
T-7	39	256	64	108	32	264	8	14	-7	+8	-56	-94
T-8	32	328	73	102								
T-9	26	296	47	69								
T-10	39	319	53	96	36	316	37	109	-3	-3	-16	+13
T-11	36	342	61	138								
T-12	37	326	61	107	44	310	61	124	+7	-16	---	+17
T-13	41	268	48	80	40	292	39	86	-1	+24	-9	+6
T-14	46	335	47	133	29	319	51	102	-17	-16	+4	-31
T-15	33	268	37	51	41	286	40	69	+8	+18	+3	+18
T-16	40	300	34	76	41	292	42	79	+1	-8	+8	+3

APPENDIX A (CONT.)

TRUANTS (T)

NUMBER	PRETEST				POST TEST				POSITIVE/NEGATIVE GAINS			
	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D
T-17	39	278	67	103								
T-18	45	265	41	109								
T-19	31	357	36	118	36	335	57	127	+5	-22	+21	+9
T-20	43	313	47	105	44	367	47	145	+1	+54	---	+40
T-21	21	340	67	127	28	353	58	117	+7	+13	-9	-10
T-22	34	282	69	106	34	295	66	107	--	+13	-3	+1
T-23	34	296	48	78	36	316	27	75	+2	+20	-21	-3
T-24	36	288	62	105	39	289	52	88	+3	+1	-10	-17
T-25	33	326	54	112	34	358	38	122	+1	+32	-16	+10
T-26	44	319	71	135	39	295	67	113	-5	-24	-4	-22
T-27	40	334	72	122								
T-28	39	346	27	105	32	368	29	108	-7	+22	+2	+3
T-29	38	273	44	83								
T-30	42	288	55	85								
T-31	39	340	44	115								
T-32	44	369	47	172	41	353	51	173	-3	-16	+4	+1

APPENDIX A (CONT.)

TRUANTS (T)

NUMBER	PRETEST				POST TEST				POSITIVE/NEGATIVE GAINS			
	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D
T-33	29	334	44	92								
T-34	18	383	53	153								
T-35	39	306	57	95								
T-36	36	285	59	131								
T-37	25	345	56	110	28	393	34	133	+3	+48	-22	+23
T-38	26	392	35	142	24	392	51	163	-2	---	+16	+21
T-39	45	242	51	106	43	270	49	103	-2	+28	-2	-3
T-40	33	288	53	77	35	267	57	77	+2	-21	+4	---
T-41	37	304	64	99								
T-42	27	372	41	143	25	334	45	99	-2	-38	+4	-44
T-43	40	295	41	93	40	300	35	89	---	+5	-6	-4
T-44	30	354	50	123	35	370	49	123	+5	+16	-1	---

APPENDIX B  
NON-TRUANTS (NT)

NUMBER	PRETEST				POST TEST				POSITIVE/NEGATIVE GAINS			
	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D
NT-1	27	321	31	74	27	338	31	78	---	+17	---	+4
NT-2	32	306	86	157	31	371	49	168	-1	+65	-37	+11
NT-3	41	319	53	120	43	332	55	126	+2	+13	+2	+6
NT-4	41	325	57	113	44	342	42	103	+3	+17	-15	-10
NT-5	30	372	37	125	35	342	33	97	+5	-30	-4	-28
NT-6	28	358	35	110	29	337	28	94	+1	-21	-7	-16
NT-7	38	332	52	123								
NT-8	39	347	54	110	35	345	46	95	-4	-2	-8	-15
NT-9	40	351	36	109	32	333	33	96	-8	-18	-3	-13
NT-10	30	343	37	87	36	349	49	117	+6	+6	+12	+30
NT-11	34	313	87	120	37	341	77	145	+3	+28	-10	+25
NT-12	31	317	63	102	35	301	59	79	+4	-16	-4	-23
NT-13	40	356	57	127	37	344	45	99	-3	-12	-12	-28
NT-14	44	287	62	105	41	325	49	102	-3	+38	-13	-3
NT-15	36	324	56	122	24	329	72	115	-12	+5	+16	-7
NT-16	18	353	59	151	18	357	81	166	---	+4	+22	+15

APPENDIX B (CONT.)

NON-TRUANT (NT)

NUMBER	PRETEST				POST TEST				POSITIVE/NEGATIVE GAINS			
	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D
NT-17	45	301	59	101	45	319	58	119	---	+18	-1	+18
NT-18	33	306	41	85	39	331	40	106	+6	+25	-1	+21
NT-19	29	343	53	104	35	384	32	139	+6	+41	-21	+35
NT-20	34	319	31	77	24	207	48	93	-10	-112	+17	+16
NT-21	47	286	76	113	48	311	73	133	+1	+25	-3	+20
NT-22	29	303	45	54								
NT-23	31	327	51	94	40	327	33	95	+9	---	-18	+1
NT-24	45	337	48	96	43	344	42	123	-2	+7	-6	+27
NT-25	41	312	43	95	39	342	51	115	-2	+30	+8	+20
NT-26	41	295	84	138								
NT-27	30	273	53	70	35	282	59	89	+5	+9	+6	+19
NT-28	44	313	46	96	48	317	61	119	+4	+4	+15	+23
NT-29	35	279	68	104	33	280	66	91	-2	+1	-2	-13
NT-30	37	346	44	107	42	315	58	107	+5	-31	+14	---
NT-31	41	338	57	118	37	362	47	129	-4	+24	-10	+11
NT-32	27	295	38	68								

APPENDIX B (CONT.)

NON-TRUANT (NT)

NUMBER	PRETEST				POST TEST				POSITIVE/NEGATIVE GAINS			
	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D
NT-33	37	346	50	128	32	350	71	132	-5	+4	+21	+4
NT-34	28	337	65	108	30	338	63	121	+2	+1	-2	+13
NT-35	39	230	67	67								
NT-36	31	314	50	118								
NT-37	35	310	55	85	32	335	39	96	-3	+25	-16	+11
NT-38	30	315	53	93	25	328	55	108	-5	+13	+2	+15
NT-39	34	355	42	129								
NT-40	32	306	36	88								
NT-41	38	343	58	104	38	341	47	105	---	-2	-11	+1
NT-42	25	374	46	144								
NT-43	31	359	37	102	32	362	46	108	+1	+3	+9	+6
NT-44	36	295	36	66	36	302	38	84	---	+7	+2	+18
NT-45	29	299	29	46	27	301	26	40	-2	+2	-3	-6
NT-46	34	279	42	64	33	305	38	72	-1	+26	-4	+8
NT-47	18	371	44	152	21	401	48	173	+3	+30	+4	+21
NT-48	40	340	49	114	39	345	41	107	-1	+5	-8	-7

APPENDIX B (CONT.)

NON-TRUANTS (NT)

NUMBER	PRETEST				POST TEST				POSITIVE/NEGATIVE GAINS			
	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D	SC	P	V	D
NT-49	38	302	59	101	43	319	54	106	+5	+17	-5	+5
NT-50	45	219	57	112								
NT-51	28	307	36	77	32	320	47	84	+4	+13	+11	+7
NT-52	32	302	48	91								
NT-53	37	270	34	80								

## VITA

Author: Ernest Maynard Ogard, Jr.

Place of Birth: Kimball, Nebraska

Date of Birth: November 26, 1934

Undergraduate Schools Attended:

Oregon College of Education, B. S. in General Studies -  
Social Science, 1960

Graduate Schools Attended:

Oregon College of Education, M. A. T. 1968  
Oregon State University, Ed. D., 1972

Relevant Professional Experience:

Parole and Probation Officer, 1960-1966  
College Instructor, The Center for Teachers of Migrant and  
Disadvantaged Children, 1966-1967  
College Instructor, Social Science - Crime, Delinquency and  
Corrections, 1967-1969  
Assistant Professor, Social Science - Crime, Delinquency and  
Corrections, 1969-1970  
Assistant Professor, Social Science - Crime, Delinquency and  
Corrections (Part time), 1970-1971  
Assistant Professor, Social Science - Crime, Delinquency and  
Corrections, 1971 to present  
Director, Oregon Juvenile Court Judges Association Summer  
Schools, 1968 to present

Areas of Special Interest:

General Education  
Social Science - Geography, Crime, Delinquency and  
Corrections  
Counseling

**Publications:**

**Handbook For Teachers of Agricultural Migrant Children,  
Selections and Editing by Ernest M. Ogard, Jr. and  
Alfred M. Potts, II, 1966**

**Handbook of Proceedings and Workshop Recommendations  
for the Oregon Juvenile Court Judges Association  
Summer Workshop 1968, Ernest M. Ogard, Jr.,  
Director**

**Handbook, 1969, Oregon Juvenile Court Judges Association  
Summer Workshop, Ernest M. Ogard, Jr., Director**