

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

7824899

RECK, UNA MAE LANGE
A STUDY OF SELF CONCEPT OF SIXTH GRADERS IN
TWO SETTINGS: RURAL APPALACHIA AND URBAN
PIEDMONT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1978

University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1978

UNA MAE LANGE RECK

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A STUDY OF SELF CONCEPT OF SIXTH GRADERS
IN TWO SETTINGS: RURAL APPALACHIA
AND URBAN PIEDMONT

by

Una Mae Lange Reck

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1978

Approved by


Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser *Walter L. Ambrose*

Committee Members *Raymond F. L. L. L.*
Thomas K. Fitzgerald
William L. Coleman
Donald W. Gussel

6 - 27 - 78
Date of Acceptance by Committee

6 - 27 - 78
Date of Final Oral Examination

RECK, UNA MAE LANGE. A Study of Self concept of Sixth Graders in Two Settings: Rural Appalachia and Urban Piedmont. (1978)
Directed by: Dr. Dale Brubaker. Pp. 159

Literature on rural life frequently points out that the rural setting is characterized by greater homogeneity, integration, and personalism as compared to the urban setting. Since self concept develops out of the social setting of the individual, the differences between social settings should produce self concept differences. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between self concept and residential setting.

The sample consisted of 86 sixth graders from three elementary schools located in a rural Appalachian region of North Carolina and 80 sixth graders from two elementary schools located in a North Carolina city with a population of 150,000. The primary instrument used to measure self concept was The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, supplemented by use of the W-A-Y technique and a series of open-ended statements derived from the Piers-Harris scale. Primary interest was in the relationship of these measures to the rural and urban residential settings.

The major finding of the study was that the rural Appalachian children possessed a significantly lower general self concept than the urban children. In addition, the rural Appalachian children scored significantly lower than the urban children on four of the six self concept

clusters which comprise the Piers-Harris scale: behavior, intellectual and school status, physical appearance and attributes, and happiness and satisfaction.

No significant differences were found in the responses to the W-A-Y technique. The responses to the open-ended statements revealed significant differences in the areas of occupational orientations and ways of perceiving the self. Urban children were found to be oriented much more to professional occupations and toward perceiving the self in terms of activities, skills, sports, and hobbies. Rural Appalachian children were found to be more oriented toward skilled occupations, farming and housewife activities and toward perceiving the self in terms of possessions and relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed in various ways to this project and I would like to briefly thank a few of them. Dr. Dale Brubaker, my committee chairperson, has been a source of continual support, inspiration, and encouragement throughout this enterprise. Without his enthusiasm, knowledge, and empathy this project could not have been completed. The other members of my committee, Dr. Dwight Clark, Dr. William Coleman, Dr. Thomas Fitzgerald, and Dr. Donald Russell, also contributed in various ways to this study throughout the phases of planning, implementing, and reporting the research. Their aid is greatly appreciated.

For their valuable aid at various times in the analysis of the data, I would like to thank Dr. Elyce Milano of the Department of Sociology-Anthropology, ASU, and Dr. Larry Kitchens of the Department of Mathematics, ASU. I would also like to thank the administrators, teachers, and most of all, the students of the participating schools who were kind enough to assist me in this research. Their cooperation made this study possible and, hopefully, they might find some small return from the information this study has produced. Thanks to all of you.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Dr. Gregory G. Reck, for his support in so many numerous ways that they cannot be named, and my daughter, Nicolya Alexandra Reck, for her continuous patience and smile.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.	1
Importance of the Study	2
Limitations of the Study.	6
Definitions	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	21
The Development of Self Concept	21
Social Variables Associated with Self Concept	23
Self Concept and Behavior	28
Self Concept and Rural and Urban Settings.	34
III. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	44
Description of the Sample	44
Description of the Instrument and Its Administration.	52
Mode of Analysis.	56
Hypotheses and Rationale.	57
IV. FINDINGS	66
General Self Concept.	66
Cluster Scores of Self Concept.	66
Additional Findings	74
V. DISCUSSION	84
Secondary Variables and Self Concept. . .	84
General Self concept and Cluster Scores .	92
Responses to the "Who Are You?" Technique	101

CHAPTER	Page
Responses to the Open-Ended Statements	109
VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	117
Summary.	117
Methodological Implications	121
Theoretical Implications.	126
Educational Implications.	132
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	138
APPENDIX A: EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIZATION.	150
APPENDIX B: EXAMPLES OF INSTRUMENTS.	153
APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL DATA.	156

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentage of Rural and Urban Fathers Classified by Educational Level.	46
2. Percentage of Rural and Urban Mothers Classified by Educational Level.	47
3. Percentage of Rural and Urban Fathers Classified by Occupational Level	49
4. Percentage of Rural and Urban Mothers Classified by Occupational Level	50
5. Percentage of Rural and Urban Respondents Classified by Total Achievement Level.	51
6. General Self Concept Scores by Area.	68
7. Behavior Cluster Scores by Area.	70
8. Intelligence and School Status Cluster Scores by Area	72
9. Physical Appearance and Attribute Cluster Scores by Area	73
10. Anxiety Cluster Scores by Area	161
11. Popularity Cluster Scores by Area.	162
12. Happiness and Satisfaction Cluster Scores by Area	76
13. Frequency Table of the "Who Are You?" by Area.	163
14. Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "When I Grow Up I Will Be..." Classified by Area.	78
15. Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "In School I Am..." Classified by Area	79
16. Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "I Have A Good..." Classified by Area.	80

Table	Page
17. Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "I Have Pretty..." Classified by Area	82
18. Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "I Am Nervous When..." Classified by Area	83
19. Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "It Is Hard For Me To..." Classified by Area.	84

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Differences in Urban and Rural Settings	17
2. Distribution of the Significant Items in the Six Clusters of The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale	97

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Although the importance of an individual's self concept for that individual's behavior has been an area of concern in various social sciences for some time, only within the past decade or two have educators become interested in self concept as it relates to behavior in the educational setting. Beginning with the pioneering longitudinal studies of Brookover and his colleagues (1962; 1965; 1967), many educators have increasingly become concerned with the relationship of self concept to a variety of educational issues. Both social science and educational research have generally pointed to the importance of understanding the influence of an individual's social environment on the development, maintenance, and change of his/her self concept. Much of this research has been summarized by Wylie (1961; 1974) in two extensive review volumes.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship of self concept to social and educational settings. The self concepts of sixth-grade public school students from two settings were compared. The settings selected for comparison were a rural Appalachian area

and an urban Piedmont area, both located in the State of North Carolina.

The study focused on comparisons of the general self concept of the two populations, as well as the specific self concept cluster scores of behavior, intelligence and school status, physical appearance and attributes, anxiety, popularity, and happiness-satisfaction. The relationship of general self concept and these six self concept cluster scores to school achievement, sex, and parents' occupational and educational level also was investigated. In addition to a standardized self concept scale, open-ended statements and the "Who Are You?" question (Bugental and Zelen 1950) were utilized to establish the self concept of the subjects. The purpose of such comparisons was to contribute to an understanding of the relationship of social and educational settings to the development of self concept.

Importance of the Study

The earliest significant consideration of the development of self concept is to be found in the writings of sociologist Charles H. Cooley. Cooley (1902:40) developed the notion of "the looking glass self," whereby one's self concept is developed through social interaction with others based on what one believes other people think of him/her:

...social reference takes the form of a somewhat definite imagination of how one's self--that is an idea he appropriates--

appears in a particular mind, and the kind of self-feeling one has is determined by the attitude toward this attributed to the other mind. A social self of this sort might be called the reflected or looking glass self.

Other sociologists like George H. Mead (1934) and psychologists like Kurt Lewin (1935), generally considered as "symbolic interactionists," continued the investigation of the development of self concept through the individual's interaction with others in particular social settings. More recently, humanistic psychologists like Abraham Maslow (1954) and Carl Rogers (1959; 1969) have made the concept of the self central to their theory of personality.

All of this theoretical development and the more recent research that it has stimulated--research that is discussed in the next chapter--has pointed to the central place that an individual's self concept has in guiding his/her behavior and the importance of social interaction with others for the development of that self concept. If this is true for the social arena as a whole, then it follows that it is also true of the self as it functions in that social setting that is generally referred to as "school." More specifically, it seems reasonable to assume that the school constitutes one specific social setting which influences the development of an individual's self concept and that an individual's self concept heavily influences how he/she functions in school.

As Purkey (1970:14) has pointed out:

For generations, wise teachers have sensed the significant and positive relationship between a student's concept of himself and his performance in school. They believed that the students who feel good about themselves and their abilities are the ones who are most likely to succeed. Conversely, it appeared that those who see themselves and their abilities in a negative fashion usually fail to achieve good grades.

The fact that this subjective evaluation has been substantiated now by considerable research can hardly be doubted (Purkey 1970:15). This research has supported the conclusion that a positive self concept is positively correlated with overall educational achievement, as well as with particular types of achievement, e.g., reading. Thus, it appears that the development of positive self concept is one potential means for attaining the goal of academic achievement. This provides sufficient reason why educators should be attentive to self concept research and theory.

In addition, the work of Maslow (1954) and Rogers (1959; 1969) suggests that the enhancement of self concept has positive consequences that far outreach the narrow educational goal of academic achievement. A positive self concept is the earmark of not only academic achievement, but, more broadly, the healthy personality. Thus, the development of a positive self concept is seen as a goal in itself, a goal which is inextricably intertwined with the development of a fulfilled, healthy, and well-adjusted personality. Taking this broader view, some educators

(Clark 1963; Marston 1968) have suggested that the primary goal of education should be the enhancement of student self concept. They argue that this is a legitimate educational goal in and of itself, particularly in relation to the lower socioeconomic segments of society. Pointing to the research (Ausubel and Ausubel 1963; Battle and Rotter 1963; Carter 1968; Crosby 1967; Hawk 1967; Soares and Soares 1969) that has found that economically disadvantaged children possess negative self concepts, many have argued for the need for education to devote a major effort toward enhancing self concept as an integral part of the solution to the broad problems of poverty.

However, whether the enhancement of self concept is seen as a means to the end of academic achievement or whether it is seen as an appropriate educational end in itself, the nature and process of self concept development must first be understood. One must understand what is before one can reasonably suggest changes in terms of what should be. Thus, research on the various influences that different social and educational settings have on self concept development needs to be carried out. This research was done in order to contribute to the attainment of that end. By examining self concept in rural and urban settings, two potentially significant influences on the development of self concept were examined and analyzed. Through such research we might come to understand what is and thus come to answer the question,

"Why?", a process which might allow us then to create reasonable dreams of what should be and to ask of ourselves, "Why not?"

Limitations of the Study

There are two sets of major limitations of the present study which need to be discussed: (1) those dealing with the self concept scale used and (2) those dealing with the sample populations examined. A reasonable awareness of these limitations is necessary in order to fully assess the significance of the findings of the study.

The first set of limitations revolves around the issue of the difference between self concept and self-report. Combs (1962:53) has explained the difference by stating that the self concept is "what an individual believes he is. The self-report, on the other hand, is what the subject is ready, willing, able or can be tricked to say he is."

Of course, the basic problem pointed to by this difference is one that is inherent in any research dealing with human beings. No matter what aspect of humankind one is investigating, there is always the problem of adequately handling the differences between explicit and implicit levels of behavior on the one hand and real and ideal levels on the other (Honigmann 1963:43). Explicit levels of behavior or culture are those aspects which can and will be verbalized by an individual or a group of individuals; implicit levels are those which are present but which cannot or will not be

verbalized. Real levels are aspects of behavior or culture which are actual; ideal levels are those which are normative. Any research with human behavior must take note of these different levels.

The differences between self concept and self-report generally correspond to the differences between implicit and explicit and real and ideal levels of behavior. The self-report consists of both the verbalized or explicit levels of how an individual feels about himself/herself and the idealized notions concerning the self. The self concept is in part comprised of unverballed, implicit, but yet quite actual and real feelings about the self.

The present study relied heavily on data collected through a self concept scale, a method which yields self-reports. Of course, the crucial issue is the degree to which self-reports correspond to actual self concept. Some researchers (i.e., Strong and Feder 1961) have argued a high degree of correspondence since every evaluative statement a person makes concerning himself/herself can be considered a sample of his/her self concept. Others (i.e., Combs, Courson, and Soper 1963) have concluded that self-reports and self concept are rarely, if ever, identical. These researchers point to the numerous factors like the subject's degree of self-awareness, his/her command of adequate symbols for expression, the nature of the testing situation, and perceptions of social expectancy which create discrepancies between self-reports and self concept.

Regardless of which position concerning the relationship of self concept to self-reports is correct, the essential dilemma of self concept research will remain. Given the fact that we can never truly know how another person subjectively feels about herself/himself, how can we best understand that person's self concept? We are inevitably dependent upon what an individual says about himself/herself and upon inferences about the self which can be made from the observation of behavior. Regardless, we can never be certain that we are getting at true self concept. Given this situation, it appears as if the only reasonable solution is to investigate self concept from a variety of methodological perspectives and remain ever aware of the limitations of them all.

The particular self concept scale used in this research, The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, is one of several widely used scales and inventories utilized in self concept studies. The Piers-Harris Scale possesses high scores on reliability and validity (See Chapter III) and thus appears quite adequate.

However, recognizing the potential limitations of such scales for getting at self concept rather than self-reports, two supplemental techniques were employed. The first was a series of open-ended statements adapted from the Piers-Harris Scale which the subjects were asked to complete. These particular statements were chosen so that various facets of self concept might be inferred from them. Secondly, each subject was asked to respond three times to the question,

"Who Are You?" Both of these types of responses required interpretations on the part of the researcher. Although such responses still are in essence self-reports, they have a supplemental benefit to scales and inventories since they are less rigidly constructed and require the responses to stem more from the subjects themselves (See Chapter III for a fuller discussion of the research methods employed).

In general, the conclusion of Purkey (1970:61) appears to be reasonable concerning the limitations and values of self-reports:

However, in spite of their weaknesses and limitations, self-reports do reveal characteristics of the self and are important... Used sensitively in conjunction with other evidence, self-reports give rich insights into how the child sees himself and his world.

A second area of limitations stems from the sample population (See Chapter III for a complete description of the sample population). The socioeconomic variable of the two populations was not controlled. Therefore, the two populations were not comparable with regard to socioeconomic status. However, the effect of socioeconomic status on self concept was investigated within each population.

A related problem has to do with the definition of socioeconomic status. This definition is based solely on parents' occupation and education with no reference to family income level. The data on income was not available for the research, while the components of occupation and education were. However,

as long as the basis of the definition is explicit and consistent, then the limitations of that definition can be evaluated, which is all that any definition can hope to accomplish.

Definitions

The major concepts important to this study are self concept, and urban and rural settings. The meanings of each of these concepts will be briefly discussed here with literature on the concepts that is more specifically related to the focus of this research to be discussed in Chapter II.

Like other major concepts in social science, self concept has been defined in numerous ways (Combs and Snygg 1959; Diggory 1966; Felker 1974; Festinger 1962; Lecky 1945; Jersild 1952; Mead 1934; Rogers 1951; Ziller 1973). However, in all of the definitions there are certain common threads behind the varied patterns of words. All in all, the definition offered by Purkey (1970:7) is excellent and concise: the self is "a complex and dynamic system of beliefs which an individual holds true about himself, each belief with a corresponding value."

There are several key words in this definition which point to important characteristics of the self which are found in one way or another in most definitions: complex, dynamic, system, and value.

seriously understand themselves or another knows quite well that such a task is rarely simple. Individuals are built-up out of layer upon layer of diverse feelings and perceptions about themselves and the world around them. Their behavior is never tied to a single feeling. Take, for example, a person who is quiet at social gatherings. What feelings about self lie behind this quietude? Is the person shy? Does he/she lack confidence? Does he/she feel superior and therefore distant from those around? Or does the individual feel inferior? Perhaps, he/she is confident, but is an observer rather than a participator. Or perhaps, and more likely, this individual has several of these feelings simultaneously. In fact, the individual may have feelings about himself/herself which produce this solitude but about which he/she is barely, if at all, aware. Thus, at any one time, an individual holds numerous, sometimes conflicting, views of himself/herself, some of which may remain relatively unconscious.

The self is a system. Numerous seemingly disparate items may be called systems: the human body, an automobile, a university, nature, and a recipe for beef stroganoff. What makes all of these systems? The fact that each is comprised of parts which are organized and interrelated in such a way as to function together as a unit to accomplish given tasks or goals makes them all systems.

There are two important implications of understanding

things as systems: (1) a part cannot be understood separate from the whole and (2) a change in any one part produces changes in other parts and, thus, in the whole. Take, for example, a recipe. Every recipe is comprised of numerous ingredients; however, there is a very real sense in which the finished product is greater than the listing or sum of its parts. Rather, the end product is dependent upon the organization of the ingredients which function together to attain the desired goal. Parts cannot be fully understood separately; if they could, the manner and amount in which they were to be combined would be of no importance. In addition, if one changes the amount or nature of one or more ingredients, this changes the organization and interaction of the parts and produces changes in the system as a whole.

How is this applicable to the self? The self also exists as a whole. The various beliefs that an individual has concerning himself/herself are organized and interrelated. An individual's behavior is influenced by the system rather than any discrete part of the self. For example, one may categorize oneself in numerous ways: intelligent, female, Mexican-American, tall, ugly, young, student, wife, and so forth. Although one of these judgments about oneself may have top priority at any given point in time, they do not generally influence behavior as separate items, but rather as an interrelated system.

Likewise, the interrelated parts of the self influence one another. Research (Diggory 1966; Ludwig and Maehr 1967) has demonstrated that there is a spread-effect when one part of one's self concept changes. For example, when a failure of a highly rated ability occurs, the self-evaluations of other, seemingly unrelated, abilities are lowered. Similarly, the success of highly related abilities raises the evaluation of other abilities.

The self is dynamic. This means that the self is an active component in shaping behavior. It is the vantage point from which we see the world and the active component in shaping our interaction with that world. As Purkey (1970:10) states, "Things are significant or insignificant, important or unimportant, attractive or unattractive, valuable or worthless, in terms of their relationship to oneself."

Thus, the self serves as an organizing force for one's behavior. Individuals behave in such a way as to maintain a consistency with his/her self concept. They also interpret other's behavior and their own experiences so as to retain this consistency. In fact, some research (Maracek and Mettee 1972) has found that individuals will even disclaim or avoid success when success is inconsistent with one's self concept. Such evidence leads one to the conclusion that, although self concept can change rather abruptly, it tends toward ultraconservatism (Purkey 1970:11).

The self has value. Each concept comprising the self is evaluated in positive or negative terms. In addition, some concepts and their corresponding value are more important for the overall self than are others. For example, one may think of oneself as a father, and depending upon one's point of view, that concept may be judged positively or negatively. One may also categorize oneself as tall and, yet, that category may be of little importance in influencing behavior.

It should be noted that the importance of a concept is not dependent upon the value attached to it. For example, one might think that being "black" is an important part of one's self, and, yet, this trait may be evaluated negatively. Likewise, being athletic may be relatively unimportant and, yet, be evaluated positively. Important or unimportant, all concepts comprising the self have value.

The final point to be made about self concept is that the self is socially developed, maintained, enhanced, protected, and altered through interaction with others within a variety of social settings. Through interaction with "significant others" (parents, friends, siblings, teachers, etc), one develops concepts and values of self. The esteem, regard, and evaluation that a person perceives these significant others have for him/her create the self (Cottrell 1969; LaBenne and Greene 1969).

The above discussion leads to the second set of definitions: urban setting and rural setting. A setting may be viewed as any instance in which two or more individuals enter into relationships over an extended period of time in order to achieve certain goals (Sarason 1972:1). The concept of setting has a great deal in common with other concepts in social science like social organization, institution, system, and relationship. The important thing is that whenever individuals enter into sustained relationships, their interaction is subject to countless manifest and latent influences which shape, limit, define, and structure the relationship. These influences are historical, cultural, social, political, psychological, and physical in nature (Reck 1978).

Two important, broadly defined social settings are those of the urban and rural community. Other than the obvious criteria of population size and density, numerous distinctions between the urban and rural community have been made. In fact, beginning with the German social philosopher, Ferdinand Tönnies (1887), considerable attention has been directed at theoretically and empirically distinguishing between urban and rural settings. Tönnies (1887) distinguished between what he called Gemeinschaft (rural) and Gesellschaft (urban) social types. The first was based on personal relationships dominated by kinship and family. The latter was based on impersonal, calculating relationships

dominated by associational ties. The anthropologist, Robert Redfield (1941; 1947; 1955), developed a "folk-urban" continuum pointing to similar kinds of distinctions.

Although these earlier distinctions have been questioned as oversimplistic or no longer applicable (Dewey 1960; Poplin 1972), many rural sociologists feel that there are still significant social distinctions between urban and rural communities. For example, Smith and Zopf (1970) have concluded that there are significant differences between urban and rural communities in terms of anonymity, complexity, diversity, and impersonality. The differences between the two settings might be summarized as seen in Figure 1, page 17 of this chapter, with differences being differences in degree.

Since self concept develops within the framework of social settings, one can deduce that if, in fact, urban and rural settings are significantly different, then self concepts of individuals from the two settings might be quite different. Moreover, one can deduce that urban and rural schools might reflect the differences between the urban and rural communities in general and, thus, contribute to the development of differences in self concept.

How might rural schools as reflections of the rural community differ from urban schools as reflections of the urban community? The following points are tentative and exploratory in nature.

Figure 1

DIFFERENCES IN URBAN AND RURAL SETTINGS

Rural

1. Homogeneity: social life and relations less complex and varied. Greater sense of belonging.
2. Personalism: social relationships are more personal, emphasizing family, kinship, and community.
3. Unity: a greater sense of unity and of goal or purpose.
4. Religion: more sacred view of life.

Urban

1. Heterogeneity: social life and relations complex and varied. Greater sense of isolation, individualism, and alienation.
2. Anonymity: social relationships are impersonal, segmented, and utilitarian.
3. Fragmentation: less agreement and more diversity in goals and purpose.
4. Secularism: more secular view of life.

The first possible difference is that in rural settings school personnel are likely to be better known to students and their parents than they are in urban settings. Teachers, students, and parents interact to a greater degree outside of the context of the school:

In old hometown America the distinction between private and public worlds hardly existed. One's private life--of family, home, and church--was public knowledge. One's public life of occupation, trade, or profession was likewise little separated, if at all, from the home and the circle of kin and lifelong friends. One's identity was one piece (Moore 1976:92).

In contrast, in urban settings:

much of life is carried on in public places, amid people who are often strangers, and certainly not the quasi-familial nature that any hometown fellow once was (Moore 1976:92).

The consequence of this is greater personalization of relationships in a rural educational setting. The self exists more as a whole, a person, which is a part of overlapping relationships in different social settings, rather than as a segment ("teacher" or "student") existing impersonally and anonymously in isolated social settings.

A second difference is that in rural settings non-school social settings are more important than they are in urban settings. This is the result of a more simple division of labor and relative absence of complex occupational specialization, as well as a greater community integration in rural settings (Poplin 1972: 44-45). The absence of

complex specialization has maintained a greater community integration through the spread of functions to several settings. Thus, the integration and relative homogeneity of the rural setting tends to make the school a part of the community rather than apart from the community. Rural schools share the educational function to a greater extent with family, religion, and other social groups.

A third difference is found in the fact that rural schools, usually being smaller than urban schools, are generally less bureaucratized than are urban schools. Bureaucratic organization in schools is directly related to the need to educate large numbers of diverse individuals in an "efficient" manner, and to educate them to function in an impersonal, bureaucratic world (Moore 1976:95-98). In rural settings where schools are smaller and bureaucratic organization less pervasive, depersonalization of the self may in fact be reduced.

These and, perhaps, other differences in the school settings of urban and rural communities appear to follow logically from the discussions of general urban and rural differences in the literature. Since, as mentioned earlier, self concept develops within social settings, the social and educational differences that exist between the rural and urban settings should produce differences in self concept. This research is designed to investigate the potential

differences between the self concepts of a sample of rural Appalachian children and those of a sample of urban Piedmont children.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As mentioned in the previous chapter, research on self concept carried out by educators has increased over the past decade or so. This research has generally built upon previous and concurrent research carried out in several of the social sciences, primarily psychology and social psychology. Stimulated by the theoretical work of such social scientists as Cooley, Mead, Lewin, Maslow, and Rogers, this research has concentrated on the development of an individual's self concept, and the influence that one's self concept has on various facets of one's behavior.

The Development of Self Concept

The initial theoretical work of Cooley, Mead, Lewin and others has pointed out the primary importance of the social environment for the development of the self. Cooley (1902:40) called the result of the self's interaction with the social environment, particularly certain socially significant others such as parents, friends, and teachers, the "looking glass self." The social environment is described by Cooley as a mirror in which we perceive our own reflection

and thus develop a sense of who we are.

Children certainly bring their own potentialities into the world with them, but they must live in a world essentially created by others. These others are, in the main, adults. The interface between the world of adults, and the world of children, is the primary point for the development of the self. As Young (1966:1) has pointed out, it is one of the strangest phenomena in a very strange world that this interface should be filled with such misunderstanding:

When you come to think of it, this is a very strange world. Nothing about it is stranger than the fact all adults were once children. One of those legendary interplanetary visitors that seem to be forever dropping by would certainly never guess it could be so... Once the individual human has passed the imposing boundary of what we euphemistically term maturity, he proceeds either to forget he ever had a past or to transform it with the adaptable colors of retrospection...

So the interface between the two worlds begins and the child is prodded and pampered, kissed and caressed, pushed and punished in order that he/she might somehow attain the skills, knowledge, values, and behavior that characterize the world of adults. Images of the self emerge through this process. Those "giants", usually parents, on whom the child is initially dependent for food, care, security, and love are particularly significant

for the development of self images. Much research (i.e., Davidson and Lang 1960; Ludwig and Maehr 1967; Manis 1958; Meyers 1966; Shaw and Dutton 1965) has demonstrated that the child's self concept is closely associated with his/her parents' or other significant adult's reported level of regard for him/her. That the self concept emerges from this continuing interaction between the individual and his/her social world is one aspect of self concept that is almost universally agreed upon (Felker 1974:30; Webster and Sobieszek 1974:7).

Social Variables Associated with Self Concept

Many studies have concentrated on the relationship of self concept to different social variables, particularly such variables as race, sex, and socioeconomic status. Although some interesting research (i.e., Dreger and Miller 1960; Gabbler and Gibby 1967; Radke-Yarrow, Trager, and Davis 1949) has found that the social evaluation of racial and ethnic groups significantly influences the self concept of individuals in those groups, the variable of race or ethnic group is not directly relevant for this study. Both the urban and rural samples examined in this study were Caucasian.

However, since both samples did include members of both sexes as well as individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds, the literature dealing with the

relationship of these variables to self concept is pertinent. The findings of research in these two areas lead to no definitive conclusions. For example, Baum (1968) found through repeated research using a self report inventory that junior-high-school-aged females possessed a significantly more positive self concept than did junior-high-school-aged males. This finding held for the overall groups as well as for high-achievers and low-achievers. In fact, low-achieving females possessed more positive self concepts than did even high-achieving males.

On the other hand, some research has found no significant differences between male and female self concepts. Lord (1971) investigated the self concept of third, sixth, and tenth graders in several locations in Appalachia and found that males and females did not differ significantly in self concept scores. The same lack of relationship was found among fifth- and sixth-grade children (Coopersmith 1967) and among adolescents (Engel 1959). Still other research (Rappaport, Payne, and Steinmann 1970) has found that male college students possessed more positive self concepts than did female college students, particularly in those areas of self concept related to achievement. In another interesting study of over five hundred sixth-graders (Yancey 1973), females were found to have a more positive self concept than males. However, when the

sample was examined with regard to sex and race, it was found that while black females possessed the most positive self concept, white males ranked second, white females were third, and black males possessed the lowest self concept (Yancey 1973:53).

All of this research indicates that if there is a relationship between self concept and sex, it is as yet poorly understood. Clearly, this is an area of self concept research needing much more investigation.

The relationship between self concept and socioeconomic status appears to be not much clearer. A common sense assumption regarding the possible relationship is that children from lower socioeconomic levels of society will possess lower self concepts due to their relatively disadvantaged economic and social position in the larger society. However, the research in this area fails to systematically verify this conclusion. There is a fairly large body of research (i.e., Ausubel and Ausubel 1963; Crovetto, Fischer, and Boudreaux 1967; Hawk 1967) which has found that the self-reports of children from lower socioeconomic levels of society are characterized by deep feelings of low self-esteem and self-deprecation. Other research has confirmed a more positive self concept for economically advantaged children. In a comparative study of economically advantaged Appalachian town children and economically disadvantaged "hollow" Appalachian

children, Lord (1971:22) found that the self concepts of the advantaged group were significantly higher than those of the disadvantaged group, although neither group possessed what could be considered a "negative" self concept. In fact, using the national normative scale developed for The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, Lord (1971: 23-24) concluded that the disadvantaged group possessed "average" self concepts while the advantaged group possessed "above average" self concepts.

There is research which directly contradicts the above findings. Some research (i.e., Carter 1968; Coleman 1966; Coopersmith 1969; Kerensky 1967) has found no significant relationship between self concept and socioeconomic status. Coleman (1966) has suggested that in a relatively culturally and economically homogeneous environment, positive self concept might be developed and maintained despite larger economic disadvantages. He has also argued that increasing cultural and economic heterogeneity in the economically disadvantaged child's environment tends to produce a lower self concept.

Still other research has found an inverse relationship between self concept and socioeconomic status. Soares and Soares (1969), in a comparative study of the self concepts of economically advantaged and disadvantaged children in grades 4 to 8 in a New England city school system, reported generally more positive self concepts for disadvantaged children than for advantaged children. Trowbridge (1972)

carried out the same sort of study using a sample from 42 elementary schools in rural and urban areas of central Iowa and found that the lower socioeconomic children exhibited significantly more positive self concepts than did the middle socioeconomic children. This finding was the inverse of her findings in earlier research (Trowbridge 1969, 1970).

Clearly, the research is ambiguous with regard to the relationship of self concept to socioeconomic status. The relationship may be compounded by other variables such as the geographic location of the sample, the degree of urbanization of the sample, the cultural and economic heterogeneity of the environment, and others. This ambiguity has led Purkey (1970:36) to conclude:

... it is likely that the emotional climate of the family is more important than economic or social factors and that the emotional press toward low self-esteem can exist in both advantaged and disadvantaged families.

For this particular study, the most important social variable examined was the effect of urban and rural settings on self concept. However, due to the central importance of this variable for the present research, the literature dealing with urban and rural settings and self concept will be discussed at length in the final section of this chapter.

Self Concept and Behavior

Considerable research has been directed at investigating the relationship between self concept and particular behavioral traits. This research is guided by the assumption that the self is the central, if not the sole, vantage point from which the individual experiences the world and that, therefore, the individual's behavior reflects this vantage point (Combs, Avila and Purkey 1971; Felker 1974; Purkey 1970). A further central assumption of this research is that the individual behaves in accordance with his/her self concept in order to reduce the potential dissonance between self concept and behavior (Festinger 1962; Lecky 1945). Thus, the interaction between self concept and behavior becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy in which an individual behaves consistently with his/her self concept and thereby confirms the accuracy of that self concept.

Research in this area has been diverse, dealing with such topics as the relationship of self concept to honesty (Eisen 1972) and attraction for others (Leonard 1975). For this study, the most significant research in this area has to do with the relationship of self concept to achievement. The research in this particular area of behavior has consistently demonstrated that positive self concept is significantly related to high academic achievement (Felker 1974:12; Purkey 1970:15).

One of the earliest and, perhaps, still one of the most significant investigations into the relationship between self concept and academic achievement was the longitudinal studies by Brookover and his associates (1962, 1965, 1967). This research set out to establish, in part, the degree to which seventh-grade students' self concept was related to academic performance. In their sample of over 1000 white students in an urban school system, the researchers concluded that there was a consistent, positive relationship between positive self concept and academic performance. This relationship remained even after I.Q. was factored out. These results have been overwhelmingly confirmed by other research.

Borislow (1962) found that academic underachievers possessed a self concept characterized by a more pessimistic and negative view of themselves than did achievers. This was found to be true both prior and subsequent to the performance of particular academic tasks.

Using a self concept rating developed from the combination of evaluations of students in a high school freshman class made by three psychologists, Fink (1962) found a significant relationship between the adequacy of self concept and the level of academic achievement. This relationship was less significant for females than for males.

Bledsoe (1967) explored the relationship of the self concepts of fourth- and sixth-grade children to intelligence, achievement, and anxiety. Confirming the findings of Fink (1962), Bledsoe found a significant positive correlation between self concept and academic achievement among males, but insignificant correlations for females.

Using a somewhat different approach, Shaw, Edson, and Bell (1960) used the "Sarbin Adjective Checklist" to measure the perceived self of high school juniors and seniors. The researchers found that male achievers scored significantly higher than male underachievers on the adjectives Realistic, Optimistic, Enthusiastic, Reliable, Clear-thinking, and Intelligent. Female achievers scored significantly higher than female underachievers on only two adjectives: Ambitious and Responsible. The researchers concluded that male achievers felt more positive about themselves than did male underachievers, while such a generalization could not be made about the female groups.

The differences often found with regard to males and females in the area of academic achievement and self concept may be related to prevalent societal attitudes toward sex roles. Achievement in general is traditionally associated with the male role and thus the male's perceived success or lack of success at achievement would have greater bearing on his self evaluation. On the other hand, traditional female roles have been less associated with

achievement so that the female's perceived success or lack of success in achievement would tend to be less important for her self concept. Such an interpretation fits with Rappaport, Payne, and Steinmann's (1970) research with college women. The researchers found that achievement was a less important component of self concept for unmarried college women than it was for married college women. They concluded that social factors (e.g., dating, social life) were more important ingredients in the self concept of unmarried females, factors which were more congruent with traditional definitions of the female role. This interpretation would also fit well with the findings that gifted and talented females frequently exhibit unresolved conflicts concerning their perceived femininity since their achievement conflicts with traditional conceptions of the female role (Horner 1969; Morse and Bruch 1970; Reck 1977).

Although the bulk of research regarding the relationship between self concept and achievement has been done with public-school-aged subjects, some research has been carried out with college students (Centi 1965; Diller 1954; Irwin 1967; Miller 1973). The reasons for the relative neglect of college-aged students in self concept research are not known, although the neglect may have something to do with the widely accepted notion that self concept is established early in life and is virtually impervious to change. Although the self does lean toward conservatism,

there is research which demonstrates that an individual's self concept can be significantly altered in a relatively short time when that individual perceives other's ratings of him/her have changed (Haas and Maehr 1965; Morse and Gergen 1970; Sherwood 1965; Videbeck 1960).

Research with college-aged students has not only found a relationship between self concept and achievement (Irwin 1967), but also has demonstrated that the self concepts of college students can and do change with experience (Centi 1965; Diller 1954). For example, Centi (1965) investigated the self concepts of college freshmen before and after their first semester of school. Those students who received poor grades suffered a loss in positive feelings about the self. They went through successive stages of hostility toward the course, the teacher, and finally the entire university, all of which culminated in an avoidance of academic concerns and a further decline in their academic achievement. The self-fulfilling prophecy was in full swing.

There has also been some research which investigated self concept and its relationship to particular academic skills, notably reading. Lamy (1965) and Wattenberg and Clifford (1962) found that the self concept of kindergarten children was a good predictor of early academic achievement, particularly in reading. Lamy found that self concept, obtained from inferences made by trained observers, was as

good a predictor of later reading achievement as were intelligence test scores. Wattenberg and Clifford measured self concept of kindergarten children through statements made by the children as they drew pictures of their family and as they responded to incomplete sentences. They, too, concluded that self concept was antecedent to and predictive of later reading achievement. This conclusion has been substantiated in research with older children which has found a relationship between self concept and reading ability (Carlton and Moore 1966; Zimmerman and Allebrand 1965). Research with college level students has also found that effective readers reported positive self concepts and ineffective readers reported negative self concepts (Brunkan and Sherri 1966).

All of this research demonstrating a relationship between positive self concept and academic achievement is overwhelmingly convincing. The significance of this relationship for education is obvious: the enhancement of self concept is an important ingredient in promoting academic achievement. Students with poor self concepts will find it difficult to succeed academically. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that such individuals will actually avoid success if it conflicts with their negative self concepts (Maracek and Mettee 1972), or that they will explain success in terms of luck rather than in terms of personal ability (Fitch 1970). On the other hand, students with

positive self concepts will tend to continue to be academic achievers.

Self Concept and Rural and Urban Settings

Research dealing with self concept in rural and urban settings is surprisingly minimal. Despite the long tradition of distinguishing between the social life of the rural and urban settings, distinctions that were discussed in the preceding chapter, there has been little research attempting to discover what effects, if any, such differences have on self concept. Of course, there is research which has used urban or rural samples independently of one another to investigate self concept, but little has been done comparing a rural population sample with an urban population sample. Much of the research discussed earlier on self concept and its relationship with achievement utilized urban samples (e.g., Brookover et al. 1962, 1965, 1967). Research on the self concept of minority groups has generally relied upon urban samples (e.g., Garrett and Willoughby 1972). All in all, rural samples have remained relatively neglected, a fact which is curious given the amount of concern with the effect of economic disadvantages on self concept. As Lord (1971:6) has pointed out, research dealing with the self concept of economically disadvantaged children has concentrated on the urban ghetto child while neglecting such groups as the rural Appalachian child.

Most of the research utilizing rural samples has concentrated on minority groups. Powell and White (1969, 1972) have examined the self concepts of rural blacks and compared these with rural whites. In one study, Powell and White (1972) investigated the self concept of 101 male and female black fifth graders in a rural community in the South through the use of the Children's Personality Questionnaire and three tests on reading materials. They concluded that the children did not value personality and self concept traits associated with academic achievement, such as word knowledge and discrimination, reading and arithmetic skills, and general intelligence. They further characterized themselves as submissive and dependent. In earlier research, Powell and White (1969) compared the self concept perceptions of 95 rural black and 95 rural white third graders and found that whites generally perceived themselves according to a consistently positive structure, while blacks possessed greater ambivalence about themselves.

Research which has actually compared the self concept of rural and urban samples is extremely limited. This research has varied in terms of such factors as the geographic region from which the samples were drawn, the racial composition of the samples, and the method and purpose of the research.

Trowbridge (1972) studied the self concept of a large sample of urban/rural elementary school children from central Iowa. Her research had three basic purposes: (1) to determine whether measurable differences in self concept existed between children of different socioeconomic status; (2) to discover the dimensions of self concept in which differences occurred; and (3) to discover whether the differences in self concept by socioeconomic status found in her earlier research were confounded with other variables such as race, age, sex, and density of population. Although her focus was on the variable of socioeconomic status, her research did examine the relationship of self concept to density of population, meaning to rural and urban locales of the sample.

Using the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory, Trowbridge found that the variables of socioeconomic status, race, and population density all had significant relationships with self concept. In contrast to her earlier research, she found that lower socioeconomic status children possessed a more positive self concept than the higher socioeconomic children. In addition, she found that the black children in her sample possessed a more positive self concept than the white children. Most related to the present study, she found that rural-small town children possessed more positive self concepts than urban children.

Conclusions of research by Wendland (1968) are in agreement with the findings of Trowbridge with regard to

rural and urban differences in self concept. Wendland was particularly interested in the interaction of race and residence area on self concept differences. Her sample consisted of 685 black and white eighth graders distributed over four categories of residence areas in North Carolina. These categories were labeled country, village, town, and city, and were conceptualized as forming a rural-urban continuum in the tradition of Redfield (1941). The primary self concept instrument utilized was the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, and the data from this scale were supplemented by two specially derived Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory scales on cynicism and estrangement and a questionnaire pertaining to family status and future aspirations.

With regard to race, Wendland found that the black adolescents did not possess a more negative self concept than the white adolescents. In fact, she found a slightly more positive self concept among the blacks in her sample. This finding was consistent in all four residential areas. She did, however, find a greater cynicism toward the world and greater feelings of estrangement from other people among the blacks in her sample. The black adolescents were thus found to possess positive self concepts, a cynical orientation to the environment, and a feeling of alienation from others. Wendland suggests that the apparent contradiction between a positive self concept

and a cynical, alienated attitude toward the world and others is understandable as a positive adaptive maneuver for blacks living in a racially prejudiced environment. In short, she interprets these findings as the blacks' reaction to the dis-esteem in which they are held by the larger society in which they interpret this as an inadequacy in the discriminator rather than in themselves.

More related to this study were her findings regarding the relationship of self concept and area of residence. She found that rural adolescents possessed a more positive self concept than did the urban adolescents. The relationship was most evident among blacks but was also present to a lesser extent among whites. However, beyond the differences in self concept with regard to a general rural/urban dichotomy, there was no consistent relationship of changes in self concept to changes in residential area on the continuum. In other words, even though the rural end of the continuum possessed more positive self concepts than the urban end, there was no consistent movement from positive to negative self concept as one moved from the rural through intermediate points toward the urban.

Another study which focused on the relationship of rural and urban settings with self concept was that carried out by Yancey (1973). Yancey utilized a random sample consisting of sixth graders from both a southern rural school district and a southern urban school district. The total

sample was 510 divided into 383 males and 127 females, and 325 whites and 185 blacks. Yancey concentrated on the self concept of academic ability (SCOAA) rather than general self concept with the intention of investigating differences between the rural and urban samples. The self concept of academic achievement was defined as "the evaluation one makes of oneself in respect to the ability to achieve in academic tasks in general as compared with others" (Yancey 1973:8-9). The SCOAA of the subjects was determined by use of the Michigan State University Self Concept of Academic Ability Scale. In addition, two tests were used to investigate who the subjects considered to be significant others in terms of their feelings about themselves.

Yancey found that black females rated themselves highest on SCOAA, while black males rated themselves lowest. White males ranked second while white females followed. The most frequently named significant others for both general self concept and self concept of academic achievement for both racial and area groups were parents.

With regard to the rural/urban variable, Yancey found that the urban sample scored significantly higher than the rural sample on SCOAA. The ranking for each group from highest mean score to lowest mean score was as follows: (1) urban black female, (2) urban white male, (3) rural white male, (4) urban black male, (5) urban white

female, (6) rural black female, (7) rural white female, and (8) rural black male. As can be seen, only one rural group (rural white males) ranked higher in mean SC00AA than any of the urban groups. Thus, Yancey's findings contrast with the findings of Wendland (1968) and Trowbridge (1972) discussed earlier. However, one must remember that Yancey dealt only with the self concept of academic achievement while Wendland and Trowbridge dealt with the broader notion of general self concept.

A study which is closest in focus, method, and sample to this study is that carried out in Appalachia by Lord (1971). Lord compared the self concepts of economically poor, Appalachian "hollow" children with the self concepts of urban, economically advantaged, Appalachian children. The sample consisted of 299 third, sixth, and tenth grade students from nine schools in southern West Virginia in the Appalachian mountains. Five of the schools with 183 of the subjects were economically poor "hollow" schools. Two of these schools with 109 of the subjects were economically homogeneous; that is, the children were all poor. The other three "hollow" schools with 74 of the subjects were economically heterogeneous, that is comprised of both poor and advantaged children. The four urban schools with 116 subjects were located in Williamson, West Virginia, a town with a population of approximately 6500 people. Lord was interested in not only comparing

the self concept of her rural and urban samples, but also was interested in seeing if there were any self concept differences between the "hollow" children in the economically homogenous schools and those in the economically heterogeneous schools.

Lord used the same self concept scale utilized in this study, The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. When analyzed, the data collected with this scale revealed that the urban children possessed significantly more positive self concepts than either of the rural groups of children. No significant differences were found between the self concepts of the rural poor children from the economically homogeneous schools and those from the economically heterogeneous schools. An analysis of each of the six self concept clusters of the overall scale revealed that the urban sample scored significantly more positive on each of the factors except Anxiety, where no significant difference was found. No significant differences were found with regard to the six clusters between the two rural groups.

Thus, Lord's findings concerning the relationship between self concept and urban and rural settings generally agree with the findings of Yancey (1973). Both studies found that urban children possessed more positive self concepts than rural children. These results conflict with the findings of Trowbridge (1972) and Wendland (1968)

who found that rural children possessed more positive self concepts than did urban children. These mixed results indicate that additional research is needed, and this research hopefully helps fill the void.

In addition, this research hopefully takes care of the major problem with Lord's research. Since Lord's "urban" sample came from a town with a population of only approximately 6500 people, it is questionable whether or not she was actually comparing a rural and an urban sample. A more accurate conceptualization of the two samples that she studied would be in terms of Wendland's (1968) categories of rural and village. In reality, Lord was comparing two rural populations living in different residential arrangements and economic conditions. Her data could, in fact, reflect the economic differences between the two populations rather than differences in residence. The present research drew its urban sample from a city with a population of approximately 150,000. Thus, the sample was truly urban. Moreover, the rural sample was drawn from a relatively isolated area of Appalachia. Being located in the mountains of Appalachia some distance from the nearest town, the area from which the rural sample was taken may possess more of the rural traits identified by theorists like Tönnies and Redfield than did the non-Appalachian rural samples used in the research by Yancey, Wendland, and Trowbridge. For these

reasons, this research will hopefully help to clarify the relationship between self concept and urban and rural settings and to help understand the basis of that relationship.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Description of the Sample

The sample consisted of 86 sixth graders from a rural Appalachian county school system and 80 sixth graders from an urban Piedmont city school system. The rural sample came from three separate schools, all of which were the most rural in location of the county schools. The county had a total population of around 28,800, with the largest town in the county having a population of 7,932. The three schools from which the sample was drawn were all located from 12-16 miles from this town. All of the rural schools consisted of grades K-8 and were small in comparison to the urban schools, ranging from approximately 180-300 students each. All of the rural subjects were members of self-contained classrooms and had lived in this setting for at least the last five years.

The urban sample came from two schools located in a Piedmont city with a population of over 150,000 people. These schools consisted only of grades 4-6 and had a total student population of around 500-600 each. Both of the schools were located in lower-middle-class residential neighborhoods; however, school busing created greater

heterogeneity in the student population. All of the urban sample were also members of self-contained classrooms and had lived in an urban setting for at least the last five years.

The rural sample consisted of 39 males (45%) and 47 females (55%); the urban sample consisted of 33 males (41%) and 47 females (59%). Thus, in the total sample there were 72 males (43.4%) and 94 females (56.6%). The sexual division of the sample was determined purely by the composition of the classes used in the sample.

The occupation and education of the parents of the students in the sample were used as measures of the socioeconomic status of the two populations. These factors were not combined to form an overall socioeconomic index but rather were examined separately in terms of their relationship with self concept. The educational levels of the rural and urban populations differed, with the rural parents possessing considerably less education than the urban parents (See Tables 1 and 2). For example, almost 35 percent of the rural fathers possessed nine years of education or less while the comparable figure for urban fathers was only 1.4 percent. On the other end of the scale, urban fathers with anywhere from one year of college to graduate school amounted to almost 57 percent, while the comparable figure for rural fathers was only about 5½ percent.

Table 1

Percentage of Rural and Urban Fathers Classified
by Educational Level

Educational Level	Rural	Urban
grades 3-6	16 21.3%	0 0%
grades 7-9	10 13.3%	1 1.4%
grades 10-12	45 60.0%	31 41.9%
college (1-4 years)	2 2.7%	37 50.0%
graduate school	2 2.7%	5 6.8%
Total ^a	75	74

^aNumber of missing observations = 17

Table 2

Percentage of Rural and Urban Mothers Classified
by Educational Level

Educational Level	Rural	Urban
grades 3-6	5 6.3%	0 0%
grades 7-9	17 21.3%	1 1.3%
grades 10-12	52 65.0%	41 53.2%
college (1-4 years)	6 7.5%	32 41.6%
graduate school	0 0%	3 3.9%
Total^a	80	77

^aNumber of missing observations = 9

Although the difference in educational level of rural and urban mothers was not as great as that of rural and urban fathers, the urban mothers did possess more educational experience. For example, almost 28 percent of the rural mothers had less than nine years of education, while only 1.3 percent of the urban mothers were in the same educational category. Over 45 percent of the urban mothers had some college education, while only 7.5 percent of the rural mothers did.

The same sort of differences were evident when parents' occupation was compared (See Tables 3 and 4). The numerous parental occupations were collapsed into eleven categories similar to the outline of occupations and prestige scores developed by NORC. The eleven categories utilized were professional, other professional, managerial, sales/advertising, white collar, skilled craft, blue collar, secretarial/clerical, owner/proprietor, homemaker, and other. For a detailed listing of what specific occupations were placed into each of these categories see Appendix A.

The differences between urban and rural fathers' occupations were greater than those of urban and rural mothers. The occupations of urban fathers were clustered to a much greater extent in professional and managerial categories (29.2 percent) than were those of rural fathers (8.2 percent). The bulk of rural fathers' occupations were clustered in the skilled craft, blue collar, and owner/

Table 3

Percentage of Rural and Urban Fathers Classified
by Occupational Level

Occupational Level ^a	Rural	Urban
Professional	2 2.3%	12 15.2%
Other Professional	1 1.2%	4 5.1%
Managerial	4 4.7%	7 8.9%
Sales/Advertising	3 3.5%	12 15.2%
White Collar	4 4.7%	11 13.9%
Skilled Craft	16 18.6%	13 16.5%
Blue Collar	27 31.4%	17 21.5%
Owner/Proprietor	16 18.6%	0 0%
Other	13 15.1%	3 3.8%
Total^b	86	79

^aThere were no respondents from either setting in the following occupational levels: homemaker and secretarial/clerical. Therefore, they were omitted in the above table.

^bNumber of missing observation = 1

Table 4

Percentage of Rural and Urban Mothers Classified
by Occupational Level

Occupational Level ^a	Rural	Urban
Other Professional	1 1.2%	6 7.5%
Managerial	2 2.3%	2 2.5%
Sales/Advertising	1 1.2%	0 0%
White Collar	1 1.2%	1 1.3%
Skilled Craft	6 7.0%	0 0%
Blue Collar	12 14.0%	4 5.0%
Secretarial/Clerical	3 3.5%	5 6.3%
Owner/Proprietor	1 1.2%	0 0%
Homemaker	55 64.0%	60 75.0%
Other	4 4.7%	2 2.5%
Total	86	80

^aThere were no respondents from either setting in the professional occupational level. Therefore, this level was omitted in the above table.

proprietor (farmer) categories (68.6 percent), while a smaller percentage of urban fathers' occupations were so categorized (38 percent). Occupations of mothers were more similar, with the vast majority of mothers in both settings working as homemakers.

The factors of parental education and occupation indicate that the two samples differed greatly in socioeconomic status when defined by education and occupation. With regard to both education and occupation, the rural sample could be judged to be of a lower socioeconomic status than the urban sample.

Finally, the two samples differed with regard to achievement level (See Table 5). Over one-half of the rural sample was below average achievement for sixth graders, while less than 18 percent of the urban sample was below average. On the other hand, almost 58 percent of the urban sample was above average achievement level, while only around 28 percent of the rural sample was above average.

The factors of sex, parents' education, parents' occupation, and educational achievement were all examined in relation to self concept. Since the two populations did differ with regard to all of these factors except sex, their relationship to self concept needed examination in order to establish the influence of rural and urban settings on self concept.

Table 5

Percentage of Rural and Urban Respondents Classified
by Total Achievement Level

Total Achievement Level	Rural	Urban
Below 5.4 G.P.A.	43 50.6%	14 17.9%
5.5 - 6.5 G.P.A.	18 21.2%	19 24.4%
6.6 and above G.P.A.	24 28.2%	45 57.7%
Total ^a	85	78

^aNumber of missing observations = 3

Description of the Instrument and Its Administration

The instrument used to measure and compare the self concept scores of the rural and urban samples was The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. The scale was developed from Jersild's (1952) self concept categories derived from collections of children's statements about what they liked and disliked about themselves. The original scale of 164 items was reduced to the present scale of 80 items after two pilot studies and item analysis (Piers and Harris 1969:2-3).

Using the scale, Piers and Harris (1965) carried out a factor analysis on 457 sixth graders and found six factors large enough to be interpretable. These were labeled (1) behavior, (2) intellectual and school status, (3) physical appearance and attributes, (4) anxiety, (5) popularity, and (6) happiness and satisfaction. A total of 67 of the 80 items cluster into one of these factors.

An internal consistency analysis for the 80-item scale produced a correlation of .90 with Kuder-Richardson formula 21 and .90 with Spearman-Brown odd-even formula. Stability by retest after a four-month interval was .77. The concurrent validity of the scale was found to be .80 when correlated with the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory.

The scale consists of 80 yes-no items of simple, clear declarative statements such as "I am smart" or "I do many

bad things." The subject responds "yes" to those items that are true of him/her and "no" to those items which are not true. Each item is scored in the direction of positive self concept depending on how it is stated. In order to reduce the effects of acquiescence, approximately half of the "correct" (positive self concept) responses are stated in the negative and half are stated in the affirmative. For example, the "correct" response to the statement "I am unpopular" is "no", while the "correct" response to "I have good ideas" is "yes."

Norms for evaluating the total self concept score were established by Piers and Harris (1969:10-11) from a study of 1183 small-town Pennsylvania public school children ranging from fourth grade to twelfth grade. Theoretically, raw scores could range from 0 to 80; in actuality, Piers and Harris (1969:10) found their sample to range from 18 to 76 with a mean of 51.84 and a median of 53.43. For the purposes of this study, "high" self concept included raw scores ranging from 61 to 80; "average" self concept included raw scores ranging from 46 to 60; and "low" self concept included raw scores falling below 46. In terms of Piers and Harris' norms, "high" self concept were those with a percentile ranking of 71 or above; "average" self concept were those with a percentile ranking of between 31 and 69; and "low" self concept were those with a percentile ranking of 29 or below.

As mentioned earlier, most of the items cluster into one of six factors. Each of the cluster scores can be looked at independently of the general self concept score. This research not only compared the rural and urban samples with regard to general self concept scores, but also with regard to each one of the cluster scores. Such an analysis provides a finer picture of self concept differences.

The six clusters, the numbers of items scored in each cluster, and examples of items from each cluster are as follows:

(1) Behavior: (Items 12, 13, 14, 22, 25, 34, 35, 38, 45, 48, 56, 59, 62, 78, 80) I do many bad things; I am obedient at home; I am often in trouble; I can be trusted.

(2) Intellectual and School Status: (Items 5, 9, 16, 17, 21, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 42, 49, 53, 66, 70) I am good in my school work; I am smart; I am a good reader; I forget what I learn.

(3) Physical Appearance and Attributes: (Items 8, 15, 29, 41, 54, 57, 60, 63, 73) I am good looking; I have a pleasant face; I am strong; I am a leader in games and sports.

(4) Anxiety: (Items 4, 7, 10, 20, 28, 37, 74, 79) I cry easily; I worry a lot; I am often afraid; I get nervous when the teacher calls on me.

(5) Popularity: (Items 1, 3, 6, 11, 40, 46, 51, 58, 65, 69, 77) People pick on me; I am among the last chosen for games; I have many friends; I feel left out of things.

(6) Happiness and Satisfaction: (Items 2, 36, 39, 43, 50, 52, 67) I am a happy person; I like being the way I am; I am unhappy; I am easy to get along with.

The scale was administered to groups of 15-20 subjects. After the researcher read aloud a set of directions, each item was read aloud and the subjects were given a short time to respond in written form to the item. The oral reading of the items by the researcher was designed to minimize the interference of reading problems. The administration of the full 80-item scale took a total of about twenty minutes for each group.

In addition to the administration of The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, each subject was asked to respond to twelve incomplete sentences (See Appendix B). These sentences were derived by the researcher from items on the Piers-Harris Scale. Each of the six self concept clusters were represented by two incomplete sentences. Each sentence was read aloud by the researcher and the subjects were asked to respond by writing in a completion of each sentence. For example, sentences included "I get worried when..." and "In school I am ..."

Finally, each subject was asked to respond three times to the question, "Who Are You?" which is known as the W-A-Y technique (Bugental and Zelen, 1950). They were instructed to respond in any manner they wished as long as they gave three answers to the question (See Appendix B).

These latter two techniques of data collection were administered to the same subjects several weeks after The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale was administered. Administration was completed in approximately twenty minutes for each class. The purpose of the data collected through these latter techniques was to supplement in the understanding and aid in the interpretation and explanation of the data collected through the Piers-Harris Scale. These latter techniques are more flexible and less structured, providing an opportunity for the subjects to create their own responses rather than to respond to predetermined statements.

Information concerning such things as each subject's achievement level, parents' occupational and educational levels, and sex of the subjects was gathered from school records. This information was used to analyze the interaction of sex, socio-economic status, and achievement with self concept.

Mode of Analysis

All hypotheses related to self (as measured by The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale) were tested for significance by utilizing the t-test. In addition, when the two sample populations (rural - urban) were grouped according to sex, achievement, and parents' education and occupation and compared to general self concept and the

cluster scores (as measured by The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale), significance was tested by use of ANOVA. When the open-ended sentences and the "Who Are You?" responses were compared with setting, sex, and achievement, the chi-square test of significance was used.

Hyptheses and Rationale

Null Hypothesis I: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in their general self concept scores.

Research Hypothesis I: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher general self concept scores.

Null Hypothesis II: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the behavior cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis II: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher behavior cluster self concept scores.

Null Hypothesis III: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the intellectual and school status cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis III: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher intellectual and school status cluster self concept scores.

Null Hypothesis IV: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the physical appearance and attributes cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis IV: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher physical appearance and attribute cluster self concept scores.

Null Hypothesis V: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the anxiety cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis V: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher anxiety cluster self concept scores (meaning less anxiety).

Null Hypothesis VI: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the popularity cluster

score of self concept

Research Hypothesis VI: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher popularity cluster self concept scores.

Null Hypothesis VII: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the happiness and satisfaction cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis VII: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher happiness and satisfaction cluster self concept scores.

As can be seen, the direction of all of the research hypotheses is toward rural Appalachian children having a more positive general self concept, as well as more positive scores on each of the six self concept factors. The rationale for directing the hypotheses in such a way lies in the differences between rural and urban communities. These differences and their relationship to **self concept** will be briefly explored in order to explain the direction of the research hypotheses and the thinking of the researcher before the hypotheses were tested.

As mentioned earlier, the development of rural and urban social typologies by social scientists like Tönnies and

Redfield, helped establish a concern with examining the important differences between these two types of communities. This tradition has continued to the present day, stimulated by what has been called one of the dominant social themes of the last half of the twentieth century: the quest for community (Nisbet 1960:82). This quest utilizes the notion of community in its philosophical or moral sense, as something of value. It has been noted that this social theme of the quest for community is rooted in the alienation and segmentation of urban mass society and the consequent desire for a sense of belonging, unity, involvement, and wholeness within a community setting (Minar and Greer 1969).

The similarity between the use of community in this moral sense and the characterization of the rural community found in writers like Tönnies and Redfield is obvious. Both the rural community and the moral community are seen as characterized by greater homogeneity, cohesiveness, personalism, and unity. Since the self develops within a social setting, it is reasonable to assume that rural and urban settings will differentially influence self concept. The differences between the two settings would seem to result in a more favorable self concept in the rural setting. Specifically, what are these differences and how might they be related to self concept differences?

The first and, perhaps, the most important factor is the greater wholeness of the rural setting. Life and

activities are less segmented into unrelated spheres than in the urban setting. The greater wholeness or inter-relatedness of the rural setting is grounded in two basic factors of rural life: (a) "... the resident of a rural community is...emeshed in a tight-knit web of social relationships" (Poplin 1972:44) and (b) the relatively "...low division of labor which typifies most rural communities" (Poplin 1972:45). Thus, the various institutions (i.e., school, church, family, etc.) which form an individual's social life are all interrelated because of small population, greater social homogeneity, and a simple division of labor. One goes to church, school, social functions, and work with the same group of people. This provides a greater wholeness and less segmentation for one's life.

The major implication of this fact of rural life on rural schools is that rural schools are community schools, they are interrelated with other community institutions, and they are less specialized, meaning that to a greater degree they share the function of education with other community institutions. Increased specialization is one of the main features of the historical development of urban centers and the more recent onset of industrialization (Eames and Goode 1977:40-41). The fact that education is not viewed as a specialized function of a specialized setting in societies that have not yet undergone

urbanization is amply documented (Henry 1976:129-132; Mead 1976:64; Moore 1976:91). As anthropologist G. Alexander Moore (1976:91) has stated:

In primitive and agrarian societies education...was carried out by the whole community. This was so even in those literate societies that had separate entities called "schools." One learned what one needed to know just by growing up among peers and elders in one's community.

The more significant role that family and kin and the church play in a person's education in a rural setting has often been noted (Bertrand 1958:215 and 240). Thus, the educational function is not factored out as much from the rural community, but rather is spread among community institutions, producing a greater interrelatedness in those institutions.

This greater community interrelatedness means that there should be greater consistency between the expectations of the various community institutions on the individual. Such consistency would result in a self that is more fully whole as opposed to a segmented self which develops in an urban area as the result of diverse and often conflicting expectations. The sort of schizophrenic division of one's self into private vs. public worlds, family vs. work worlds, home vs. play worlds that occurs in urban settings is reduced in rural settings (Moore 1976:92). The result of this should be a more fully integrated, more positive self concept.

A second related difference is that social life in a rural setting is a great deal more personalized than in an urban setting. Individuals interact with one another within different social contexts, creating a less depersonalized (role-oriented) mode of interaction. Mrs. Jones is known to students not only in her role as teacher, but also on the basis of church and family relations. Similarly, ten-year old Martha is known to her teacher not only from her role as student, but also from family and church relations. Thus, individuals are seen as individuals rather than as role-segments of individuals.

This means that the knowledge of individuals who interact with one another in a rural school is greater than in an urban school where individuals generally "know" each other only for the duration of the school day and interact with one another only in the limited sphere of school-defined roles. Once again, the result should be a more fully integrated, more positive self concept.

The final important difference is that rural life is less bureaucratized than is urban life. The increased bureaucratization of life is closely related to the presence of impersonal social relationships. Bureaucracies operate according to rules and routines; interaction and decisions are therefore impersonal. Wherever social institutions develop size and complexity they tend to develop toward greater bureaucratization.

Even though the movement toward rural school consolidation during the 1950's decreased the number of rural school districts by over fifty percent (Bertrand 1958:232), rural schools have generally remained much smaller than urban schools. Certainly, the schools from which samples for this study were drawn reflect this fact: the rural schools averaged around 250 students spread over eight grades while the urban schools averaged around 550 spread over just three grades.

The result of less bureaucracy and size in rural schools is a greater personalism between personnel in the school system. As has been pointed out (Moore 1976:95-98), bureaucratic organization in schools is directly related to the need to "efficiently" educate vast numbers of diverse individuals so that they can function in an impersonal, bureaucratic world. This need is present in the urban school and relatively absent in the rural school. The impersonalism of bureaucratic organization may be necessary under certain conditions, but it takes its toll in terms of producing feelings of alienation, depersonalization, and loneliness.

Thus, where bureaucratic organization is less pervasive, as in rural school settings, the result will be a lessening of the factors of alienation, depersonalization, and isolation of the self. A more positive self concept would once again be the result of this factor in the rural setting.

All of these ingredients of the rural setting and their interaction with the rural school and individuals' self concepts would reasonably seem to produce a more positive self concept among rural children. These are the reasons which lie behind the direction of the research hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

All of the hypotheses that were formulated in Chapter III were tested by comparing two sixth-grade sample populations, urban and rural.

General Self Concept

Null Hypothesis I: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in their general self concept scores.

Research Hypothesis I: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth-graders to have higher general self concept scores.

The data did not support either the null hypothesis or the research hypothesis (See Table 6). Therefore, both hypotheses were rejected. However, the data did support the inverse of the research hypothesis. Scores obtained by administering The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale revealed that urban Piedmont sixth graders have a higher general self concept score than rural Appalachian sixth graders ($t = -5.10, 154 \text{ df}, p < .001$).

Cluster Scores of Self Concept

The measure of general self concept according to the

Table 6

General Self Concept Scores^a by Area

	Rural	Urban
Mean Number of Responses	53.5465	63.5465
Standard Deviation	13.762	11.471
Standard Error	1.484	1.282

$t = -5.10$

$df = 164$

$p < .001$

^aBased on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers and Harris, 1969).

Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale contains the following cluster scores from which the remaining hypotheses were formed: (1) behavior, (2) intellectual and school status, (3) physical appearance and attributes, (4) anxiety, (5) popularity, and (6) happiness and satisfaction.

Null Hypothesis II: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the behavior cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis II: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher behavior cluster self concept scores.

The data **did** not support either the null hypothesis or the research hypothesis (See Table 7). Therefore, both hypotheses were rejected. However, the data did support the inverse of the research hypothesis. Behavior cluster scores obtained by administering The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale revealed that urban Piedmont sixth graders have a higher behavior self concept score than rural Appalachian sixth graders ($t = -3.72$, 164 df, $p < .001$).

Null Hypothesis III: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the intellectual and school status cluster score of self concept.

Table 7
Behavior Cluster Scores^a by Area

	Rural	Urban
Mean Number of Responses	11.9186	13.3625
Standard Deviation	3.022	1.891
Standard Error	0.326	0.211

$t = -3.72$

$df = 164$

$p < .001$

^aBased on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers and Harris, 1969).

Research Hypothesis III: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher intellectual and school status cluster self concept scores.

The data did not support either the null hypothesis or the research hypothesis (See Table 8). Therefore, both hypotheses were rejected. However, once again, the data did support the inverse of the research hypothesis. Intellectual and school status cluster scores obtained by administering The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale revealed that urban Piedmont sixth graders have a higher intellectual and school status self concept score than rural Appalachian sixth graders ($t = -5.93$, 164 df, $p < .001$).

Null Hypothesis IV: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the physical appearance and attributes cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis IV: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher physical appearance and attribute cluster self concept scores.

The data failed to support either the null hypothesis or the research hypothesis (See Table 9). Therefore, both hypotheses were rejected. The data did support the

Table 8

Intelligence and School Status Cluster Scores^a by Area

	Rural	Urban
Mean Number of Responses	9.2907	12.4875
Standard Deviation	3.907	2.934
Standard Error	0.421	0.328

$t = -5.93$

$df = 164$

$p < .001$

^aBased on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers and Harris, 1969).

Table 9

Physical Appearance and Attribute Cluster Scores^a by Area

	Rural	Urban
Mean Number of Responses	3.9419	6.2750
Standard Deviation	2.214	2.465
Standard Error	0.239	0.276

$t = -6.42$

$df = 164$

$p < .001$

^aBased on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers and Harris, 1969).

inverse of the research hypothesis. Physical appearance and attribute cluster scores obtained by administering The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale revealed that urban Piedmont sixth graders have a higher physical appearance and attribute self concept score than rural Appalachian sixth graders ($t = -6.42, 164 \text{ df}, p < .001$).

Null Hypothesis V: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the anxiety cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis V: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher anxiety cluster self concept scores (meaning less anxiety).

The data revealed no significant difference between the rural Appalachian sixth graders and the urban Piedmont sixth graders in anxiety self concept scores (See Table 10, Appendix C). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Consequently, the research hypothesis was rejected.

Null Hypothesis VI: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the popularity cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis VI: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to

have higher popularity cluster self concept scores.

The data revealed no significant differences between the rural Appalachian sixth graders and the urban Piedmont sixth graders in popularity self concept scores (See Table 11, Appendix C). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The research hypothesis was rejected.

Null Hypothesis VII: There will be no significant difference between rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont sixth graders in the happiness and satisfaction cluster score of self concept.

Research Hypothesis VII: Rural Appalachian sixth graders will be more likely than urban Piedmont sixth graders to have higher happiness and satisfaction cluster self concept scores.

The data did not support either the null hypothesis or the research hypothesis (See Table 12). Therefore, both hypotheses were rejected. However, the data did support the inverse of the research hypothesis. Happiness and satisfaction cluster scores obtained by administering The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale revealed that urban Piedmont sixth graders have a higher happiness and satisfaction self concept score than rural Appalachian sixth graders ($t = -2.95, 156.31 \text{ df}, p < .05$).

Additional Findings

When rural Appalachian sixth graders and urban Piedmont

Table 12

Happiness and Satisfaction Cluster Scores^a by Area

	Rural	Urban
Mean Number of Responses	6.1512	6.9625
Standard Deviation	2.021	1.496
Standard Error	0.218	0.167

$t = -2.95$

$df = 156.31$

$p < .05$

^aBased on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers and Harris, 1969).

sixth graders were grouped according to total achievement, sex, parents' occupation and parents' education, there were no significant differences found in general self concept scores or in any of the six cluster scores (behavior, intellectual and school status, physical appearance and attributes, anxiety, popularity, and happiness and satisfaction) as analyzed by ANOVA.

No significant differences were found in the "Who Are You?" when urban and rural respondents were compared. However, it is still interesting to take notice of the categories as seen in the frequency table in Appendix C (See Table 13) when compared by area. The responses to the W-A-Y technique will be discussed in the next chapter.

In addition some significant differences were found when the responses to the open-ended statements were compared by area. The following open-ended statements had significant differences when compared by area:

(a) Statement 3: "When I grow up I will be..." ($X^2=22.24$, $df=8$, $p < .01$). This statement represented the Intelligence and School Status Cluster (See Table 14).

(b) Statement 4: "In school I am..." ($X^2=19.40$, $df=4$, $p < .001$). This statement also represented the Intelligence and School Status Cluster (See Table 15).

(c) Statement 5: "I have good..." ($X^2=6.99$, $df=2$, $p < .05$). This statement represented the Physical Appearance and Attributes Cluster (See Table 16).

Table 14

Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "When I
Grow Up I Will Be ..." Classified by Area

Categories	Rural	Urban
Professional Male	14.3%	23.5%
Sports Figure	12.9	22.1
Professional Female	10.0	23.5
Creative Skill	8.6	13.2
Learned Skill (Male)	20.0	7.4
Learned Skill (Female)	11.4	2.9
Referred to Self	10.0	5.9
Obscure	4.3	0.0
Uncertain	8.6	1.5

$$\chi^2=22.24$$

$$df=8$$

$$p < .01$$

Table 15

Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "In School
I Am ..." Classified by Area

Categories	Rural	Urban
Good at Something	13.9%	33.3%
Good as a Person	48.6	26.1
Negative at Something	2.8	4.3
Negative as a Person	19.4	5.8
Average	15.3	30.4

$$\chi^2=19.40$$

$$df=4$$

$$p < .001$$

Table 16

Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "I Have
A Good ..." Classified by Area

Categories	Rural	Urban
Self	30.6%	50.0%
Outside of Self	69.4	48.6
Nothing	0.0	1.4

$\chi^2=6.99$

df=2

$p < .05$

(d) Statement 6: "I have pretty..." ($X^2=8.69$, $df=2$, $p < .05$). This statement also represented the Physical Appearance and Attribute Cluster (See Table 17).

(e) Statement 8: "I am nervous when..." ($X^2=12.57$, $df=5$, $p < .05$). This statement represented the Anxiety Cluster (See Table 18).

(f) Statement 10: "It is hard for me to..." ($X^2=10.44$, $df=4$, $p < .05$). This statement represented the Popularity Cluster (See Table 19).

Table 17

Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "I Have
Pretty ..." Classified by Area

Categories	Rural	Urban
Self	51.5%	75.4%
Outside of Self	45.6	21.5
Nothing	2.9	3.1

$\chi^2=8.69$

df=2

$p < .05$

Table 18

Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "I Am
Nervous When ..." Classified by Area

Categories	Rural	Urban
Self-related (Emotional)	18.8%	10.4%
Activity Outside School	7.2	19.4
School-related	49.3	43.3
Family and Others	10.1	22.4
Diffuse	11.6	3.0
Never	2.9	1.5

$$\chi^2=12.57$$

$$df=5$$

$$p < .05$$

Table 19

Percentages of the Open-ended Statement "It Is
Hard For Me To ..." Classified by Area

Categories	Rural	Urban
Expression of Self (General)	20.6%	17.7%
Expression of Self (Specific)	14.7	8.1
Sports-related	5.9	25.8
School-related	36.8	29.0
Other	22.1	19.4

$$\chi^2=10.44$$

$$df=4$$

$$p < .05$$

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this discussion is to explore the findings presented in the last chapter in a more detailed fashion in order to attempt to explain the findings as well as to uncover possible implications of the research and suggestions for further study. The discussion is divided into four major sections: (1) a discussion of the data on the interaction of secondary variables--sex, parents' occupational and educational levels, and achievement--with self concept; (2) a discussion of the details of the data dealing with general self concept as well as the scores on the six self concept clusters; (3) an examination of the responses to the Who Are You? technique; and (4) an examination of the responses given to the open-ended statements. Such a discussion will help elucidate the reasons why the rural Appalachian children showed a consistently lower self concept than the urban Piedmont children.

Secondary Variables and Self Concept

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the findings of the research indicated no significant relationship between self concept and sex, self concept and parents' educational

or occupational level, or self concept and achievement. In other words, scores of males and females in the samples were not significantly different from one another on general self concept, nor did individuals of different socioeconomic levels as defined by occupation and education, and neither did low, average, and high achievers. An examination of the potential relationship between self concept and socioeconomic status and achievement was particularly needed since the rural and urban samples differed significantly with regard to these variables. The rural sample was considerably lower in both achievement and socioeconomic status. Thus, the differences in self concept found between the two groups could have been created by differences in achievement level or socioeconomic status rather than by differences in residence. In fact, based on the previous research discussed in Chapter II one might have expected this to be the case, particularly with regard to achievement and self concept since research has consistently found that high achievers possess a more positive self concept than do low achievers. However, the research found no significant relationship between self concept and any of these variables. Such a lack of relationship strengthens the conclusion that the significant differences found between the rural and urban samples were due to the two different settings.

Despite the absence of significant relationships between self concept and these three variables, it is worthwhile to note the particular items on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale which did reveal significant differences in either the rural or urban setting between males and females and between high and low achievers. Such an examination may aid in understanding the overall differences between the rural and urban samples and point to particular areas of self concept that were significant in terms of either achievement or sex.

By looking at the items in terms of how males or females responded to them, several interesting patterns emerge. Out of the total of 80 items on the scale, the rural samples as a whole scored significantly lower than the urban sample on 30 items. On over half (16) of these 30 items, it was the sex of the respondents which made the difference in the overall scores. In other words, in the total of 30 significant items, both rural males and females scored significantly lower than both urban males and females on 14 items. However, on nine of the items rural and urban males showed no significant differences while rural females scored significantly lower than urban females. On seven items, there were no significant differences between females while rural males scored significantly lower than urban males.

It is interesting to examine what these items were. The main items in which rural females scored significantly lower than urban females, but where there were no significant differences between rural and urban males, were classified in two self concept clusters of intellectual and school status (items 21, 30, 53) and physical appearance and attributes (items 15, 54, 60). The main items in which rural males scored significantly lower than urban males, but where there were no significant differences between rural and urban females, were classified in the two self concept clusters of intellectual and school status (items 17, 42, 70) and behavior (items 34, 45, 56). In fact, the overall differences between the rural and urban children found in the self concept clusters of behavior and physical appearance and attributes appear to be directly dependent upon differences between how rural and urban females viewed themselves physically and how rural and urban males viewed themselves behaviorally. Rural females in the sample viewed themselves as less physically attractive than urban females in the sample. On the other hand, rural males in the sample viewed themselves more negatively behaviorally than did urban males in the sample.

What these differences mean is difficult to tell. One problem in interpretation is that some of these differences may reflect cultural variations. For example, although a "yes" response to the statement "I get into a lot of

"fights" is scored negatively on the Piers-Harris Scale, it is possible that in some cultural contexts an affirmative response would be a positive response. Thus, the fact that rural males answered "yes" significantly more than urban males to the statements "I get into a lot of fights" and "I often get into trouble" may be indicative of different values. The rural male, in making such judgments about himself, may in fact be making what he feels to be a positive statement about himself. Getting "into trouble" or "into a lot of fights" may be seen in a positive light for males in the rural setting.

On the other hand, such differences may actually reflect more negative feelings about these particular aspects of self on the part of rural females and males. For example, rural females did consistently respond more negatively to items having to do with physical appearance and attributes (items 15, 54, 60, 73) than did urban females. This fact does indicate that the rural female does not feel as good about her physical appearance as does the urban female. Perhaps this is because the most frequently used reference groups for beauty (television stars, movie stars, etc.) appear to be further removed from the rural setting than they do from the urban setting.

Another interesting pattern which appears in the data has to do with those particular items on which males and females, regardless of residential setting, scored

most positively or most negatively. These differences often appear to be related to traditional notions of sex roles. A large number of the items that females scored more negatively on than males are predictable given a knowledge of social norms surrounding sex roles. For example, females consistently scored lower than males on items having to do with fear, anxiety, or the expression of emotions. Thus, females scored considerably more negatively than males on such items as "I am nervous," "I am often afraid," and "I cry easily." Other items on which females scored more negatively than males were such items as "I am strong" and "I am popular with boys."

Interestingly, those items on which males scored considerably more negatively than females were less predictable. Such items as "I have pretty eyes," "I have a good figure," and "I get into a lot of fights," on which one might have predicted a more negative score for males, did not reveal substantial differences. Some of the items had to do with school work ("I am slow in finishing my school work"). Others, like "I often get into trouble" and "I am popular with girls," were a bit more predictable.

It is also of interest to note the patterns of items on which males and females consistently scored the highest. Items on which males, regardless of residential setting, evaluated themselves most positively were again often linked to sex stereotypes. Males consistently responded "no" to

such items as "I cry easily," "I am often afraid," and "I am clumsy." They consistently responded "yes" to such items as "I have lots of pep."

On the other hand, females appeared to feel most positive about themselves in the areas of happiness and family. For example, they consistently responded "yes" to such items as "I am a happy person" and "I like my brother (sister)," and consistently "no" to such items as "I am unhappy," "My family is disappointed in me," and "It is hard for me to make friends."

Thus, despite the fact that there were no statistically significant differences between the general self concept or any of the self concept cluster scores of males and females, some interesting patterns or tendencies do appear in the data when one looks at each of the specific items on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. These differences seem to point to the fact that males and females in the sample, regardless of residential setting, do think of themselves along the lines of many traditional sex role stereotypes. Both the rural and the urban settings appear to have socialized the children in these directions.

With regard to achievement, it is interesting to note certain differential responses to particular items made by low-achievers and high-achievers despite the fact that achievement had no significant relationship with self concept. Some of these patterns can be briefly considered.

In the urban sample, there were only four items on which low-and high-achievers responded significantly different from one another. Interestingly, on three of these items, high-achievers responded more negatively than low-achievers, while on only a single item did low-achievers respond more negatively than high-achievers. Two of the three items on which urban high-achievers scored significantly more negatively than urban low-achievers had to do with strength and sports: "I am strong" and "I am a leader in games and sports." This could indicate that urban low-achievers considered themselves as more physical and athletic than did urban high-achievers. The other item on which urban high-achievers scored more negatively than urban low-achievers was the statement "I am different from other people." The urban high achievers considered themselves to be significantly different from others, while the low achievers did not. The only item on which the urban low achievers scored significantly more negatively than the high achievers was on the statement "I get nervous when the teacher calls on me." Surprisingly, on all of the other items dealing with intellectual and school status there were no significant differences in the responses of low- and high-achievers in the urban setting. Thus, in the urban setting there was not even a tendency toward low-achievers having a more negative self concept than high-achievers.

In the rural setting, although there was no significant difference between the self concept of low-achievers and high-achievers, there were a greater number of individual items (12) on which low-achievers scored significantly more negatively than high-achievers, and no items on which the high-achievers scored significantly more negatively than the low-achievers. Over half of these items were directly or indirectly related to intellectual and school status (items 5, 7, 9, 21, 24, 30, 70). The other items were spread out over all of the other cluster areas except physical appearance and attributes. In contrast to the urban children, there was no tendency for the rural low-achievers to feel better about themselves physically or athletically. These differences indicate that in contrast to children in the urban setting, children in the rural setting did tend toward a relationship between achievement and self concept, particularly in those items having to do with school and school-related activities. Thus, it appears as if there is a tendency for the lack of academic achievement in the rural setting to be related to a negative self concept in school-related areas. This is not the case in the urban setting. The reasons for this will be explored in the next section of this chapter.

General Self Concept and Cluster Scores

The most important finding of this research was that

the rural sample of sixth graders possessed a significantly more negative general self concept than the urban sample of sixth graders, and that the rural sample scored significantly lower than the urban sample in four of the six self concept clusters. It will be remembered that the opposite finding was expected by the researcher. The reasoning behind this expectation had to do with the literature which discussed the greater homogeneity, integration, and personalism of the rural setting as compared with the urban setting. It was reasoned that this greater homogeneity, integration, and personalism would have a positive effect on the self concept of rural children when compared with urban children. If, in fact, rural settings do differ from urban settings in these areas, then this research questions the degree to which the presence or absence of these social factors affect self concept. On the other hand, this research could raise questions about the literature on rural and urban social life. Perhaps, the differences between urban and rural settings are not as great as they might seem. Both of these possibilities will be explored here in a search for an understanding of this finding.

It will be remembered from the previous chapter that the rural children scored significantly lower than the urban children on four of the six self concept clusters. Three of these clusters---behavior, intellectual and school status, and physical appearance and attributes--- were particularly significant ($p < .001$), while the fourth

cluster score, happiness and satisfaction, was less significant ($p < .05$). The precise meaning of these self concept differences can be better understood if one takes a closer look at the specific items on which the rural and urban children responded significantly different from one another.

It might be useful to first briefly review the basic structure of the instrument used in this research, The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. It will be remembered from the description of the instrument given in Chapter III that the scale is comprised of a total of 80 items. The total self concept score is computed from the responses to these individual items. In addition, most of the items can be grouped into six self concept clusters, each of which deals with a particular area of self concept. These clusters and the number of items in each cluster are as follows: (1) behavior (15 items); (2) intellectual and school status (15 items); (3) physical appearance and attributes (9 items); (4) anxiety (8 items); (5) popularity (11 items); and (6) happiness and satisfaction (7 items). Fifteen of the items are not grouped into any of these six clusters.

In examining the responses to each of these items, one finds that the rural children scored significantly more negatively than the urban children on 30 individual items, while the urban children did not score significantly more negative than the rural children on any of the items.

These 30 items fall into all six of the clusters and also include items which do not fall into any particular cluster. However, their distribution in the clusters, even those that showed significant differences, is not uniform. This distribution can be seen in Figure 2.

The fact that so many of the significant items are clustered in the intellectual and school status cluster is of interest. Of the 30 significant items, 12 (40%) are found in this single cluster. In addition, four of the other significant items are explicitly school-related despite the fact that they are formally classified in other clusters. These items are "I get nervous when the teacher calls on me," "I am well behaved in school," "I can draw well," and "I hate school." Thus, over half of the items on which the rural children scored significantly more negatively than the urban children had to do specifically with school.

One must also remember that the scale was administered in the school. This fact makes it likely that a large number of seemingly unrelated items were in fact seen as school-related by the respondents. For example, the statement "I often get into trouble" may have been interpreted by the respondents as referring to trouble in school since this was the context in which the scale was being administered. There are many other items in which this could be equally true.

FIGURE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIGNIFICANT ITEMS IN THE SIX
CLUSTERS OF THE PIERS-HARRIS CHILDREN'S SELF
CONCEPT SCALE

Cluster	Number of total items	Number of significant items	p
Behavior	15	4	.001
Intellectual and School Status	15	12	.001
Physical Appearance and Attributes	9	6	.001
Anxiety	8	1	N.S.
Popularity	11	1	N.S.
Happiness and Satisfaction	7	2	.05
No Cluster	15	4	---

It will also be remembered from the discussion in the previous section of this chapter that with the rural children there was a greater tendency toward a relationship between academic achievement and self concept. Children in the rural setting who were low-achievers in school did tend to evaluate themselves more negatively than high-achievers, whereas this was not the case in the urban setting. Once again, school-related activities appear to be more closely related to the negative self concept of the rural children than they are for the urban children.

Despite the fact that there were significant differences between the rural and urban children on four of the six clusters, the number of significant items which focus on school-related behavior and skills is striking. Clearly, school-related notions of self concept constituted the single most important area in which rural children felt more negatively about themselves than did urban children. In fact, one could reasonably conclude that it was the topic of school which actually contributed most to the overall significantly greater negative self concept of the rural respondents as opposed to the urban respondents. How is this to be understood?

The explanation possibly lies in the particular nature of the public schools in Appalachia. Many writers on education in Appalachia have pointed out that in contrast to many other rural areas in the United States, public

schools have never really been a part of the community. Instead, they have been largely external impositions created initially by "missionary" forces coming to bring enlightenment and education to a "backward" land and secondly by a local political system linked economically to the larger society. Mike Clark (1974:12), a native Appalachian and community organizer, has observed regarding this process:

The missionaries, or their supporters, ended up by controlling the people they were trying to save from eternal damnation... By setting up an educated class of native people who are trained to be doctors, lawyers, teachers, social workers, a larger society can control a smaller one, or one without political power.

Thus, as another well-known writer on Appalachia, Jim Branscome (1974:20), has observed, "the role of the school in mountain communities is inherently a political one, given the nature of mountain politics and life." In an area where still in very recent years 65 percent of all students never graduated from high school (Branscome 1972:224), public education has frequently aided in maintaining the political, economic, and social stratification of the area. Externally imposed and controlled by a world which has always rejected and exploited them, or by a local educated class linked to that external world, Appalachian schools have generally remained strangely removed and alienated from the local community. Writers have commented

(e.g. Ernst and Drake 1972:3; Schrag 1972:220) on the strange unreality of seeing and hearing Appalachian children recite facts about the French Revolution or sing "America", almost as if they were playing school or acting in a little play purporting to represent real education.

All of this is to say that contrary to many views of rural education as a fully integrated institution existing in a homogeneous community, education for most Appalachians "has meant learning to live outside the regular way of life and the American public school system must be viewed as a force imposed upon the people---not as a tool of their own creation" (Branscome 1974:21). Thus, schools in Appalachia are alienated from rather than integrated into the communities which they serve.

This is true even where school personnel are local people. Teachers with local origins are not at all necessarily members of the communities in which they teach. Frequently, they are from a higher socioeconomic class than the children they teach. Even if they do have personal origins in a lower socioeconomic class, their successful rise through formal education often alienates them from their own past and, thus, from the present of those that they teach (Branscome 1972:225). In fact, due to the external source and control of schools and education, rural Appalachian people often have a real suspicion of those local people who have survived twelve years

of public education and four more of college in order to become school teachers and administrators (Branscome 1974:21).

Rural Appalachian people often possess fear, suspicion, and hostility toward the schools. It has often been noted that rural Appalachian people find it difficult to believe (most of the time with ample reason) that schools ideally exist for them and that they have potentially meaningful access to school personnel (Schrag 1972:221). One extensive study (Graff 1967:196) of education in the Appalachian region found that true community participation in schools is rare. Due to the educational and economic gulf that typically exists between those who operate the schools and those who attend the schools, residents of Appalachia generally leave the operation of schools to specialized personnel with whom they have little in common.

Of course, Appalachia is a diverse region and the degree to which the externality of public education exists no doubt varies from one area to another. Nevertheless, it seems apparent that rural schools in Appalachia are not the community run and oriented schools that one might expect to find in the rural setting as described in much of the literature on rural life. Instead, the schools are to one degree or another external intrusions which are typically neither controlled by nor oriented toward the

rural Appalachian people that they serve.

Given this view of schools in Appalachia, the relatively more negative self concept of the Appalachian children in this study becomes more understandable. The fact that the more negative nature of the self concept of these children was so heavily linked to school-related skills and activities indicates that these children do not perceive themselves positively in the school setting. Operating in an environment which is to a degree alien to the community setting from which they come, interacting with school personnel who are often the socioeconomic elite of the local area, and performing skills which are often not practically tied to their home and community life, the Appalachian child is not at home in the schools. The self concept expressed by them in the school setting is quite possibly a reflection of this personal estrangement.

The Responses to the "Who Are You?" Technique

As mentioned in the previous chapter, when the responses to the question, "Who Are You?", were organized into a number of different categories, there were no statistically significant differences between the responses of the rural Appalachian children and the urban Piedmont children. However, if one examines the distribution of the responses into the several categories, certain interesting differences between the rural and urban children are apparent.

Each child in both groups was asked to provide three responses to the question, although not all of them did so. The responses by category for the two groups are found in a frequency table, Table 13, in Appendix C.

As can be seen from the table, the majority of responses from the rural children cluster into four categories: positive behavior, neutral physical, personal pronouns, and sex of self. These four categories contain 139 out of a total of 194 responses from the rural group. This means that approximately 72 percent of the responses of the rural sample fell into these four categories.

The majority of the responses from the urban children can also be seen to cluster into four categories, two of which are the same as the rural children, and two of which are different: positive behavior, self-other, hobby, and personal pronouns. The responses in these four categories included 136 out of the total of 195 responses from the urban children. Thus, approximately 70 percent of the urban responses fell into these four categories.

The two categories which were heavily represented in both the rural and the urban groups were positive behavior and personal pronouns. Approximately 13 percent of the responses of the rural group and 17 percent of the urban group fell into the category of positive behavior responses. Responses which contained references to a particular behavior which was saying something positive about the self

were placed into this category. Typical responses of this category were "I am a good person," "I am generous," "I am cheerful," "I am a together person," "I am fun to be with," and "I am a good personality." These responses were distinguished from the category of neutral behavior responses on the basis of their apparent positive connotations.

Neutral behavior responses were such things as "I am talkative" and "I am a person who eats a lot" in which the evaluation of the self being made in the response was not readily apparent. Within the category of positive behavior responses there were no systematic differences between the responses of the rural and urban children.

The second category in which both groups exhibited numerous responses was that of personal pronoun responses. Approximately 25 percent of the responses of both the rural and the urban groups fell into this category. Included in this category were direct references to the self in terms of personal pronouns, such as "I am me" or "I am myself." Also included were generalized personal references such as "I am an individual" or "I am a person." Once again, within this particular category there were no patterned differences between the responses of the rural and urban groups.

The other two areas which dominated the rural responses were less significantly represented in the urban responses: neutral physical and sex of self. Approximately 18 percent

of the rural responses fell into the category of neutral physical responses, while around 16 percent of the responses referred to the sex of the individual. The comparable percentages for the urban group were 7 percent and 6 percent, respectively.

Responses referring to the sex of the individual were simply "I am a boy," "I am a male," "I am a girl," and "I am a female." Those responses categorized as neutral physical responses involved descriptions of various physical attributes about which any evaluation of the self was not readily apparent. Examples of this category were responses such as "I am tall," "I have brown eyes," "I wear glasses," "I have freckles," "I have black hair," "I have curly hair," and "I have short hair." These responses could be distinguished from positive self responses which were more obviously evaluative: "I am beautiful" or "I am handsome."

The other two areas of importance for the urban children were somewhat less important for the rural children: self-other and hobby. Approximately 10 percent of the urban responses were in the category of self-other while over 17 percent fell into the category of hobbies. The comparable figures for the rural group were just under 9 percent for the self-other category and just over 9 percent for the hobby category. The self-other category, in which the two groups did not really differ much from each other, included

statements which referred to relationships between the individual and other persons. Examples of such responses are "I am a friend," "I am in love," "I am a sister/brother," and "I am someone's girl/boy friend." The category of hobbies is a more obvious one. This category included responses which referred to activities of the self. Such responses as "I am a car collector," "I am a jogger," "I am a basketball (football, baseball) player," "I am a party goer," "I am a cook," and "I am a motor bike rider" were placed in this category.

In examining these patterns, several important differences between the two groups stand out. First of all, the rural children responded much more frequently than the urban children in terms of their physical characteristics, including their sex. Approximately one-third of the rural responses dealt with these areas while only 13 percent of urban responses did. On The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, rural children, particularly rural females, scored significantly more negatively on the self concept cluster of physical appearance and attributes than did urban children. However, the statements relating to physical appearance and attributes given by the rural children in response to the question, "Who Are You?", did not contain negative evaluations, but rather were typically simple declarative statements. Nevertheless, the greater tendency among rural children toward defining the self in terms of

physical traits could be related to their more negative view of themselves physically as expressed in the self concept scale. When particular traits are important for defining the self (e.g. physical traits in the rural sample), it is likely that a judged deficiency in these traits would result in a more negative self concept. The rural children are more concerned with their physical attributes and this concern appears to be related to a relatively negative view of their physical attributes. Whether or not the negative feelings about themselves physically has led to the concern with defining the self in physical terms or whether the concern has led to the negative evaluation cannot be judged. But certainly the differences between the two groups in terms of their reliance upon physical definitions of self in the W-A-Y technique and the differences in the evaluation of physical attributes in the self concept scale are interesting dimensions of self concept in the two settings.

An important part of the differences discussed above involves references to the sex of the self. There was a much greater tendency for the rural children to define the self as "male" or "female" than for the urban children to do so. This tendency may indicate that the rural children view sex roles as more distinct and important than the urban children, a reflection of a more traditional view of sex roles. Children who have been more strongly socialized

toward the importance of being a "male" or a "female" may very likely view these attributes as more important for the definition of self than would children who had not been so strongly socialized in that direction.

Another interesting difference in the responses involves the greater preponderance of hobby-related statements among the urban children. This could be the result of several things. It could point to a difference between the rural setting and the urban setting, in which non-school activity in the urban setting is likely to be invested in a particular hobby, while nonschool activity in the rural setting is more likely to be invested in helping in the fields or around the house. In fact, "having a hobby" seems to be a decidedly urban industrial notion of time-use which reflects the explicit segmentation of life into work and play.

On the other hand, the difference in the frequency of this sort of response may involve more of an activity-related definition of self among the urban children. These responses seem to be saying, "I am what I do." This view of self has greater importance for the urban children. The importance of this difference is bolstered when one looks at the competency category of the responses. Although neither group responded heavily in terms of this category, the urban responses dealing with competence were almost three times greater than the rural responses

(7.2% to 2.6%). These responses had to do with activities as well, but in addition involved references to special competence in these areas (e.g. "I am good in art," "I am a good swimmer"). If one combines the competence category with the hobby category, the rural-urban differences with regard to defining the self in terms of activities is even more pronounced.

Finally, the almost complete absence of explicitly negative responses to the W-A-Y technique is notable. In fact, so few negative responses were given that they were simply combined with certain other responses into the category of "other" responses. In one sense this result is surprising since there was a much greater willingness to make negative statements about the self on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. This may point to the importance of the nature of the particular technique used to solicit responses about the self in determining the nature of the response themselves. It may be easier to respond "yes" or "no" and indicate something negative about oneself than it is to actually spell it out. However, in another sense, this finding is not that surprising. Neither the rural or the urban sample really possessed a negative self concept. Rather, the rural self concept was "average" while the urban was "above average" based on the norms established for the particular scale used. Thus, it may not be that surprising to find the virtual absence of

explicitly negative responses to the W-A-Y technique.

In summarizing the important points from this data, it can be concluded that the rural children's responses to the question, "Who Are You?", could be best summarized by the conglomerate statement, "I am a nice male/female who possesses certain physical traits." The responses of the urban children could be best summarized by the response, "I am a nice person who engages in certain activities."

Responses to the Open-Ended Statements

Six of the twelve open-ended statements showed significant differences in responses between the rural and urban groups as shown in Chapter IV. The statements which revealed significant differences were the following: (1) When I grow up I will be...; (2) In school I am ...; (3) I have good ...; (4) I have pretty ...; (5) I am nervous when...; and (6) It is hard for me to.... The first two statements were designed to refer to intelligence and school status, the third and fourth to physical appearance and attributes, the fifth to anxiety, and the last to popularity. None of the statements referring to behavior and happiness/satisfaction showed significant differences. Each of the significant statements will be discussed in turn.

The first statement was designed to get at the individual's conception of his/her future (See Table 14, Chapter IV).

Since one's future aspirations indicate something about one's present concept of self, responses to this statement reveal present concepts of self. The most striking differences between the rural and urban children's responses were in the categories of professional male and female, sports figure, and learned male and female skill. Less than one-fourth of the rural children responded that they would be professionals of one sort or another, while almost one-half of the urban children so indicated. This difference was present with both males and females, but was a bit more pronounced among females. Interestingly, in both the rural and urban groups, the professional occupations referred to by males and females were traditional male or female occupations. Thus, males tended to name such professions as doctor, dentist, lawyer, college professor, and scientist, while females tended to refer to such professions as teacher (not college professor) and nurse (not doctor). Thus, both the rural and the urban children tended to be traditional in their selection of male and female professions. However, the rural children, particularly the females, were much less likely to point to a future in some professional field.

Instead, rural children tended to refer to a future in learned skill occupations. Twenty percent of the rural responses referred to male learned skills and over 11 percent referred to female learned skills. The comparable percentages

for the urban children were $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent and less than 3 percent. The primary learned skills mentioned by the rural males were farmer, truck driver, and sawmill worker, while the primary learned skills mentioned by urban males were policeman and fireman. The main learned skills mentioned by both the rural and urban females were housewife, secretary, and hairstylist.

A final difference reflected in the responses to this statement is in the area of sport-related activities, a response found almost exclusively with males. Almost one fourth of the urban responses were in this category while only about one eighth of the rural responses were so classified.

Thus, the differences found in the responses to the statement, "When I grow up I will be....," indicate basic differences in occupational orientations of the two groups. Of course, these do not necessarily indicate anything about positive or negative evaluations about conceptions of the self; they may simply indicate different value orientations. However, the rural children did reply significantly more negatively than the urban children to the statement, "When I grow up I will be an important person," on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. This may indicate a feeling on the part of the rural children that being a farmer or a housewife, although perhaps respectable in the local community, does not make one an important person as far as the larger society is concerned.

The second statement which revealed a significant difference was the statement, "In school I am..." (See Table 15, Chapter IV). The most important differential pattern in the responses to this statement involved responses referring to internal states as opposed to those referring to external activities. The rural children referred much more frequently to internal states, either positively or negatively. Precisely 68 percent of the rural responses referred to such things as nice kid, a good friend, unpopular, or bad, while only around 32 percent of the urban children made references to these personal qualities. On the other hand, almost 38 percent of the urban responses referred to skills or activities such as good in spelling, good in sports, or a poor speller. Less than 17 percent of the rural responses referred to specific activities.

This activity orientation of the urban children conforms to the same orientation found in the data collected through the W-A-Y technique. Once again, the rural children appear to be more oriented toward internal, personal judgments about self while the urban children tend toward greater concerns with activities, skills, and competencies. It should also be noted that negative statements were twice as frequent among the rural children as they were among the urban children, although positive or neutral responses predominated in both groups.

The third statement which revealed a significant difference was "I have a good..." (See Table 16, Chapter IV). The two categories of responses to this statement were "Self" and "Outside of Self." The former category included responses like mind, personality, brain, memory, name, and imagination. The urban children responded more often in these ways than did the rural children. The second category included responses such as teacher, book, cat, dog, and mother. The rural children responded significantly more often in these ways than did the urban children. Thus, the rural children responded more frequently in terms of personal possessions or relationships rather than in terms of personal qualities, while the urban responses were more evenly divided.

The fourth statement that showed a significant difference was "I have pretty..." (See Table 17, Chapter IV). Once again, the two categories of responses were "Self" and "Outside Self." The first category included such responses as hair, eyes, face, teeth, legs, and muscles. Although a slight majority of rural responses were in this category, over three-fourths of the urban responses referred to the self. The second category included responses such as friends, house, clothes, and room. Almost one-half of the rural responses fell in this latter category, while only around one-fifth of the urban responses referred to things outside the self. As with the previous statement, the rural children tended to respond in less personal, more

external ways than did the urban children. In both cases, the urban children appear to possess a greater concern for the self.

The fifth significant statement was "I am nervous when..." (See Table 18, Chapter IV). Both the rural and the urban children responded most frequently in terms of school-related anxiety, such as when I have tests or when I am called upon. The rural children showed a slightly greater tendency than the urban children to indicate school-related anxiety. The rural children referred more frequently to self-related anxiety, while the urban children referred more frequently to extra-school, including family-related, anxiety. Self-related anxiety included such responses as when I think, when I get mad, and when I am worried. Extra-school anxiety included responses such as when I play baseball, when I am swimming, and when my parents get mad. The greater urban reference to extra-school activities as a source of anxiety may be related to the urban child's greater concern with hobbies, activities, and skills as revealed in some of the data discussed previously. The greater family-related anxiety expressed by the urban children may reflect a number of factors: greater family pressure to succeed or a less happy family situation.

Finally, the last significant statement in the series of incomplete sentences was "It is hard for me to..." (See Table 19, Chapter IV). The rural children responded

more frequently than the urban children in terms of self and school-related tasks. Self-related responses were those such as to make friends, to be nice/mean, to smile, to forgive people, and to sit still. School-related responses were responses such as to take tests, to do homework, to answer questions, and to think. Urban children showed a greater tendency to make sport-related statements such as to play basketball, to roller skate, to swim, and to do a headstand. These differences are related to previously discussed differences which showed a greater concern for sports among the urban children and a greater difficulty with school among the rural children.

In summary, the data from the completion of the open-ended sentences reveal certain differences between the rural and urban children. The groups certainly exhibited different career orientations. The rural children showed slightly more school-related anxiety and difficulties than did the urban children. In addition, when it came to positive feelings about the self, the rural children were more externally or impersonally oriented; but when it came to negative statements, the rural children were slightly more personally or self-oriented. The urban children showed a greater concern with sports, hobbies, activities, and skills than did the rural children. The implications of all of these differences will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare the self concept of a sample of rural Appalachian sixth graders with a sample of urban Piedmont sixth graders. Educators have increasingly become interested in research in the area of self concept for essentially two reasons: (1) there is a strong relationship between self concept and academic achievement; and (2) the development of a positive self concept is often viewed as a valuable educational goal in itself. Educationally, self concept may be viewed as both a means to the goal of academic achievement and as an end in itself. Since self concept is socially developed, maintained, and enhanced, it is important for educators to carry out research into the various potential influences on self concept. This research was designed to examine the influences of self concept of a pair of residence variables: the rural and the urban setting.

The sample for the study consisted of 86 sixth graders drawn from three elementary schools located in a rural Appalachian area of North Carolina and 80 sixth graders

drawn from two elementary schools located in a Piedmont North Carolina city with a population of approximately 150,000. The rural and urban samples were comparable in terms of the numbers of males and females, and that each sample resided for at least the last five years in their respective setting. However, they differed significantly in terms of academic achievement levels and occupational and educational levels of parents. The rural sample consisted of significantly lower academic achievers and of children whose parents possessed considerably less formal education and were working in more blue collar and skilled craft occupations than were the parents of the urban sample. The effects of these differences in the two samples on self concept were also investigated.

The primary instrument used to measure and compare the self concept of the rural and urban samples was The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. The scale is comprised of 80 simple declarative statements about the self to which the individual responds either "yes" or "no". Each item is scored in the direction of positive self concept depending upon how the item is stated. The total of positive responses to the items yields the general self concept score for the individual.

Most of the 80 items in the scale can be grouped into one of six self concept clusters, each of which comprises a different aspect of self concept. These six clusters are:

(1) behavior, (2) intellectual and school status, (3) physical appearance and attributes, (4) anxiety, (5) popularity, (6) happiness and satisfaction. Thus, the scale not only establishes a general self concept score, but also six cluster scores. This aids in a more specific analysis of self concept differences.

In addition to the administration of The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, two other data collecting techniques were utilized. The first was the W-A-Y technique in which the children were asked to give three responses to the question, "Who Are You?". The second consisted of a series of twelve open-ended sentences about the self which each individual was asked to complete. The responses of the rural and urban samples to both the W-A-Y technique and the open-ended sentences were categorized and compared for content differences.

The major finding of the research was that the rural Appalachian children possessed a significantly lower general self concept score than did the urban children. The differences in academic achievement and parental education and occupation of the two groups had no significant relationship to general self concept differences. In addition, the rural Appalachian children possessed significantly lower scores on four of the six self concept clusters: behavior, intellectual and school status, physical appearance and attributes, and happiness and satisfaction.

No significant differences were found in the responses to the W-A-Y technique when rural and urban children were compared. However, there were certain different tendencies in the data. The most important were that the rural children responded much more frequently than the urban children did in terms of their physical attributes and their gender. The urban children responded much more frequently than did the rural children in terms of activities and hobbies.

Of the twelve open-ended statements, six showed significant differences in responses between the rural and the urban groups. These were the statements: (1) When I grow up I will...; (2) In school I am...; (3) I have good...; (4) I have pretty...; (5) I am nervous when...; and (6) It is hard for me to.... The responses to these statements revealed: (1) that the urban children looked forward to a future in the professions or in sports while the rural children looked forward to skilled labor occupations, farming, and housewife activities; (2) the urban children exhibited a greater concern with defining the self in terms of activities and hobbies than did the rural children; (3) the rural children responded more frequently in terms of possessions and relationships rather than in terms of personal qualities and traits; (4) the rural children showed a slightly greater tendency to express school-related anxiety, while the urban children expressed considerably greater extra-school, including family, anxiety; and (5) the urban

children expressed much greater concern for athletic and sport-related definitions of the self.

Methodological Implications

Throughout most of the present century, scientists have become increasingly aware that any scientific study is not simply a process of observing "facts," but rather is a process of making observations. What this means is that the essential element in any research is not the "fact" but rather the observation. This point recognizes that the observer and the observed cannot be isolated from one another; they are inextricably bound up with one another in the observation. One does not simply observe facts; one makes observations. The reason that this is true is that "we cannot observe the course of nature without disturbing it" (Matson 1964:143).

Thus, the particular methodology used in research is inevitably a part of the data, for it is through the methodology that the reality under investigation is filtered to become an observation. With regard to this research, there are two important implications that stem from this view of the interaction of methodology and data: (1) the interaction of the setting for the research with the data on self concept differences between the rural and the urban samples; and (2) the interaction of the particular data-gathering technique with the data on rural-urban

self concept differences.

All three data collection techniques utilized in this study were administered in school settings in both the rural and the urban areas. The main question is the degree to which the school setting influenced the responses of the children. The techniques used were designed to investigate the general self concept of the children rather than the more limited self concept of academic ability that has been the focus of other research carried out in the school setting (e.g., Yancey 1973). However, since the techniques were administered to the children in the school setting, it is quite possible that on the whole their responses reflected their feelings about themselves in that setting. If this were the case, then the data presented here would be more significantly oriented toward perceptions of the school-related self than they would toward general self concept.

This possibility is particularly important given the fact that the rural children's more negative self concept hinged so much upon school-related skills and activities. For if, as the data show, rural Appalachian children do feel less positively than urban children about themselves with regard to school-related skills and activities, then the fact that the data were collected in the school setting could have accentuated the overall self concept differences found.

For example, statements such as "I am often in trouble," "I am often afraid," "I have many friends," and "I am unhappy" may have all been conceptualized by the children as referring to the school setting. Thus, even though these statements supposedly refer to nonschool related aspects of the self (behavior, anxiety, popularity, happiness), they may have been interpreted as school-related since they were responded to in the school setting.

Thus, the significantly greater negative self concept of the rural Appalachian children in the clusters of behavior, physical appearance and attributes, and happiness and satisfaction could have been reflections of negative feelings about the self in school rather than negative feelings about their behavior, physical appearance, and happiness in general. Such a phenomenon would have accentuated or even distorted the overall self concept differences between the two samples.

Of course, one can never be absolutely positive of the total effect of the research setting on the data. However, one suggestion that can be made concerning self concept research in general and research on the effects of residential setting on self concept in particular is that the collection of data should occur in diverse locales. This could possibly counteract the effects of the test setting on the self concept scores. For example, one wonders whether the self concept scores of the rural Appalachian

children, or for that matter the urban children, would have been the same if the self concept scale would have been administered at home or at church. Future research might be well-advised to administer the particular self concept scale utilized in diverse settings other than the school. This is particularly true when dealing with populations that possess negative school-related self concepts.

The methodology utilized in this research also illustrates the need for diverse approaches to the study of self concept. As previously mentioned, the technique utilized to collect data invariably influences the nature of the data collected. Rosenthal (1966) has called this the "modeling effect" in which the methodology employed structures, or models, the data collected. There are ample examples of the modeling effect in various kinds of research (Phillips 1971:21-28).

This research relied upon one main technique, The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, and two supplemental techniques, the W-A-Y technique and a technique of open-ended statements adapted from the Piers-Harris scale. The primary focus was on a single dimension of self concept--the positive/negative dimension, which was measured through the use of the Piers-Harris scale. Most self concept research has concentrated on this aspect of self concept (Wyne, White, and Coop 1974:12). However, there is also a need to understand the content of self

concept in addition to the evaluation of self concept. For this reason, the two supplemental techniques were utilized, techniques which were designed to arrive at the content as well as the evaluation of the self. Responses to items on the Piers-Harris scale were also examined in terms of possible self concept content differences between the rural and urban groups.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, both the responses to the W-A-Y technique and to the open-ended statements showed an interesting absence of negative statements about the self. Statements of both the urban and rural children were generally either neutral or positive in direction. On the other hand, there was a much greater tendency for both groups, but especially the rural group, to make negative evaluations of the self on the Piers-Harris scale. When faced with making either "yes" or "no" responses to previously and externally constructed statements about the self, there was a willingness to make negative evaluations of the self. However, when faced with internally creating statements about the self, practically no negative evaluations were made at all.

Precisely what this means cannot be known. It could mean that the rigidly dichotomized response technique of self concept scales leads to a greater number of negative evaluations simply because the respondent has only two choices: yes or no. Ambiguous and conflicting feelings

about the self must be suddenly made clear and uniform in order to respond to the statements. The other techniques, since they leave possible responses totally open, may lead to fewer negative responses simply because the potential responses are limitless. Or it could mean that it is psychologically easier for a person to admit to negative feelings about the self when faced with a pre-existing statement which requires a simple yes or no response than it is when faced with creating an entire statement about the self.

Whatever the explanation, the basic methodological point is the same. The particular technique utilized to elicit responses about the self is going to influence the responses received. Therefore, it is a good idea to use diverse methodologies, not only because they might allow one to get at both evaluations and content of the self, but also because they may allow one to see the potential modeling effects of each separate technique.

Theoretical Implications

The primary finding of this research was that the rural Appalachian children scored significantly more negatively than did the urban children on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. This finding was contrary to initial expectations. It was initially reasoned that the greater homogeneity, integration, and personalism of

the rural setting as compared to the urban setting would produce a beneficial effect on the self concept in the rural Appalachian area. The fact that this was not the case necessitates some theoretical reformulation and suggests the need for further research.

It is obvious that the relatively isolated "folk" or Gemeinschaft community of Redfield and Tönnies' theoretical formulations no longer exists in this country. However, as mentioned in Chapter II, many rural sociologists maintain that there is still a real difference between rural and urban communities in terms of such factors as homogeneity, integration, and personalism. Others suggest that the process of urbanization in a mass society such as ours is not limited to urban areas alone. Mass communication, highways, economic interdependence and other factors, have all served to link rural areas with urban areas and to make urbanization a national process rather than a process restricted only to certain regions or locales.

If the latter view is in fact a more accurate picture of the situation, then one would not necessarily expect to find significant differences in self concept between rural and urban children. The increased specialization, impersonalism, and segmentation of life that accompanies urbanization would have penetrated rural areas and considerably reduced the social distance between the city and the countryside. Any self concept differences which

would have resulted from important social differences would also be considerably reduced.

The more negative self-image of rural Appalachian children found in this study might then be understood as due in part to their acceptance of a negative social image of rural Appalachia imposed by the larger society. Rural people in general and Appalachian rural people in particular in an urban society are confronted with an image of the desirable which is largely alien to their own experience and an image of the undesirable which is more than familiar to them. The dominant nonrural, non-Appalachian society may serve as a "valuation group" (See Berreman 1964:233) to which rural Appalachians compare and judge themselves without fully adopting the standpoints of this external group. Thus, they may value or identify with such a group positively, and, yet, remain alienated from it. Their "identification group" (Berreman 1964:232) would remain their home community, the primary source of their major perspectives and values. This would lead to some acceptance of the negative image of rural Appalachia extant in the larger society without resulting necessarily in surrendering their self-identification as rural Appalachian people.

An additional important component of this possible explanation of the more negative self concept of the rural Appalachian children is the nature of Appalachian schools

discussed in Chapter V. Whether or not one agrees with the interpretation of rural Appalachia as a kind of political and economic colony of the larger society that is found in much literature on Appalachia, it does appear likely that rural schools in Appalachia are generally not controlled by or oriented toward the local rural populations that they serve. Rural Appalachian areas are socioeconomically stratified and the operation of schools frequently reflects this stratification.

The data in this study definitely leads to the conclusion that the more negative self image of rural Appalachian children centers around school-related skills and activities. These children generally did not feel good about themselves in the school context. This fact becomes more understandable given the possibility that schools are perceived, with good reason, to be external intrusions made and controlled by a world which looks negatively upon them. Life in the schools for these children would not only then be time spent in an alien institution, but time spent in an institution which in some ways is a visible symbol of the larger society or the local socioeconomic elite which looks down upon them. As the major institutional point of contact with the external valuation group, the schools may be the most crucial place at which the rural Appalachian child confronts the negative view

of them held by the larger society. The effect on self concept in such a setting appears obvious. This is precisely why there is a need to investigate self concept in areas like Appalachia and in settings other than the schools. At home or in church---institutions which serve as internal identification groups rather than external valuation groups---the self concept of rural Appalachian children may be found to be much more positive.

Considerable research in the area of self concept from a cross-cultural perspective has demonstrated that members of minority groups or microcultures confronted with a dominant culture may successfully adapt to the pressures of the situation by developing a sort of plural identity. Research with urbanized Native Americans (Ablou 1964), rural Native Americans (Polgar 1960), the diverse microcultures of Trinidad (Crowley 1957), Aleutian Eskimos (Berreman 1964), the Maori of New Zealand (Fitzgerald 1977), and numerous other groups has demonstrated the ability of individuals to adapt in terms of their self concept and identity to the different and at times conflicting demands of their native culture and the dominant culture.

For example, Fitzgerald (1977:149) distinguishes between social and cultural identity in his study of Maori university graduates. Social identity is a sort of "relative" identity which allows the Maori to identify

with particular social roles that are expected of him/her in the context of the larger society. This is a less rigid, less central, and more situationally specific identity than is a cultural identity. The latter refers to a more "absolute" identity of self with group. Thus, the Maori university graduate is able to assume any number of social identities in the larger society of New Zealand while still maintaining a distinctive Maori cultural identity.

The degree to which distinctions between social and cultural identity suggested by Fitzgerald (1977) or between valuation and identification groups suggested by Berremen (1964) apply to rural Appalachia awaits further research. Nevertheless, the implications of the data in this study do point in that direction. The need for research into the self concept of rural Appalachian children in settings outside of the school context is great. For if the rural Appalachian school consists of a social setting in which a group of children, who by-and-large constitute an identification group with a shared cultural identity, are interacting with representatives of a valuation group which negatively evaluates them, then the rural Appalachian child's self concept in such a setting may be a distortion of or variation from his total self concept. It may represent a social identity in which the child has, within that context, accepted the negative evaluation of being from Appalachia imposed by the larger society. However, when the child

is outside of the school context, the self concept may take on entirely different evaluations and dimensions.

This theoretical discussion should be viewed as speculative. The intent was not to reach definitive explanations, but rather to suggest certain theoretical implications and possibilities stemming from the research in hopes of pointing toward future lines of inquiry into the question of self concept among rural Appalachian children.

Educational Implications

The data from this study indicate that school and school-related skills are the primary source of more negative feelings concerning the self among rural Appalachian children when compared with urban, non-Appalachian children. It was suggested that the reason for this is that rural Appalachian schools are generally not controlled by nor oriented toward the population that they serve, but rather are controlled by a local elite which symbolically represents a larger society which generally looks down upon the rural Appalachian native. The rural Appalachian child, within the school context, appears to accept this negative evaluation, most likely because he/she uses the larger society as an evaluative reference group in the school setting. It was further suggested that, perhaps, outside of the school context, in settings of strong cultural

identity (e.g., family, church), the rural Appalachian child might possess or express a more positive self concept.

What implications do this data and interpretation have for education? Given the well-established relationship between academic achievement and self concept discussed previously in Chapter II, it would seem that the more negative self concept of the rural Appalachian children would be relatively detrimental to their ability to achieve in school. However, the data from this study did not show a significant relationship between self concept and academic achievement. There was no significant difference in the self concept of low and high achievers in either the rural or the urban setting. Both high and low achievers in the rural sample had more negative self concepts than the urban sample. There was a slight tendency for rural high achievers to feel more positively about themselves than rural low achievers, but this tendency was not significant. There was no such tendency at all among the urban children.

This finding is unusual in educational research and is difficult to explain given the seemingly overwhelming research evidence that there is a relationship between academic achievement and self concept. Certainly, the lack of such a relationship in the urban sample can only be understood in terms of the operation of some unspecified variable(s) which is more important than achievement

in influencing self concept. Identification of this variable(s) would require further research.

With regard to the rural Appalachian sample, one might expect there to be no significant relationship. If the suggestion is accurate that the externality of rural Appalachian schools is related to the more negative self concept of rural Appalachian children, then the effects of achievement in reversing this negative image might be expected to be negligible. The externality of the schools is not necessarily changed because a child is a high academic achiever. Thus, academic achievement does not appear to be the key to an improved self-image for the rural Appalachian child.

Where is the key to be found? Such a complex problem no doubt has multiple doors and locks requiring a myriad of keys. Some might suggest that the most important ingredient in changing the self concept of rural Appalachian children in school would be to create schools with a greater degree of local community control and orientation. Greater local control has been suggested as a primary remedy for many of the problems facing Appalachia (See Walls and Stephenson 1972). This suggestion seems to be logical if the problem centers around the present externality of the schools, for if one can create schools which are more internal to the local rural Appalachian community then a more positive self concept in school might very well

result. Branscome (1972:226-227) has suggested that unless Appalachian youth feel in control of their destiny, be it in school or on the job, then their chances of succeeding and feeling good about themselves are considerably reduced.

Greater local control of rural Appalachian schools could make the schools a more meaningful part of life rather than an external, meaningless or threatening aspect of life. As one parent who was fighting for local control of a small rural school in Blackey, Kentucky said (Branscome 1974:27):

We lose our purpose when we lose our children. We think it is important for our children to have a sense of continuity of their lives as they flow from lives of their parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents. If our children are moved to a large consolidated school, we lose touch with them and they lose touch with the community. They will become citizens of nowhere.

However, as some writers (e.g., Snyder 1974:41) have pointed out, the chances of this happening are minimal. The control of the schools by educational specialists is a form too entrenched to be easily or rapidly dislodged. However, one thing that can be done is to make teachers and administrators in rural Appalachian schools sensitive to the factors contributing to the negative self concept of rural Appalachian children in the school setting. The development of such a sensitivity would be an initial

step---not sufficient, but necessary---to reducing the division between school and people.

One of the primary steps that could be taken in this regard is to get school personnel to view rural Appalachian children with a "difference model" rather than a "deficit model." Although these terms have been used primarily in the linguistic study of social dialects, they are nevertheless applicable to a broader range of cultural phenomena. The deficit model treats cultural differences in terms of a norm and deviation from that norm, while the difference model treats cultures as different from one another, but neither inherently superior or inferior (Wolfram and Fasold 1974:10). Too often, educators working in rural Appalachia have made the judgment that the language, behavior, values, and interests of rural Appalachian people are inferior to those of the nonrural middle class from which most of the educators come. They look at rural Appalachian children and primarily see what they do not have rather than what they do have. In other words, there is a tendency to view these children as deficient in certain language, behavioral, and motivational skills when measured against the norms that educators accept. Such a view can only accentuate the cleavage between the schools and the people they serve. The schools then will remain external impositions in which rural Appalachian children continue to feel ill at ease, as suggested by this research.

The need is for an authentic approach to rural Appalachia as in some ways different from the world of the non-rural middle class, but in no way inferior to it. This does not mean developing a shallow sensitivity to the more popular and stereotyped images of Appalachia: bluegrass music, clogging, dulcimers, and various kinds of crafts. These are a part of Appalachia, but the need goes much deeper if the schools are going to participate in more than the latest fad of "rediscovering" Appalachia (See Munn 1972).

What is necessary is an honest acceptance of the human equality of individuals who exhibit cultural and social differences. This requires a sensitivity to the existence of sociocultural differences between educators and rural Appalachian children, an attitude that these constitute differences rather than deficiencies, an awareness of the economic reality of rural Appalachia, and an awareness of the cleavage which exists between the schools and the people of rural Appalachia. In the long run, this sensitivity will inevitably contribute to the process of bringing schools and people closer together and to help alleviate the negative self concept in the school setting that rural Appalachian children in this study were found to possess.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ablou, J.
1964 Relocated American Indians in the San Francisco Bay area: social interaction and Indian identity. *Human Organization* 23:296-304.
- Ausubel, D.P and P. Ausubel
1963 Ego development among segregated Negro children. In *Education in depressed area*: H. A. Passow, ed. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University.
- Battle, E. S. and J. B. Rotter
1963 Children's feelings and personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. *Journal of Personality* 31:482-490.
- Baum, M., et al.
1968 Unified effort of a junior high school faculty to encourage success for seventh-graders. *Reporting Research (Oregon Board of Education)*.
- Berreman, G. D.
1964 Aleut reference group alienation, mobility, and acculturation. *American Anthropologist* 66:231-250.
- Bertrand, A. L.
1958 *Rural sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.
- Bledsoe, J.
1967 Self concept of children and their intelligence, achievement, interests, and anxiety. *Childhood Education* 43:436-438.
- Borislow, B.
1962 Self-evaluation and academic achievement. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 9:246-254.
- Branscome, J.
1972 The crisis of Appalachian youth. In *Appalachia in the sixties*. D. S. Walls and J. B. Stephenson, eds. Lexington, Kentucky: the University Press of Kentucky.

- Branscome, J.
1974 The case for Appalachian studies. In Appalachian miseducation. M. Clark, J. Branscome, and B. Snyder, eds. Huntington, West Virginia: Appalachian Press.
- Brookover, W. B., A. Patterson and S. Thomas
1962 Self concept of ability and school achievement. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University.
- Brookover, W. B., et al.
1965 Self concept of ability and school achievement II: improving academic achievement through students' self concept enhancement. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University.
- Brookover, W. B., E. Erickson, and L. Joiner
1967 Self concept of ability and school achievement III: relationship of self concept to achievement in high school. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University.
- Brunkan, R. J. and F. Sherri
1966 Personality characteristics of ineffective, effective, and efficient readers. Personnel and Guidance Journal 44:837-844.
- Bugental, J. and Seymour Z.
1950 Investigation into the self-concept I: the W-A-Y technique. Journal of Personality 18:483-498.
- Carlton, L. and R. H. Moore
1966 The effects of self-directive dramatization on reading achievement and self concept of culturally disadvantaged children. Reading Teacher 20:125-130.
- Carter, T. P.
1968 The negative self concept of Mexican-American students. School and Society 96:217-219.
- Centi, P.
1965 Self perception of students and motivation. Catholic Educational Review 63:307-319.

- Clark, K. B.
1963 Educational stimulation of racially disadvantaged children. In Education in depressed areas. H. A. Passow, ed. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Clark, M.
1974 Education and exploitation. In Appalachian miseducation. M. Clark, J. Branscome, and B. Snyder, eds. Huntington, West Virginia: Appalachian Press.
- Coleman, J. S.
1966 Equality of educational opportunity. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Combs, A. W.
1962 The self in chaos. Review of R. C. Wylie, The self Concept: a critical survey of research literature. Contemporary Psychology 7:53-54.
- Combs, A. W., D. L. Avila, and W. W. Purkey
1971 Helping relationships: basic concepts for the helping professions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Combs, A.W., C. C. Courson and D. W. Soper
1963 The measurement of self concept and self-report. Educational and Psychological Measurement 23:493-500.
- Combs, A. W. and D. Snygg
1959 Individual behavior: a perceptual approach to behavior. Boston: Harper and Row.
- Cooley, C. H.
1902 Human nature and social order. New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons,
- Coopersmith, S.
1967 The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co.
- Coopersmith, S.
1969 Self concept research: implications for education. Address presented at American Educational Research Association Convention, Los Angeles.

- Cottrell, L. S.
1969 Interpersonal interaction and the development of the self. In Handbook of socialization theory and research. D. A. Goslin, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.
- Crosby, M.
1967 Elementary school programs for the education of the disadvantaged. NSEE yearbook, the educationally retarded and disadvantaged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crovetto, A. M., L. L. Fischer, and J. L. Boudreaux
1967 The pre-school child and his self-image. New Orleans: Division of Instruction and Division of Pupil Personnel, New Orleans Public Schools.
- Crowley, D. J.
1957 Plural and differential acculturation in Trinidad. American Anthropologist 59: 817-824.
- Davidson, H. H. and G. Lang
1960 Children's perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them related to self-perception, school achievement, and behavior. Journal of Experimental Education 29: 107-118.
- Dewey, R.
1960 The rural-urban continuum: real but relatively unimportant. American Journal of Sociology 66:60-66.
- Diggory, J. C.
1966 Self-evaluation: concepts and studies. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Diller, L.
1954 Conscious and unconscious self-attitudes after success and failure. Journal of Personality 23:1-12.
- Dreger, R. M. and K. S. Miller
1960 Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States. Psychological Bulletin 55:55-60.
- Eames, E. and J. Goode
1977 Anthropology of the city. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Eisen, M.
1972 Characteristic self-esteem, sex, and resistance to temptation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 24:68-72.
- Engel, M.
1959 The stability of the self concept in adolescence. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 58:211-215.
- Ernst, H. and C. Drake
1972 The lost Appalachians. In *Appalachia in the sixties*. D. S. Walls and J. B. Stephenson, eds. Lexington, Kentucky: the University Press of Kentucky.
- Felker, D.
1974 Building positive self concepts. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Co.
- Festinger, L.
1962 A theory of cognitive dissonance. New York: Harper and Row.
- Fink, M. B.
1962 Self concept as it relates to academic achievement. *California Journal of Educational Research* 13:37-62.
- Fitch, G.
1970 Effects of self-esteem, perceived performance, and choice on causal attributions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 16:311-315.
- Fitzgerald, T. K.
1977 Education and identity: a study of the New Zealand Maori graduate. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Gabbler, R. and R. Gibby
1967 The self concept of Negro and white children. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 23:144-148.
- Garrett, A. and R. H. Willoughby
1972 Personal orientations and reactions to success and failure in urban black children. *Developmental Psychology* 7:92-96.
- Graff, O. B.
1967 The needs of education. In *The southern Appalachian region*. T. T. Ford, ed. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press.

- Haas, H. I. and M. L. Maehr
1965 Two experiments on the concept of the self and the reaction of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1:100-105.
- Hawk, T. L.
1967 Self concepts of the socially disadvantaged. *The Elementary School Journal* 67:196-206.
- Henry, J.
1976 A cross-cultural outline of education. In *Educational patterns and cultural configurations*. J. I. Roberts and S. K. Akinsanya, eds. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Honigmann, J.
1963 *Understanding culture*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Horner, M.
1969 A bright woman is caught in a double bind. *Psychology Today* 3:1-4.
- Irwin, F. S.
1967 Sentence completion responses and scholastic success or failure. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 14:269-271.
- Jersild, A. T.
1952 *In search of self*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Kerensky, V. M.
1967 Reported self concept in relation to academic achievement in an inner-city setting. *Dissertation Abstracts* 27:23-25.
- La Benne, W. and B. Greene
1969 Educational implications of self concept theory. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.
- Lamy, M. W.
1965 Relationship of self-perceptions of early primary children to achievement in reading. In *Human development: readings in research*. I. J. Gordon, ed. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Lecky, P.
1945 *Self-consistency: a theory of personality*. New York: Island Press.

- Leonard, R. L.
1975 Self concept and attraction for similar and dissimilar others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 31:926-929.
- Lewin, K.
1935 A dynamic theory of personality. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Lord, S. B.
1971 Self concepts of Appalachian children: a comparative study of economically poor and economically advantaged children using the Piers-Harris Self Concept Inventory. Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- Ludwig, D J. and M. L. Maehr
1967 Changes in self concept and stated behavioral preferences. *Child Development* 38:453-467.
- Manis, M.
1958 Personal adjustment, assumed similarity to parents, and inferred parental evaluations of the self. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 22:481-485.
- Maracek, J. and D. Mettee
1972 Avoidance of continued success as a function of self-esteem, level of esteem certainty, and responsibility for success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 22:98-107.
- Marston, A. R.
1968 Dealing with low self-confidence. *Educational Research* 10:134-138.
- Maslow, A.
1954 Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row.
- Matson, F.
1964 The broken image: man, science, and society. New York: George Braziller.
- Mead, G. H.
1934 Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, M.
1976 Primitive education. In *Educational patterns and cultural configurations*. J. I. Roberts and S. K. Akinsanya, eds. New York: David Mckay Company, Inc.

- Meyers, E.
1966 Self concept, family structure, and school achievement: a study of disadvantaged Negro boys. Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Miller, T. W.
1973 Male self-esteem and attitudes toward women's roles. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 14:402-406.
- Minar, D. and S. Greer
1969 The concept of community. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Moore, G. A.
1976 An anthropological view of urban education. In *Educational patterns and cultural configurations*. J. I. Roberts and S. K. Akinsanya, eds. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Morse, J. and C. Bruch
1970 Gifted women: more issues than answers. *Educational Horizons* 49:25-32.
- Morse, S. and K. Gergen
1970 Social comparison, self-consistency, and the concept of self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 16:148-156.
- Munn, R.
1972 The latest rediscovery of Appalachia. In *Appalachia in the sixties*. D. S. Walls and J. B. Stephenson, eds. Lexington, Kentucky: the University Press of Kentucky.
- Nisbet, R.
1960 Moral values and community. *International Review of Community Development* 5:82-86.
- Phillips, M.
1971 Knowledge from what? Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Piers, E. and D. Harris
1965 Age and other correlates of self concept in children. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 55:91-95.
- Piers, E. and D. Harris
1969 Manual for the Piers-Harris children's self concept scale. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests.

- Polgar, S.
1960 Biculturation of Mesquakie teenage boys. American Anthropologist 62:217-235.
- Poplin, D.
1972 Communities: a survey of theories and methods of research. New York: the Macmillan Co.
- Powell, E. and W. White
1969 Peer-concept ratings in rural children. Psychological Reports 24:461-462.
- Powell, E. and W. White
1972 Affect structure and achievement in a select sample of rural negro children. The Journal of Negro Education 41:53-56.
- Purkey, W. W.
1970 Self concept and school achievement. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Radke-Yarrow, M., H. Davis, and H. Trazer
1949 Social perceptions and attitudes of children. Genetic and Psychological Monographs 40:327-447.
- Rappaport, A., D. Payne, and A. Steinmann
1970 Perceptual differences between married and single college women for the concepts of self, ideal woman, and man's ideal woman. Journal of Marriage and the Family 32:441-442.
- Reck, U. M. L.
1977 A portrait of the gifted female. NCAGT Quarterly Journal 3:17-23.
- Reck, U. M. L.
1978 An existential model designed for the development of positive learner self concept. Publication 14 of the University of North Carolina-Greensboro Humanistic Education Project.
- Redfield, R.
1941 The folk culture of Yucatan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Redfield, R.
1947 The folk society. American Journal of Sociology 52:293-308.

- Redfield, R.
1955 The little community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rogers, C.
1951 Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.
- Rogers, C.
1959 Counseling and psychotherapy: theory and practice. New York: Harper and Row.
- Rogers, C.
1969 Freedom to learn. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Rosenthal, R.
1966 Experimenter effects in behavioral research. New York: Appleton-Centurey-Crofts.
- Sarason, S.
1972 The creation of settings and the future societies. San Francisco: JosseyPlass Publishers.
- Schrag, P.
1972 The school and politics. In Appalachia in in the sixties. D. S. Walls and J. B. Stephenson, eds. Lexington, Kentucky: the University Press of Kentucky.
- Shaw, M. C. and B. E. Dutton
1965 The use of the parent-attitude research inventory with the parents of bright academic underachievers. In The self in growth, teaching, and learning: selected readings. D. E. Hamachek, ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Shaw, M. C., K. Edson, and H. Bell
1960 The self concept of bright under-achieving high-school students as revealed by an adjective checklist. Personnel and Guidance Journal 39:193-196.
- Sherwood, J. J.
1965 Self identity and referent others. Sociometry 28:66-81.
- Smith, T. L. and P. Zopf
1970 Principles of inductive rural sociology. Philadelphia: J. A. Davis Company.

- Snyder, B.
1974 Edubygodcation. In Appalachian miseducation. M. Clark, J. Branscome, and B. Snyder, eds. Huntington, West Virginia: Appalachian Press.
- Soares, A. T. and L. M. Soares
1969 Self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. American Educational Research Journal 6:14-18.
- Strong D. and D. Feder
1961 Measurement of the self concept: a critique of the literature. Journal of Counseling Psychology 8:170-175.
- Tönnies, F.
1887 Gemeinschaft and gesellschaft. Leipzig: K. Curtius.
- Trowbridge, N.
1969 Project IMPACT research report, 1968-1969. U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Report.
- Trowbridge, N.
1970 Self concept and socioeconomic class. Psychology in the Schools 7:304-306.
- Trowbridge, N.
1972 Self concept and socioeconomic status in elementary school children. American Educational Research Journal 9:525-537.
- Videbeck, R.
1960 Self conception and the reactions of others. Sociometry 23:351-359.
- Walls, D. and J. Stephenson, eds.
1972 Appalachia in the sixties. Lexington, Kentucky: the University Press of Kentucky.
- Wattenberg, W. W. and C. Clifford
1962 Relationship of self concept to beginning achievement in reading. U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 377.
- Webster, M. and B. Sobieszek
1974 Sources of self-evaluation: a formal theory of significant others and social influence. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Wendland, M.
1968 Self concept in southern Negro and white adolescence as related to rural-urban residence. Ph.D. dissertation, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Wolfram, W. and R. Fasold
1974 The study of social dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Wylie, R.
1961 The self concept: a critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wylie, R.
1974 The self concept: a review of methodological considerations and measuring instruments. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wyne, M. D., K. White, and R. Coop
1974 The black self. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Yancey, L.
1973 The self concept of academic ability and significant others of rural and urban sixth grade elementary school children. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio University.
- Young, L.
1966 Life among the giants: a child's-eye view of the grown-up world. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Ziller, R. C.
1973 The social self. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Zimmerman, I. L. and G. Allebrand
1965 Personality characteristics and attitudes toward achievement of good and poor readers Journal of Educational Research 59:28-30.

APPENDIX A
EXPLANATIONS OF CATEGORIZATION

CATEGORIES OF OCCUPATIONS

1. Professional
 - a. college professor
 - b. certified public accountant
 - c. engineer
 - d. attorney
2. Other Professionals
 - a. school teacher (public)
 - b. social worker
 - c. minister
 - d. nurse
 - e. librarian
3. Managerial
 - a. bakery manager
 - b. jewelry store manager
 - c. grocery store manager
 - d. commercial credit manager
 - e. dairy manager
 - f. chemical manager
 - g. delicatessen manager
 - h. vice-president of savings and loan
 - i. HUD representative
 - j. inspector
4. Sales and Advertising
 - a. auto dealer
 - b. salesman
 - c. insurance agent
 - d. buyer for electric company
 - e. system analyst
 - f. salesman for oil company
5. White Collar
 - a. worker for highway department
 - b. U.S. army
 - c. computer operator
 - d. city worker
 - e. shipping clerk
 - f. technician
 - g. bankteller
 - h. clerk

- i. statetrooper
- j. policeman

6. Skilled Craft

- a. carpenter
- b. plumber
- c. truck driver
- d. lineman
- e. T.V. repairman
- f. welder
- g. draftsman
- h. bus driver
- i. mechanic
- j. machinist
- k. nurses aide
- l. seamstress
- m. cook
- n. barber

7. Blue Collar

- a. factory worker
- b. laborer
- c. shoe plant worker
- d. janitor
- e. furniture worker
- f. plant worker
- g. delivery man
- h. milkman
- i. dairyworker
- j. mill worker
- k. construction worker
- l. sheet worker
- m. coater operator
- n. meat cutter
- o. carpet cleaner
- p. pipe fitter

8. Secretary and Clerical Work

- a. secretary

9. Owner and Proprietor

- a. farmer

10. Homemaker

11. Other

APPENDIX B
EXAMPLES OF INSTRUMENTS

WHO ARE YOU?

I am going to ask you a question and I want you to write three answers to the question on this paper. Your answer may be anything you wish: words, phrases, sentences, or anything at all, so long as you feel satisfied that you have answered the question. Remember you are to give three answers. The question is: "Who are you?"

1.

2.

3.

OPEN-ENDED STATEMENTS

1. It is usually my fault when _____

2. My parents expect _____

3. When I grow up I will be _____

4. In school I am _____

5. I have a good _____

6. I have pretty _____

7. I get worried when _____

8. I am nervous when _____

9. My classmates make fun of me when I _____

10. It is hard for me to _____

11. I am happy when _____

12. I am easy to get along with when _____

APPENDIX C
ADDITIONAL DATA

Table 10

Anxiety Cluster Scores^a by Area

	Rural	Urban
Mean Number of Responses	5.5116	5.5750
Standard Deviation	2.320	1.820
Standard Error	0.250	0.203

$t = -0.19$

$df = 164$

$p = N.S.$

^aBased on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers and Harris, 1969).

Table 11

Popularity Cluster Scores^a by Area

	Rural	Urban
Mean Number of Responses	7.6512	8.3875
Standard Deviation	2.593	2.617
Standard Error	0.280	0.293

$t = -1.82$

$df = 164$

$p = N.S.$

^aBased on The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers and Harris, 1969).

Table 13

Frequency Table of the "Who Are You?" by Area

Who Are You?	Rural	Urban
Positive Self	2	4
Competence	5	14
Positive Behavior	26	34
Self-other	17	20
Neutral Physical	34	14
Neutral Behavior	5	9
Hobby	18	34
Personal Pronoun	49	48
Sex of Self	30	12
Compares to Others	4	1
Occupation	0	2
Other	4	3