

**This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received**

69-18,465

**SCOTT, Lederle J., 1925-
AN ANALYSIS OF THE SELF-CONCEPT OF
SEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS IN
SEGREGATED-DESEGREGATED PUBLIC
SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA CITY.**

**The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1969
Education, administration**

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

**THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE**

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE SELF-CONCEPT OF SEVENTH GRADE
STUDENTS IN SEGREGATED-DESEGREGATED PUBLIC
SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA CITY**

**A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION**

**BY
LEDERLE J. SCOTT
Norman, Oklahoma
1969**

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE SELF-CONCEPT OF SEVENTH GRADE
STUDENTS IN SEGREGATED-DESEGREGATED PUBLIC
SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA CITY**

APPROVED BY

Glenn R. Snider

Philip D. ...

Jack E. Rucker

Mary Clare Petty

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Sincere and grateful acknowledgment is expressed to the following persons whose assistance has been immeasurable; the Chairman of my doctoral committee, Dr. Glenn R. Snider, for his generous, perceptive guidance and counsel throughout all phases of the doctoral program; Dr. Jack F. Parker, Dr. Mary Clare Petty and Dr. Robert F. Bibens for their suggestions, assistance, and interest as members of the committee. In addition, appreciation is expressed to Mr. Jerry Prather and others for their assistance in the statistical treatment of the data.

Gratitude is also expressed to the 41⁴ seventh grade students at Harding, Kennedy and Jefferson Junior High Schools, their teachers, principals, counselors, and the psychometrist who administered the inventory, for their cooperation in providing the data used in the study.

True appreciation is expressed to Dr. Stanley Coopersmith for his permission to use the Inventory of Self-esteem.

A most special acknowledgment is humbly extended to my wife, Mari, and my mother-in-law, Mrs. Marjorie Gumm, for their encouragement and support.

TO

Margie, Sharon and Bill

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM: ITS BACKGROUND AND SCOPE	1
Introduction	1
Background and Need for the Study	5
Current Desegregation in Oklahoma City	10
Purpose of the Study	11
Statement of the Problem	11
Hypotheses to be Tested	12
Major Assumptions	13
Definition of Terms	13
Delimitation of the Study	14
Method and Procedure of the Study	15
Statistical Treatment	17
Organization of the Study	18
II. A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	19
Reading Material	20
Early References to Importance of Self- concept	22
Recent Investigations	25
Segregation and White Children	34
III. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	41
Selection of the Problem	41
Description of the Instrument	42
Selection of Samples	43
Administering the Instrument	46
Statistical Treatment	47
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	48

Chapter	Page
Item Analysis	59
Summary	99
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	101
Summary	102
Findings	103
Conclusions	105
Recommendations	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY	108
APPENDIX	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Kennedy-Jefferson Raw Scores Grouped for Determining the Median	51
2. Number of Scores Above and Below the Median for Kennedy and Jefferson Groups . . .	52
3. Jefferson-Harding White Raw Scores Grouped for Determining the Median	53
4. Number of Raw Scores Above and Below the Median for Jefferson and Harding Group	54
5. Harding Negro and White Raw Scores Grouped for Determining the Median	55
6. Number of Raw Scores Above and Below the Median for Harding Groups	56
7. Kennedy and Harding Negro Raw Scores Grouped for Determining the Median	57
8. Number of Raw Scores Above and Below the Median for the Kennedy and Harding Groups . .	58
9. Self-Concept Mean Scores	59
10. Frequencies of Response to Item 1	61
11. Frequencies of Response to Item 2	61
12. Frequencies of Response to Item 3	63
13. Frequencies of Response to Item 4	63
14. Frequencies of Response to Item 5	64
15. Frequencies of Response to Item 6	65
16. Frequencies of Response to Item 7	66
17. Frequencies of Response to Item 8	67

Table	Page
18. Frequencies of Response to Item 9	67
19. Frequencies of Response to Item 10	68
20. Frequencies of Response to Item 11	69
21. Frequencies of Response to Item 12	69
22. Frequencies of Response to Item 13	70
23. Frequencies of Response to Item 14	71
24. Frequencies of Response to Item 15	72
25. Frequencies of Response to Item 16	73
26. Frequencies of Response to Item 17	73
27. Frequencies of Response to Item 18	74
28. Frequencies of Response to Item 19	75
29. Frequencies of Response to Item 20	76
30. Frequencies of Response to Item 21	76
31. Frequencies of Response to Item 22	77
32. Frequencies of Response to Item 23	78
33. Frequencies of Response to Item 24	78
34. Frequencies of Response to Item 25	79
35. Frequencies of Response to Item 26	80
36. Frequencies of Response to Item 27	80
37. Frequencies of Response to Item 28	81
38. Frequencies of Response to Item 29	82
39. Frequencies of Response to Item 30	83
40. Frequencies of Response to Item 31	84
41. Frequencies of Response to Item 32	85
42. Frequencies of Response to Item 33	86

Table	Page
43. Frequencies of Response to Item 34	86
44. Frequencies of Response to Item 35	87
45. Frequencies of Response to Item 36	88
46. Frequencies of Response to Item 37	89
47. Frequencies of Response to Item 38	89
48. Frequencies of Response to Item 39	90
49. Frequencies of Response to Item 40	91
50. Frequencies of Response to Item 41	92
51. Frequencies of Response to Item 42	93
52. Frequencies of Response to Item 43	94
53. Frequencies of Response to Item 44	94
54. Frequencies of Response to Item 45	95
55. Frequencies of Response to Item 46	96
56. Frequencies of Response to Item 47	97
57. Frequencies of Response to Item 48	97
58. Frequencies of Response to Item 49	98
59. Frequencies of Response to Item 50	99

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SELF-CONCEPT OF SEVENTH GRADE
STUDENTS IN SEGREGATED-DESEGREGATED PUBLIC
SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA CITY

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: ITS BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

Introduction

Child development and the subsequent self-concept are inseparable entities. According to Frostig child development must follow an orderly pattern for a child to function in the cognitive realm of abstraction. The various stages include sensory motor development (birth to two years), language development (up to four years), perceptual development (three and one-half years to seven and one-half years), and conceptual development. These stages are not entirely distinct and tend to overlap. Children learn through their senses and if there is a lag in any developmental stage the child cannot develop proper concepts. The result is frustration, withdrawal, hostility, and disinterest; thus, a damaged self concept.¹

¹Marianne Frostig and David Horne, "The Frostig Program for the Development of Visual Perception," Teachers' Guide (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1964), p. 15.

This suggests that the home bears a great responsibility in the conceptual development of children. Parents teach children by example and expectation. For the majority of Negro and white middle-class children, this is not too great a problem, because excluding a traumatic experience, the child can identify with the parents. Therefore, middle-class children tend to develop their self-concept in the image of their parents--some good and some bad. Coopersmith¹ implied that in studying children up to the age of adolescence, family experiences were an important source of self-esteem. Children were still highly dependent upon their parents and were very likely to employ the family context and its values to judge their own worth.

For the disadvantaged Negro or white child who has been reared in a ghetto or low economic area, the self-concept often becomes damaged during the stage of perceptual development. He perceives a distorted world. He also tends to identify with some adult whose characteristics are such that this identification becomes distorted. The deprived parent or parents can teach their children by neither example nor expectation as middle-class society would define proper behavior. The example that the deprived parent sets for his child is--by middle-class

¹Stanley Coopersmith, The Antecedents of Self-Esteem (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1967), p. 6.

standards--poor and frequently dishonest. Generally the parent has very little expectation for his child beyond that of daily living. He feels that his child is caught in the same vicious cycle that he himself has endured during his lifetime--and possibly the same experienced by his parents and grandparents.

Being deprived is tragic for a child of any ethnic group but the Negro child is faced with a far more hopeless situation than children of other races. The Negro child becomes aware of his color difference sometime during the perceptual stage of development. Negro children respond to color differences as early as three years of age and this difference becomes accentuated during the succeeding years. Clark states:

These findings clearly support the conclusion that racial awareness is present in Negro children as young as three years old. Furthermore, this knowledge develops in stability and clarity from year to year, and by the age of seven it is a part of the knowledge of all Negro children. Other investigators have shown that the same is true of white children.¹

Consequently, as the child develops concepts his "ideal" is white. This "ideal" is unattainable and eventuates in hostilities toward whites, self-hatred, and hatred of others of his own race. Thus the self-concept has been developed in the very young child and this self-concept more often than not is a poor one. "White is

¹Kenneth B. Clark, Prejudice and Your Child (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), p. 19.

right--black is bad,"¹ this has become almost a universal concept of color in general. Ask any child to explain what black means to him and he will respond in a negative fashion. He will use such adjectives as bad, dirty, scary, haunted, ugly, or nigger. If asked to respond to white, he will use such adjectives as clean, pretty, pure, good, or bright.

The self-concept of the Negro child has been defined and studied by many authorities. Wiley stated:

Self-concept is the congruence between self and ideal self or being proud² of one's self or evaluating one's attributes rightly.

Thorpe, Clark, and Teigs defined self-concept as follows:

An individual possesses a sense of being worthy when he feels he is well regarded by others, when he feels that others have faith in his future success, and when he believes that he has average or better than average ability.³

Some authors regard self-esteem as concept of self. A child's self-concept is bound to suffer when he hears repeatedly that he is lazy, a simple child of nature, an animal, expected to steal, and has inferior blood and

¹Encyclopedia Brittanica Library Research Service, a research paper entitled, The Negro Self-Concept (Chicago: August, 1967), p. 4.

²Ruth C. Wiley, The Self-Concept (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), p. 40.

³Louis P. Thorpe, Willis W. Clark, and Ernest W. Teigs, Manual for the California Test of Personality (Monterey, California: California Test Bureau, rev. 1953), p. 3.

intelligence--all of this is believed by many Negro children simply because they have a black skin.

The Negro child frequently feels what Richard Wright stated in the concluding chapter of his book,

Black Boy:

Not only had the southern whites known me, but more important still, as I had lived in the South I had not had the chance to learn who I was. The pressure of southern living kept me from being the kind of person that I might have been. I had been what my surroundings had demanded, what my family--conforming to the dictates of the whites above them--had exacted of me, and what the whites had said that I must be. Never being fully able to be myself, I had slowly learned that the South could recognize but a part of man, could accept but a fragment of his personality, and all the rest--the best and deepest things of heart and mind--were tossed away in blind ignorance and hate.¹

Background and Need for the Study

Society as a whole must now accept responsibility for effecting a change for the better. At the present we see evidence of great strides being made toward providing equal educational opportunities for all children; but this is only a beginning. The federal government has assumed the leadership by providing funds and personnel to improve the educational opportunity of the Negro child.

The results of this can be seen in the many Head Start Programs all over the country. However it takes more than an eight week condensed summer program to

¹Richard Wright, Black Boy (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 284.

compensate for the years of deprivation suffered by children of poverty. James Hymes, an acknowledged authority on pre-school education, made the following statement:

The one seemingly impressive figure--560,000 young children in the first and largest summer Head Start--is actually cause for shame rather than elation. It is estimated that 1,193,000 young children in each age bracket live in poverty, a total of approximately 3,600,000 at ages three, four, and five. Summer Head Start reached about one-seventh of these youngsters--primarily at one age level--and for a quickie, condensed, eight-week program. We can be pleased but hardly gleeful over this tiny advance.¹

Head Start is a beginning. A beginning at the proper time, when the self-concept is developing. Head Start is but one facet of the many programs funded by the federal government.

Other agencies of our society have also assumed responsibility. America is at last seeing an honest and forthright appraisal of the Negro-White relationship being presented over national television networks during prime viewing time. Leaders of various human relations agencies are being afforded opportunities to express their views and give accounts of up-to-date progress. In addition, Negroes are now presented in popular television programs in roles that are realistic, not just as servants, objects of ridicule, or athletes. All of this is hopefully changing the Negro child's self-concept for the better.

¹James L. Hymes, Jr., Teaching the Child under Six (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968), p. 7.

White society, whether consciously or unconsciously, has deprived the Negro child of his heritage. In no place is this more obvious than in the history books which have been in use for generations. John Hope Franklin, Chairman of history at the University of Chicago, points the fact out very aptly in the following statements taken from an article by Lois Wille:

History books move from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries as though the Negroes were not here. Oh, there is a mention of slavery and of the reconstruction period--but even then it is usually to denigrate the Negro.¹

It is small wonder then that the Negro child has not been allowed to develop a healthy self-concept. It is very easy for an individual who has lived out his life in white middle-class society to feel that anyone can rise above his environment and achieve some success in life. But as Dr. Martin Luther King stated in his book, Why We Can't Wait:

The average Negro is born into want and deprivation. His struggle to escape his circumstances is hindered by color discrimination. He is deprived of normal education and normal social and economic opportunities. When he seeks opportunity, he is told in effect to lift himself by his own bootstraps, advice which does not take into account the fact that he is barefoot.²

In 1954 the Supreme Court rendered its now famous

¹Lois Wille, "Negro History Mislaid," Chicago Daily News Service, reprinted in Oklahoma City Times, LXXIX (July 12, 1968), editorial page.

²Martin Luther King, Jr., Why We Can't Wait (New York: New American Library, 1964), p. 23.

decision to desegregate all public schools with deliberate speed. However, the Supreme Court then negated its own decision to a degree by giving approval to the Pupil Placement Law. This law permitted the states themselves to determine placement of school children.¹

Life Magazine made the following statement about the 1954 decision:

A solitary child psychologist, Kenneth B. Clark, by his research on the psychological crippling of child minds by segregation was probably as important an influence on the Supreme Court's historic desegregation decision of 1954 as all the N.A.A.C.P.'s mobilization of legal talent.²

Kenneth B. Clark, social scientist and psychologist from City College of New York, had submitted important research findings to the Mid-century White House Conference which later came to the attention of the Supreme Court. His book, Prejudice and Your Child,³ contained his major findings along with his recommendations. These findings were based on the results of the California Test of Personality and on tests devised by himself and his wife, Dr. Mamie P. Clark. The tests devised by Clark and Clark were a color test and a doll selection test. Their findings proved conclusively that the self-concept of the

¹Ibid., p. 19.

²"The Action Intellectuals," Life Magazine, LXII, (June 16, 1967), p. 38.

³Kenneth B. Clark, Prejudice and Your Child (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963).

Negro child was damaged by segregated living and by segregated schooling. In the same book, Dr. Clark pointed out that the white child is not born with prejudice but acquires it later.

As a result of the many government sponsored programs and the dedication of individuals committed to the human-rights movement, there is non-supported evidence that the Negro child's self-concept is improving.

Did the march on Washington in August, 1963, for example, produce children who have a different image of themselves? Dr. Grambs' interview with a young girl of twelve who took part in the march reveals a partial answer--He said to her, "Just tell me honey, how did you feel when you walked down Constitution Avenue?" and this little girl answered, "I felt proud!"¹.

Margaret Anderson, in referring to the low self-concept of the Negro child stated:

One of the most noticeable of these handicaps is the Negro child's low estimate of himself and his possibilities. In his mind, he conceives of himself as never being much more than he is now, or than his parents are. He starts out assuming that he will fail. He knows white people will be astonished if he succeeds. This is not simply a neurotic attitude. There are very real reasons why the Negro child has a low estimate of himself and his opportunities. He is the product of a home background and of a society that fostered the suppression of initiative on his part. His parents have been victims of suppression, and many have adjusted to an inferior status; the child knows little else but to feel the same way. It becomes a normal way of life for him.²

¹Sister M. Herman, O.S.F., "The Self-Concept of the Negro Child," Catholic School Journal, LXVI (April, 1966), p. 63.

²Margaret Anderson, The Children of the South (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1966), pp. 34-35.

Current Desegregation in Oklahoma City

The Supreme Court decision of 1954 has been implemented in different ways in different communities in order to assure Negro children equal educational opportunities.

In October, 1961, Robert L. Dowell, et al., initiated a civil suit in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, against the Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public School District, I-89. The plaintiffs were seeking equitable relief to enjoin the Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools from "operating a qualified bi-racial school system . . .," from "maintaining a dual school scheme, pattern or implied agreement or understanding of school zone lines based upon race or color," from maintaining a "minority to majority" system of pupil transfers and from continuing other racial discriminatory practices within the school system.¹

After litigation resulting from the Dowell case, Judge Luther Bohanon issued a final court order for the implementation of a plan for desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System. Briefly, the plan consisted of three major categories:

¹Coleman Hayes, Oklahoma City Board of Education Attorney, in an unpublished Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, No. 8523, Jan. Term, 1967, The Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public School District I-89, et al., appellants with Robert L. Dowell, et al., appellers.

1. A combination of four secondary school attendance areas which included the pairing of Northeast Junior-Senior High School and Harding Junior-Senior High School, with Harding becoming a junior high school, and Northeast becoming a senior high school; and the pairing of Central Junior-Senior High School and Classen Junior-Senior High School, with Central becoming a junior high school, and Classen becoming a senior high school.
2. A majority to minority transfer policy which allows a student attending a school where his race is in the majority to transfer to a school where his race is in the minority.
3. Desegregation of faculty which provides for racial balance in all school plants in the Oklahoma City school district to be accomplished by the school year 1970.

The ultimate goal of the Oklahoma City Board of Education apparently is to achieve full and complete desegregation and integration of races in the public schools of Oklahoma City.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the self-concept of students in an integrated school setting in comparison with that of students in a segregated school setting.

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to determine if there was any significant difference in the self-concept of students in a desegregated school setting and students in a segregated school setting. This was done by a comparison of (1) a group of Negro seventh grade students who have been in

totally segregated schools throughout their elementary school experience, (2) a group of Caucasian seventh grade students who have spent their elementary school years in a segregated situation, (3) a mixed group of seventh graders--both Negro and Caucasian--who have been and are in schools which have been desegregated for a period of at least two years.

Hypotheses to Be Tested

A general null hypothesis was tested in this experiment: the self-concept of seventh grade students in an integrated school setting is no different from the self-concept of seventh grade students in a segregated school setting. The experiment also involved:

H_{01} There is no significant difference in the self-concept of white students in all-white segregated school and the self-concept of Negro students in an all-Negro segregated school.

H_{02} There is no significant difference in the self-concept of white students in an all-white segregated school and the self-concept of white students in an integrated school.

H_{03} There is no significant difference in the self-concept of Negro students in an integrated school and the self-concept of white students in an integrated school.

H₀₄ There is no significant difference in the self-concept of the Negro students in an integrated school and the self-concept of Negro students in a segregated school.

Major Assumptions

1. Seventh grade students were suitable subjects for this study because they had not yet acquired a sophisticated social consciousness at this age.
2. The "Self-esteem Inventory" developed by Coopersmith was appropriate to administer as a test instrument for the measurement of self-concept for the investigation.
3. The total number of seventh grade students in the three schools involved was large enough to select random samples of the four groups described in the study.

Definition of Terms

The terms utilized in this study are common to educational literature; however, for sake of clarity the terms are defined.

Self-concept is an abstraction that an individual develops about the attributes, capacities, objects, and activities which he possesses and pursues. This abstraction is represented by the symbol "me" which is a person's idea of himself to himself.¹

¹Coopersmith, op. cit., p. 20.

Personality is an organization of traits, attitudes, and habits which determine an individual's behavioral and emotional tendencies.

School segregation is a system of separate school facilities which results in a separation of students and faculty based on race.

School desegregation is the process which results in persons of different racial groups actually attending school together.

Faculty desegregation is the assignment of teachers to school buildings so that members of different races are represented on the faculty.

Delimitation of the Study

The study involved one hundred twenty seventh grade students--four groups of thirty each. The experimental group was a group of sixty seventh grade students--thirty Negro and thirty Caucasian--at Harding Junior High which is one of the four schools paired under a Federal Court Order involving the Oklahoma City Public School System. This was an integrated group coming from elementary schools where token integration had already taken place.

The two control groups were from segregated Jefferson Junior High School in the southwest area of Oklahoma City and the segregated Kennedy Junior High in the east-central part of Oklahoma City. All of the students had been in segregated schools for their entire school life.

Thus, the sampling procedure was limited by the availability of the subjects.

Method and Procedure of the Study

An ex post facto design was used in this study. Kerlinger¹ described the design as "That research in which the independent variable or variables have already occurred and in which the researcher starts with the observation of a dependent variable or variables." The study consisted of analyzing the differences in self-concept of four groups of students by utilizing the median test described in Downey and Heath.² Also, a further investigation analyzed the responses of the four groups to each item of the instrument. Differences between the four groups were analyzed statistically by use of upper and lower confidence intervals. Two groups were control and two were experimental. For the Control Group, the subjects were selected from those seventh grade students who had been in segregated schools throughout their entire school career. One control group consisting of thirty students was from Kennedy Junior High which is a segregated Negro junior high and the other was a group of

¹Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 360.

²N. M. Downey and R. H. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (2d ed.; New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 239-240.

thirty students from Jefferson Junior High which is a segregated white junior high. The subjects comprising the Experimental Groups were seventh grade students at Harding Junior High which is an integrated junior high. The Harding Junior High subjects had been in desegregated elementary schools for at least two years--specifically throughout the fifth and sixth grades. One group consisted of thirty Negro students and the other group had thirty Caucasian students.

While grouping may or may not affect self-concept, it was interesting to note that in the two segregated junior high schools--Jefferson and Kennedy, seventh grade students were grouped by achievement and teacher recommendation. According to the teachers and principals involved the groups tested in these two schools were normal, average or middle groups. (Operationally, the term "normal" means that there were no indications of serious symptoms of stress or emotional disorders revealed by the teachers and principals or the psychometrist who administered the tests.) These students were not considered discipline problems nor were they having learning difficulties. At Harding, the desegregated junior high, students had been grouped heterogeneously with the exception of a special education class and three sections of accelerated students. The latter four sections were not used in the investigation. Thus, according to the teachers

involved as well as the principal, the students tested at Harding were in average or middle groups and were progressing educationally in the same manner as those students from Kennedy and Jefferson.

Of those seventh grade students tested at Kennedy and Jefferson Junior High Schools, thirty in each school were selected by a "table of random numbers." The same process was used at Harding for selecting two groups--one of thirty Negro students and one of thirty white students.

A fifty-item "Self-esteem Inventory," a test developed by Stanley Coopersmith,¹ was administered by a psychometrist shortly after the beginning of the 1968-1969 school year.

Chi Square was used to test the significance of the differences according to the hypotheses of the study.

Statistical Treatment

The students involved in the segregated junior high schools were selected as the control group. The students attending the desegregated junior high were selected as the experimental groups. Samples of thirty Negro students at segregated Kennedy Junior High and thirty Caucasian students at segregated Jefferson Junior High were selected by means of using a table of random numbers. Samples of thirty Negro students and thirty white students

¹Coopersmith, op. cit., p. 20.

were selected at Harding who had been in integrated elementary schools during their fifth and sixth years of education. These samples were also selected by a table of random numbers. This provided four equal-sized groups of samples.

In order to analyze the self-concepts of the students in the four groups, the significance of the difference among the mean scores of these groups was tested. The median test was used to test the significance of the difference at the .05 level. This test involved the grouping of two sets of scores; thus, a common median was determined. (See Chapter IV.) An item analysis using upper and lower confidence levels was also employed.

Organization of the Study

The study consists of five chapters and a bibliography. Chapter I is a description of the investigation which includes the introduction, background and need, statement of the problem, hypotheses, major assumptions, definition of terms, delimitation, and a brief description of the treatment of the data. Chapter II presents an examination of the pertinent research and literature related to the problem. Chapter III contains a description of the procedure of the study. The presentation and analysis of the data is reported in Chapter IV. Chapter V consists of a summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations, based upon the analysis and interpretation of the data.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This study was primarily concerned with determining whether there was a difference in the self-concept of students in a desegregated school setting and students in segregated school settings. Selected literature which related to the central purpose of this investigation is reviewed in this chapter. A survey of the literature was made to include references to the importance of self-concept as defined by Freudian and Neo-Freudian psychiatrists and psychologists, as well as literature revealing studies of Negro self-concept which were initiated in the 1950's.

The 1950 Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth had dealt with in part, the theme of healthy personality development in children. Clark¹ prepared and presented a manuscript, which was used as a basis for discussion of this problem at the White House Conference. The damaging effects of racial discrimination on the personality development of Negro children finally came

¹Kenneth B. Clark, op. cit.

into focus, even though concerned psychologists and social scientists had studied and struggled with this fact for years. The next year, the first case to challenge the constitutionality of segregation in public elementary and secondary schools was heard before three judges in a Federal District Court in Charlestown, South Carolina. The events following, including the 1954 Supreme Court Decision, are now history. The Coleman¹ report, published in 1966, indicated very little progress had been made in the implementation of the Supreme Court decision. The great majority of American school children still attended schools that were largely segregated. Among all groups considered, white children were the most segregated.

Reading Material

The books used in reading and social studies in the elementary schools did little to enhance the Negro child's self-concept. The elementary school can be used as an example since the self-concept is developing at this age in the area of social awareness. The protection of the family no longer can keep the school age child from judging himself in regard to society as a whole. The reading books, until a very few years ago were all oriented around the "nice white middle class family" living in close

¹James S. Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

proximity to other "nice white middle class families," all having "nice white middle class" experiences that many disadvantaged children could neither identify with or ever hope to have in their own lives. The result has been retardation in reading from their initial attempts in first grade trying to decode a sterile vocabulary which has little resemblance to the language they have learned to speak and understand in the home. In addition, the pre-school experiences or lack of experiences place the disadvantaged child two to three years behind before he ever goes to school. Thus, instead of "catching-up" in reading in later years he falls further behind. The self-concept begins to deteriorate with the first failure, because of the inability to cope with this strange new language about people who could be living on another planet.

The deadly effects of unrealistic reading material can be matched by the equally unrealistic social studies material. The history presented in elementary schools has given these children a distorted view of racial truths. The following excerpt on slavery came from a social studies state adopted text in use until the school year 1968-69:

. . . . You remember how the Negroes were brought from Africa and sold to the people of our country in early times. After a while there came to be thousands and thousands of these Negro slaves. Most of them were to be found in the southern states. They were not useful in the northern mills and factories. On the southern plantations, where tobacco and cotton and rice were grown, they worked away quite cheerfully.

In time many people came to think that it was wrong to own slaves. Some of these said that all the Negro slaves should be freed. Some of the people who owned slaves became angry at this. They said that the black people were better off as slaves in America than they would have been as wild savages in Africa. Perhaps this was true, as many of the slaves had snug cabins to live in, plenty to eat and work that was not too hard for them to do. Most of the slaves seemed happy and contented.¹

Any child reading such an account of slavery in his formative years would be adversely affected. The self-concept of the Negro child would receive another devastating blow. The white child would also suffer, because he would receive another distorted impression which would hinder rather than help him accept individuals for their personal worth, rather than their racial or ethnic origin.

Because of situations similar to the above, the self-concept of the Negro child, especially the disadvantaged Negro child, of the early 1950's could not have been good. It would not have mattered too much where he lived.

Early References to the Importance of Self-Concept

Self-concept is an illusive term. Its definitions are as varied as are the psychologists and psychiatrists who have attempted to define it.

Perhaps some of the first definitions of

¹Merlin M. Ames, Jesse H. Ames, and Odille Ousley, My Country (St. Louis: Webster Publishing Company, 1951), p. 352.

self-concept came from William James and George H. Mead. The origin of self-concept did receive attention in their works. James¹ concluded that human aspirations and values have an essential role in determining whether we regard ourselves favorably. Our achievements are measured against our aspirations for any given area of behavior. Mead² felt that man carried within himself the reflecting mirror of his social group. Man places high value upon himself if there have been people in his life who have treated him with concern and respect. If on the other hand he has been regarded as an inferior object, then he believes himself to be inferior.

Two neo-Freudians, Karen Horney and Alfred Adler, advanced theories on the origin of self-concept or self-esteem.

Horney³ listed such factors as indifference, lack of respect, disparagement, lack of admiration, lack of warmth, isolation, and discrimination, that can create a disturbance in the relationship between parent and child. The child then has to build defenses against the created anxiety and in so doing creates an idealized image of his

¹William James, Principles of Psychology (New York: Holt Publishing Company, 1890), 2 vols.

²George H. Mead, Mind, Self, and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

³Karen Horney, Our Inner Conflicts (New York: Norton Publishing Company, 1945).

capacities and goals. Dissatisfaction then occurs when the unrealistic goals are not achieved.

Adler¹ described three conditions that can have fortunate or unfortunate consequences on the development of the concept of one's self. The first is organ inferiority. Children should be encouraged to compensate for their physical weaknesses and turn them into strengths. Turning weaknesses into strengths represents his second condition. The third condition is not to let children develop an unrealistically inflated value of their own worth. All of these conditions affect the self-concept.

Rogers² proposed that all individuals develop a self-concept of themselves which serves to guide their adjustment to the external world. The self-concept will develop out of interaction with the environment. He feels that a permissive atmosphere which permits free expression of ideas and does not resort to harsh or frequent comparisons will help the individual know and accept himself.

The above statements define self-concept in its broadest sense with no specific reference to race or school environment. Du Bois made the following comments

¹H. L. and R. R. Ansbacher, The Individual: Psychology of Alfred Adler (New York: Basic Books, 1956).

²Carl R. Rogers, Client-centered Therapy: Its Current Practice Implications, and Theory (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Publishing Company, 1951).

about both as early as 1935.

Other things being equal, the mixed school is the broader, more natural basis for the education of all youth. It gives wider contacts; it inspires greater self-confidence; and suppresses the inferiority complex.¹

Weinberg stated recently that in the integrated school, children develop sounder self-concepts.²

Recent Investigations

Coopersmith has made one of the most recent and exhaustive studies of self-concept or self-esteem. There will be numerous references to Coopersmith, since his Self-esteem Inventory is the instrument used in this study and will be detailed in chapters III and IV. Coopersmith's findings indicated that parental interest or the lack of it are major determinants in a child's self-concept.

Thus we find that the parents of children with high self-esteem who are more attentive and concerned about their children are also more demanding and are inclined to lead active lives outside their families; they are no more likely to spend time with their children than the parents of children with less self-esteem. Similarly, if we turn to the concept of control we find that the families of children with high self-esteem are marked by well-defined limits of behavior and clear statements of rights and privileges, coexisting with greater tolerance for

¹William E. B. Du Bois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?," Journal of Negro Education (July, 1935), p. 335.

²Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1968), p. 83.

individual expression and less drastic forms of punishment.¹

Dr. Robert Coles,² physician, author, and chronicler of the civil rights movement, spent years in the south seeking answers to what "race" and social change meant to its participants. Some of his observations pointed out how important race and color were to children during the years the self-concept was being developed. One little three year old tried to use her finger for a crayon hoping the color would rub off. Some Negro children would not draw Negroes, others distorted the body of the Negroes they drew and others made the Negroes in a given picture smaller than the white people they drew. These children were trying to accept themselves. Coles also noted anger and spite directed at white people in the drawings of the Negro children. Parents interviewed by Coles explained that Negro parents taught their children to fear white people as a condition for survival.

Weinberg made a monumental contribution to the literature in his book, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. The following statements were applicable to this study:

Aspirations and self-concept are at the core of the motivation to learn. Yet little is known about their

¹Coopersmith, op. cit., pp. 256-257.

²Robert Coles, Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967).

role in education. Through a process of circular reasoning, these elements are almost always viewed as properties of individual students. That is, if children are learning they are assumed to be expressing some degree of aspiration and a more or less sound self-concept. If they are not learning satisfactorily, there is an automatic tendency to attribute the failing to a lack of motivation. This, in turn, is often translated as low aspirations and poor self-concept.

at, however, is to be made of the situation wherein aspirations are high and self-concept is sound . . . still no satisfactory learning occurs? Attention should then shift away from the isolated child and toward social factors--race is pre-eminent among those--for possible light on the subject.¹

Blake² made a study of the level of aspiration of three groups of students in a midwestern city. His study consisted of 59 white students from integrated high schools, 59 Negro students from integrated high schools and 59 Negro students from segregated high schools.

He set out to test four hypotheses:

1. On the average, Negro pupils will have higher levels of aspiration than those of their white counterparts in the mixed school situation.
2. There will be greater variability in the aspirations of the minority group in the segregated school system than in the mixed school system.

¹Weinberg, op. cit., p. 64.

²Elias Blake, Jr., "A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Illinois, 1960).

3. The Negro pupils in the mixed school sample will show a higher average level of aspiration than the Negroes in segregated school samples.
4. The average aspiration will be approximately the same for whites and the segregated school group, but there will be greater variability in the segregated Negro group.

When Blake examined his findings he found that hypothesis number one was supported. Negro students in integrated schools did set higher aspirational levels than did their white counterparts. His second hypothesis was rejected since Negro students in the segregated schools set fewer low aspirational levels than either Negroes or whites in the integrated schools. The third hypothesis was rejected because Negro students in the integrated schools failed to set higher average aspirational levels than the Negro students in segregated schools. The fourth hypothesis was also rejected because he found that segregated Negro students had higher average levels of aspiration than did white students in integrated schools and the segregated Negro students had the highest aspiration level of all three groups.

Blake interpreted the high aspiration of Negro students as a defensive measure whereby they attempted to maintain their self-esteem--to set a low level of aspiration could be interpreted by others as an admission of

lower self-esteem. Blake maintained that it is segregation and not desegregation that threatens the Negro's self-esteem. He pointed out the fact that a rigid segregated environment is constantly devaluing to the Negro student and because of segregation the Negro students were not able to accept themselves as realistically as did the integrated Negro students.

Meketon¹ investigated the results of desegregation upon the self-esteem of Negro children. Her sample consisted of 89 fifth and sixth grade Negro students who were in three schools. One school (A) had an enrollment of 821 students all of whom were Negro, school (B) was an integrated school of 416 with 30 percent of the student body being Negro, school (C) had 22 percent Negro students of an enrollment of 586. Students were matched comprehensively--29 students from school A, 29 students from school B, and 31 students from school C were studied. Meketon noted that school B and school C had desegregated under different circumstances. School B desegregated as a result of administrative initiative with no outside forces being in evidence. School C desegregated after prolonged and bitter controversy involving demonstrations by the Negro community.

¹Betty F. Meketon, "The Effects of Integration upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and upon His Level of Self Esteem" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966).

Meketon's findings contradicted two principal hypotheses: (1) The Negro child's performance will be adversely affected by the process of school integration, and (2) Forced competition with a group considered to be "superior" will affect the Negro child's feelings of self-esteem in a negative fashion.

Meketon found that self-esteem measured in the three schools indicated that students at school A, the desegregated school, scored significantly higher than school B which had desegregated peacefully. School C, the tumultuously desegregated school, had significantly higher self-esteem scores than students at school A. Meketon suggested that the explanation for students in school C scoring higher than the other two schools was the unification of the students' environment which included the family and immediate neighborhood. She also noted several other factors contributing to the high self-esteem of students at school C, (1) support and sympathy of the close knit community, (2) N.A.A.C.P. legal counsel support, (3) Supreme Court decisions, (4) Negro community morale, (5) victory for the Negro in the interchange with whites, (6) the presence of Negro teachers at school C--there were no Negro teachers at school B and there were no white teachers at school A.

Meketon's original hypothesis that student anxiety would adversely affect the Negro child was not supported.

The consequences she predicted did not occur. She suggested that adaptability and flexibility of the child in the right circumstances can overcome the presumed detrimental aspects of integration.

A study made by Cramer, Bowerman, and Campbell¹ examined the educational aspirations of southern Negro high school students. Over 10,000 Negro adolescents completed questionnaires, which included follow-up studies. The sampling covered a four-state area: Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Virginia. The period covered was from November, 1963, to January, 1965. Apparently none of the students was enrolled in a meaningfully desegregated school. They found that the students with low socioeconomic status would definitely benefit from a school environment that expected its students to go on to college. This was true of the white control group also.

The study indicated that the expectations of the adults in the student's immediate environment, both teachers and parents, determined to a great extent the student's aspirations. Student aspirations in turn greatly influenced their self-concept.

Haggstrom investigated self-esteem and racial

¹M. Richard Cramer, Charles Bowerman, and Ernest Q. Campbell, Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations among Negro Adolescents, ed. by M. Weinberg (2 vols., Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in a Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1966), pp. 79-80.

desegregation in Detroit and Ypsilanti with a sample of 120 Negro households. His central finding was that desegregated Negroes had higher self-esteem than did segregated Negroes. He tentatively concluded that this was so "because the Negro community as a symbol of inferiority depresses the self-esteem of its members." The Negro community, according to Haggstrom, is a white-created symbol of "permanent social inferiority" flying in the face of a social value of equality. In the ghetto, exaggerated perceptions of whites develop, and persistent social failure there leads to further identification of Negro (of self) with failure.¹

Parental concern was studied by Smith² and his colleagues in the Detroit area. Negro and white parents in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties were queried about aspirations for their children's careers. They found that the Negro parents had high aspirations for their children and expected these aspirations to materialize through an effective school system. The Negroes expressed higher

¹Warren C. Haggstrom, Self-esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Social Psychology, University of Michigan, 1962).

²Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashshur, and Gary W. Shannon, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis (Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, Sept. 8, 1967), Weinberg, op. cit., pp. 82-83.

support for the schools than did the various groups of white adults.

Another example of how parental involvement with the schools can influence change was illustrated in a 1968 N.B.C. White Paper Television Special.¹ Teachers interviewed in New York City stated that when the parents began to experience awareness of the intercity schools and demanded local control of their schools, the children improved in both performance and aspiration.

Much of the literature examined in this study indicated that the student's total environment was contributory to the self-concept. In the case of the Negro child the problem polarizes in the school. Young people learn to live and function in an integrated society only after they have reached full self-actualization in an integrated school.

Weinberg² cited a situation that indicated that possibly, the self-concept of the Negro child was improving. Of particular interest was the fact that the sale of Negro dolls had increased by forty percent from 1965 to 1967 according to Daniel M. O'Connell, manager of a national doll manufacturing firm.

This fact is pertinent when one remembers that

¹White Paper, N.B.C., 8:00 Central Standard Time, December 30, 1968.

²Weinberg, op. cit., p. 93.

many Negro children rejected Negro dolls and showed a marked preference for white dolls in Clark's¹ study just prior to 1950.

The following statement by Weinberg also indicated that the Negro self-concept was improving:

Negro students' aspirations are as high and often higher than those of white students. . . . Desegregation has most often benefited the Negro child's self-esteem and virtually never has harmed it. Historical factors such as the Civil Rights movement are critical in raising self-esteem of Negro children. Desegregation has facilitated Negro acceptance of color as a constructive factor while heightening Negro willingness to live and learn with white.²

Segregation and White Children

There is relatively little in the literature concerning the effects of segregation upon the white child. At the same time the collections of recent studies dealing with the derogatory effects of segregation on the Negro child are multitudinous. Since American education is dedicated to all children, we cannot ignore the possible damaging effects of racial isolationism upon the self-concept of white children.

The following supporting statement came from Clark:

A normal American parent would resent a description of his child as having the following characteristics --characteristics that a group of University of California social scientists have ascribed to what

¹Clark, op. cit., p. 23.

²Weinberg, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

they call the "authoritarian personality": He worships the strong and despises the weak.

He has strong impulses toward cruelty toward others and sometimes toward himself. He is rigid, compulsive, and punitive in his ideas and behavior. He is constantly striving for superficial social status; he is willing to grovel before those whom he believes to be his superiors while he is contemptuous of those whom he considers his inferiors.

Even his feelings toward his parents and others in authority are not without deep conflicts; on the other hand he subjugates his own desires to their demands while on the other hand he hates them.

Because he cannot face his negative feelings toward parents and other authorities, he takes out his frustration by aggressions against those whom he considers weak and acceptable as victims. This description is based on studies of the personality patterns of a group of prejudiced individuals--children, adolescents and adults.¹

Clark,² in his discussion of personality types, further indicated that the unprejudiced or non-authoritarian individuals were not "ideal" personalities. As adolescents and young adults they sometimes searched unrealistically for affection and love in an attempt to re-create the type of family relationship they enjoyed as children. Unprejudiced or non-authoritarian individuals were also more likely to be openly rebellious against other authorities. He pointed out that since racial prejudice is a latent factor in the American culture, all individuals were affected by it to one degree or another.

The white child, upon reaching the age of

¹Clark, op. cit., p. 66.

²Ibid.

conceptualization, cannot help but observe the inequities that are a part of the total culture. Racial segregation and social injustice are direct contradictions to the principles of Democracy. This realization cannot help but have a derogatory effect upon healthy personality development within the context of the whole culture.

The white child that grows up in "Suburbia," is not the recipient of a total education. A humorous yet poignant illustration is cited by Fred M. Heckinger, Education Editor of The New York Times in his Foreword to the Shortchanged Children of Suburbia:

The story is told about a little girl in a school near Hollywood who was asked to write a composition about a poor family. The essay began: This family was very poor. The Mommy was poor. The Daddy was poor. The brothers and sisters were poor. The maid was poor. The nurse was poor. The butler was poor. ¹ The cook was poor. And the chauffeur was poor. . . .

Alice Miel in the same pamphlet makes a pertinent observation:

Our study as well as other inquiries indicate clearly that to grow up in an American suburb today is not a wholly enviable lot.²

The following statements by Shirley H. Schell gives even more impetus to fulfilling the needs of all children:

¹Alice Miel and Edwin Kiester, Jr., The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia (New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1967), Pamphlet Series Number 8, American Jewish Committee, p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 43.

If "separate but equal" are inherently bad, then integrated schools ought to have some positive benefits for all students, white as well as black. Nevertheless, the focus in integration has been exclusively on the advantages to be gained by the black children. It is hard not to conclude that it was presumed the white children would gain nothing from the new experience. Perhaps this is the key to the failure. It has been too one-sided. White society has said to the black student that the purpose of integration is to help him become more like the white students.

The emphasis of integration should have been to provide the black student with a better opportunity to discover himself and realize his own potential. Perhaps the white child should have understood that integration would have some advantages for him, too--opportunities to know people different from himself, to learn from them and to share his own experiences. Despite many fine declarations to the contrary, the emphasis in American education has long been on making all students as nearly like one another as possible. The failure of desegregation is just one more example of the failure of American education. We cannot make black students like white students, any more than we can make all white children copies of one another.¹

A similar thesis was held by Harvard educational theorist, Theodore R.Sizer, and Chesler and Segal. Their findings are reported in a pamphlet, Desegregation Works, A Primer for Parents and Teachers, by Lillian S. Calhoun.

Sizer stated:

No segregated school can fully teach, whether it is a black school in a slum or a white middle class school in a posh neighborhood. We must mix our children, not necessarily to make them alike--to "integrate" them--but to give them a true picture of realities and possibilities.

¹Shirley H. Schell, "The Spirit of the Law," Educational Leadership, Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A., XXVI, No. 2 (Washington: November 1968), p. 124.

Sizer's theory was borne out by Chesler and Segal's concrete findings on Alabama desegregation where the Negro youngsters, their white classmates, and especially their teachers markedly changed concepts of self and others.¹

The ultimate goal of education should be to use all means available to help each student develop a sound, realistic self-concept. Later adjustment to life, according to Coopersmith's studies, depends a great deal upon one's concept of "self" developed during childhood's formative years.²

It is interesting to note that some of the personality characteristics found in the authoritarian-prejudiced individual are strikingly similar to those characteristics found in the individual of low self-esteem. Conversely, there are also some similarities to be found in the non-authoritarian, non-prejudiced individuals with high self-esteem. These traits are described by Coopersmith as follows:

The child with high self-esteem is likely to be a considerable source of travail and disturbance to his parents, teachers, and other persons in authority, and the child with low self-esteem is more inclined to be overtly submissive and accepting. We should note however, that persons who are low in self-esteem have higher levels of anxiety, more frequent psychosomatic symptoms, are rated as less effective, and are likely to be more destructive than persons who regard themselves with considerable worth. The frequently raised question of whether the criteria of

¹Lillian S. Calhoun, "Desegregation Works: A Primer for Parents and Teachers," Integrated Education Associates, 1968.

²Coopersmith, op. cit.

adjustment to one's social group is a suitable basis for judging psychological health is revoked by the finding that children with high self-esteem are at least as aware as other persons of their social world but they are inclined to pay greater attention to their personal beliefs and convictions than are persons who are less sure of themselves. The relation between inner convictions and social values, like the relation between the individual and his society, cannot be assumed to operate best when the individual negates his own views and merges harmoniously into the group.¹

Even though healthy self-concept development places high priority on attitudes and acceptance in the home, this does not mean that the school does not play an important role in the emerging self-concept of children. The school plays a vital part, because success or failure in the school environment relates directly to acceptance or rejection on the part of the parents in the home. Thus a vicious cycle can trap many students. Rejection or acceptance in the home influences school performance. At the same time success or failure in school may often result in acceptance, rejection, increased pressure to succeed, or perhaps worst of all total disinterest, on the part of the parents. All forces in the environment contribute to the self-concept.

Sound and effective leadership on the part of school officials responsible for curriculum and pupil placement is vitally important in helping students develop a healthy, realistic concept of self. Children of all

¹Coopersmith, op. cit., p. 253.

racess must learn to live and function in an integrated society. As has been witnessed, when one race assumes superiority over another race, the self-concept and personality development of all the children suffer.

The schools must continue to strive toward better human relations. This fact is beautifully clarified in a statement by Glenn R. Snider:

If not achieved to a far higher degree in the American civilization, hostility and conflict may well be the leak in the dike which will assure us a minor role in the future history of the world. The general problem of improving the understanding and behavior of individuals and groups toward one another is perhaps the most crucial issue we face. The responsibility of the school and of educational leadership in the achievement of this task is apparent. If the latter is not consistent with the political, moral, and ethical values of this society then the goals of that society have little chance of fruition.¹

¹Glenn R. Snider, "Educational Leadership an Analysis," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIX, No. 300, April, 1965, p. 94.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the major procedures utilized in the investigation of this problem. The procedures included: selection of the problem, description of the instrument, selection of samples, administration of the instrument and statistical treatment for the data.

Selection of the Problem

The selection of the problem was followed by a review of the literature related to the self-concept of students, particularly, minority group and other disadvantaged students. The review of this literature was presented in Chapter II.

After a considerable search and evaluation of test instruments and scales designed to measure the self-concept, an instrument devised by Stanley Coopersmith, an associate professor of psychology at the Davis Campus of the University of California, was selected to be used in testing the population for the investigation.

Permission to utilize the instrument was acquired through a telephone conversation with Coopersmith. Full

permission to use all or any part of the instrument deemed necessary to facilitate the study was granted for this investigation.

Description of the Instrument

The fifty-item Self-esteem Inventory,¹ devised by Coopersmith is an instrument which included many items based upon items selected from the Rogers and Dymond scale and added to Coopersmith's original items. All statements in the inventory were worded for use with preadolescents. After five psychologists sorted the items and eliminated those which seemed repetitious or ambiguous or about which there was disagreement, the set of items was tested for comprehensibility. After the final form of the Inventory was initially administered to 87 boys and girls the scores ranged from 40 to 100 with a mean of 82.3 and a standard deviation of 11.6. The mean score for the 44 boys was 81.3 and the standard deviation was 12.2; the mean score of the 43 girls was 83.3 and the standard deviation was 16.7. The difference between the mean scores for the boys and girls was not significant ($F=.80$; $p<.50$). Five weeks later the Inventory was readministered and the test-retest reliability was .88.

The Inventory was subsequently administered to a

¹For further description of the instrument see: Stanley Coopersmith, The Antecedents of Self-esteem (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1967), pp. 9-15.

total of 1,748 students. The mean for the males was not significantly different from that of the girls. Test-retest reliability after a three-year interval with a sample of 56 students from the population of 1,748 was .70. Coopersmith's final study employed 85 subjects from the large group of 1,748 students.

The subjects in this investigation responded to each question on the Self-esteem Inventory by checking one of the two items, these items being Like Me and Unlike Me. If the subject felt that an item indicated how he usually felt he checked the blank space under the column Like Me. If the item did not indicate how he usually felt he checked the blank space under the column Unlike Me. The sum of the correct answers was the score of the subject taking the test. See the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory in Appendix A.

Raw scores on the test ranged from 14, indicating a low self-concept, to 50 which indicated a very high concept of self.

Selection of Samples

The selection of the samples for this study involved three schools. One of the schools, Harding, had been a junior-senior high school until the current school year, 1968-69. As a result of court litigation, Harding became a junior high school in 1968-69 and Northeast became a senior high school in the same year.

The incoming seventh grade, eighth grade, and ninth grade students at Harding for the school year 1968-69, had had varied school environmental backgrounds since some students had attended, until the current school year, white segregated elementary and secondary schools. Some had attended Negro segregated elementary and secondary schools and the remainder of the student body attended desegregated elementary and secondary schools.

Another school in the study was Kennedy Junior High which is a segregated Negro school. Some of the students at Kennedy had attended desegregated schools and others had attended only segregated elementary schools. Jefferson Junior High School was the third school and the students there had attended segregated elementary schools.

Since a major part of the study involved those seventh grade students at Harding who had spent their last two years of elementary schooling in elementary schools which were desegregated, a majority of these students were administered the Self-esteem Inventory. Those students who were in a special education class and those who were in three accelerated classes were not selected as subjects. The students selected were heterogeneously grouped into what the principal, counselors, and teachers at Harding considered normal, average or middle groups.

The size of the initial sample at Harding consisted of 280 students, 136 of whom were Negro students

and 144 white. Samples of thirty Negro and thirty white students were selected by using a table of random numbers. These students met the following criteria: (1) students attended desegregated elementary schools during the fifth and sixth grades, (2) schools attended were in the Oklahoma City Public School System, (3) students were presently in a desegregated school setting, (4) no student selected was in a special education class, (5) no student was in an accelerated or high achievement class, (6) students were not having discipline problems or apparent emotional disorders, and (7) students, according to the teachers, were progressing at a normal rate.

The Self-esteem Inventory was administered to 64 seventh grade students at segregated Kennedy Junior High. Sixty-two of these students had attended segregated schools throughout their entire school life. From this total of 62 students a sample of thirty students was selected by using a table of random numbers. These students met the same criteria as the students at Harding with one exception: the Kennedy students had never attended desegregated schools.

The selection process used at segregated Jefferson Junior High was identical to that used at Kennedy Junior High in selecting thirty subjects from a sample of seventy students who had attended segregated schools throughout their school career.

The decision to study the self-concept of seventh grade students was prompted by several considerations. Coopersmith evaluated this particular age group (preadolescents) in the following manner:

By this age (10 to 12), the individual appears to have sufficient experience and ability to think abstractly, so that he can make general assessments of his powers. The period follows one of relative stability in academic and social affairs and is marked by fewer stresses and demands than the ensuing period of adolescence. These children are sufficiently advanced in their academic activities to have an idea of their relative competence. They also have had sufficient exposure to competitive standards and achievement that academic performance would probably be reflected in their self-esteem.¹

As a result of Coopersmith's above quoted statement, the author selected for the study those students who were in academically average classes. In general, the high achiever tends to have a higher self-concept whereas the low achiever tends to have a lower self-concept.

Administering the Instrument

Most of the standardized and special tests for purposes of guidance and counseling in the Oklahoma City Schools are administered by counselors, visiting counselors, and psychometrists. For the purpose of achieving uniformity in the administration of the Self-esteem Inventory, a certified psychometrist of the above school system visited all three schools and administered the tests in individual classes. The psychometrist developed a uniform

¹Coopersmith, op. cit., p. 8.

approach in regard to testing the overall sampling and proceeded in the same manner with each class. His directions for completing the tests were understandable to each subject and all questions regarding any item of the test were answered or clarified, thus making the test more valid. There was no time limit and each subject was urged to answer all of the test items.

Out of the total population of 416 tested only two tests had to be disregarded. These two tests were rejected because the subjects had not followed directions.

Statistical Treatment

The tests were scored and evaluated by the investigator and then the descriptive and statistical treatments of the data were selected for their relevance to the purpose of the study. In order to analyze self-concepts of the selected subjects in the four groups, the difference among mean scores was used. The median test was used to test the significance of the difference at the .05 level. An item analysis involving the fifty items of the test using the upper and lower confidence levels registered by each group was also employed. Descriptions and interpretations of the statistical findings involving groups as well as the analysis of the test items were presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was concerned with the analysis of the self-concept of seventh grade students in selected segregated and desegregated junior high schools in the Oklahoma City Public School system.

The problem was to determine whether there was any significant difference in the self-concept of four groups of students in desegregated and segregated schools. The four groups concerned were: (1) those seventh grade Negro students who had attended segregated elementary schools and were in a segregated junior high school at present, (2) those seventh grade Caucasian students who had attended segregated elementary schools and were presently attending a segregated junior high school, (3) those Negro students who had attended desegregated elementary schools for at least two years and were presently attending a desegregated junior high school, and (4) those Caucasian students who attended desegregated elementary schools for at least two years and were presently attending the same desegregated school as group 3.

This chapter is concerned with the presentation

of a descriptive and statistical analysis and interpretation of the collected data.

The seventh grade students in the segregated junior high schools comprised the control groups and seventh grade students in the desegregated junior high school comprised the experimental groups.

The primary statistical problem was to analyze the significant difference in the self-concept scores found after administering the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory (see Appendix A). The statistical analysis consisted of testing for the significant difference in the self-concept between the following groups: (1) the white students at segregated Jefferson Junior High School and the Negro students at segregated Kennedy Junior High School, (2) the white students at Jefferson and the white students at desegregated Harding Junior High, (3) the Negro students at Harding and the white students at Harding, (4) the Negro students at Harding and the Negro students at Kennedy.

In order to determine if the difference between groups was significant, the median test described in Downie and Heath¹ was utilized.

The median test involved the grouping of two sets of scores; thus a common median was determined. The formula

¹N. M. Downie and R. H. Heath, op. cit., pp. 239-240.

used to determine the median was:

$$\text{Mdn} = LL + \left(\frac{.5n - \sum fb}{fw} \right) i$$

This was followed by returning to the individual sets and counting the number of scores above and below the common median for each group. These frequencies were then cast into a 2 x 2 contingency table.

Table 1 contains the data necessary for determining the median for the Kennedy-Jefferson groups.

Table 2 shows the scores above and below the median for the Jefferson and Kennedy students. For example, Cell "a" is the number of students from Kennedy who scored below the median of the combined scores.

The results of the Chi square computation was .067. From Table 4 of Downey and Heath,¹ the critical ratio at one degree of freedom was found to be 3.841 at the .05 level of confidence.

H_{01} which stated that there is no significant difference in the self-concept of white students in a segregated school and the self-concept of Negro students in a segregated school was accepted.

Table 3 contains the data utilized in determining the median for the Jefferson and Harding white students.

Table 4 shows the scores above and below the median for Jefferson and Harding white students.

¹Ibid., p. 239.

TABLE 1
KENNEDY-JEFFERSON RAW SCORES GROUPED
FOR DETERMINING THE MEDIAN

Raw Score	Kennedy Frequencies	Jefferson Frequencies	Total Frequencies
19	1	0	1
22	2	1	3
23	1	1	2
24	1	0	1
25	0	4	4
26	1	1	2
27	0	4	4
28	1	1	2
29	0	2	2
30	5	1	6
31	2	0	2
32 - Median	0	1	1
33	2	0	2
34	2	1	3
35	1	3	4
36	0	1	1
37	1	0	1
38	0	1	1
39	3	0	3
40	1	3	4
41	3	0	3
42	1	1	2
43	1	0	1
44	1	1	2
45	0	2	2
46	0	1	1
Totals	30	30	60
Median	32		

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF SCORES ABOVE AND BELOW THE MEDIAN
FOR KENNEDY AND JEFFERSON GROUPS

	<u>Kennedy</u>	<u>Jefferson</u>	
Number at or below Median	a 16	b 14	k 30
Number above Median	c 14	d 16	l 30
	m 30	n 30	N = 60

$$\begin{aligned}
 X^2 &= N \left(\frac{AD - BC}{N} - \frac{N}{2} \right)^2 \\
 &= \frac{60 \left(\frac{16 \times 16 - 14 \times 14}{30} - \frac{60}{2} \right)^2}{(30)(30)(30)(30)} \\
 &= .067
 \end{aligned}$$

TABLE 3
JEFFERSON-HARDING WHITE RAW SCORES GROUPED
FOR DETERMINING THE MEDIAN

Raw Score	Jefferson Frequencies	Harding Frequencies	Total Frequencies
15	0	1	1
17	0	1	1
20	0	1	1
22	2	0	2
23	1	1	2
24	0	1	1
25	4	2	6
26	1	2	3
27	4	2	6
29	2	1	3
30	1	1	2
32 - Median	1	1	2
33	0	2	2
34	1	2	3
35	3	2	5
36	1	0	1
39	1	1	2
40	3	1	4
41	0	1	1
42	1	2	3
43	0	1	1
44	1	0	1
45	2	1	3
46	1	1	2
48	0	1	1
50	0	1	1
Totals	30	30	60
Median	32		

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF RAW SCORES ABOVE AND BELOW THE MEDIAN
FOR JEFFERSON AND HARDING GROUPS

	<u>Jefferson</u>	<u>Harding</u>	
Number at or below Median	a 16	b 14	k 30
Number above Median	c 14	d 16	l 30
	m 30	n 30	N = 60

$$\begin{aligned}
 \chi^2 &= \frac{N \left(\frac{ad-bc}{\frac{N}{2}} \right)^2}{(k)(l)(m)(n)} \\
 &= \frac{60 \left(\frac{16 \times 16 - 14 \times 14}{\frac{60}{2}} \right)^2}{(30)(30)(30)(30)} \\
 &= .067
 \end{aligned}$$

The results of the Chi square computation was .067. The critical ratio at one degree of freedom was 3.841 at the .05 confidence level. Since .067 was less than the critical ratio of 3.841, there was no significant difference in the self-concept scores between the segregated Jefferson students and the white students at desegregated Harding Junior High. Consequently H_0 which stated that there is no significant difference in the self-concept of white students in an all-white segregated school and the self-concept of white students in a desegregated school

was accepted.

Table 5 contains the data utilized in determining the median for Harding Negro and Harding white students.

TABLE 5
HARDING NEGRO AND WHITE RAW SCORES GROUPED
FOR DETERMINING THE MEDIAN

Raw Score	Harding Negro Frequencies	Harding White Frequencies	Total Frequencies
14	1	0	1
15	0	1	1
17	0	1	1
20	0	1	1
21	1	0	1
22	4	0	4
23	1	1	2
24	1	1	2
25	0	2	2
26	0	2	2
27	1	2	3
29	0	1	1
30	1	1	2
31	2	0	2
32	2	1	3
33 - Median	2	2	4
34	0	2	2
35	2	2	4
36	3	0	3
37	1	0	1
38	3	1	4
40	0	1	1
41	1	1	2
42	0	2	2
43	3	1	4
45	1	1	2
46	0	1	1
48	0	1	1
50	0	1	1
Totals	30	30	60
Median	33		

Table 6 contains the scores above and below the median for both the Negro and White students at Harding.

TABLE 6
NUMBER OF RAW SCORES ABOVE AND BELOW
THE MEDIAN FOR HARDING GROUPS

	Harding Negro	Harding White	
Number at or below Median	a 16	b 16	k 32
Number above Median	c 14	d 14	l 28
	m 30	n 30	N = 60

$$\begin{aligned}
 X^2 &= \frac{N \left(\frac{ad-bc}{(k)(l)} - \frac{N}{(m)(n)} \right)^2}{(k)(l)(m)(n)} \\
 &= \frac{60 \left(\frac{16 \times 14}{(32)(28)} - \frac{60}{(30)(30)} \right)^2}{(32)(28)(30)(30)} \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

The computation for Chi square was 0. Since it was evident that Chi square 0 was less than the critical ratio of 3.841 at the .05 level with one degree of freedom, there was no significant difference between the two groups. Thus the null hypothesis H_{03} , of no significant difference between the Negro students at Harding and the white students at Harding, was accepted.

Table 7 shows the data utilized in determining the median for the students at Kennedy and the Negro students at Harding.

TABLE 7
KENNEDY AND HARDING NEGRO RAW SCORES
GROUPED FOR DETERMINING THE MEDIAN

Raw Score	Kennedy Frequencies	Harding Negro Frequencies	Total Frequencies
14	0	1	1
19	1	0	1
21	0	1	1
22	1	4	5
23	1	1	2
24	2	1	3
26	1	0	1
27	0	1	1
28	1	0	1
30	5	1	6
31	2	2	4
32	0	2	2
33 - Median	2	2	4
34	2	0	2
35	1	2	3
36	0	3	3
37	1	1	2
38	0	3	3
39	3	0	3
40	1	0	1
41	3	1	4
42	1	0	1
43	1	3	4
44	1	0	1
45	0	1	1
Totals	30	30	60
Median	33		

Table 8 shows the scores above and below the median for the Negro students at Kennedy and Harding.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF RAW SCORES ABOVE AND BELOW THE MEDIAN
FOR THE KENNEDY AND HARDING SCHOOLS

	Kennedy	Harding Negro	
Number at or below Median	a 16	b 15	k 32
Number above Median	c 14	d 14	l 28
	m 30	n 30	N = 60

$$\begin{aligned}
 X^2 &= \frac{N \left(\frac{ad-bc}{(k)(l)} - \frac{N}{(m)(n)} \right)^2}{(k)(l)} \\
 &= \frac{60 \left(\frac{16 \times 14}{(32)(28)} - \frac{60}{(30)(30)} \right)^2}{(32)(28)} \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Chi square was calculated and as indicated was 0. Thus, there was insufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis - H_{04} - of no significant difference between the Negro students at Kennedy and the Negro students at Harding. The hypothesis therefore was accepted.

Table 9 shows the calculated mean scores of the four groups of students indicating the mean scores broken down by boys and girls.

It was apparent that the same mean score pattern held for the four paired groups. Even though the differences

TABLE 9

SELF-CONCEPT MEAN SCORES

	Boys	Girls	School Mean Scores
Kennedy	31.80	34.40	33.10
Jefferson	32.53	32.53	32.53
Harding Negro	31.80	32.40	32.10
Harding White	32.93	32.73	32.83

in the mean scores in Table 9 were found to be non-significant, apparently there was some variation among the groups. However this variation was not accounted for since one group's variation apparently balanced the other group's variation. For example, in comparing the Kennedy and Jefferson groups, the Kennedy boys were below the mean of the Jefferson group whereas the Kennedy girls were above the mean of the Jefferson group. Also, the mean of the Jefferson boys and girls was the same. Thus, it was decided to analyze the responses of the four groups to each item of the instrument. The statistical technique employed in this analysis was a determination of upper and lower confidence levels registered by each group.

Item Analysis

The item analysis was made by comparing the samples and pool of samples to a model that was based upon the

chance occurrence of .5 probability.¹ Thus, p (probability of success) was .5 and q (probability of failure) was .5; the upper and lower confidence intervals or levels at the .05 level was computed as follows:

95% Confidence Interval = $\bar{X} \pm 1.96 \times \sigma$ where

$$\sigma = \sqrt{Npq}$$

For the group $N = 30$ the mean expected score is

$$.5 \times 30 = 15, \text{ thus } \sqrt{Npq} = 2.74$$

$$1.96 \times 2.74 = 5.37, \text{ thus the}$$

$$95\% \text{ confidence interval} = 15 \pm 5.37.$$

Hence the upper limit for the groups was 20.37 and the lower limit was 9.63.

Similarly for the pool of groups where $N = 120$ and $\bar{X} = 60$ the upper confidence limit was 70.78 and the lower confidence limit was 49.22.

Table 10 consists of the frequencies of responses to item 1 which stated: I spend a lot of time daydreaming. The correct response for this item was - UNLIKE ME.

The frequencies of response to item 1 for the pooled population fell within the confidence intervals of 70.78 and 49.22 indicating no significance. The within cell responses were within the confidence intervals of 20.37 and 9.63 resulting in no significant differences. Since all four groups scored above the mean of 15, their scores supported the standardization of the test item.

¹Ibid., pp. 125-127.

TABLE 10
 FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 1

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	16	17	18	19	70
-	14	13	12	11	50
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The near uniformity of responses of all four groups of students indicated that daydreaming was not an uncommon characteristic of this age group.

Table 11 consists of the frequencies of response to item 2 which stated: I'm pretty sure of myself. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 11
 FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 2

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	23	21	20	22	86
-	7	9	10	8	34
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

It was interesting to note that the pooled population responses fell outside the levels of significance. The greatest contributors were the within cells of white

segregated groups and the white desegregated groups. The least contributors to the overall difference was the Negro desegregated group. Thus, it was apparent that in response to item 2, the performance of Negro students in both the segregated as well as desegregated schools showed no significance. The white groups' scores fell outside of the confidence intervals where the Negro groups' scores fell within.

The within cells showed enough significant differences, that the total supports the position taken when the test was standardized. This total sample of 120 significantly differed from a chance score in support of the LIKE ME response in the position taken for the standardization of this item. Even though the responses of both Negro groups fell within the confidence intervals, the difference was not great enough to indicate that the Negro students felt anymore unsure of themselves than did the white students.

Table 12 consists of the frequencies of response to item 3 which stated: I often wish I were someone else. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

Since the frequencies of response for the pooled groups as well as the within cell groups fell within the confidence limits of 70.78 and 49.22 and 20.37 and 9.63 respectively, no significance existed. All cells fell within the confidence limits. The only inconsistency was

TABLE 12

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 3

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	18	13	17	17	65
-	12	17	13	13	55
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

the Kennedy within cell group which indicated a reversal of scores just below the expected mean score of 15 which possibly could indicate that the segregated Negro student found his school environment less satisfactory than did the other three groups.

Table 13 consists of the frequencies of response to item 4 which stated: I'm easy to like. The correct response was LIKE ME.

TABLE 13

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 4

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	26	23	28	24	101
-	4	7	2	6	19
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

No inconsistencies existed in item 4 because all four groups scored significantly above the mean of 15 as

did the pooled population. All samples indicated a good self-concept on this particular item. The Harding Negro students involved in this response (desegregated Negro) scored especially high.

Table 14 shows the frequencies of response to item 5 which stated: My parents and I have a lot of fun together. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 14
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 5

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	25	28	28	19	100
-	5	2	2	11	20
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

It was noted that the pooled responses exceeded the confidence limits. However, three of the within cell groups were consistent in that they exceeded the mean in relatively the same manner. The outstanding inconsistency was the Harding white group which fell within the confidence limits of 20.37 and 9.63. This group did not significantly show a difference from chance in scoring on the item. The other three groups supported the standardization of the item. However, it was apparent that a more formal relationship existed between the students and parents of the desegregated white group. It was also

evident that the opposite was true for the two Negro groups.

Table 15 consists of the frequencies of response to item 6 which stated: I find it very hard to talk in front of the class. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 15
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 6

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	9	15	10	16	50
-	21	15	20	14	70
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Even though the pooled group responses, as well as most of the within cell group responses, fell within the 95% confidence interval, it was interesting to note that the white segregated group showed a significant difference in a negative direction and the Negro desegregated group responded in a like manner. However, responses of these two groups did not quite reach the significant level. The responses of the segregated white students and the desegregated Negro students evidenced much shyness when talking before the class.

Table 16 shows the frequencies of response to item 7 which stated: I wish I were younger. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 16

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 7

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	30	19	23	29	101
-	0	11	7	1	19
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

No particular inconsistencies existed in this item since all four groups scored well above the mean of 15. The Kennedy group did not show a significant difference from chance response. It was interesting to note that both Negro groups were more apprehensive about growing up than were their white counterparts. The segregated Negro group showed this more than the desegregated Negro group.

Table 17 consists of the frequencies of response to item 8 which stated: There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

Responses to item 8 were significant by rejection of the standardization of answering UNLIKE ME and the strongest supporters were the segregated groups. The two desegregated groups scored in the opposite direction also but were still not significant with respect to the confidence intervals. The desegregated group responses showed a more positive acceptance of themselves than did the

TABLE 17

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 8

	Segretated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	8	10	12	14	44
-	22	20	18	16	76
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

responses of the segregated groups.

Table 18 includes the frequencies of response to item 9 which stated: I can make up my mind without too much trouble. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 18

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 9

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	17	22	21	25	85
-	13	8	9	5	35
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The pooled responses to item 9 were practically the reverse of item 8 with the within cell of the white desegregated group being the greatest contributor and the white segregated within cell group being the least contributor to the significance. There was consistency between the two Negro groups. The only within cell falling

within the confidence intervals was the segregated white group. The other three samples supported the standardization for the item. It was apparent that the segregated white group indicated less confidence in themselves than the other groups. However, the desegregated white group showed the greatest amount of confidence in themselves.

Table 19 shows the frequencies of response to item 10 which stated: I'm a lot of fun to be with. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 19
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 10

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	26	24	28	22	100
-	4	6	2	8	20
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

No inconsistencies were evident in item 10 since the pooled population scored significantly above the mean. The within cell groups responded in the same positive manner even though they scored outside the 95% confidence limit. All four groups felt a high degree of sociability. The Harding Negro group scored especially high.

Table 20 shows the frequencies of response to item 11 which stated: I get upset easily at home. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 20

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 11

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	18	14	14	20	66
-	12	16	16	10	54
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

There were no significant differences in item 11 due to all cells, including the pooled population, falling within the confidence limits. However, the within cells of the Kennedy and Harding Negro groups did respond slightly below the mean in a negative fashion. Presumably the responses indicated that the Negro home tolerated more emotionalism than perhaps did the white home.

Table 21 contains the frequencies of response to item 12 which stated: I'm proud of my school work. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 21

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 12

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	19	20	21	19	79
-	11	10	9	11	41
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The within cell group responses fell comfortably within the confidence limits indicating no significant difference. Even though the pooled population fell outside the confidence limits, the differences were not great enough in response to this item to indicate any significance.

Table 22 shows the frequencies of response to item 13 which stated: Someone always has to tell me what to do. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 22
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 13

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	24	22	17	24	87
-	6	8	12	6	33
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 22 indicated that there was significance in the pooled samples and those cells contributing most to that significance also showed significant differences. These cells were segregated white and Negro and desegregated white. The cell contributing least was the desegregated Negro. All within cells indicated a score in the positive direction above the mean. Presumably the desegregated Negro felt himself to be in a minority and did not show a desire to take the initiative.

Table 23 shows the frequencies of response to item 14 which stated: It takes me a long time to get used to anything new. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 23
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 14

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	20	23	14	24	81
-	10	7	16	6	39
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

There was significance in the pooled samples in item 14. Those cells contributing most to the significance also showed significant difference. These cells were the desegregated white and segregated Negro. The cell contributing least was the desegregated Negro. The greatest within cell difference was between the desegregated Negro and the desegregated white with the desegregated Negro cell scoring in the negative direction from the other cells. It was understandable that the desegregated Negro students might respond in a more negative fashion since they found themselves in a much different school setting than they had previously experienced.

Table 24 portrays the frequencies of response to item 15 which stated: I'm often sorry for the things I do. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 24

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 15

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	7	5	8	9	29
-	23	25	22	21	91
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

No inconsistencies were evident in item 15 even though the pooled population scored significantly below the mean. The within cell samples responded in the same negative manner; hence, there was no indication of any significant difference. However, the negative responses of all four groups indicated a rejection of the standardization of the test item, UNLIKE ME. Ninety-one out of the 120 students indicated through their responses that there were things for which they felt sorry. This did indicate a healthy and normal response.

Table 25 consists of the frequencies of response to item 16 which stated: I'm popular with kids my own age. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

A slight degree of significance was indicated in this item due to the pooled samples showing significance from the 95% confidence level. The cell contributing most to that significance was the desegregated Negro group. The cell contributing least was the segregated Negro.

TABLE 25

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 16

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	12	18	23	21	74
-	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	46
	30	30	30	30	120

The only cell showing a negative difference was the segregated white. In response to this item the desegregated students showed a higher evaluation of themselves in relation to their peers.

Table 26 shows the frequencies of response to item 17 which stated: My parents usually consider my feelings. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 26

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 17

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	21	19	18	20	78
-	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	42
	30	30	30	30	120

The within cell group responses were within the estimated confidence limits. Even though the pooled group

responses fell outside the confidence limits, this difference was not great enough to indicate significance.

Table 27 shows the frequencies of response to item 18 which stated: I'm doing the best work that I can. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 27
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 18

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	25	24	27	20	96
-	5	6	3	10	24
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The pooled group responses to this item exceeded the confidence limits. However, three of the within cell groups were consistent since they exceeded the mean in practically the same pattern. The outstanding inconsistency, even though it fell within the confidence limits, was the within cell desegregated white group. It was apparent that the segregated students and the desegregated Negro students were better satisfied with their school work than were the desegregated white students.

Table 28 exhibits the frequencies of response to item 19 which stated: I give in very easily. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 28

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 19

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	19	19	14	22	74
-	11	11	16	8	46
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The responses to item 19 indicated that there was significance in the pooled samples. The cell contributing most to the significance was the desegregated white. The cell contributing least was the desegregated Negro. The greatest within cell difference was between the desegregated Negro and desegregated white. There was no within cell difference between the segregated groups since their responses were identical. As in item 13 and 14 the desegregated Negro students' responses indicated uncertainty in relation to the white majority within the school.

Table 29 portrays the frequencies of response to item 20 which stated: I can usually take care of myself. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

No inconsistencies were indicated in item 20 since all four groups scored significantly and uniformly above the mean of 15 as did the pooled population. It was noted that three of the groups scored very high and it was apparent that all of the students considered themselves to be self-sufficient.

TABLE 29

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 20

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	28	24	28	28	108
-	2	6	2	2	12
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 30 includes the frequencies of response to item 21 which stated: I'm pretty happy. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 30

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 21

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	28	26	26	25	105
-	2	4	4	5	15
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The responses to item 21 were quite similar to those of item 20 in that no inconsistencies were indicated. All four groups scored significantly above the mean as did the pooled population. It was apparent that all four groups were pretty happy since only 15 students out of 120 responded that they were unhappy.

Table 31 depicts the frequencies of responses to

item 22 which stated: I would rather play with children younger than me. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 31
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 22

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	26	24	26	28	104
-	4	6	4	2	16
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The pooled population as well as all four within cell groups responded significantly above the mean of 15. Since the responses were uniform and in a positive direction, no inconsistencies existed. Apparently students of this age had no desire to associate socially with younger children.

Table 32 includes the frequencies of response to item 23 which stated: My parents expect too much of me. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

Table 32 indicated that there was significance in the pooled groups and those cells contributing most to the significance were the segregated white and Negro groups. The cells contributing least were the desegregated groups. All within cells indicated a score in the positive direction above the mean of 15. The parental expectation of the desegregated groups appeared to be higher.

TABLE 32
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 23

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	22	22	18	20	82
-	8	8	12	10	38
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 33 consists of the frequencies of response to item 24 which stated: I like to be called on in class. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 33
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 24

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	15	20	17	19	71
-	15	10	13	11	49
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

There was no significant difference in item 24, due to all cells, including the pooled population, falling within the confidence limits. With the exception of the Jefferson students the other within cell groups scored in the positive direction of the mean of 15. The results of the Jefferson group fell precisely on the mean.

Table 34 portrays the frequencies of response to

item 25 which stated: I understand myself. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 34
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 25

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	23	27	26	20	96
-	7	3	4	10	24
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The frequencies of responses to this item indicated that the pooled population responses exceeded the confidence limits of 70.78 and 49.22. Three of the within cells indicated consistency in that they fell outside the confidence limits in relatively the same pattern. The outstanding inconsistency, even though it fell within the confidence limits of 20.37 and 9.63, was the desegregated white group. The responses of both Negro groups showed a better understanding of self than did both white groups.

Table 35 depicts the frequencies of response to item 26 which stated: It's pretty tough to be me. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

Table 35 indicated that the pooled population fell well within the confidence limits. The responses of the within cells were within the confidence limits.

TABLE 35
 FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 26

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	12	20	16	15	63
-	18	10	14	15	57
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Consequently there was no significance in item 26. The within cell of the segregated white group showed an inconsistency since the responses for that group scored in a negative pattern relative to the mean. It was evident from the high number of negative responses of the segregated white students that possibly they were not generally satisfied with their lot in life.

Table 36 shows the frequencies of response to item 27 which stated: Things are all mixed up in my life. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 36
 FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 27

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	18	24	22	18	82
-	12	6	8	12	38
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

There was significance in the pooled samples of this item. Those cells contributing most to this significance also showed significant difference. These cells were the Kennedy and Harding Negro groups. The cells contributing least to the overall significance were the Jefferson and Harding white groups. It was apparent that the greatest within cell differences were between the two white groups and the two Negro groups. The responses of the Negro students indicated greater personal stability than did the responses of the white students.

Table 37 includes the frequencies of response to item 28 which stated: Kids usually follow my ideas. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 37
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 28

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	13	16	17	18	64
-	17	14	13	12	56
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The responses of the pooled samples fell well within the confidence limits indicating no significance. The within cell of the Jefferson group showed a slight inconsistency because the responses for that group took a negative position from the mean of 15. Responses indicated

that effective communication among the white segregated students may not exist to the degree that it does among the other three groups.

Table 38 consists of the frequencies of response to item 29 which stated: No one pays much attention to me at home. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 38
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 29

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	21	22	23	21	87
-	9	8	7	9	33
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The pooled groups' totals indicated a definite significance since the totals fell outside the confidence limits. The cells contributing most to this significance were the segregated Negro and desegregated Negro groups. Even though the segregated and desegregated white groups contributed the least to the overall significance, it was apparent that the scores for all four groups were relatively close to the extremes of the confidence limits. It was also noted that there were no outstanding inconsistencies among the responses for the four groups; thus the majority of the students felt they were receiving adequate attention at home.

Table 39 shows the frequencies of response to item 30 which stated: I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 39
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 30

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	10	18	7	14	49
-	20	12	23	16	71
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The responses to item 30 for the pooled population fell within the 95% confidence interval. The only within cell group to show a positive difference was the segregated Negro group. The segregated and desegregated white groups indicated a negative difference to the item while the desegregated Negro group showed the greatest negative difference. The Negro desegregated group was the only group which actually scored outside the confidence levels of 20.37 and 9.63. The outstanding observation of the responses for this item related to the manner in which the desegregated Negro group responded. Apparently the desegregated Negro students' lack of satisfaction with their work indicated that they had a higher aspirational level and felt a greater school expectation than the other three groups.

Table 40 includes the frequencies of responses to item 31 which stated: I can make up my mind and stick to it. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 40
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 31

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	20	23	20	18	81
-	10	7	10	12	39
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The responses of the pooled groups indicated in item 31 were significant. The cell contributing most to the significance also showed a significant difference. This cell consisted of the segregated Negro group. The cell contributing the least was the desegregated white group and the greatest within cell difference occurred between these same two groups. The segregated Negro students had the highest number of correct responses. Possibly the nature of the segregated Negro students' environment has not provided them with enough experiences to enable them to change their decisions and viewpoints.

Table 41 portrays the frequencies of response to item 32 which stated: I really don't like being a boy-girl. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 41

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 32

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	23	19	20	25	87
-	7	11	10	5	33
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The pooled population totals of 87 and 33 indicated significance with those cells contributing most to that significance being the white segregated and white desegregated groups. The cells contributing least were the segregated and desegregated Negro groups. The greatest within cell difference occurred between the two white and the two Negro groups.

It was interesting to note that both Negro groups scored significantly lower in relation to both white groups on this particular response - UNLIKE ME.

Table 42 includes the frequencies of the response to item 33 which stated: I have a low opinion of myself. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

The pooled population responses in item 33 fell outside the levels of significance. The greatest contributor was the white segregated Jefferson group. The least contributor was the Harding Negro group because these scores were closer to the mean of 15. The number of

responses of the desegregated groups possibly indicated guilt feelings as a result of their previous stereotyped opinions of the opposite race.

TABLE 42
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 33

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	26	21	17	19	83
-	4	9	13	11	37
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 43 shows the frequencies of response to item 34 which stated: I don't like to be with other people. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 43
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 34

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	29	24	23	25	101
-	1	6	7	5	19
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

No inconsistencies were apparent in this item since all four groups scored significantly above the mean, as did the pooled population. The Jefferson group scored

especially high. The within cells showed enough significant differences as did the pooled population to the degree that the pattern of responses supported the position taken when the test was standardized. The most apparent indication was that a vast majority of all the students' responses revealed social awareness.

Table 44 depicts the frequencies of response to item 35 which stated: There are many times when I'd like to leave home. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 44
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 35

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	12	17	15	16	60
-	18	13	15	14	60
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The frequencies of the pooled group responses fell within the confidence intervals. It was noted that the total group scores fell precisely on the mean. The within cell groups were within the confidence limits even though the Jefferson group responded in a negative fashion. These segregated white students indicated a greater degree of displeasure with their home life than the other three groups.

Table 45 shows the frequencies of response to

item 36 which stated: I often feel upset in school. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 45
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 36

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	17	18	12	15	62
-	13	12	18	15	58
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

There was no significant difference in the pooled samples of responses to item 36 since all four groups fell within the confidence limits. Even though the within cell groups scored within the confidence limits estimated, the Harding Negro group scored in a negative pattern which was below the mean of 15. Possibly this negative response was another indication of the Harding Negro students constituting a racial minority in that school.

Table 46 includes the frequencies of response to item 37 which stated: I often feel ashamed of myself. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

The frequencies of response to item 37 for the pooled population fell within the confidence intervals of 70.78 and 49.22 indicating no significance. All within cell responses were within the confidence limits of 20.37 and 9.63 resulting in no significant difference. However,

the only inconsistency was the Kennedy Negro group which scored in a negative pattern from the mean with more of this group indicating dissatisfaction with themselves.

TABLE 46
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 37

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	18	14	18	17	67
-	12	16	12	13	53
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 47 consists of the frequencies of response to item 38 which stated: I'm not as nice looking as most people. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 47
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 38

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	12	12	16	13	53
-	18	18	14	17	67
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The pooled population responses fell within the levels of confidence even though these responses registered in a negative pattern from the mean. The within cells

showed an inconsistency in that the Harding Negro group was the only group to score in a positive manner above the estimated confidence limits. The other three groups showed a negative consistency in that their responses were below the mean. The desegregated Negro students evidenced a better self-concept about their looks than the other three groups. Their parents may have tried to build this self-concept as partial preparation for their entry into a recently desegregated junior high school setting.

Table 48 shows the frequencies of response to item 39 which stated: If I have something to say, I usually say it. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 48
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 39

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	18	21	16	21	76
-	12	9	14	9	44
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The within cell group responses were well within the confidence limits indicating no significant differences. Even though the pooled samples fell outside the confidence limits of 70.78 and 49.22, the difference was not great enough to indicate any significance. The pooled as well as the cell frequencies fell within range of the

95% confidence limit estimated. The inconsistencies of responses to this item would seem to support individual differences found in all students. Some students are verbally forthright and some are not.

Table 49 portrays the frequencies of response to item 40 which stated: Kids pick on me very often. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 49
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 40

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	25	18	25	24	92
-	5	12	5	6	28
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The totals for the pooled population went beyond the level of significance estimated. The same situation existed for the within cell groups with the exception of the Kennedy group which fell within the levels estimated. However, no great inconsistencies existed since all four cell samples scored significantly above the mean. It was quite possible that as a result of being disadvantaged the segregated Negro students were more sensitive to their peers.

Table 50 shows the frequencies of response to item 41 which stated: My parents understand me. The

correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 50
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 41

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	22	22	22	19	85
-	8	8	8	11	35
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The pooled groups' responses to item 41 went beyond the estimated level of significance. However, no significance was evident since there was, in the main, a pattern of consistency within the cell groups. All four cells scored well above the mean, except the Harding white group. Even though the Harding white group did not respond with LIKE ME as high as the other three cells, the difference was not significant. However, as in item 5, the fewer positive responses for the desegregated white students could again possibly have indicated strained parent-student relations.

Table 51 consists of the frequencies of response to item 42 which stated: My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

In response to this item there was significance evident since the total population scores fell beyond the estimated levels of significance. The greatest contributors

were the within cells of the Jefferson segregated and Harding Negro groups. The groups contributing the least to the overall difference were the Kennedy segregated and Harding white groups. There was consistency, however, since all four groups scored considerably above the mean. It was apparent that all four groups of students had enough negative responses to indicate that possibly teachers had not contributed enough to a better student self-concept.

TABLE 51
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 42

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	23	21	22	20	86
-	7	9	8	10	34
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 52 shows the frequencies of response to item 43 which stated: I don't care what happens to me. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

Responses to this item were significantly outside the confidence limits in both the pooled population as well as the cell groups. However, no significance was indicated due to all cell groups responding consistently and uniformly high above the mean of 15.

TABLE 52

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 43

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	26	24	25	25	100
-	4	6	5	5	20
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 53 depicts the frequencies of response to item 44 which stated: I'm a failure. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 53

FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 44

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	24	25	25	23	97
-	6	5	5	7	23
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

No significance was found in this item even though the pooled samples as well as the within cell groups scored well outside the confidence limits. There were no significant differences among the within cells which indicated consistency throughout. All four groups scored well above the mean in response to: I'm a failure. They consistently regarded themselves as not failures.

Table 54 includes the frequencies of response to item 45 which stated: I get upset easily when I'm scolded. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 54
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 45

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	15	18	13	15	61
-	15	12	17	15	59
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

No significance was found in the responses to this item. The pooled population as well as the within cell groups fell within the confidence limits of 70.78 and 49.22 and 20.37 and 9.63, respectively. The Harding Negro group was the only group to show any amount of inconsistency. The Harding Negro scores indicated a negative response since they fell below the mean. It was quite possible that the desegregated Negro was being scolded more at home as a result of higher parental aspiration.

Table 55 depicts the frequencies of response to item 46 which stated: Most people are better liked than I am. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

The responses to item 46 presented a pattern which was similar to those of item 45. The pooled group responses as well as those of the within cell groups fell

within the estimated confidence limits. Consequently there were no significant differences. There was one inconsistency which was evident with the Harding Negro group which scored below the Mean. This pattern of response was possibly a result of the Negro students being in a minority and feeling slighted because they were unable to get acquainted with their peers as rapidly as did the white students.

TABLE 55
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 46

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	16	17	13	17	63
-	14	13	17	13	57
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 56 includes the frequencies of response to item 47 which stated: I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

The responses to item 47 indicated that there was significance in the pooled population. The cell contributing least was the Jefferson group. All of the within cells scored above the mean of 15. The white students contributed more negative responses to this item than did the Negro students. In all probability this was due to white middle class parents who pushed their children into

as many activities as possible.

TABLE 56
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 47

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	17	21	22	20	80
-	13	9	8	10	40
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Table 57 consists of the frequencies of response to item 48 which stated: I often get discouraged in school. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 57
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 48

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	
+	13	20	17	13	63
-	17	10	13	17	57
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

It was apparent that there was no significance in item 48 since the pooled group responses as well as those of the within cell groups fell within the confidence limits. However, there was a considerable degree of difference between the Negro groups and the white groups.

The Kennedy and Harding Negro students scored above the mean, while the Jefferson and Harding white students scored below the mean. The Kennedy group scored significantly above the mean. The white students' responses again indicated that parental pressure was greater in the white home than in the Negro home. It was also possible that teachers at Jefferson and Harding were exerting more pressure and had higher expectations for white students.

Table 58 exhibits the frequencies of response to item 49 which stated: Things usually don't bother me. The correct response was - LIKE ME.

TABLE 58
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 49

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	15	18	16	14	63
-	15	12	14	16	57
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

Since the frequencies of response for the pooled groups as well as the within cell groups fell within the confidence limits estimated no significance was evident. A slight inconsistency existed in that the desegregated white group scored in a negative manner. However, it was the segregated Negro students who appeared to be less sensitive to being bothered than the other three groups

of students.

Table 59 identifies the frequencies of response to item 50 which stated: I can't be depended on. The correct response was - UNLIKE ME.

TABLE 59
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE TO ITEM 50

	Segregated		Desegregated		
	White	Negro	Negro	White	
+	25	22	16	21	84
-	5	8	14	9	36
	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	120

The frequencies of response in Table 59 indicated that there was significance in the pooled groups and those cells contributing most also showed significant difference. These cells were the two segregated groups. The desegregated groups contributed least to the difference, also these two cells fell within the estimated confidence limits. Even though there was significance, it was evident that all four groups scored above the mean. Again it was apparent that the desegregated Negro felt that he was not measuring up to the aspirational level set for him by his parents and teachers.

Summary

The investigation revealed that there were no major differences between the segregated and desegregated

groups of students with respect to self-concept. The hypotheses therefore were accepted. The fact that the Negro students' self-concept did not differ significantly from the self-concept of the white students was an important finding. Presumably the Negro self-concept has improved in the two decades since Clark's¹ study which was presented at the Mid-Century White House Conference. This improvement might be expected as a result of the Civil Rights Movement in the nation.

¹Clark, op. cit.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations based on the investigation and related literature.

The problem of this investigation involved the examination of the self-concepts of seventh grade students in selected segregated and desegregated junior high schools in the Oklahoma City Public School System. The design of the investigation required the testing of a general null hypothesis: the self-concept of seventh grade students in a desegregated school setting is not different from the self-concept of the seventh grade students in a segregated school setting.

In addition to the general null hypothesis, four sub-hypotheses were advanced in this investigation: (1) there is no significant difference in the self-concept of white students in an all-white segregated school and the self-concept of Negro students in an all-Negro segregated school, (2) there is no significant difference in the self-concept of white students in an all-white segregated school and the self-concept of white

students in an integrated school, (3) there is no significant difference in the self-concept of Negro students in an integrated school and the self-concept of white students in an integrated school, (4) there is no significant difference in the self-concept of the Negro students in an integrated school and the self-concept of Negro children in a segregated school. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence.

Summary

The investigation involved 414 seventh grade students regularly enrolled in the following schools:

- (1) segregated all-white Jefferson Junior High School,
- (2) segregated all-Negro Kennedy Junior High School, and
- (3) desegregated Harding Junior High School.

The fifty-item Self-esteem Inventory by Cooper-smith was administered to all individuals in the sample groups shortly after the beginning of the 1968-69 school year. According to the principals, teachers, and counselors all of the students tested were average students progressing in their school work at a normal or average rate. None of the subjects were experiencing known emotional or disciplinary problems.

Samples of 30 students from each of the two segregated schools were selected along with 30 students from the Harding Negroes and 30 students from the Harding whites. The main criterion for the Harding selections

was that each of the 60 students had experienced at least two years of desegregated education in the fifth and sixth years of elementary school before entering Harding. The 60 students selected at Kennedy and Jefferson had attended segregated elementary schools throughout their entire school life.

Using the fifty-item Self-esteem Inventory, the raw scores of the four sample groups were utilized. The statistical analysis consisted of testing for the significant difference in the self-concept among the samples selected for the investigation. The median test was used to determine a common median for each group analyzed. The frequencies of the scores found to be above and below the median for each group were cast into a 2 x 2 contingency table and chi square was then utilized to compute the degree of significant difference between each group analyzed. The statistical technique employed in the item analysis was a determination of upper and lower confidence intervals registered by each group. The analysis was accomplished by comparing the group samples and the pooled population samples to a model that was based upon the chance occurrence of .5 probability.

Findings

This study revealed the following major findings:

1. It was found that there was no significant difference in the self-concept of the four groups of

students tested in this investigation. Thus the null hypotheses were accepted and it was of major significance that the self-concept of the Negro students was comparable to the self-concept of the white students.

2. The segregated Negro students at Kennedy exhibited dissatisfaction with their current personal status.

The responses of the desegregated Negro students did not indicate these feelings.

3. The segregated white students indicated negative feelings in regard to their status in life. Their response to item 26 displayed the feeling; "it is pretty tough to be me."

4. The responses of the desegregated white students indicated a strained relationship with their parents. This feeling was not found with the other groups of students. Presumably some parents resisted the school pairings and their children sensed the dis-sension.

5. The Negro students in both groups evidenced a more positive acceptance of life than did the white students in both groups.

6. Student reactions indicated that Negro students in the desegregated school were being accepted into the life of that school and that the school expectation level for these students was probably satisfactory.

7. Both groups of Negro students indicated satisfaction with school which is a necessary prerequisite to improved holding power for these students later in high school. This finding is supported by the more positive Negro student's responses to item 48. "I often get discouraged in school."

8. The responses of the desegregated Negro students indicated a higher aspirational level than did the other groups of students. It was found that they were proud of their school work but still desired to do better.

9. Apparently there was a higher Negro as well as white parental expectation in the desegregated school than in the segregated schools.

Conclusions

As a result of the statistical treatment in all four areas, the null hypotheses were accepted. Also, the null hypotheses were not rejected after an analysis of the responses to the individual items of the inventory had been made.

1. It was felt at the outset of this study that the major null hypothesis would be rejected. Negro students, however, in both segregated and desegregated schools had self-concepts comparable to those of white students.

2. In addition to the contribution of the school

in developing and improving the Negro students' self-concept, it was concluded that other factors such as the home, church, community, and various communication media had also been instrumental in this development.

3. The desegregated school setting probably resulted in greater parental expectations for children of both races and a consequent increase in aspirational level.

4. The consistently high responses of all four groups to items such as: "I don't care what happens to me" and "I'm a failure," supported the assumption that the student sample was one of average ability possessing emotional stability.

5. Desegregation did not impair the self-concept or the aspirations of the Negro student in the desegregated school setting. White students in the desegregated school setting also appear to have suffered no lowering of self-concept.

6. There was evidence to support the conclusion that white students appeared to have less self-understanding than did their Negro counterparts.

7. The inservice program provided by the Oklahoma City schools for faculties in the desegregated paired schools may have significantly helped Negro and perhaps white students to adjust to the desegregated school setting.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made as a result of the investigation and review of related literature.

1. In-service education opportunity should be provided for teachers in the area of Human Relations. These programs should enable teachers to examine their own basic feelings and prejudices, and hopefully change any negative attitudes and behaviors that might be directed at members of other ethnic and/or socio-economic groups.

2. Studies should be made to determine what, if any, damaging personality characteristics white students show as a result of continued school racial segregation.

3. It is also recommended that a study of Negro students' self-concept be conducted five years hence, using the same or a similar instrument, the same age students, and the same schools.

4. Self-concept development should be a high priority item in the educational philosophy and behavior of all teachers and administrators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adler, Alfred. The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology. New York: Harcourt, 1927.
- Ames, Merlin M. and Jesse H. and Odille, Ousley. My Country. St. Louis: Webster Publishing Company, 1951.
- Anderson, Margaret. The Children of the South. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1966.
- Ansbacher, H. L. and R. R. The Individual: Psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books, 1956.
- Boyles, Sarah P. For Human Beings Only. New York: Seabury Press, 1964.
- Clark, Kenneth B. Dark Ghetto. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Clark, Kenneth B. The Negro Protest. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Clark, Kenneth B. Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Coles, Robert. Children of Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.
- Coopersmith, Stanley. The Antecedents of Self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1967.
- Downie, N. M. and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. Second Edition. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Franklin, John Hope. From Slavery to Freedom. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Incorporated, 1956.

- Griffin, John H. Black Like Me. New York: New American Library, 1961.
- Hentoff, Nat. Our Children Are Dying. New York: The Viking Press, 1966.
- Horney, Karen. Our Inner Conflicts. New York: Norton Publishing Company, 1945.
- Hymes, James, Jr. Teaching the Child Under Six. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968.
- James, William. Principles of Psychology. New York: Holt Publishing Company, 1890.
- Katz, William L. Eyewitness: The Negro in American History. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1967.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research Education and Psychological Inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. Why We Can't Wait. New York: New American Library, 1964.
- Kohl, Herbert. 36 Children. New York: The New American Library, Incorporated, 1967.
- Lomax, Louis E. The Negro Revolt. New York: The New American Library, Incorporated, 1963.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Rogers, Carl R. Client-centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.
- Shaw, Marvin E., and Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Weinberg, Meyer. Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Phil Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Indiana, 1968.
- Weinberg, Meyer. Integrated Education. Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press, 1968.
- Wiley, Ruth C. The Self-Concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Wright, Richard. Black Boy. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Woodson, Carter G., and Wesley, Charles H. Negro Makers of History. Washington, D.C.: The Associated Publishers, Incorporated, 1958.

Articles and Periodicals

"The Action Intellectuals," Life Magazine, LXII (June 16, 1967), p. 24.

Calhoun, Lillian S. "Desegregation Works: A Primer for Parents and Teachers," Integrated Education Associates, 1968.

Coleman, James S., et al. "Equality of Educational Opportunity." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Du Bois, William E. B. "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" Journal of Negro Education (July, 1935), p. 335.

Encyclopedia Britannica. Volume 16, Chicago, 1957, p. 199.

Ginsburg, David. (Executive Director) "Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders." New York: A Bantam Book, 1968.

Herman, Sister M.O.S.F. "The Self-Concept of the Negro Child," Catholic School Journal, LXVI (April, 1966), p. 63.

Mill, Alice and Kiester, Edwin Jr. "The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia," Institute of Human Relations Press, American Jewish Committee, Series No. 8, New York, 1967.

Olsen, Jack. "The Black Athlete," Sports Illustrated, XXIX, Nos. 1-5, 1968.

Schell, Shirley H. "The Spirit of the Law," Educational Leadership, A.S.C.D., N.E.A. XXVI, No. 2 (November, 1968).

Snider, Glenn R. "Educational Leadership an Analysis," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, No. 300 (April, 1965).

"Television Special," National Broadcasting Company
(December 30, 1969).

Wille, Lois. "Negro History Mislaid," Oklahoma City Times
(July 12, 1968).

Pamphlets

Frostig, Marianne and Horne, David. The Frostig Program
for the Development of Visual Perception, Teachers'
Guide, Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1964.

Objectives of Consultative Center - Southwestern Center
for Human Relations, College for Continuing Educa-
tion, University of Oklahoma.

Thorpe, Louis P., Clark, Willis W. and Teigs, Ernest W.
Manual for the California Test of Personality.
Catalog 1968-69, p. 51.

Unpublished Material

Blake, Elias, Jr. "A Comparison of Intraracial and Inter-
racial Levels of Aspirations." Unpublished Ph.D.
dissertation. Department of Education, University
of Illinois, 1960.

Haggstrom, Warren C. "Self-esteem and Other Characteris-
tics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes."
Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Department of
Social Psychology, University of Michigan, 1962.

Hayes, Coleman. Oklahoma City Board of Education Attorney,
in an unpublished "Appeal from the United States
District Court for the Western District of Okla-
homa," No. 8523, January Term, 1967.

Meketon, Betty F. "The Effects of Integration upon the
Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and upon
His Level of Self-Esteem." Unpublished Ph.D.
dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966.

"The Negro Self Concept," Unpublished and incomplete
research service paper, Encyclopedia Britannica
Library Research Service, August, 1967.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

School attended - 4th grade _____

5th grade _____

6th grade _____

Name _____ Sex _____ School _____

Teacher _____ Date _____

Birthdate _____ Age _____ Race _____ Score _____

Please mark each statement in the following way:
 If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check () in the column "LIKE ME."
 If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check () in the column "UNLIKE ME."
 There are no right or wrong answers.

	LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
1. I spend a lot of time daydreaming.	_____	_____
2. I'm pretty sure of myself.	_____	_____
3. I often wish I were someone else.	_____	_____
4. I'm easy to like.	_____	_____
5. My parents and I have a lot of fun together.	_____	_____
6. I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.	_____	_____
7. I wish I were younger.	_____	_____
8. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.	_____	_____
9. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.	_____	_____
10. I'm a lot of fun to be with.	_____	_____
11. I get upset easily at home.	_____	_____

	LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
12. I'm proud of my school work.	_____	_____
13. Someone always has to tell me what to do.	_____	_____
14. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.	_____	_____
15. I'm often sorry for the things I do.	_____	_____
16. I'm popular with kids my own age.	_____	_____
17. My parents usually consider my feelings.	_____	_____
18. I'm doing the best work that I can.	_____	_____
19. I give in very easily.	_____	_____
20. I can usually take care of myself.	_____	_____
21. I'm pretty happy.	_____	_____
22. I would rather play with children younger than me.	_____	_____
23. My parents expect too much of me.	_____	_____
24. I like to be called on in class.	_____	_____
25. I understand myself.	_____	_____
26. It's pretty tough to be me.	_____	_____
27. Things are all mixed up in my life.	_____	_____
28. Kids usually follow my ideas.	_____	_____
29. No one pays much attention to me at home.	_____	_____
30. I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.	_____	_____
31. I can make up my mind and stick to it.	_____	_____
32. I really don't like being a boy - girl.	_____	_____

	LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
33. I have a low opinion of myself.	_____	_____
34. I don't like to be with other people.	_____	_____
35. There are many times when I'd like to leave home.	_____	_____
36. I often feel upset in school.	_____	_____
37. I often feel ashamed of myself.	_____	_____
38. I'm not as nice looking as most people.	_____	_____
39. If I have something to say, I usually say it.	_____	_____
40. Kids pick on me very often.	_____	_____
41. My parents understand me.	_____	_____
42. My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough.	_____	_____
43. I don't care what happens to me.	_____	_____
44. I'm a failure.	_____	_____
45. I get upset easily when I'm scolded.	_____	_____
46. Most people are better liked than I am.	_____	_____
47. I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.	_____	_____
48. I often get discouraged in school.	_____	_____
49. Things usually don't bother me.	_____	_____
50. I can't be depended on.	_____	_____