Texas Southern University Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University

Dissertations (Pre-2016)

Dissertations

1986

The Self-Concept of Incarcerated and Nonincarcerated Individuals Completing the General Educational Development (GED) Examination.

William James Selmon

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/pre-2016_dissertations

Part of the Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons

Recommended Citation

Selmon, William James, "The Self-Concept of Incarcerated and Nonincarcerated Individuals Completing the General Educational Development (GED) Examination." (1986). *Dissertations (Pre-2016)*. 50. https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/pre-2016_dissertations/50

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations at Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations (Pre-2016) by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University. For more information, please contact haiying.li@tsu.edu.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SELF-CONCEPT OF INCARCERATED AND NONINCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS COMPLETING THE GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (GED) EXAMINATION

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Education in the Graduate School of Texas Southern University

By

William James Selmon, B.Sc., M.S.

Texas Southern University

1986

Approved by School of Education and Behavioral Sciences Advisor te)

Dean, The Graduate School

THE SELF-CONCEPT OF INCARCERATED AND NONINCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS COMPLETING THE GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (GED) EXAMINATION

by

William James Selmon, Ed.D. Texas Southern University, 1986 Professor Joseph L. Jefferson, Advisor

This study examined significant differences between the self-concepts of incarcerated and nonincarcerated individuals completing the General Educational Development (GED) examination. The sample included 49 incarcerates confined to the Harris County Sheriff's Department and 34 nonincarcerates completing the GED within the Houston Community College System.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965) was administered to measure the self-concept differences between the two groups. In addition, the TSCS was also utilized to measure the self-concepts of the two groups when compared by age, sex, last grade completed, reason for taking the GED examination, and pass/fail status.

The study revealed a significant difference between incarcerates' and nonincarcerates' self-concepts; similarly, the last grade completed by each group was significantly different. A comparison of each group using post-hoc

1

analysis revealed significant mean differences in grades 6 through 9. There was also a noticeable significant difference between incarcerates when comparing the mean scores of grades 6 through 9 with the mean scores of grade 10; in addition, statistically significant differences occurred between the mean scores of incarcerates when comparing grade 10 with the mean scores of grade 11. The ANOVA table displayed a significant difference between the composite GED scores of both groups. A significant difference was found between incarceration status and test scores on each part of the GED examination. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (\underline{r}) revealed a significant relationship between the self-concept score and the average GED score and between the selfconcept score and the score on each part of the GED examination.

Recommendations included: (1) the implementation of special programs relating to the improvement of self-concepts of underachievers, (2) the establishment of seminars, courses, and workshops which address self-concept and anxiety in the learning process, (3) attention being given to study habits, study attitudes, and overall academic abilities of underachieving individuals, (4) improvement of self-concept, with emphasis on where individuals lived, if they worked, and sex, (5) establishment of preventive services which alleviate stress in the environment and enhance skills of the individuals or remedy problems before they reach crisis proportions, (6) preventive consultation which might involve training faculty and/or staff to recognize early signs of depression, stress, and alcohol/drug abuse, delinquency, and (7) training paraprofessionals with similar characteristics of the low-achieving student to encourage positive self-concepts and promote retention rates.

Approved By AD AN Adviser Committee Member 1 40 Committee Member Committee Member Date Dolimitations ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
LIST OF TABLES
LIST OF FIGURES
VITA
DEDICATION
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION
Problem Statement
Purpose
Significance
Hypotheses
Assumptions
Limitations
Delimitations
Definition of Terms
Organization of the Study
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
Incarcerated Individuals and Delinquency
Academic Achievement and Underachievement
Minorities
Comparative GED Studies
Summary

																			Page
	3.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY		•		•				•				•					36
		Setting			•	•			•										36
		Population of the Study									•	•							37
		Sample																	37
		Instrument																	38
		Procedure	5																39
		Variables																	40
		Statistical Analyses																	41
		Summary		•			•												41
	4.	ANALYSIS OF DATA																	42
		Demographic Analysis																	42
		Results																	44
		Hypotheses																	46
		Summary																	64
	5.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, A	AN	D	F	RE	c	DM	M	EN	D	AI	TIC	N	s				66
		Findings																	68
		Conclusion																	70
		Implications																	71
		Recommendations												-				-	72
APP	PENI	DICES.		1						-	1	ĺ		Ì					74
	Δ	Confidential Belease Agreeme	nt		•				•			·		•		•	•	•	75
	A .	Confidential Release Agreeme	m		•	•		•		•	•	•	i		•	•	•	•	15
	в.	Correspondence		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	77
	c.	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.			•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	86
REE	ERI	ENCES																	93

iv

LIST OF TABLES

Tab	le	Page
1.	Demographics of the Sample	43
2.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Total <u>P</u> Score of TSCS	47
3.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Age	48
4.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Sex	49
5.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Last Grade Completed	51
6.	Mean Interactions of Last Grade Completed by Incarceration Status	51
7.	Mean Scores and <u>t</u> -values of Grade Level by Incarceration Status	53
8.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Reason for Testing	55
9.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Pass/Fail Status	56
10.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Average GED Score	57
11.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Writing Skills	58
12.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Social Studies	59
13.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Science	60
14.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Reading.	60

Table

Page

15.	ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Mathematics														
16.	Correlation Matrix for Self-Concept Scores and Average GED Scores		63												

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure																	Page
1. Tennes	se	e	Se	lf	-C	on	ce	pt	S	cal	le	Pr	of	ile	S	he	et
1974																	
																	M.S., Texas Southern University Houston, Texas
																	Crisis Intervention Counselor Chicago Board of Education Chicago, Illinois
															1		
																	Testing/Piscement Advisor Houston Community College Houston, Texes
1055 - 86																	Counselor Bouston Community College Bouston, Texas
																	Counselor Education

VITA

October	4,	19	948	8.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. Born - Jackson, Mississippi
1974	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	.B.S., Eastern Illinois University Charleston, Illinois
1976	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. M.S., Texas Southern University Houston, Texas
1977 - 7	9.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. Instructor, Mathematics & English Chicago Board of Education Chicago, Illinois
1979 - 8	0.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. Crisis Intervention Counselor Chicago Board of Education Chicago, Illinois
1979 - 8	1.		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. Assistant Director Off the Street Club Chicago, Illinois
1982 - 8	4.		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		. Graduate Assistant Texas Southern University Houston, Texas
1983 - 8	5.	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. Testing/Placement Advisor Houston Community College Houston, Texas
1985 - 8	6.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•	•		. Counselor Houston Community College Houston, Texas
Major fi	eld	:															. Counselor Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation and gratitude to few of the many people who made this research study possible.

Sincere appreciation is extended to my major advisor, Dr. Joseph L. Jefferson, who provided counsel, encouragement, and guidance. Special thanks are expressed to my mentor, Dr. J. B. Jones, who assisted me in maturing and who provided me with a family atmosphere while studying in the doctoral program. Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Bobby Gentry, who provided assistance throughout this research study.

The support provided by Dr. Calvin Matthews will not be forgotten, because of his patience and williness to assist me in evaluating and processing the data for this study.

The writer is grateful to fellow students Kenneth Holden, Carol Hightower, and Stephen Zibili for their relentless support and encouragement and to Sharon Bierman of the Devereaux Bureau, who was tireless in her efforts to provide word processing and manuscript editing.

Special appreciation is expressed to Dr. Joseph Butler, Dr. James Norman, Dr. Edith Irby Jones and staff, Dr. Alvin J. McNeil, and a host of other friends for their assistance in various facets of this study.

x

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

The principal concern in the general life process is one of adjustments, and the forms of adjustment effort are behavior. In humans -- as distinguished from an animal society -- the problem of the adjustments of individuals and groups is related to a cultural situation, i.e., one in which a body of values has been accumulated and preserved mainly through the instrumentality of language in the form of institutions, niches, and codes, together with a reinforcing set of attitudes or tendencies to act in conformity with prescribed behavior patterns.

> What a person thinks and how he behaves are largely determined by the concept he holds about himself and his abilities. How we act in any given situation will be dependent upon how we perceive ourselves and how we perceive the situation in which we are involved. (Combs & Snygg, 1948, p. 140)

Psychologists and educators are becoming more aware that an individual's self-concept (his attitudes toward himself and perception of himself) is intimately related to how he learns and behaves. Evidence suggests that low performance in school work, poor motivation, misbehavior, and academic disengagement -- so characteristic of the underachiever, the dropout, the disadvantaged individual, and the incarcerated individual -- are due in part to selfattitudes and self-perceptions (Sherif, 1935). This concept of self is regarded by

1

most authorities as an important variable in understanding human behavior. The individual, as James (1890) pointed out, has many selves. The individual might, for example, conceive of the self as he really believes he is, the self he realistically aspires to be, the self which he believes is perceived by others, the self he hopes he is now, or the self he fears he is now. The self-concept is a configuration of these plus other possible self definitions. The stability of selfconcept derives from interrelations among these various ways of defining self.

Combs and Snygg (1948) reported that, in later life, those expectancies of self form the individual's levels of aspiration. Depending upon the concept of self possessed by the individual, he will choose this goal or that as appropriate for such a person which he regards himself to be.

> Whatever goals are considered worthy of the individual's consideration are dependent upon the way in which he regards himself and the kinds of self expectancies he has acquired in the course of his experience. (p. 140)

The literature is nearly deplete of information comparing the self attitudes and perceptions of incarcerated individuals striving toward academic accomplishments. The academic goal utilized in this study to evaluate such measures is the General Educational Development (GED) examination. The targeted populations will be incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

Yochelson (1976), after 15 years of researching the behavior of incarcerated individuals, concluded that the process of changing incarcerated individuals so that they can function successfully in society involved convincing the individuals that irresponsible people were those who failed to understand that all individuals were interdependent. Self-concept provided individuals with an indication of the effect on the person of social characteristics, local environment, family characteristics, and the individual's response to them. Explanations of the causes for incarceration that focused on society, neighborhood, and family as causative variables were fallaciously assuming that all macrosocial characteristics, neighborhood characteristics, or family settings had similar effects on all people. One's interraction and people's reactions to them are more important and are contained within self-concept.

Over the years, the General Educational Development tests provided personal satisfaction as well as professional, occupational, and educational opportunities for millions of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals, who for many reasons were unable to complete their formal high school studies (American Council on Education, 1984). Known to many as a "second chance," the GED testing program provided testing services to individuals, thereby enabling them to earn high school equivalency credentials and subsequent benefits. The programs for incarcerated individuals have received decreased attention in past years. It is within this context that this study was focused to make a comparative analysis of the self-concepts of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals completing the General Educational Development examination.

Problem Statement

The central research question was, "Is there a difference between the self-concept of a group of incarcerated school dropouts and a group of nonincarcerated school dropouts who were within an academic setting?" A related concern was to determine if sex, age, grade, and reason for taking the GED examination of both groups accounted for differences in their self-concepts.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not incarcerated individuals' self-concepts could be significantly differentiated from nonincarcerated individuals' self-concepts. In addition, this study determined if incarcerated and nonincarcerated individuals were significantly different relative to the self-concept as affected by age, sex, grade, reason for taking the GED examination, and interaction between the stated variables. In addition, this study determined the significant relationship between the self-concept of both groups and individual GED tests scores/composite GED test scores.

Significance

The focus of this study was to investigate the self-concepts of incarcerated and nonincarcerated school dropouts. The significance of this study provided usable information to educators, counselors, school administrators, and those people serving under the auspices of maladjustment services. A review of the literature, which is discussed in-depth in Chapter 2, reveals limited data available with reference to the self-concept of incarcerated individuals. Therefore, this researcher believes that there would be a pressing need for research of incarcerated individuals' self-concept and its relationship to academic attainment. Furthermore, this study generated additional information and provided recommendations to various educational centers that would enhance the strategies and programmatic offerings of services to former incarcerated individuals and/or school dropouts.

Hypotheses

This study was designed to test the following null hypotheses which were generated from the problem. They were:

Ho₁: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

Ho₂: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by age.

Ho₃: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by sex.

Ho₄: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by last grade completed.

Ho₅: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by reason for taking the General Educational Development (GED) examination.

Ho₆: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by pass/fail status on the GED examination.

Ho₇: There will be no statistically significant difference between the average GED score of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

Ho₈: There will be no significant correlation between the self-concept score and average GED score of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

Hog: There will be no significant correlation between the self-concept score and score on each part of the GED examination of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

Assumptions

This study was developed within the constructs of the following assumptions:

1. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965) was a valid and accurate instrument for measuring self-concept.

2. The last grade completed in high school was a valid and accurate measure of academic achievement.

3. All students involved in the study responded honestly to all items on the TSCS.

4. All students involved in the study followed the directions for completing the TSCS as outlined by the researcher.

5. The GED examination was an appropriate testing instrument to compare the educational aspirations of incarcerated and nonincarcerated high school dropouts.

6. Data derived from the study could be used to design programs aimed toward self-concept development.

Limitations

The major considerations for this study were limited to the following:

 To certain incarcerated individuals of the Harris County Sheriff's Department during August 1985 through March 1986.

2. Less than 10% of the penal system's total population.

3. A representative sample of nonincarcerated individuals proportionate to that of the incarcerated individuals.

4. The TSCS as the only instrument used to make comparisons regarding self-concept.

Delimitations

Despite efforts to examine alternatives, the researcher found it possible that some correlated variables which could not be controlled by the study were responsible for some degree of the outcome. There were no known significant differences among the populations of the study and other similar populations; thus, the findings of the study might be applicable to numerous other situations.

Definition of Terms

Several terms were used for clarification throughout this study. They were:

<u>Academic self-concept</u>. The index of a student's perception of his previous school history in relation to the achievement of the other learners in his class.

<u>Achiever</u>. An individual who had a relatively high opinion of himself and was optimistic about his future performance (Ringness, 1961) and had confidence in his general ability (Taylor, 1964).

<u>Analysis</u>. An intent to discover or uncover qualities, motives, or possibilities as a basis for action, judgment, or decision-making.

<u>Dropout</u>. An individual who withdrew from elementary school or high school before successful completion.

<u>General Educational Development (GED) examination</u>. Developed by the American Council on Education (1984) to enable people who had not graduated from high school to demonstrate the attainment of developed abilities normally acquired through completion of a high school curriculum.

<u>Incarcerated individuals</u>. Individuals awaiting trial and/or those who have been convicted and sentenced to a correctional institution, i.e., the Harris County Sheriff's Department, Houston, Texas.

<u>Nonincarcerated individuals</u>. Individuals completing the GED examination within the Houston Community College system who did not fall in the category of incarcerated individuals.

<u>Self-concept</u>. The sum total view of worthiness that was expressed in the attitudes that an individual had of himself (Coopersmith, 1967; Felker, 1974; Fitts, 1965). In this study, self-concept was measured by the total raw score on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965).

<u>Self-esteem</u>. Used interchangeably with self-concept. A positive or negative attitude toward self.

<u>Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS)</u>. A no-item self-reporting questionnaire developed to measure one's level of self-esteem (Fitts, 1965).

<u>Underachiever</u>. An individual less eager to learn, less confident, and less ambitious.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 involved a discussion of the introduction, problem statement, purpose, significance, hypotheses, assumptions, limitations, delimitations, and definition of terms for this study. Chapter 2 presents a review of literature which is pertinent to the current study. Chapter 3 presents a description of the methological procedures and describes the instrument. An analysis of the data is presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 offers a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

literature from significant research regarding the self-concept of incorcovated school deepouts and nonincercerated school dropouts. In general, the literature was replete with reversi studies which dealt in a variety of ways with the subject of self-concept and achievers/underachievers; there was not a great deal of research reported concerning the self-concept of incorcerated individuals ar their comparison to those with similar educational backgrounds. Therefore, the aim of this study was, to towertigate how the self-concept of incorcerated individuals with limited education differed from the self-concept of incorcerated estated individuals with comparable educational training.

Although the topic was discarable throughout the antire spectrum of behavioral sciences literature, a lesser portion was reported with reference to incorrected individuals. It was in this regard that reviewing such a voluminous body of literature created the problem of determining relevance, selection, and organization. As a result, the literature was reviewed within the framework of four major division. The first division deals with the self-concepts of those individuals with delinquent disrectoristics and the self-concepts of achievers and individuals. The record division formed on the self-concept of achievers and individuals. The third division formed on the self-concept of achievers and individuals. The third division formed on achievers because of their high

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a concise review of pertinent literature from significant research regarding the self-concept of incarcerated school dropouts and nonincarcerated school dropouts. In general, the literature was replete with several studies which dealt in a variety of ways with the subject of self-concept and achievers/underachievers; there was not a great deal of research reported concerning the self-concept of incarcerated individuals or their comparison to those with similar educational backgrounds. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate how the self-concept of incarcerated individuals with limited education differed from the self-concept of nonincarcerated individuals with comparable educational training.

Although the topic was discernible throughout the entire spectrum of behavioral sciences literature, a lesser portion was reported with reference to incarcerated individuals. It was in this regard that reviewing such a voluminous body of literature created the problem of determining relevance, selection, and organization. As a result, the literature was reviewed within the framework of four major divisions. The first division deals with the self-concepts of those individuals with delinquent characteristics and the self-concepts of incarcerated individuals. The second division focused on the self-concept of achievers and underachievers. The third division focused on minorities because of their high proportions within the penal systems. The final division focused on comparative studies and delinquent studies involving the GED examination.

Incarcerated Individuals and Delinquency

Many researchers emphasized that incarcerated populations may have varied markedly within their own ranks and they could in no sense be considered a uniform, stereotyped category of people. In groups, however, incarcerated individuals had a number of distinguishing characteristics that were consistent among the samples. Nevertheless, there still remained wide individual differences in self-concepts within these populations. Several investigations sought to account for these differences. Some of the factors that were studied are examined in this section.

Whenever a given population showed large within-group variations, there arose the question of whether these variations were attributed to differences in age, sex, intelligence quotient, race, socioeconomic status, birth order, urban versus rural residence, or other demographic variables. For example, a recent study of this type (Scheurer, 1971) compared delinquents and nondelinquents in Indiana. These two samples were carefully matched on socioeconomic status and age. They were then compared for racial differences, and none was found. The demographic variable which had the greatest effect on self-concept was age. But it was generally upheld throughout the foregoing studies that demographic variables did not account for self-concept differences.

Waters (1969) compared incarcerated individuals with two other groups designated by teachers and counselors as incipient delinquents and nondelinquents. The incipient delinquents did not show the hypothesized differences from the incarcerated group, but both of these groups differed in the usual ways from the nondelinquent group. The TSCS scores were used in this analysis, except for the distribution subscores, the empirical scales, and number of deviant signs.

McKee (1970) studied adult male prisoners in Alabama. Because the inability of prison inmates to employ standard patterns of speech in communicating with others may have interfered with rehabilitation, this project focused upon the modification of speech habits. A special treatment intervention -training in standard English usage -- resulted in significant improvement in both oral and written language facility. This report was a pilot project preparatory to the development of a large-scale educational program. The samples were small, no data were reported for actual TSCS scores, and the statistical analyses were rather unique. The findings regarding self-concept change associated with improvement in speech were neither dramatic nor completely clear. There was a consistent trend across most TSCS scores toward greater and more desirable changes for the experimental subjects than for control subjects. McKee (1970) hypothesized that increased ability in verbal communication would generate increased feelings of adequacy, which the data tended to support. Subsequently, Vacca (1983) found a positive correlation between reading achievement and the self-concepts of inmates in New York correctional facilities.

The research relating self-concept and delinquency was consistent in its findings and crossculturally validated. Fitts and Hammer (1969) concluded that delinquents were a homogeneous group with consistently low self-concepts and that few delinquents had average or better-than-average scores. Delinquents were more uncertain, more variable, and more negative in their selfconcepts and had more personal conflicts. Motoori (1963) found that the existing self-concepts of delinquents were significantly different from those of a control group, while their ideal selfs were quite similar. Epstein (1962) reported that the delinquent female's self-concept was more negative than was the nondelinquent female's self-concept. Fitts and Hammer (1969), however, pointed out that profiles of nondelinquents showed many deviant signs but that profiles of delinquents showed significantly greater deviancy.

Chapman (1964) studied incarcerated individuals in terms of a process of social interaction resulting in people being alienated from a legitimate value system and being attracted to an illegitimate value system. The process of alienation and attraction was viewed as the result of how people perceived others and of how they perceived themselves in relation to others. Chapman (1964) proposed three hypotheses. (1) The incarcerated individual would perceive the people who embodied values of an illegitimate social system more positively than would the nonincarcerated individual. (2) The nonincarcerated individual would perceive the people who embodied values of a legitimate value system more positively than the incarcerated individual would. (3) The nonincarcerated individual would show a more positive self-concept than would the incarcerated individual in relation to a legitimate social system. All these hypotheses were confirmed. Incarcerated and nonincarcerated individuals perceived people who embodied values of an illegitimate social system significantly different from people who embodied values of a legitimate social system. The nondelinquent person's self-concept was significantly more positive than that of a delinquent person.

The delinquent person was in search of self-validation or of some group or social system that would be a good looking glass to mirror the self as good or worthy. If self-acceptance was based upon other acceptance of the self and if the legitimate social system produced only negative images of the self and of people in the system, the individual would have needs for self-validation through love and acceptance that were not met by the legitimate social system. The delinquent individual then rejected the legitimate social system for any system that offered an opportunity for fulfillment of his needs. The negative perception by the delinquent individual of a school teacher would indicate that the delinquent individual was being alienated from school and did not perceive school as a means to the achievement of status.

According to Moberly (1985), this manner of defensive detachment was adaptive insofar as it sought to protect the inchoate self from an object that was experienced as hurtful (whether or not willfully hurtful). The major goal must be the restoration of a structuralizing attachment to a self object to continue the normal developmental process.

Thompson's (1974) study of 2,000 11-year-old children in British schools illustrated this way of enhancing self-esteem. At this age, children who deviated in various ways felt rejected and undervalued and had poor self-esteem. By the age of 15 years, they had changed their membership and conference groups, substituting delinquents for teachers and parents as significant others. This was an unexpected tendency. If people felt isolated, rejected, and undervalued, they sought others in a like condition, expecting from them some support.

Adolescents with low self-identification as students tended to group with others they saw as involved in delinquent lifestyles (Frease, 1972). Just as the proper credentials must have been possessed by a person who entered a trade or profession, so it was with a delinquent subculture. The credentials possessed by virtually all delinquents may have been low academic performance, and low academic performance may have become one of the symbols necessary for entry into the illegitimate system. Furthermore, low academic performance might have been taken as a lack of commitment to the legitimate normatic structure which stressed the need for high academic performance and high academic selfconceptions. Therefore, low academic performance might have been taken as a sign of solidarity with the delinquent subculture. The study by Sherif (1935) demonstrated that, in a situation wherein the individual was unable to tell whether his answer was right or wrong, he was almost completely dependent upon the group for selecting a response.

Research has produced some positive results concerning self-concept and rehabilitation. If the incarcerated group permitted the incarcerated individuals to recoup self-esteem which had been lost through defeat in a middleclass subculture and institutions, providing success for such incarcerated individuals in socially acceptable behaviors and settings should have led to gains in self-esteem and alleviated the need to gain such esteem in antisocial and deviant ways. Such an argument motivated Eitzen's (1976) study on the effects of a behavior modification program on delinquent and self-esteem.

Shore, Masino, and Reids (1965) concluded that changing delinquents' feelings about competence generally changed self-esteem for the better. Fitts and Hammer (1969) noted that individuals who showed the greatest change through correctional measures tended to have the most negative and deviant self-concepts.

Academic Achievement and Underachievement

Education is a common route which people pursue toward selfactualization, rehabilitation, or fulfillment. As a result of self-theories from James (1890), Snygg and Combs (1948), Rogers (1951, 1961, 1969), Coopersmith (1967), and others, educators became increasingly aware of the students' selfconcepts as variables in the educational process.

Several studies dealt with self-concept and academic performance. They employed various subject populations, academic levels, performance criteria, and data analysis. The most common performance criteria were standard achievement tests and academic grades (grade point average). Many studies used one or two common types of analysis -- (1) correlations between self-concept scores and academic criteria, or (2) self-concept comparisons between high- and low-achievement groups.

In studies which dealt with the educational variable, little relationship was found between self-concept and educational level. Piety (1958) found a correlation of only .09 between total <u>P</u> and years of education. Corrigan's (1970) study with American Indians also showed no significant correlations. Monson's study (1969) with unemployed adults showed no significant difference in selfconcept between those who had graduated from high school and those who had not. Schwab, Clemons, and Marder (1966) reported no significant correlation with education for 199 general hospital patients. Harrington (1971) reported that, when his 255 Air Force officers were divided into three groups based on educational level, no significant differences were found on 28 TSCS scores. Brooks (1970) reported no significant relationship between self-concept and years of formal education among teachers at community colleges.

From studies reporting significant correlations between TSCS scores and achievement tests, the highest correlations were reported by Gay (1966). In a study of 207 black eighth graders in Texas and based upon the total <u>P</u> score only, this measure correlated .45 with the Metropolitan Achievement Test (Durost, 1959). When the sample was divided by sex, the r for males was .61 and for females was .30. Williams and Cole (1968) reported correlations between total P scores and the California Achievement Test. These correlations were .31 with reading and .33 with arithmetic for 80 Georgia sixth graders. Clark (1971) shared some unpublished data collected from 100 fifth graders in Wisconsin. She computed correlations between all P scores and the Vocabulary Comprehension and Total scores from the Gates-McGintie Reading Test. Those correlations were largely in the .20s and .30s -- statistically significant but of low practical magniture. An interesting feature of these data was that Identify and Moral-Ethical Self subscores correlated higher with reading achievement than did any of the other TSCS scores, including total P. Further corroboration for the relationship between self-concept and reading ability was provided by Hebert (1968). Using the Reading Comprehension section of the Cooperative English Test with 83 high school freshmen, he classified subjects into high and low groups on both self-concept and reading scores. A chi-square analysis revealed a significant relationship at the .02 level, but this finding was somewhat clouded by his neither designating the self-concept score (presumably total P) nor the cutoff scores used in classifying the high and low self-concept groups.

Overall, the research showed a persistent and significant relationship between self-concept and academic achievement. This relationship appeared quite clear for males but less so for females. Both Bledsoe (1967) and Campbell (1967), using self-report inventories, found stronger relationships between selfconcept and achievement in males than females. Sex differences seemed to influence the relationship between the self and achievement, primarily in the area of underachievement. Male underachievers tended to have more negative self-concepts than did female underachievers. The reason for this was perhaps learned from Baum (1969), who found, through repeated testing with self-concept on the Learner Scale (a self-report inventory), that females -- both high and low achievers -- reported higher self-concepts than did males and that females as a group indicated higher self-concepts.

Palazzetti's (1982) study of self-concept in 75 economically and educationally disadvantaged rural adults was designed to determine whether the self-concepts of the respondents in the sample would improve significantly with participation in a 12- to 14-week compensatory GED diploma course. The selfconcepts of the females were more stable than those of the males. Clark's (1981) study of self-concepts among participants in selected adult educational programs showed that there was no difference between the self-concepts of males and females. This question of the influence of sex on self-concept was a high field of exploration and needed more research.

Caplin (1966), in a study of black students, found that children who professed more positive self-concepts tended to have higher academic achievements. It appeared that the influence of the self had no racial boundaries. Students who felt unsatisfied concerning their abilities seldom succeeded in school, regardless of skin color.

In an early investigation of factors of achievement in high school and college, Gowan (1960) reported that achievers were characterized by selfconfidence, self-acceptance, and positive self-concept. Brunkan and Sheni (1966) considered effective and ineffective readers at the college level and found that the efficient and effective readers characterized themselves in favorable ways, which was not the case for the ineffective readers. Davidson and Greenberg (1967) investigated successful learners among lower-class children and the correlates of school achievement. On these different and distinct aspects of self-personal competence, academic competence, and social competence, the high achievers rated themselves significantly better than did the low achievers. In a similar study previously cited, Williams and Cole (1968) explored the relationship between the reported self-concepts and school adjustment of 80 sixth-grade students and found significant positive correlations between selfconcept and such variables as reading and mathematics achievement. Another study relating self-report to achievement was conducted by Farguhar (1968), who studied 11th-grade high school students. Overachievers and underachievers responded with significant differences to items designed to measure their reflected self-concepts, and students with high academic productivity tended to have high self-concepts.

Brookover, Erickson, & Joiner (1967) showed that, while students who reported low self-concepts rarely performed at above average levels (as would be expected), a significant proportion of those who professed high self-concepts of ability did not perform at comparable levels. This led Brookover et al. to hypothesize that confidence in one's academic ability was a necessary but not sufficient factor in determining scholastic success.

Why some students with high self-concepts of ability failed to succeed in school remained to be explored, it can be conjectured that these students (particularly among the socially disabled) believed that they had ability to succeed in school but viewed school as irrelevant and/or threatening. Socially disabled students did not necessarily report low self-concepts, as determined in a comparative study of self-perceptions of disadvantaged and advantaged elementary school children; on the whole, there were more positive selfperceptions among the disadvantaged children than among the advantaged children (Soares & Soares, 1969). Other studies which questioned the commonlyheld assumption that disadvantaged children had negative self-concepts included Carter (1968). Judging by available evidence, this researcher found it difficult to assume that ghetto children, because of their socioeconomic circumstances, had lower self-concepts than did children in better environments.

A composite portrait of successful students would seem to show that they had relatively high opinions of themselves and were optimistic about future performance (Ringness, 1962). They have confidence in their general ability (Taylor, 1964) and in their ability as students (Brookover, 1969). They need fewer favorable evaluations from others (Dittes, 1959) and believe that they work hard, are liked by other students, and are generally polite and honest (Davidson & Greenberg, 1967). Judging by their statements, successful students can generally be characterized as having positive self-concepts and tending to excel in feelings of worth as individuals.

There were several studies which supported that underachievers tended to have negative self-concepts. Goldberg (1960) studied underachievers in grades 9 through 19. On a list of characteristics and abilities, the underachiever perceived himself as less able to fulfill required tasks, less eager to learn, less confident, and less ambitious. Shaw (1961) reported that underachievers had more negative self-concepts than did achievers and demonstrated less mature behavior than did achieving peers. This tendency toward immaturity of behavior was also reported by Bruck and Bodwin (1962), who studied students from grades 3, 6, and 11 and found positive relationships between educational disability and immature self-concept as measured by the Self-Concept Scale of the Macharer Draw-A-Person test.

Shaw and Alves (1963) attempted to verify previous findings of Shaw, Edson, and Bell (1960) in that bright, underachieving male high school students had more negative self-concepts than did equally bright achieving male students. Their results showed that male achievers and underachievers reported significant differences on the variables of self-concept, self-acceptance, and selfacceptance of peers. Their study confirmed that male underachievers had more negative self-concepts than did achievers. In addition, their study showed that male underachievers were less accepting and attributed a similar lack of selfacceptance to their peers. Underachieving females in the study had ambivalent self-concepts.

More recent studies seemed to confirm the findings of earlier ones that underachievers generally saw themselves as less adequate and less accepted by others. Durr and Schmatz (1964) investigated differences between achieving and underachieving elementary school children. They reported that underachievers were more withdrawing and tended to lack self-reliance, a sense of personal finding, behavioral maturity, and feelings of adequacy. Taylor's (1964) review of the literature on personality traits and discrepant achievement reported that the underachievers was, among other things, self-derogatory, had a depressed attitude toward himself, had feelings of inadequacy, and tended to have strong inferiority feelings.

The available information concerning underachievers suggested that they also held unflattering views about themselves. The nonachiever was in the unenviable position of lacking the ability to meet the demands of school, so that he must (unless the school makes special arrangements for him) face repeated failure. A comparative study by Harding (1966) of white male high school students who stayed in school and those who dropped out found that the dropouts had significantly lower self-concepts of their academic ability when intelligence quotients and grade point averages were factored out. Harding (1966) concluded that a student's attitude toward his ability to achieve in academic endeavors was a critical variable in predicting whether the student would stay in school or not.

Clark (1982) described a study that found that Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) students had low selfconcepts and unrealistic career aspirations. The results indicated the need for emphasis on building positive self-concepts and better career education programs for ABE and GED students.

Zimmerman and Allebrand (1965) studied urban fourth graders and fifth graders of middle to lower socioeconomic status, half from Mexican descent. They found that poor readers, according to their performance on the California Test of Personality (a self-report inventory), lacked a sufficient sense of personal worth, freedom, stability, and adequacy to the extent that they avoided achievement. Carlton and Moore (1966) stressed the importance of selfconcept to reading ability. They showed that self-directed dramatization and self-selection of stories improved the reading skills of elementary school children while bringing about favorable changes in their professed self-concepts.

Judging by the available research, this researcher assumed that unsuccessful students, whether underachievers or poor readers, were likely to hold attitudes about themselves and their abilities which were pervasively negative. Students with negative self-images of ability rarely performed well in school, as Brookover et al. (1967) indicated.

Achievement led to higher self-concept, and higher self-concept led to greater achievement. In addition, a student's self-concept influenced his motivation to learn in the first place (Ballif, 1978). If students did not feel good about themselves generally and good about themselves specifically as learners, they lacked the motivation to improve their performance in many school-related activities.

Numerous researchers examined the relationship between academic achievement and self-concept. With few exceptions, findings indicated a significant and positive relationship between the two variables. High selfconcept was concomitant with high achievement, and low self-concept with concomitant with low achievement. For instance, high achieving intermediate grade students had significantly higher general self-concepts and academic selfconcepts than did low achieving peers (Farls, 1967). Similar findings were reported for the relationship between reading and mathematics achievement and self-concept (Williams & Cole, 1968). A study of 11th-grade overachievers and underachievers revealed that students who exhibited high academic productivity levels tended to have higher self-concepts (Farguhar, 1968). Other researchers found underachievers with more negative self-concepts than had achievers (Fink, 1962; Shaw, 1961) and underachievers who saw themselves as less adequate (Durr & Schmatz, 1964).

At first glance, these differences in self-concept levels of achievers and underachievers might have been attributable to differences in intelligence. However, a study involving over 1,000 seventh graders found that positive relationships between achievement and self-concept remained intact even after intelligence quotient scores were factored out of the data analysis (Brookover, 1965). Also, evidence uncovered by others researchers revealed that intelligent underachieving high school male students had more negative self-concepts than did students of equal intelligence who were achieving at the ability levels (Shaw & Alves, 1963). Thus, it was reasonable to conclude that achievement and self-concept were related and that the relationship could not be accounted for solely on the basis of intelligence.

High achievers (pupils whose high potential was realized in performance or whose performance exceeded their potential) were rewarded by the classroom value system. Low achievers, regardless of potential or effort, were either unrewarded or rewarded for behavior other than academic achievement. If academic achievement were to serve as a source of self-esteem, it must have first been valued; to have acquired this value, the pupils must have been recognized and affirmed as achievers who had positive impacts on significant others and the environment. This may have required pupils to have been given psychological experiences which offered a new basis for self-evaluation, a clear understanding of the values and standards by which to have judged performance, and the skills necessary to have evaluated work. Glasser (1969) argued that the whole of American society was dichotomized between those who identified with success and those who identified with failure.

Need achievement appeared to differentiate people with more favorable self-esteems from those with less favorable self-esteems (Bedeian & Touliatas, 1978). The inextricable link between self-esteem and achievement was emphasized by Bardwick (1971), who noted that striving for success was striving for self-esteem.

Research has shown that people with high self-esteem were likely to persevere and forge ahead despite the obstacles they faced. In McFarlin's (1985) report, 34 undergraduate women took a test to determine their level of selfesteem. They then completed an extremely difficult word-association test, which they were almost guaranteed to fail. McFarlin found that, when students were not told that some of the problems were impossible to solve, those with
high self-esteem persisted longer on unsolvable problems than did those with low self-esteem. But, when students knew some of the problems were unsolvable, the reverse was true. Among the students told nothing, there was no difference between those with low and high self-esteem.

Some large crosscultural studies by Smith (1969) provided strong indications of the contribution of self-concept elements to academic performance. From data collected on 37 samples comparing 5,777 9- to 11-yearolds, Smith (1969) found that the variables which provided the highest correlations with academic performance related to self-attitudes and personal motivation. The use of the self-concept elements enabled Smith to more than double the accuracy of prediction of performance and of dropping out of school in his samples.

Torshen (1969) reported that academic self-concept (general) correlated to .46 with overall teachers' grades, while for the same students it correlated to .33 with overall achievement test scores. The higher relation between academic self-concept and teachers' grades can be attributed to teacher judgment (and grades given) having been communicated to the student on a daily basis, while standardized tests were used rarely during an academic year. Furthermore, teacher judgment tended to emphasize the student's relative standing in the class or school. This is the peer group against which the student typically compared himself, especially in reporting academic self-concept. The standardized test scores referred to a larger population (typically the national distribution), and this was rarely the group against which the student judged his own progress. Thus, the student's view of himself was likely to be more directly influenced by the frequent judgments about himself as a learner which he received in school and especially those judgments made by teachers and peers in the school and parents and siblings in the home. These tended to be relative judgments in that each student's learning was compared with the learning of other students in the same class or school.

Such teacher judgments have cumulative effects on the student's academic self-concept. This was studied by Kifer (1973) who followed the relation between academic self-concept and teachers' grades given. The academic self-concept of students was clearly influenced by the number of years in which the students had been judged and graded by the schools. This was most clearly apparent for the extreme students.

Self-concept can affect performance at an early age, as Wattenberg and Clifford (1964) reported. They found that unfavorable self-concept utilization and achievement were instilled in many children before they entered first grade. They studied 128 kindergarten students in two schools, one serving a working class neighborhood and the other serving a middle class neighborhood. They measured intelligence, ego strength, and reading ability of all the students when they were in kindergarten and gain when these same students finished second grade. Measures of self-concept and ego strength made at the beginning of kindergarten were more predictive of reading achievement 30 months later than were measures of intelligence. In other words, self-attitudes of the kindergarten student were more accurate indications of potential reading skills than were intelligence test scores.

The personality characteristics and attitudes toward achievement of two groups of fourth-grade and fifth-grade children differentiated in reading ability were analyzed by Zimmerman and Allebrand (1965). Subjects consisted of 71 poor readers and 82 good readers who were equated as nearly as possible for age, sex, ethnic background, and intelligence. Compared to the poorer readers, the good reader described himself as well adjusted, motivated, and striving for success. This was in contrast to the picture of poorer readers, who willingly admitted to feelings of discouragement, inadequacy, and nervousness and whose proclaimed goals were often ephemeral or immediate, especially in avoiding achievement.

Mintz and Muller (1977) indicated that self-concept measures which reflected school success were more closely related to achievement than were either global self-concept measures or specific self-concept measures that were reflective of other areas of the child's school experience (e.g., poor relations, physical maturity, or school adaptiveness). They also stated that self-concept measures which specifically reflected success within a given academic area maximized the correlation between self-concept and achievement within that area. This suggested that the prediction of area-specific achievement scores were maximized with the use of subject area-specific measures of academic success self-concepts.

These data bring into focus that a person's self-concept was closely connected to how he behaved and learned. Increasing evidence indicated that low performance in basic school subjects, misdirected motivation, and lack of academic involvement were characteristics of the underachiever, the dropout, the culturally disadvantaged individual, and the incarcerated young adult. These characteristics may have been due in part to the individual's negative perceptions of the self (Hamachek, 1971). Shaw et al. (1960) and Shaw and Alves (1963) found that student performance depended not only on how intelligent the student actually was but also on how intelligent the student thought he was. Fink (1962) found that there was a significant positive relationship between self-concept and academic achievement from elementary levels to college. It seemed reasonable to assume that the relationship between selfconcept and academic attainment was reciprocal, not unidirectional. Academic success raised or maintained self-esteem, while self-esteem influenced performance through expectations, standards, recognition of personal strength, higher motivation, and higher levels of persistence.

Minorities

It was apparent that life experiences of minority children have not aided them in developing positive senses of themselves or their places in the world. Minority children, from earliest school entry through graduation from high school, need opportunities to view themselves in a realistically positive light. According to Gordon (1980), there was danger in building programs which had little effect on minorities' self-concepts on specific dimensions which were vital to life changes. What the individual might have needed was a specific program through which he was able to better understand the national political and economic structure and a means through which long-term effective changes could have been made in the interest of the disadvantaged.

Monat (1968) concluded that low socioeconomic children who resided in urban ghettos participated in senseless violence in the cities, and this was usually attributed to a massive sense of personal worthlessness. They could not answer the question of, "Who am I?" They possessed negative self-concepts. Monat (1968) also noticed that children raised in impoverished environments may have self-concepts distorted by crippled powers of conceptualization.

Crosswait (1966) studied black and white students representing three economic classifications: self-supporting, economically sufficient families (incomes \$4,000+ annually), self-supporting, economically depressed families (incomes of less than \$4,000 annually), and public welfare families. He found that significant differences existed in terms of self-concept among blacks when children from self-supporting, economically depressed families and children from economically sufficient families were compared. He established no significant differences in the self-concepts of blacks and whites. Georgeoff (1968) concluded that white children of a lower socioeconomic status had lower selfconcepts than did white children of a higher socioeconomic status.

The problem of achieving a sense of self-worth or a healthy selfconcept for minority children (i.e., blacks and Mexican-Americans) was a difficult one. For years, minority children have believed that they were different from the mainstream of middle class Americans. Allport (1965) observed:

> What would happen to your own personality if you heard it said over and over again that you were lazy, a simple child of nature, expected to steal, and had inferior blood? Suppose this opinion were forced on you by the majority of your fellow citizens. And suppose nothing you could do would change this opinion -- because you happen to have different color skin. (p. 13)

Many individuals believed that with circumstances such as these a child from a minority group could not develop a self-concept adequate to meet the demands which life placed upon him. Georgeoff (1968) found that many of the negative self-concepts possessed by black children were often the result of lack of knowledge about the ethnic group's history, culture, and contribution to America and the world civilization. His research proved this to be correct by utilizing a curriculum which portrayed black contributions. He subsequently found a higher self-concept in black students who participated in this curriculum.

Clark (1963) stressed an enlightening new point in his research. When minority children observed that they were often segregated, they reacted with feelings of inferiority. These children were thrown into conflict regarding feelings about themselves. This conflict led to self-hatred and to negative selfconcepts.

Rosenberg (1965) found that black students did not have particularly low self-concepts because ethnicity, according to Rosenberg, was not related to self-esteem. The status of one's ethnic group was ascribed -- not achieved. He contended that the adolescents' own achievements were definitely related to self-concept because adolescents had more control over this factor of their lives, whereas ethnicity was an ascribed factor over which adolescents had no control. Rosenberg (1965) further pointed out that one's ethnic status was not likely to affect self-concept, as evidenced by members of an ethnic group often ranking their own group higher than did others.

Studies concerned with the self-concepts of Spanish-American individuals deserved a separate category for two reasons. Very little research has been conducted in this area, and what research has been conducted was somewhat subject or inferential in its nature. Cardora (1969) stated, "The low educational achievement of Spanish-American students leads to a lack of gratification and acquisition of a low self-concept which contributes to a feeling of alienation from school" (p. 5).

Manuel (1965) contended that Mexican-American children were constantly frustrated and disappointed in school. This frustration promoted feelings of inferiority. Children became caught in a syndrome of failure from which they essentially withdrew and assumed the inferiority feelings ascribed to them by schools.

According to Carter (1968), Mexican-American students were quite resilient as a group without thinking of themselves negatively as a group. Their own Mexican-American peer society established the norms by which they judged themselves. Anglo-American society seemed to be rejected. Carter stated, "The supposed self-image of the Mexican-American is, in reality, our stereotype projected into him. Anglos tend to think of Mexican-Americans in negative ways, and conclude they see themselves in the same light" (p. 217).

Williams and Byars (1968) attributed much of the results of their study to minorities having suffered great degradation in the past decade, leading to uncertainty in self-identity. However, even those minorities in integrated schools did not differ significantly from those attending segregated schools. The minority child needed to be provided with an atmosphere in which he could more fully discover and respect himself.

Comparative GED Studies

Because of the limited amount of information directly related to this study, the researcher has provided the reader with information concerning other GED studies which were also conducted within a comparative framework. These studies are summarized in this section.

In a study comparing GED performance between Indian and non-Indian adult learners, Farlee (1982) found that women scored higher overall on English, social studies, and literature, while men obtained higher scores on science and math. When test scores were compared between Indians and non-Indians, non-Indian scores were consistently higher. When Indian men and Indian women were compared, men scored higher on all tests than did females. The findings demonstrated that there were significant differences of performance scores on the GED between Indian and non-Indian adult learners.

For research comparing academic performance of high school graduates and GED certificate holders, Wilson (1982) answered whether there was a difference between the students that entered a junior college with a high school diploma and students who entered with a GED certificate with regard to GPA, hours of attrition, and hours attempted/completed. In addition, the study compared the backgrounds of the two groups to determine if there were any differences regarding age, sex, marital status, and stated educational goals. The findings indicated significant differences between the full-time high school graduates and the full-time GED students in GPA, number of hours completed, marital status, age, and time of attendance. Significant differences were found between the part-time high school graduates and the part-time GED students in marital status, age, and educational objectives.

Welch (1980) determined whether there were significant differences in the academic performance level of those students admitted to the Associate of Science degree program in nursing at the University of Tennessee (Nashville) who were admitted on the basis of GED test scores, high school diploma, and college transfer credit. There was a statistical relationship between sex and the three groups, the percentage of married (90.85%) in the GED population was considerably higher than in the high school (43.13%) and college transfer (58.26%) groups, there was no significant difference in the cumulative means of the three groups, and the GED scores and the Nursing State Board scores had significant positive correlations. The overall intent of Roberson (1980) was to compare the success of candidates for the GED tests who received learning laboratory instruction and the success of candidates who received no laboratory instruction. Learning laboratory and nonlearning laboratory candidates were equally successful on the GED tests. Learning laboratory and nonlearning laboratory candidates exhibited equal perseverance to succeed on the GED tests. Sex and race were significantly related to this perseverance; age and highest grade completed were not. The difference between learning laboratory and nonlearning laboratory candidates' success on the GED tests was not related to age, race, or highest grade completed.

Bennani (1983) determined if Adult Basic Education/General Educational Development students and Developmental Education students were significantly different in selected basic skills and in selected personality characteristics. Distinguishing between ABE/GED and DE students in programs teaching basic skills was unnecessary because students in ABE/GED and DE classes were far more similar than they were dissimilar.

The comparative success in college between first-time college entrants who possessed standard high school diplomas and students who entered on the basis of earning certificates of high school equivalency by passing the GED tests was examained by Spillar (1982). Variables were overall GPA, persistence in college, grades in freshman English, and scores on a standardized test used for admission and placement. Recommendations from the student centered around the suggestion that GED holders deserved to be treated on an equal basis with other students entering college.

The problem of determining when an individual was ready to take the GED test has been a concern of correctional educators as well as adult

educators. Because the GED test was extensively revised in 1979, all previous studies of this problem are obsolete. In addition, the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) is the major assessment and placement test utilized in the Ohio adult prison system. Therefore, Littlefield (1983) studied a large sample (n = 1,120) of Ohio incarcerated individuals who took the GED in 1980. The TABE was a significant predictor of performance on the GED test. The best single predictor was the TABE reading comprehension subtest. The study recommended that other adult achievement tests should be examined as predictor instruments for evaluating the potential performance of adults on the GED test.

Stevens' (1981) study answered two questions concerning the impact of GED diploma on the probability of returning to prison and the identification of inmate characteristics that were significantly related to GED success and recidivism. Male inmates released from the Georgia correctional system between 1972 and 1978 showed that success in obtaining a GED diploma significantly reduced the prospect of recidivating when compared to the entire inmate population. In terms of those inmates who succeeded in obtaining GED diplomas most, they were white, single, had above-average IQs, had less children, had more substance abuse problems, had higher incomes, were younger, and were less occupationally skilled than the rest of the prison population.

Summary

The literature reflected in this chapter showed that guidelines for policy might have been obtained from continued study of self-concept, especially those studies which gave closer attention to situations which affected selfconcept on specific dimensions. The intent of this study was to determine the significant differences between self-concepts of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals striving for academic achievement. This study determined if different or adjusted learning environments were more conclusive for either group based upon their self-attitudes.

According to have and Michael (1977), descriptive inferential research explonates systematically the characteristics of a population or area of interest, both factually and accurately. The instrument identified for this study was the Termssee Self-Congept Scale (Fitz, 1965), which eligited information models to determine the extent to which the self-concept of incarcurated school dropouts and noninconcerated school dropouts differed. Therefore, this chapter delineates the research method used in this study and examines the data accord to confirm or deny the hypothesis. This chapter further describes the setting, population, sampling procedures, collection procedures, and statistical analyses.

Satting

The researcher selected a multistimle commonity college and a multistimic correctional facility located in the southeastern alone of Turus. Thuse facilities were selected because of the availability of the sample population in the researcher. The researcher was employed either directly or indirectly by both locatitutions at the first of this study. Houston Community College is the largest college in Herseler, Texas. It operates in locations throughout the city and offers a broad spectrum of lifelong educational opportunities, 50,000 students are excelled at 10 mighterbody anaputes in 164

Chapter 3 DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The research method used in this study was descriptive in nature. According to Isaac and Michael (1977), descriptive inferential research explicates systematically the characteristics of a population or area of interest, both factually and accurately. The instrument identified for this study was the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965), which elicited information needed to determine the extent to which the self-concept of incarcerated school dropouts and nonincarcerated school dropouts differed. Therefore, this chapter delineates the research method used in this study and examines the data needed to confirm or deny the hypotheses. This chapter further describes the setting, population, sampling procedures, collection procedures, and statistical analyses.

Setting

The researcher selected a multiethnic community college and a multiethnic correctional facility located in the southeastern area of Texas. These facilities were selected because of the availability of the sample population to the researcher. The researcher was employed either directly or indirectly by both institutions at the time of this study. Houston Community College is the largest college in Houston, Texas. It operates in locations throughout the city and offers a broad spectrum of lifelong educational opportunities; 50,000 students are enrolled at 30 neighborhood campuses in 168 programs. The Harris County Sheriff's Department is located in downtown Houston, Texas. It operates the county jail in which approximately 4,000 inmates are confined there at any one time; 70% are pretrial detainees, 20% are awaiting appeal, and 10% have been convicted of misdemeanors and are serving jail sentences that range up to two years. Of the incarcerated individuals, usually 91% are males and 9% are females. Established in 1837, the facility's main purpose is to hold arrestees awaiting trial.

Population of the Study

The population of this study consisted of 49 multiethnic incarcerated individuals at the Harris County Sheriff's Department who were completing the General Educational Development (GED) examination. Incarcerated examinees were allowed to take the GED examination once a month, with the option of being retested if they were not successful on their previous GED tests. In contrast, 34 multiethnic nonincarcerated individuals completed the GED examination within the Houston Community College System.

Sample

The primary issue in choosing a sample size was to ensure that the sample was large enough to represent the population accurately. The representative sample in this study was 83 incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals. It was necessary to utilize incarcerated examinees from June 1985 through February 1986 to accrue a valid sample. There were 29 incarcerated females and 20 incarcerated males. A sufficient sample of nonincarcerated examinees was available on any single occasion. All participants included in the study were nonrandomly selected using the incidental sampling techniques; in addition, each individual was required to sign a confidential release agreement for the express purpose of anonymity (Appendix A).

Instrument

The counseling forms of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965) were utilized as a measure to determine a profile of self-concept of both groups. The standardization group from which the norms of the scale were developed consisted of a broad sample of 626 people, which included individuals from various parts of the United States and an age range of 12 to 68 years. There were approximately equal numbers of both sexes, equal numbers of both black and white subjects, representatives of all social, economic, and intellectual levels, and representatives of expressed educational levels ranging from the sixth grade through doctoral programs. Subjects were obtained from high school and college classes, employers at state institutions, and various other sources.

The counseling form of the TSCS used for this study was composed of four major divisions and 10 subcategories of self-concept. Low scores indicated defensiveness, while high scores indicated normal healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism. Extremely high scores (above the 99th percentile) indicated that the person may have been lacking in defenses and may have been pathologically undefended. The total positive scale was a measure of overall self-esteem or the positive-negative level of self-regard. The total positive score was a composite of three rows and five column scores. Row #1 indicated a measure of identity, Row #2 indicated self-satisfaction, and Row #3 indicated behavior. Column A presented a view of the physical self, Column B described the moral-ethical self, Column C reflected the personal self, Column D reflected one's family feelings, and Column E depicted the self in relation to others. The variability score provided a simple measure of the amount of variability or inconsistency from one area of self-perception to another. The distribution score was a summary score of the way one distributed answers across the five available choices in responding to the items of the scale.

The reliability of the instrument was determined by the test-retest method. In Congdon's (1958) study with psychiatric patients, a shortened version of the scale was used; it obtained a reliability coefficient of .88 for the total positive score. Other evidence of reliability was found in the remarkable similarity of profile patterns found through repeated measures of the same individuals over long periods of time.

Validity procedures for the instrument included content validity, discrimination between groups, correlation with other personality measures, and personality changes under particular conditions. The overall validity of the instrument was estimated to be .89.

Procedure

Various permissions were received for testing the subjects (Appendix B). Prior to the administration of any information related to this study, the researcher requested and received permission to conduct this study from authorities at both the Harris County Sheriff's Department and Houston Community College. Similarly, permission was received in the form of a confidential release agreement from all subjects tested at both facilities (Appendix B).

The TSCS (Appendix C) was administered by the researcher to all subjects preceding the GED examination. All subjects utilized were selected because of employment status (testing specialist) of the researcher at the time of the study. Because of the alternating pattern of incarcerated males testing one month and incarcerated females testing the following month, the sample population of incarcerated females happened by chance to be larger than that of the incarcerated males. The time frame for retrieving data on the incarcerates in this study included administering the TSCS and the GED examination once a month, beginning in June 1985 and concluding in February 1986. Similarly, the TSCS and the GED examination were given to all Houston Community College examinees on two separate occasions during two administrations in the month of February 1986.

The mean total positive score on the TSCS was computed to determine significant differences between the self-concepts of both groups. The researcher determined the validity of each hypothesis by testing for significant differences of mean self-concept scores for incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by sex, age, grade, and reason for taking the GED examination of both groups. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique was utilized as the statistical tool in determining the significant and nonsignificant differences between the groups. Correlations were conducted between the selfconcept and GED test scores/GED composite scores to determine significant relationships. There was also an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for homogeneity of variance for main effects, along with the necessary post hoc t-test analyses.

Variables

The independent variables for the study were sex, age, grade, and reason for testing of both groups. The dependent variables were the total <u>P</u> score on the TSCS for each group, pass/fail status as measured by the GED, scores on each part of the GED examination, and composite GED scores.

Statistical Analyses

The researcher analyzed the data obtained from this study by using a series of analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques and the Pearson productmoment correlation coefficient (<u>r</u>). Each stated hypothesis was analyzed by the appropriate statistical method. ANOVA tested for any significant differences between the self-concepts of both groups. The <u>t</u>-test was used to test for degrees of significance.

Summary

Two groups of 83 examinees each were randomly selected from eligible populations of incarcerates and nonincarcerates, each group being administered the TSCS as an evaluation instrument to determine significant differences in self-concepts between the groups. Six hypotheses were tested utilizing the analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique; the remaining three hypotheses were subjected to the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r). In each instance, the .05 level of confidence was used.

The analyses of data are presented in Chapter 4. Reports of specific conclusions and recommendations resulting from available data and findings are presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4 ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings from the statistical procedures in examining the differences between self-concepts of incarcerates and nonincarcerates relative to sex, age, last grade completed, reason for taking the GED examination, and pass/fail status. The analysis process undertaken in this chapter involves essentially the following steps: demographic analysis, statement of each hypothesis with a report of the results and appropriate tables from the statistical analyses, and presentation of other relevant and pertinent findings.

Demographic Analysis

Table 1 provides the frequency distributions for the demographic characteristics of the sample. Included are sex, age, last grade completed, reason for testing, pass/fail status, and incarceration status. There were 41 males and 42 females; there were 49 incarcerates (20 males and 29 females) and 34 nonincarcerates (20 males and 14 females). The ages ranged from 17 to 49 years, with the two largest categories being 17-19 years of age and 26+ years of age. In reference to last grade completed, grades 6 through 9 were grouped because of the limited amount of individuals ascribed to the cells in the ANOVA design. The largest number of individuals (33) appeared in the 6th through 9th grades.

included in this study fall either the lower grade	n	%
Sex Males Females	40 <u>43</u> 83	$ 49.4 \\ 50.6 \\ 100.0 $
Age 17-19 years 20-22 years 23-25 years 26+ years	27 18 12 <u>26</u> 83	32.521.714.531.3100.0
Last grade completed 6th to 9th grade 10th grade 11th grade	33 27 23 83	39.832.527.7100.0
Reason for testing Job or military Additional schooling Personal	31 30 22 83	37.336.126.5100.0
Pass/fail status Pass Fail	44 <u>39</u> 83	53.0 47.0 100.0
Incarceration status Incarcerated Nonincarcerated	49 <u>34</u> 83	$59.0 \\ 41.0 \\ 100.0$

Table 1 Demographics of the Sample

There were 27 individuals in the 10th grade category and 23 individuals in the 11th grade category. Approximately 40% of all the high school dropouts included in this study fell within the lower grades, a percentage which decreased as the last grade completed increased. The reasons for testing included job and military, additional schooling, and personal; job and military were grouped because of the limited amounts of individuals ascribed to their cells in the ANOVA design. Most (44, 53%) of the individuals passed the GED examination.

Results

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique was used to discern the significant differences in the hypotheses of this study. The instrument provided mean self-concept scores (total \underline{P} on TSCS) for both groups. The composite self-concept score was also grouped with all variables. The ANOVA summary table for the self-concept score, sex, age, last grade completed, reason for testing, pass/fail status, and score of each part of the GED examination yielded degrees of freedom, sum of squares, mean score of squares, and \underline{F} -ratio. The .05 level of significance was used to evaluate the results of the analyses. The mean TSCS total \underline{P} score of both groups was 330.481 and fell within the 40th to 50th percentile. The variability for both groups was within the 50th to 60th percentile (Figure 1).

44



Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Profile Sheet

45

In the computer print-out of the ANOVA with the dependent and independent variable scores, the design was balanced. Except for truncation and rounding errors, the analysis of variance was exact. The Pearson productmoment correlation coefficient (<u>r</u>) determined relationships between selfconcept and GED test scores. Calculations of <u>t</u>-values made comparisons among the marginal mean scores of significant factors when indicated.

Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant differences existed between the self-concepts of incarcerates and nonincarcerates completing the General Educational Development examination. As a result of this stated problem, nine hypotheses were postulated.

Ho₁: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) provided statistical results for this hypothesis. The degrees of freedom for between groups was 1 and for within groups was 81, totaling 82 for both groups. The sum of squares for between groups was 9892.9067 and for within groups was 140045.8687, totaling 149938.7800 for both groups. The mean squares for between groups was 9892.9067 and for within groups was 1728.961. The <u>f</u>-ratio was 5.722. Because the <u>f</u>-ratio was more than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that Ho₁ would happen by chance more than 5% of the time. It was determined that a significant difference existed between incarcerates' and nonincarcerates' selfconcepts as measured by the total <u>P</u> score on the TSCS; therefore, Ho₁ was not accepted. The data are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and
Nonincarcerates on Total P Score of TSCS

Carlos E.	đf	SS	ms	<u>f</u> -ratio
Between groups	1	9892.9067	9892.9067	5.722*
Within groups	<u>81</u>	140045.8687	1728.9613	
Total	82	149938.7800		
11.4	av a	0.0		

CV = 3.96

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Ho₂: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by age.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) provided results for this hypothesis. The degrees of freedom for the main effects was 4, incarceration status was 1, age was 3, 2-way interactions was 3, explained was 7, and residual was 75; the total degrees of freedom was 82. The sum of squares for the main effects was 11570.981, incarceration status was 11008.043, age was 1678.126, 2-way interactions was 1976.772, explained was 13547.752, and residual was 13690.970; the total sum of squares was 149938.720. The mean squares for the main effects was 2892.745, incarceration status was 11008.043, age was 559.375, 2-way interactions was 658.924, explained was 1935.393, and residual was 1818.546; the total mean square was 1828.521. The <u>f</u>-ratio for 2-way interactions was .362. Because the f-ratio was less than the critical value of 2.72, it was determined that Ho_2 would happen by chance less than 5% of the time. It was determined that no significant difference existed between incarcerates and nonincarcerates when compared by age; therefore, Ho_2 was accepted. The data are shown in Table 3.

ms	<u>f</u> -ratio
2892.745	1.591
11008.043	0.053
559.375	0.308
658.924	0.362**
1935.393	1.064
1818.546	
1828.521	
	ms 2892.745 11008.043 559.375 658.924 1935.393 1818.546 1828.521

	Table 3	
ANOVA	Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates	S
on Mea	sures of Self-Concept When Compared by Age	

CV = 2.72

** Nonsignificant at the .05 level of confidence.

Ho₃: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by sex.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) provided results for this hypothesis. The degrees of freedom for the main effects was 2, incarceration status was 1, sex was 1, 2-way interactions was 1, explained was 3, and residual was 79; the total degrees of freedom was 82. The sum of squares for the main effects was 9910.869, incarceration status was 9518.358, sex was 18.014, 2-way interactions was 1827.225, explained was 11738.094, and residual was 138200.630; the total sum of squares was 149938.720. The mean squares for the main effects was 4955.435, incarceration status was 9518.358, sex was 18.014, 2-way interactions was 1827.225, explained was 3912.698, and residual was 1749.375; the total mean square was 1828.521. The <u>f</u>-ratio for 2-way interactions was 1.045. Because the <u>f</u>-ratio was less than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that Ho₃ would happen by chance less than 5% of the time. It was determined that no significant difference existed between incarcerates and nonincarcerates when compared by sex; therefore, Ho₃ was accepted. The data are shown in Table 4.

	df	SS	ms	<u>f</u> -ratio
Main effects	2	9910.869	4955.435	2.833
Incarceration status	1	9518.358	9518.358	5.441
Sex	1	18.014	18.014	0.010
2-way interactions	1	1827.225	1827.225	1.045**
Explained	3	11738.094	3912.698	2.237
Residual	79	138200.630	1749.375	
Total	82	149938.720	1828.521	

Table 4 ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Sex

CV = 3.96

** Nonsignificant at the .05 level of confidence.

Ho₄: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by last grade completed in high school.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) provided results for this hypothesis. The degrees of freedom for the main effects was 3, incarceration status was 1, last grade completed was 2, 2-way interactions was 2, explained was 5, and residual was 77; the total degrees of freedom was 82. The sum of squares for the main effects was 18718.837, incarceration status was 7932.100, last grade completed was 8826.982, 2-way interactions was 10141.399, explained was 28861.236, and residual was 121077.490; the total sum of squares was 149938.720. The mean squares for the main effects was 6239.946, incarceration status was 7932.100, last grade completed was 4413.491, 2-way interactions was 5070.700, explained was 5772.247, and residual was 1572.435; the total mean square was 1828.521. The f-ratio for 2-way interactions was 3.255. Because the f-ratio was greater than the critical value of 3.11, it was determined that Ho₄ would happen by chance more than 5% of the time. It was determined that a significant difference existed between incarcerates and nonincarcerates when compared by last grade completed; therefore, Ho4 was not accepted. The data are shown in Table 5.

the party of the lines.	df	SS	ms	<u>f</u> -ratio
Main effects	3	18719.837	6239.946	3.968
Incarceration status	1	7932.100	7932.100	5.044
Last grade completed	2	8826.982	4413.491	2.807
2-way interactions	2	10141.399	5070.700	3.225*
Explained	5	28861.236	5772.247	3.671
Residual	77	121077.490	1572.435	
Total	82	149938.720	1828.521	

Table 5 ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Last Grade Completed

CV = 3.11

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 6 presents mean values, numbers, and standard deviations for

last grade completed, according to incarceration status.

Mean Interactions of Last Grade Completed by Incarceration Status					
	MS	n	SD		
G rades 6–9 Incarcerates Nonincarcerates	307.09 350.91	22 11	24.74 27.69		
Grade 10 Incarcerates Nonincarcerates	351.43 341.92	14 13	34.16 35.22		
Grade 11 Incarcerates Nonincarcerates	313.23 337.70	13 10	65.49 45.97		

bla C

Table 7 presents the calculations of <u>t</u>-values to test for possible significant differences among mean scores of last grade completed by incarceration status. When the mean score of 307.09 (incarcerates, grades 6-9) was compared with the mean score of 350.91 (nonincarcerates, grades 6-9), the <u>t</u>-value of -4.61 showed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence. When the mean score of 307.09 (incarcerates, grades 6-9) was compared with the mean score of 351.43 (incarcerates, grade 10), the <u>t</u>-value of -4.52 showed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence. When 351.43 (incarcerates, grade 10) was compared with the mean score of 313.23 (incarcerates, grade 11), the <u>t</u>-value of 2.18 showed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence.

Beneficiary at the Unit land of Arefuldings.
 Beneficiary Desci. 41 Dec. 35 Level of earthdorses.

Degl They will be an its industry significant, differences between the estimation of houringhest industrials and containerstated industrialistic stars employed by reason for tables the finiteral franchises, therebywards (0.00) association.

and by the solid sugress of a	X	t	df	S	
Incarcerates, grades 6-9 Nonincarcerates, grades 6-9	307.09 350.91	-4.61	31	p>.05	*
Incarcerates, grade 10 Nonincarcerates, grade 10	351.43 341.92	.71	25	p<.05	**
Incarceraates, grade 11 Nonincarcerates, grade 11	313.23 337.70	1.93	21	p<.05	**
Incarcerates, grades 6-9 Incarcerates, grade 10	307.09 351.43	-4.52	34	p ^{>} .05	*
Incarcerates, grade 10 Incarcerates, grade 11	351.43 313.23	2.18	25	p>.05	* .
Incarcerates, grades 6-9 Incarcerates, grade 11	307.09 313.23	40	33	p<.05	**
Nonincarcerates, grades 6-9 Nonincarcerates, grade 10	350.91 341.92	.69	22	p<.05	**
Nonincarcerates, grade 10 Nonincarcerates, grade 11	341.92 337.70	.25	21	p<.05	**
Nonincarcerates, grades 6-9 Nonincarcerates, grade 11	350.91 337.70	.81	19	p<.05	**

Table 7 Mean Scores and t-values of Grade Level by Incarceration Status

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.
** Nonsignificant at the .05 level of confidence.

Hos: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by reason for taking the General Educational Development (GED) examination.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) provided results for this hypothesis. The degrees of freedom for the main effects was 3, incarceration status was 1, reason for testing was 2, 2-way interactions was 2, explained was 5, and residual was 77; the total degrees of freedom was 82. The sum of squares for the main effects was 23872.667, incarceration status was 7411.944, reason for testing was 13979.812, 2-way interactions was 3164.530, explained was 27037.196, and residual was 122901.530; the total sum of squares was 149938.720. The mean squares for the main effects was 7957.555, incarceration status was 7411.944, reason for testing was 6989.906, 2-way interactions was 1582.265, explained was 5407.439, and residual was 1596.124; the total mean square was 1828.521. The f-ratio for 2-way interactions was .991. Because the f-ratio was less than the critical value of 3.11, it was determined that Ho, would happen by chance less than 5% of the time. It was determined that no significant difference existed between incarcerates and nonincarcerates when compared by reason for testing; therefore, Ho₅ was accepted. The data are shown in Table 8.

54

df	SS	ms	<u>f</u> -ratio
3	23872.667	7957.555	4.986
1	7411.944	7411.944	4.644
2	13979.812	6989.906	4.379
2	3164.530	1582.265	.991**
5	27037.196	5407.439	3.388
77	122901.530	1596.124	
82	149938.720	1828.521	
	df 3 1 2 2 5 77 82	df ss 3 23872.667 1 7411.944 2 13979.812 2 3164.530 5 27037.196 77 122901.530 82 149938.720	df ss ms 3 23872.667 7957.555 1 7411.944 7411.944 2 13979.812 6989.906 2 3164.530 1582.265 5 27037.196 5407.439 77 122901.530 1596.124 82 149938.720 1828.521

 Table 8

 ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on

 Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Reason for Testing

CV = 3.11

** Nonsignificant at the .05 level of confidence.

Ho₆: There will be no statistically significant difference between the self-concept of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals when compared by pass/fail status on the GED examination.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) provided results for this hypothesis. The degrees of freedom for the main effects was 2, incarceration status was 1, pass/fail status was 1, 2-way interactions was 1, explained was 3, and residual was 79; the total degrees of freedom was 82. The sum of squares for the main effects was 16255.076, incarceration status was 3635.220, pass/fail status was 6362.221, 2-way interactions was 630.147, explained was 16885.223, and residual was 133053.500; the total sum of squares was 149938.720. The mean squares for the main effects was 8127.538, incarceration status was 3635.220, pass/fail status was 6362.221, 2-way interactions was 630.147, explained was 5628.408, and residual was 1684.222; the total mean square was 1828.521. The <u>f</u>-ratio for 2-way interactions was .374. Because the <u>f</u>-ratio was less than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that Ho₆ would happen by chance less than 5% of the time. It was determined that no significant difference existed between incarcerates and nonincarcerates when compared by pass/fail status; therefore, Ho₆ was accepted. The data are shown in Table 9.

terrene and another date	df	SS	ms	<u>f</u> -ratio
Main effects	2	16255.076	8127.538	4.826
Incarceration status	1	3635.220	3635.220	2.158
Pass/fail status	1	6362.221	6362.221	3.778
2-way interactions	1	630.147	630.147	.374
Explained	3	16885.223	5628.408	3.342
Residual	79	133053.500	1684.222	
Fotal	82	149938.720	1828.521	

Table 9	
ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates on	
Measures of Self-Concept When Compared by Pass/Fail Status	s

CV = 3.96

** Nonsignificant at the .05 level of confidence.

Ho₇: There will be no statistically significant difference between the

average GED score of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) provided results for this hypothesis. The degrees of freedom for between groups was 1 and for within groups was 81, totaling 82 for both groups. The sum of squares for between groups was 764.2465 and for within groups was 4689.3232, totaling 5453.5697 for both groups. The mean squares for between groups was 764.2466 and for within groups was 57.8929; the mean squares for incarcerates was 40.853 and for nonincarcerates was 47.023, totaling 43.380. The standard deviation was 8.155, and the <u>f</u>-ratio was 13.201. Because the <u>f</u>-ratio was greater than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that Ho₇ would happen by chance more than 5% of the time. It was determined that a significant difference existed between incarcerates' and nonincarcerates' average GED scores; therefore, Ho₇ was not accepted. The data are shown in Table 10.

	df	SS	ms	SD	f-ratio
Between groups	1	764.2465	764.2466	8,155	- 13.201*
Within groups	<u>81</u>	4689.3232	57.8929		
Total	82	5453.5697			
		CV = 3.96			

Table 10ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates andNonincarcerates When Compared by Average GED Score

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Because the composite scores of incarcerates and nonincarcerates revealed a significance, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique was utilized to test for significant differences between both groups on each part of the GED examination, including writing skills, social studies, science, reading, and mathematics. These groups will be discussed in the following tables.

The analysis of variance for writing skills revealed a mean score of 40.3469 for the incarcerates and 45.8235 for nonincarcerates, totaling 42.5904. As shown in Table 11, the standard deviation was 9.2973, and the <u>f</u>-value was 7.518. Because the <u>f</u>-value of 7.518 was greater than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that this comparison would happen by chance more than 5% of the time.

Nominea	arcerates wh	ien Compared	by writing s	kills	
	df	SS	ms	SD	<u>f</u> -ratio
Between groups	1	602.0280	602.0280	9.2973	7.518*
Within groups	<u>81</u>	6486.0432	80.0746		
Total	82	7088.0712			
in Table 11, the stars	herd Section	CV = 3.96	and the f		-

Table 11 ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Writing Skills

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The analysis of variance for social studies revealed a mean score of 40.8980 for the incarcerates and 47.0294 for nonincarcerates, totaling 43.4096. As shown in Table 12, the standard deviation was 9.1372, and the <u>f</u>-value was 10.034. Because the <u>f</u>-value of 10.034 was greater than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that this comparison would happen by chance more than 5% of the time.

A Noninca	NOVA Summ rcerates Wh	Table 12 nary for Incarce en Compared b	erates and by Social Stu	dies	
Dereste	df	SS	ms	SD	<u>f</u> -ratio
Between groups	1	754.6126	754.6126	9.1372	10.034*
Within groups	<u>81</u>	6091.4604	75.2032		
Total	82	6846.0730			10, 1, 100

CV = 3.96

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The analysis of variance for science revealed a mean score of 40.8776 for the incarcerates and 50.5588 for nonincarcerates, totaling 44.8434. As shown in Table 13, the standard deviation was 9.6582, and the <u>f</u>-value was 26.421. Because the <u>f</u>-value of 26.421 was greater than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that this comparison would happen by chance more than 5% of the time.

	df	SS	ms	SD	<u>f</u> -ratio
Between groups	1	1881.3171	1881.3171	9.6582	26.421*
Within groups	<u>81</u>	5767.6477	71.2055		
Total	82	7648.9648			

Table 13	
ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and	
Nonincarcerates When Compared by Science	9

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The analysis of variance for reading revealed a mean score of 41.9388 for the incarcerates and 47.7353 for nonincarcerates, totaling 44.3133. As shown in Table 14, the standard deviation was 9.4171, and the <u>f</u>-value was 8.280. Because the <u>f</u>-value of 8.280 was greater than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that this comparison would happen by chance more than 5% of the time.

Noni	ncarcerates	When Compare	ed by Readin	g	
HDA THEM	df	SS	ms	SD	<u>f</u> -ratio
Between groups	1	674.4222	674.4222	9.4171	8.280*
Within groups	<u>81</u>	6597.4340	81.4498		
Total	82	7271.8562			

Table 14
ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and
Nonincarcerates When Compared by Reading

CV = 3.96

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.
The analysis of variance for mathematics revealed a mean score of 40.2041 for the incarcerates and 43.9706 for nonincarcerates, totaling 41.7470. As shown in Table 15, the standard deviation was 7.7897, and the f-value was 4.917. Because the f-value of 4.917 was greater than the critical value of 3.96, it was determined that this comparison would happen by chance more than 5% of the time.

ANOVA Summary for Incarcerates and Nonincarcerates When Compared by Mathematics								
	df	SS	ms	SD	<u>f</u> -ratio			
Between groups	1	284.7572	284.7572	7.7897	4.917* .			
Within groups	<u>81</u>	4690.9298	57.9127					
Total	82	4975.6870						
		CV = 3.96						

Table 15

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Ho_o: There will be no significant correlation between the self-concept score and average GED score of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) provided results for this hypothesis. The results of the statistical test revealed a significance at the .05 level of confidence. If the computed r value was equal or greater than the table value, the null hypothesis was not accepted; otherwise, the null hypothesis was accepted. It was determined that a significant difference existed between incarcerates' and nonincarcerates' self-concept scores and average GED scores; therefore, Ho_8 was not accepted. The data are shown in Table 16.

 SC
 VS
 SC
 VS
 SC
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S
 S</t

	SC	WS	SS	S	R	М	GED		- 7
Self-concept	1.000 (0) .001	.3419 (83) .001	.2854 (83) .004	.3688 (83) .001	.2139 (83) .026	.2207 (83) .022	.3208 (83) .002	r n s	•
Writing skills	.3419 (83) .001	1.000 (0) .001	.8160 (83) .001	.8057 (83) .001	.7958 (83) .001	.7337 (83) .001	.9257 (83) .001	r n s	*
Social studies	.2854 (83) .004	.8160 (83) .001	1.000 (0) .001	.8122 (83) .001	.7770 (83) .001	.6903 (83) .001	.9138 (83) .001	r n s	*
Science	.3688 (83) .001	.8057 (83) .001	.8122 (83) .001	1.000 (0) .001	.8085 (83) .001	.6827 (83) .001	.9197 (83) .001	r n s	*
Reading	.2139 (83) .026	.7958 (83) .001	.7770 (83) .001	.8085 (83) .001	1.000 (0) .001	.6544 (83) .001	.9031 (83) .001	r n s	*
Mathematics	.2207 (83) .022	.7337 (83) .001	.6903 (83) .001	.6827 (83) .001	.6544 (83) .001	1.000 (0) .001	.8259 (83) .001	r n s	*
Composite GED	.3208 (83) .002	.9257 (83) .001	.9138 (83) .001	.9197 (83) .01	.9031 (83) .001	.8259 (83) .001	1.000 (0) .001	r n s	*

Table 16 Correlation Matrix for Salf-Concept Scores and Average GED Se

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.r = coefficient;n = number;s = significanceSCSelf-ConceptWSWriting SkillsSSSocial StudiesRReadingGEDComposite GEDSScienceMMathematics

Hog: There will be no significant correlation between the self-concept score and score on each part of the GED examination of incarcerated individuals and nonincarcerated individuals.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (<u>r</u>) provided results for this hypothesis. The results of the statistical test revealed a significance at the .05 level of confidence. If the computed <u>r</u> value was equal or greater than the table value, the null hypothesis was not accepted; otherwise, the null hypothesis was accepted. It was determined that a significant difference existed between incarcerates' and nonincarcerates' self-concept scores and scores on each part of the GED examination; therefore, Ho₉ was not accepted. These data are also shown in Table 16.

Summary

The results of the statistical analysis supported Ho_2 , Ho_3 , Ho_5 , and Ho_6 ; Ho_1 , Ho_4 , Ho_7 , Ho_8 , and Ho_9 were not supported. Incarcerates' and nonincarcerates' self-concepts were significantly different; similarly, the last grade completed by each group was significantly different. A comparison of each group using post-hoc analysis revealed significant mean differences in grades 6 through 9. There was also a noticeable significance between incarcerates when comparing the mean scores of grades 6 through 9 with the mean scores of grade 10; in addition, statistically significant differences occurred between the mean scores of grade 11. The ANOVA table displayed a significant difference between incarceration status and test scores on each part of the GED examination. The

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (\underline{r}) revealed a significant relationship between the self-concept score and the average GED score and between the self-concept score and the score on each part of the GED examination.

forces about which there are many conjectives and few exclainties (Wiggins, 1973). Like the inner perticles of the atom, which are seen only by the shadows they east, so are only the shedows of the workings of the human psyche, Humans are not elways sure and certainly not always in agreement as to what these shadows represent; but, statever components there may be to personality, might researchess agree, it is an organization of traits and attitudes of which the individuel's conception of self is pentrel.

There are unresolved differences of opinion encong psychologists as to the source of behavior (Scimur, 1953). Whetever it is that impair an individual to act or not to act, a significant role is played in this determination by what the person thinks about self. Individuals may be able to relate something about their views of themselves, or they may be able to relate very little. What they relate may be what they really think, or it may be a selective version for a particular public. On what appears to be safer ground, individuals may reveal a different version of what they fulfic they are, or individuals may be completely insware of what their true feelings are about themselves. Researchers assume, however, that the person ents and can only set in terms of what one thinks about self in a given plustion, and individuals cannot essent that situation and its action

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is commonly held that the human personality is a bundle of dynamic forces about which there are many conjectives and few certainties (Wiggins, 1973). Like the inner particles of the atom, which are seen only by the shadows they cast, so are only the shadows of the workings of the human psyche. Humans are not always sure and certainly not always in agreement as to what these shadows represent; but, whatever components there may be to personality, most researchers agree, it is an organization of traits and attitudes of which the individual's conception of self is central.

There are unresolved differences of opinion among psychologists as to the source of behavior (Skinner, 1953). Whatever it is that impels an individual to act or not to act, a significant role is played in this determination by what the person thinks about self. Individuals may be able to relate something about their views of themselves, or they may be able to relate very little. What they relate may be what they really think, or it may be a selective version for a particular public. On what appears to be safer ground, individuals may reveal a different version of what they think they are, or individuals may be completely unaware of what their true feelings are about themselves. Researchers assume, however, that the person acts and can only act in terms of what one thinks about self in a given situation, and individuals cannot assess that situation and its action

66

requirements except in terms of their own views of themselves. The way people view themselves is the way they will behave.

This study investigated the significant difference of the self-concept among incarcerates and nonincarcerates utilizing selected independent variables (such as sex, age, grade, and reason for testing) and dependent variables (selfconcept, score on each part of the GED examination, composite GED examination, and pass/fail status). Self-concept was measured by the total \underline{P} score on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS).

Data were collected from 83 incarcerates and nonincarcerates taking the GED examination at the Harris County Sheriff's Department and Houston Community College, both located in the southeastern part of Texas. All examinees were administered the TSCS prior to the GED examination. Information regarding all variables (except self-concept score) was obtained from the GED information form.

The review of literature strongly suggested that self-concept was directly related to academic achievement. Additionally, the literature review provided strong support for achievers being characterized by self-confidence, self-acceptance, and positive self-concept. There was an underlying presumption that overachievers and underachievers responded with significant differences to items designed to measure their reflected self-concepts, and students with high academic productivity tended to have high self-concepts. There remained, however, concern for the understanding of the self-concept and academic achievement related to special populations. A special population with virtually replete information, as it related to self-concept and academic achievement, was the incarcerated population. An extensive review of the literature reflected much needed research in this area. The concern was, however, as to which variables were most important in this endeavor. This researcher has chosen to use self-concept, demographics, and test scores of incarcerates and nonincarcerates as variables in determining significant differences between the two groups.

The data from this study were analyzed using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (<u>r</u>). A post hoc <u>t</u>-test analysis, which determined levels of significance, was used in the statistical evaluations.

Findings

Among the comparisons of the self-concepts of the two groups, the self-concept score of the nonincarcerates was significantly greater than that of the incarcerates. The mean score of the incarcerates was 321.3878; the mean score of the nonincarcerates was 343.5882. The estimate of variance between components was 203.3636.

Among the comparison of the self-concepts of each group when compared by age, there was no significant difference. The mean squares for 2-way interactions was 658.924. The standard deviation was .06.

Among the comparison of the self-concepts of each group when compared by sex, there was no significant difference. The mean square for 2-way interactions was 1827.225. The standard deviation was .05.

Among the comparison of the self-concepts of each group when compared by last grade completed in high school, there was a significant difference. The mean square for 2-way interaactions was 10141.399. The standard deviation was .27. A <u>t</u>-test post hoc analysis revealed the mean score of incarcerates was 307.09 for the 6th through 9th grade category, which was significantly lower than that of the nonincarcerates (350.91) for the same category. The mean score of the incarcerates at the 6th through 9th grade category was significantly lower than the mean score (351.43) of the incarcerates in the 10th grade category. The mean score of the nonincarcerates in the 10th grade category was 341.92. The mean score of the incarcerates in the 11th grade category was 313.23. The mean score of the nonincarcerates in the 11th grade category was 337.70.

Among the comparison of the self-concepts of each group when compared by reason for testing, there was no significant difference. The mean square for 2-way interactions was 1582.265. The standard deviation was .33.

Among the comparison of the self-concepts of each group when compared by pass/fail status, there was no significant difference. The mean square for 2-way interactions was 630.147. The standard deviation was .29.

Among the comparison of average GED scores of each group, there was a significant difference. Analysis revealed the mean score of the nonincarcerates was 47.0235, which was significantly greater than that of the incarcerates of 40.8531. The estimate of component variance was 17.5952.

Among the intellective factors, writing skills, social studies, science, reading, mathematics, and composite GED scores contributed significantly to the self-concept score. A coefficient of .3419 (p > .05) was revealed for writing skills scores in relationship to self-concept scores; a coefficient of .2854 (p > .05) was revealed for social studies scores in relationship to self-concept scores; a coefficient of .3688 (p > .05) was revealed for science scores in relationship to self-concept scores; a coefficient of .2139 (p > .05) was revealed for reading scores in relationship to self-concept scores; a coefficient of .2207 (p > .05) was revealed for mathematics scores in relationship to self-concept scores; a coefficient of .3208 (p>.05) was revealed for composite GED scores in relationship to self-concept scores.

The finding that self-concept contributed significantly to academic performance was consistent with the findings reported by Farles (1967) and Farguhar (1968), which suggested that students who exhibited high academic productivity levels tended to have higher self-concepts. Mintz and Muller (1977) reinforced these findings; however, it was reported that self-concept measures which specifically reflected success within a given academic area maximized the correlation between self-concept and achievement within that area.

The importance of viewing self-concept in the prediciton of academic success cannot be underestimated. Findings in this study certainly provided a basis for increased attention. As reported earlier, incarcerates and nonincarcerates possessed significant differences in self-concept. In this regard, serious consideration should be given to the inclusion of improving the self-concept of the incarcerate aspiring for academic success. If it were suggested that incarcerates who possessed higher self-concepts would make better grades, then a renewed emphasis on the self-concept would certainly be warranted.

The relative lack of information about the self-concept of the incarcerate striving for academic success, although significant, should be noted. These findings certainly warranted further investigation as studies on self-concept and achievement have traditionally focused heavily on the nonincarcerate.

Conclusion

From these data, it can be concluded that the approach toward academic success for the incarcerated individual should focus on the improvement of self-concept. This study revealed that the self-concepts of incarcerates and nonincarcerates differed significantly when the last grade of school attendance was in the 6th through 9th grades. It was concluded that increased attention should be given to the self-concepts of incarcerates striving for academic success and who drop out of school before the 10th grade. Furthermore, it was evidenced by the mean self-concept score of the incarcerates that this group differed substantially before and after the 10th grade. Analysis of variance revealed a significant decrease in the self-concept of the incarcerates after completion of the 10th grade.

Additionally, it was concluded that test scores on the GED examinations, as well as composite GED scores, were strongly related to the incarcerates' and nonincarcerates' self-concepts. The GED subject areas utilized in the statistical analysis were writing skills, social studies, science, reading, and mathematics.

Implications

This study is of valuable importance to administrators, counselors, and educators in academic settings both inside and outside penal institutions. Selfconcept was shown to be regarded as crucial to success. Individuals who experienced success also reflected positive self-concepts that related positively to academic experience. With such positiveness, these individuals were more likely to remain in school and continue their efforts toward study. The lack of positive self-concepts certainly influenced negatively the decisions to return to school in subsequent years.

Administrators, counselors, and educators, whose responsibility is the development of cost-effective programs which facilitate the student's growth

and development and thereby aid in the retention of students plus the increasing of positive self-concepts, would find that this is a major task. Because of extremely low self-concept scores, specific attention should be directed to the backgrounds of individuals dropping out of school in grades 6 through 9. Additionally, some attention should be directed to the role which anxiety plays in the shaping of the self-concept of individuals. It is not implied that individuals should be discriminated against on the basis of such factors, rather that attention should be given to such issues when possible. Remediation and assistance could then be provided to help students overcome any barriers caused by possible deficits in these areas. The related literature of this study implied that incarcerates and underachievers were more comfortable within environments consisting of their peers.

Recommendations

Remediation could certainly be provided in the academic programming by implementing special programs relating to the improving of the self-concept of the underachiever. Seminars, courses, and workshops which address selfconcept and anxiety in the learning process could be incorporated into existing programs or dealt with as a new and separate entity. This could be encompassed in the academic realm or addressed from targeted components within the penal system. Additionally, attention should be given to the study habits, study attitudes, and overall academic abilities of underachieving individuals. Merely being attuned to such effects when making decisions or implementing programmatic changes could facilitate the administrative process in various institutions. Programs and administrative decisions which are designed with a cognizance of these issues would certainly do more to assist individuals than do those which are built on sound theoretical foundations but do not address such practical issues.

This study provided valuable analysis into the differences of the selfconcepts of incarcerates and nonincarcerates in search of academic credentials. The research cautions readers against the use of such analysis as a panacea. It merely aims to provide greater understanding and insight into the complex phenomenon of self-concept and academic performance.

With this in mind, the researcher recommended that administrators, counselors, and educators utilize the statistical analysis in this study to provide insight into the academic performance of both incarcerated and nonincarcerated school dropouts. Some specific recommendations for counselors would be to focus on preventive service which alleviate stress in the environment and enhance skills of the individual or remedy problems before they reach crisis proportions. A preventive consultation effort might involve training faculty and/or staff to recognize early signs of depression, stress, alcohol/drug abuse, delinquency, i.e., to intervene and refer. The training of paraprofessionals with similar characteristics is an additional approach in encouraging positive selfconcepts and retention rates of low-achieving students. The underachiever has a distinct propensity to respond more positively to individuals with whom they can identify. Further study should be conducted with a different and/or larger incarcerated versus nonincarcerated population, which addresses the need of self-concept and achievement. In addition, replication of this study should focus on the possibility of previous incarceration of nonincarcerates and its impact upon self-concept.

73

APPENDICES

Confidential Relance Agreement

Upon termination, participants often request that information is suct to schools, colleges, employers, or parents regarding their contracts with dispertation researchers. Release of this information can be made only upon signed authorization of the participants.

140.03-0

They lot at a later

APPENDIX A

Confidential Release Agreement

Please indicate your authorized preferences

Counselor's actas may be released.

I prefer that the information herein is released to no one.

(Note: state exceptions, if any.)

Live sessions and andiotapes (if any were recorded) may be used for instructional and/or educational outposet.

Date

75

75

Confidential Release Agreement

Upon termination, participants often request that information is sent to schools, colleges, employers, or parents regarding their contracts with dissertation researchers. Release of this information can be made only upon signed authorization of the participants.

Name

Date of birth

City/state/zip

Race:

- White
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/Non-Hispanic Chicano/Mexican American Spanish American
- Other (please specify:

Please indicate your authorized preference:

- Results may be released.
- Counselor's notes may be released. I prefer that the information herein is released to no one. (Note: state exceptions, if any.)

Live sessions and audiotapes (if any were recorded) may be used for instructional and/or educational purposes.

Date

Signature

Witness

ng, papu notay ramina Teusing Offickr Nouston Computity Colling Roussin, Texas 77000

Duar Ma. Fleids,

APPENDIX B

Correspondence

12713.0

Dr. James, Engle, Vius President, Brudent Barwissen Br. Josspie Jeffermon, Chairperson, Ginservation Committee Dr. J. B. Jonas, Advisor, Disservation Committee Dr. Fares Norman, Advisor, Disservation Committee

77

February 27, 1985

Ms. Dona Robey Fields Testing Officer Houston Community College Houston, Texas 77004

Dear Ms. Fields,

I am presently completing my doctoral studies at Texas Southern University. My dissertation title is "A Comparative Analysis of the Self Concept of Incarcerated and Non-Incarcerated Males Completing the General Educational Development Examination (G.E.D.)". I would like permission to use as subjects the male incarcerates and non-incarcerates who are administered the test by Houston Community College.

The data collection will consist of the administration of a self concept scale and a personal interview of all participants. All participants will remain anonymous in the reporting of the findings. To further assure anonymity, with your agreement, I will present all findings (test results, etc.) for your persual prior to their inclusion in the study.

If you have questions, concerns, or need further information, please don't hesitate to call or write. Thank you for you cooperation.

Sincerely,

alliam Selmon

William Selmon 2601 Prospect Houston, Texas 77004 523-6340

WS/jkh

cc: Dr. James, Engle, Vice President, Student Services Dr. Joseph Jefferson, Chairperson, Dissertation Committee Dr. J. B. Jones, Advisor, Dissertation Committee Dr. James Norman, Advisor, Dissertation Committee



TO:	Dean Sylvia Ramos
FROM:	Dona Robey Fields
DATE:	March 8,1985
RE:	Request for Dissertation Data

Attached is a letter from William Selmon, part-time proctor, Testing Department, requesting permission to use GED data compiled by the Testing Department.

Please provide me with the guidelines for using Houston Community College System data for research purposes.

I would appreciate your reply to Mr. Selmon's request as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

XC: William Selmon

bit survey and being the possiblest dist be specify us of her scales on the picet of the state.

The Callege has an excentioning for interaction of probation paralaryon to depres matrix identities spected, must be granted income the Result Gauger Descift's Repartment.

If you have forthis government and are availabling that entry planter parters we are then considering and a



22 Waugh Drive P.O. Bax 7849 Houston, Texas 77270-7849 Phone (713) 869-5021

-

MEMORANDUM April 22, 1985

TO: Sylvia Ramos

FROM: James/Engle

RE: Dissertation Research

In response to the question concerning dissertation research at HCCS, the College policy is to have the researcher request in writing permission to complete the activity at HCCS. The request should be in detail and, if the research includes students or student records, be addressed to me. Upon review of the request, permission will or will not be approved. It is general policy to approve research requests unless the material is controversial or there are legal questions involved.

In the case of Mr. William Selmon's request, approval is granted with the following stipulations:

- Any survey instrument given to GED students must be voluntary. Under no circumstances will a graduate be <u>required</u> to complete a questionnaire or be interviewed.
- Any student surveyed or interviewed should be given in writing an explanation of the activity and should sign in writing their willingness to participate.
- All survey and interview questions must be approved through my office prior to the start of the study.
- 4) The College has no responsibility for incarcerated GED graduates. Permission to survey and/or interview inmates must be granted through the Harris County Sheriff's Department.

If you have further questions concerning this matter please contact me at your earliest convenience.

May 13, 1985

Dona Robey Fields, Officer Student Placement/Testing 3517 Austin Room 5 Houston, Texas 77004 Dear Mrs. Fields:

This communication is written as a request for permission to remain in the capacity of testing proctor at future G.E.D examinations ad-ministered at the Sheriff's Department. My intention is to utilize the subjects tested as statistical data in my dissertation. This endeavor would depend upon my acquiring permission from the Alief-Elsik director (Lill Bell).

I am presently employed as a full-time counselor at the Houston Community College Alief-Elsik Campus, and would require a substitute on the testing days in question. Permission has been granted to me by the Houston Community College System, in order that I may conduct my dissertation research. Although collecting data for the dissertation is important, it is readily understood that my role as testing proctor remains my priority in this setting.

Advanced appreciation is offered for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Villia

William Selmon

August 13, 1985

Major T. R. Coney Harris County Sheriff Department Houston, Texas 77002

Dear Major Coney:

I am presently completing my doctoral studies at Texas Southern University. My dissertation title is "A Comparative Analysis of the Self Concept of Incarcerates and Non-Incaracerates Completing the General Educational Development Examination (G.E.D.)." I would like permission to use as subjects, the male/female incarcerates who are administered the test by the Sheriff Department. There will be approximately sixty (60) incarcerates included in the research study. The time span will cover a period of four (4) months. All research sessions will be conducted once a month on the pre-scheduled date of the General Educational Development Examination (G.E.D.)

In addition to the administration of the (G.E.D.) Examination, the data collection will consist of the administration of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and a personal interview with all participants. Participants will remain <u>anonymous</u> in the reporting of findings. To further assure anonymity, with your agreement, I will present all findings (test results, etc.) for your persual prior to inclusion in the study.

Attached is a Confidential Release Agreement form to be signed by all participants in the study. Along with the Confidential Release Agreement form is an Authorization Sheet, that requires the Signature of an appropriate official of the Sheriff Department, in order that I may officially conduct research on the premises. Please feel free to copy these documents for your records.

If you have any questions, concerns, or need further information, please call or write using the information herein. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Villa

William Selmon 2601 Prospect Houston, Texas 77004

WS:jkh

cc: Dr. James Engle, Vice-President, Student Services, H.C.C.S. Dr. Joseph Jefferson, Chairperson, Dissertation Committee, T.S.U. Dr. James B. Jones, Advisor, Dissertation Committee, T.S.U.

Dr. James Norman, Advisor, Dissertation Committee, T.S.U.

08-13-85 Date

AUTHORIZATION FOR DISSERTATION RESEARCH AT SHERIFF DEPARTMENT

Hathleen Come Fayle SUPERVISOR Ι.

authorize William J. Selmon to officially conduct dissertation research on the premises of the Houston, Texas Sheriff Department. The data gathered by the researcher must be limited to incarcerates completing the General Education Development Examination (G.E.D.)

HARRIS COUNTY SHERIFT'S DEPARTMENT

(NAME OF PERSON AT AGENCY OR SCHOOL)

(AGENCY ADDRESS NO. AND STREET)

Thuston TEXAS 77002 (CITY, STATE & ZIP CODE)

83



MEMORANDUM

	n
TO:	Willtam Selmon, Sounselor
	and when a

FROM:

: Dona Robey Fields M Student Placement and Testing Officer

DATE: March 4, 1986

RE: Dissertation Research

In reviewing a copy of the letter from Dr. James Engle, Vice President, dated April 22, 1985, I have discovered I am missing the following:

"All survey and interview questions must be approved through my office prior to the start of the study."

Please submit to me a copy of that approval as soon as possible.

I was recently informed that you have requested copies of the scores of various students. The April 22, 1985 approval letter does not mention releasing any scores to you. In order for us to do this, I must have a release on file for the protection of the Testing Department.

I would also appreciate you submitting the written explanation you presented to students regarding their willingness to participate in your survey.

Please call me at your earliest convenience so that we may get this matter cleared as soon as possible.



P.O. Box 7849 Houston, Texas 77270-7849 Phone (713) 869-5021

> MEMORANDUM March 5, 1986

TO: Dona Fields FROM: James Engle

RE: Dissertation Research - Bill Selmon

This is to certify that Mr. Bill Selmon may use GED test scores for his current dissertation research.

This approval is given with the understanding that no test scores of HCC students will be made public as part of this research.

THE COURT OF THE

On the top line of the separate enswer sheet, fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill in these boxes later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

APPENDIX C

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked "time started" and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box of your answer sheet marked "time finished."

As you start, be surn that your answer sheat and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a drole around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

	true

You will find these response numbers repeated at the top of each page to help you remember them.

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale

Instructions

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill in these boxes later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item. Read each statement carefully, then select one of the five responses below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an aswer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an "X" mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked "time started" and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked "time finished."

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

		Partly false		
Completely	Mostly	å	Mostly	Completely
false	false	partly true	true	true
1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the top of each page to help you remember them.

1.	I have a healthy body.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I am an attractive person.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I consider myself a sloppy person.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I am a decent sort of person.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I am an honest person.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I am a bad person.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	I am a cheerful person.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	I am a calm and easygoing person.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	I am a nobody.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.	1	2	3	4	5
57.	I am a member of a happy family.	1	2	3	4	5
59.	My friends have no confidence in me.	1	2	3	4	5
73.	I am a friendly person.	1	2	3	4	5
75.	I am popular with me.	1	2	3	4	5
77.	I am not interested in what other people do.	1	2	3	4	5
91.	I do not always tell the truth.	1	2	3	4	5
93.	I get angry sometimes.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I like to look nice and neat all the time.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I am full of aches and pains.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I am a sick person.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I am a religious person.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I am a moral failure.	1	2	3	4	5

24.	I am a morally weak person.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	I have a lot of self-control.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	I am a hateful person.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	I am losing my mind.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	I am an important person to my friends and family.	1	2	3	4	5
58.	I am not loved by my family.	1	2	3	4	5
60.	I feel that my family doesn't trust me.	1	2	3	4	5
74.	I am popular with women.	1	2	3	4	5
76.	I am mad at the whole world.	1	2	3	4	5
78.	I am hard to be friendly with.	1	2	3	4	5
92.	Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.	1	2	3	4	5
94.	Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I am neither too fat nor too thin.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I like my looks just the way they are.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I would like to change some parts of my body.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I am satisfied with my moral behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I am satisfied with my relationship to God.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I ought to go to church more.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	I am satisfied to be just what I am.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	I am just as nice as I should be.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	I despise myself.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	I am satisfied with my family relationships.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	I understand my family as well as I should.	1	2	3	4	5

65.	I should trust my family more.	1	2	3	4	5
79.	I am as sociable as I want to be.	1	2	3	4	5
81.	I try to please others but don't overdo it.	1	2	3	4	5
83.	I am no good at all from a social standpoint.	1	2	3	4	5
95.	I do not like everyone I know.	1	2	3	4	5
97.	Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I am neither too tall nor too short.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I don't feel as well as I should.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I should have more sex appeal.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I am as religious as I want to be.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I wish I could be more trustworthy.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	I shouldn't tell so many lies.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	I am as smart as I want to be.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.	1	2	3	4	5
62.	I treat my parents as well as I should (use past tense if parents are not living).	1	2	3	4	5
64.	I am too sensitive to things my family says.	1	2	3	4	5
66.	I should love my family more.	1	2	3	4	5
80.	I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.	1	2	3	4	5
82.	I should be more polite to others.	1	2	3	4	5
84.	I ought to get along better with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
96.	I gossip a little at times.	1	2	3	4	5
98.	At times I feel like swearing.	1	2	3	4	5

I take good care of myself physically.	1	2	3	4	5
I try to be careful about my appearance.	1	2	3	4	5
I often act like I am "all thumbs."	1	2	3	4	5
I am true to my religion in my everyday life.	1	2	3	4	5
I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
I sometimes do very bad things.	1	2	3	4	5
I can always take care of myself in any situation.	1	2	3	4	5
I take the blame for things without getting mad.	1	2	3	4	5
I do things without thinking about them first.	1	2	3	4	5
I try to play fair with my friends and family.	1	2	3	4	5
I take a real interest in my family.	1	2	3	4	5
I give in to my parents (use past tense if parents are not living).	1	2	3	4	5
I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
I get along well with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
I do not forgive others easily.	1	2	3	4	5
I would rather win than lose in a game.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel good most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5
I do poorly in sports and games.	1	2	3	4	5
I am a poor sleeper.	1	2	3	4	5
I do what is right most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5
I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
I have trouble doing the things that are right.	1	2	3	4	5
	I take good care of myself physically. I try to be careful about my appearance. I often act like I am "all thumbs." I am true to my religion in my everyday life. I try to change when I know Fm doing things that are wrong. I sometimes do very bad things. I can always take care of myself in any situation. I take the blame for things without getting mad. I do things without thinking about them first. I try to play fair with my friends and family. I take a real interest in my family. I give in to my parents (use past tense if parents are not living). I try to understand the other fellow's point of view. I get along well with other people. I do not forgive others easily. I feel good most of the time. I do what is right most of the time. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead. I have trouble doing the things that are right.	I take good care of myself physically.1I try to be careful about my appearance.1I often act like I am "all thumbs."1I am true to my religion in my everyday life.1I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.1I sometimes do very bad things.1I can always take care of myself in any situation.1I take the blame for things without getting mad.1I do things without thinking about them first.1I take a real interest in my family.1I give in to my parents (use past tense if parents are not living).1I get along well with other people.1I do not forgive others easily.1I do poorly in sports and games.1I do what is right most of the time.1I am a poor sleeper.1I have trouble doing the things that are right.1	I take good care of myself physically.12I try to be careful about my appearance.12I often act like I am "all thumbs."12I am true to my religion in my everyday life.12I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.12I sometimes do very bad things.12I can always take care of myself in any situation.12I take the blame for things without getting mad.12I do things without thinking about them first.12I try to play fair with my friends and family.12I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.12I get along well with other people.12I do not forgive others easily.12I do poorly in sports and games.12I do what is right most of the time.12I do what is right most of the time.12I do not forgive other and games.12I feel good most of the time.12I do what is right most of the time.12I do what is right most of the time.12I have trouble doing the things that are right.12	I take good care of myself physically.123I try to be careful about my appearance.123I often act like I am "all thumbs."123I am true to my religion in my everyday life.123I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.123I sometimes do very bad things.123I can always take care of myself in any situation.123I do things without thinking about them first.123I do things without thinking about them first.123I take a real interest in my family.123I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.123I do not forgive others easily.123I do poorly in sports and games.123I do what is right most of the time.123I do what is right most of the time.123I have trouble doing the things that are right.123	I take good care of myself physically.1234I try to be careful about my appearance.1234I often act like I am "all thumbs."1234I am true to my religion in my everyday life.1234I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.1234I sometimes do very bad things.1234I can always take care of myself in any situation.1234I take the blame for things without getting mad.1234I try to play fair with my friends and family.1234I take a real interest in my family.1234I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.1234I do not forgive others easily.1234I do poorly in sports and games.1234I do what is right most of the time.1234I do what is right most of the time.1234I have trouble doing the things that are right.1234

50.	I solve my problems quite easily.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	I change my mind a lot.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	I try to run away from my problems.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	I do my share of work at home.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	I quarrel with my family.	1	2	3	4 ·	5
72.	I do not act like my family thinks I should.	1	2	3	4	5
86.	I see good points in all the people I meet.	1	2	3	4	5
88.	I do not feel at ease with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
90.	I find it hard to talk with strangers.	1	2	3	4	5
100.	Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you for your participation.

Allport, G. (1986). Hours self-monouply implications for school and eliisenship. New Yorks McGress-Hill. American Council an Education. (1984). <u>GED compiler's manual Tests of</u>

REFERENCES

Bardwick, J. M. (1971). Psychology of woman. New York: Harper & Row.

pilot guidance program to andourage success for seventh-graders. Research, 44, 311-510.

Bedelan, A. G., & Textister, J. (1978). Work-related multives and self-esteen in American women. Journal of Psychology, 98, 53-78.

Bennem, N. (1963). A comparison of selected basic skills and personality characteristics in edd): basic education/general educational development (ABE/GED) and developmental education students. <u>Dissertation</u> <u>Abstracts International</u>, 43, 5195A.

Biedson, J. (1987). Self-concept of children and their intelligence, activerances, interests, and unciety. Children Bducstion, 43, 434-438.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. (1965). <u>Negro self-concept: Implications for school and citizenship</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- American Council on Education. (1984). <u>GED examiner's manual: Tests of</u> general educational development. Washington: Author.
- Ballif, B. L. (1978). <u>The significance of the self-concept in the knowlege society</u>. Paper presented at the Self-Concept Symposium, Boston.

Bardwick, J. M. (1971). Psychology of women. New York: Harper & Row.

- Baum, M. (1968, October). Unified effort of a junior high school faculty NDEA pilot guidance program to encourage success for seventh-graders. <u>Reporting Research</u>, 44, 311-316.
- Bedeian, A. G., & Touliatas, J. (1978). Work-related motives and self-esteem in American women. Journal of Psychology, 99, 63-70.
- Bennani, N. (1983). A comparison of selected basic skills and personality characteristics in adult basic education/general educational development (ABE/GED) and developmental education students. <u>Dissertation</u> <u>Abstracts International</u>, 43, 3196A.
- Bledsoe, J. (1967). Self-concept of children and their intelligence, achievement, interests, and anxiety. <u>Children Education</u>, <u>43</u>, 436-438.

Brookover, W. B. (1965). <u>Self-concept of ability and school achievement. II:</u> <u>Improving academic achievement through students' self-concept</u> <u>enhancement</u>. (USOE Research Project No. 1636). East Lansing: Michigan State University.

- Brookover, W. B. (1969). <u>Self-concept and achievement</u>. Paper presented at the convention of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.
- Brookover, W. B., Erickson, E. L., & Joiner, L. M. (1967). <u>Self-concept of ability</u> and school achievement. III: Relationship of self-concept to achieve-<u>ment in high school</u> (USOE Research Project No. 2831). East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Brooks, J. B. (1970). <u>An analysis of community college faculty morale and</u> <u>selected factors</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.
- Bruck, M., & Bodwin, R. F. (1962). The relationship between self-concept and the presence and absence of scholastic underachievement. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Clinical Psychology</u>, 18, 181-182.
- Brunkan, R. J., & Sheni, F. (1966). Personality characteristics of ineffective, effective, and efficient readers. <u>Personnel and Guidance Journal</u>, <u>44</u>, 837-844.
- Campbell, P. B. (1967). School and self-concept. <u>Education Leadership</u>, <u>24</u>, 510-515.
- Caplin, M. D. (1966). The relationship between self-concept and academic achievement and between level of aspiration and academic achievement. Dissertation Abstracts International, 27, 979-A.

- Cardora, I. R. (1969). <u>The relationship of acculturation, achievement, and</u> <u>alienation among Spanish-American sixth-grade students</u>. Paper presented at the Conference on Teacher Education for Mexican-Americans, Las Cruces.
- Carlton, L., & Moore, R. H. (1966). The effects of self-directive dramatization on reaching achievement and self-concept of culturally disadvantaged children. <u>Reading Teacher</u>, <u>20</u>, 125-130.
- Carter, T. P. (1968). Negative self-concepts of Mexican-American students. School and Society, 96, 217-229.
- Chapman, I. (1964). <u>A comparative study of delinquents and nondelinquents</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, St. Louis.
- Clark, A. (1981). Self-concepts among participants in selected adult education programs. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>42</u>, 4249A.
- Clark, A. (1982). The self-concept and occupational aspirations of ABE and GED students. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 6(3), 189-194.
- Clark, K. (1963). Segregated schools in New York City. <u>Journal of Educational</u> <u>Sociology</u>, <u>36(6)</u>, 245-255.
- Clark, R. J. (1971). <u>Self-concept as a correlate of reading achievement</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wisconsin State University, Madison.
- Combs, A. W., & Snygg, S. (1948). <u>Individual behavior</u>. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Congdon, C. S. (1958). <u>Self theory and chlorpromazine treatment</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). <u>The antecedents of self-esteem</u>. San Francisco: W. H. Freedman & Co.
- Corrigan, F. V. (1970). A comparison of self-concepts of American Indian students from public or federal school backgrounds. <u>Dissertation</u> <u>Abstracts International</u>, <u>31</u>, 2679A. (University Microfilms No. 70-74,959).
- Crosswait, A. (1966). A study of selected cognitive and affective variables functioning in two subgroups of lower economic class fifth and sixth grade pupils in a nonmetropolitan area. <u>Dissertation Abstracts Inter-</u> <u>national</u>, <u>27</u>, 2721A.
- Davidson, H. H., & Greenberg, J. W. (1967). <u>School achievers from a deprived</u> <u>background</u>. (USOE Research Project No. 2805, Contract No. OE-5-10-132). New York: City College of the City University of New York.
- Dittes, J. E. (1959). Effects of changes in self-esteem upon impulsiveness and deliberation in making judgments. Journal of Abnormal and Social <u>Psychology</u>, <u>58</u>, 348-356.
- Durost, W. N. (1959). <u>Metropolitan achievement tests manual</u>. New York: World Book.
- Durr, W. K., & Schmatz, R. R. (1964). Personality differences between highachieving and low-achieving gifted children. <u>Reading Teacher</u>, <u>17</u>, 251-254.
- Eitzen, S. (1976). The self-concept of delinquents in a behavior modification treatment program. <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, <u>99</u>, 203-206.
- Epstein, E. (1962). Self-concept of the delinquent female. <u>Smith College Studies</u> <u>in Social Work</u>, <u>32</u>, 220-224.

- Farguhar, W. W. (1968). <u>A comprehensive study of the motivational factors</u> <u>underlying achievement of 11th-grade high school students</u>. (USOE Research Project No. 846). East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Farlee, C. (1982). A comparative analysis of GED performance scores between Indian and non-Indian adult learners. <u>Dissertation Abstracts Interna-</u> tional, 43, 1792A.
- Farls, R. J. (1967). High and low achievement of intellectually average intermediate grade students related to the self-concept and social approval. Dissertation Abstracts, 28, 1205A.

Felker, D. (1974). Building positive self-concept. Minneapolis: Burgess.

- Fink, M. B. (1962). Self-concept as it relates to academic achievement. California Journal of Educational research, <u>13</u>, 57-62.
- Fitts, W. (1965). <u>Tennessee self-concept scale manual</u>. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests.
- Fitts, W. H., & Hammer, W. (1969). <u>The self-concept and delinquency</u>. Nashville: Marshall & Bruce.
- Frease, D. (1972). The schools, self-concept, and juvenile delinquency. <u>British</u> Journal of Criminology, 12, 133-146.
- Gay, C. J. (1966). Academic achievement and intelligence among Negro eighthgrade students as a function of the self-concept. <u>Dissertation</u> <u>Abstracts International</u>, <u>27</u>, 112A. (University Microfilms No. 66-64,09)
- Georgeoff, P. J. (1968). <u>The effect of the curriculum upon the self-concept of</u> <u>children in racially integrated fourth-grade classes</u>. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Glasser, W. (1969). Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row.

- Goldberg, M. L. (1960). Studies in underachievement among the academically talented. In A. Frazier (Ed.), <u>Freedom to learn</u> (pp. 40-45). Washington: National Education Association.
- Gordon, V. V. (1980). <u>The self-concept of black Americans</u>. Lonham, MD: University Press of America.
- Gowan, J. C. (1960). Factors of achievement in high school and college. <u>Journal</u> of Counseling Psychology, 7, 91-95.
- Hamachek, D. E. (1971). <u>Encounters with self</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Harding, K. L. (1966). A comparative study of Caucasian male high school students who say in school and those who drop out (Doctoral dissertation, Michgian State University, 1966). <u>Dissertation Abstracts Inter-</u> national, 27, 2883A.
- Harrington, J. J. (1971). <u>The relationship of self-concept measures to selected</u> <u>characteristics of Air Force officers</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, District of Columbia.
- Hebert, D. J. (1968). Reading comprehension as a function of self-concept. <u>Perceptual and Motor Skills</u>, 27, 28.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. (1977). <u>Handbook in research and evaluation</u>. San Diego: Edits.
- James, W. (1890). <u>Principles in psychology</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kifer, E. (1973). <u>The effects of school achievement on the affective traits of</u> <u>the learner</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Glasser, W. (1969). Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row.

- Goldberg, M. L. (1960). Studies in underachievement among the academically talented. In A. Frazier (Ed.), <u>Freedom to learn</u> (pp. 40-45). Washington: National Education Association.
- Gordon, V. V. (1980). <u>The self-concept of black Americans</u>. Lonham, MD: University Press of America.
- Gowan, J. C. (1960). Factors of achievement in high school and college. <u>Journal</u> of Counseling Psychology, 7, 91-95.
- Hamachek, D. E. (1971). <u>Encounters with self</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Harding, K. L. (1966). A comparative study of Caucasian male high school students who say in school and those who drop out (Doctoral dissertation, Michgian State University, 1966). <u>Dissertation Abstracts Inter-</u> national, 27, 2883A.
- Harrington, J. J. (1971). <u>The relationship of self-concept measures to selected</u> <u>characteristics of Air Force officers</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, District of Columbia.
- Hebert, D. J. (1968). Reading comprehension as a function of self-concept. <u>Perceptual and Motor Skills</u>, 27, 28.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. (1977). <u>Handbook in research and evaluation</u>. San Diego: Edits.
- James, W. (1890). <u>Principles in psychology</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kifer, E. (1973). <u>The effects of school achievement on the affective traits of</u> <u>the learner</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.

- Littlefield, J. (1983). The prediction of success on the test of general educational development based upon the test of adult basic education in a correctional setting. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>44</u>, 44A.
- Manuel, H. T. (1965). <u>Spanish-speaking children of the southwest: Their</u> education and the public welfare. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- McFarlin, D. (1985). The old college try. <u>Personality and Social Psychology</u> <u>Bulletin, 11, 2.</u>
- McKee, J. M. (1970). <u>The acquisition of standard English speech habits using</u> <u>second language techniques: An experiment in speed modification and</u> <u>generalization in the verbal behavior of prison inmates</u>. Elmore, AL: Rehabilitation Research Foundation.
- Mintz, R., & Muller, D. (1977). Academic achievement as a function of specific and global measures of self-concept. <u>Journal of Psychology</u>, <u>97</u>, 53-58.
- Moberly, E. (1985). <u>The psychology of self and other</u>. New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Monat, C. E. (1968). Four, poor, nonwhite, and out-of-sight. <u>Young Children</u>, <u>24</u>, 4-14.
- Monson, M. R. (1969). The self-concept change of male adults enrolled in a manpower development training act (MDTA) agribusiness training program. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>30</u>, 2790A. (University Microfilms No. 69-22,289)
- Motoori, T. (1963). A study of juvenile delinquents by the self-concept. <u>Family</u> <u>Court Probation</u>, 2, 44-49.

- Palazzetti, N. (1982). The self-concept of disadvantaged adult students who perform successfully in a GED high school diploma program. <u>Disserta-</u> <u>tion Abstracts International</u>, <u>44</u>, 959A.
- Piety, K. R. (1958). The role of defense in reporting on the self-concept. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>18</u>, 1869A. (University Microfilms, No. 69-21,220)
- Ringness, T. A. (1962). Self-concept of children of low, average, and high intelligence. <u>American Journal of Mental Deficiency</u>, <u>65</u>, 453-461.
- Roberson, L. (1978). A comparative study of candidates for the tests of general educational development who received learning laboratory instruction and those who received no learning laboratory instruction. <u>Disserta-</u> <u>tion Abstracts International, 41</u>, 865A.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). Client-oriented therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961). On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1969). Freedom to learn. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). <u>Society and the adolescent self-image</u>. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Scheurer, W. E., Jr. (1971). <u>Self-concept: A comparison of delinquent and</u> <u>nondelinquent adolescents</u>. Unpublished master's thesis, Ball State University, Muncie.
- Schwab, J. J., Clemons, R. S., & Marder, L. (1966). The self-concept: Psychosomatic applications. <u>Psychomatic</u>, 7, 1-5.
- Shaw, M. C. (1961). Definition and identification of academic underachievers. In L. M. Miller (Ed.), <u>Guidance for the underachiever with superior</u> <u>ability</u> (pp. 15-77). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Shaw, M. C., & Alves, G. J. (1963). The self-concept of bright academic underachievers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 42, 401-403.
- Shaw, M. C., Edson, K., & Bell, H. (1960). The self-concept of bright underachieving high school students as revealed by an adjective checklist. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 39, 193-196.
- Sherif, M. (1935). A study of some social factors in perception. <u>Archives of</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>187</u>, 111.
- Shore, M., Masino, J., & Reids, D. F. (1965). A factor analytic study of psychotherapeutic change in delinquent boys. <u>Journal of Clinical</u> Psychology, 21, 208-212.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). Science and human behavior. New York: Macmillan.
- Smith, G. M. (1969). <u>Personality correlates of academic performance in three</u> <u>dissimilar populations</u>. Paper presented at the 77th annual convention of the American Psychology Association, Washington.
- Snygg, D., & Combs, A. W. (1949). <u>Individual behavior</u>. New York: Harper & Row.
- Soares, A. T., & Soares, L. M. (1969). Self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. <u>American Educational Research</u>, <u>6</u>(1), 105-113.
- Spillar, W. (1982). A comparison of scholastic success of community college students admitted on the basis of alternative admissions requirements. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 43, 631A.
- Stevens, R. (1981). Effects of selected demographic characteristics on general educational development (GED) participant success and recidivism within Georgia correctional facilities. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 42, 3767A.

Taylor, R. G. (1964). Personality traits and discrepant achievement: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, <u>11</u>, 76-81.

- Thompson, B. L. (1974). Self-concepts among secondary school pupils, <u>Educa-</u> <u>tional Research</u>, 17, 41-47.
- Torshen, K. (1969). <u>The relation of classroom evaluation of students' self-</u> <u>concept and mental health</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Vacca, J. (1983). The influence of reading achievement, reading program visibility, and personal characteristics on the self-concept and acceptance of others of inmates in New York State correctional facilities. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>44</u>, 2825A.
- Waters, D. B. (1969). <u>Differential self-concept of incarcerated delinquents</u>, <u>incipient delinquents</u>, and <u>nondelinquent adolescent males</u>. Unpublished master's thesis, Emory University, Atlanta.
- Wattenberg, W. W., & Clifford, C. (1964). Relation of self-concept to beginning achievement in reading. <u>Child Development</u>, <u>35</u>, 461-467.
- Welch, W. (1980). A comparison of the academic performance of GED, high school, and college transfer students in an associate of science degree program in nursing. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>41</u>, 3914A.
- Wiggins, J. (1973). <u>Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assess-</u> <u>ment</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Williams, R. L., & Byars, H. (1968). Negro self-esteem in a transitional society: Tennesee self-concept scale. <u>Personnel and Guidance Journal</u>, <u>46(5)</u>, 478-481.
- Williams, R. L., & Cole, S. (1968). Self-concept and school adjustment. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46, 478-481.

Wilson, S. (1982). A comparison of the academic performance of high school graduates and GED certificate holders at Tulsa junior college. <u>Disser-</u> <u>tation Abstracts International</u>, <u>44</u>, 616A.

Yochelson, S. (1976). The criminal personality. New York: Jason Aronson.

Zimmerman, I. L., & Allebrand, G. N. (1965). Personality characteristics and attitudes toward achievement of good and poor readers. Journal of Educational Research, 59, 28-30.