THE EVALUATION OF PROJECT SCORE: A LIFE SKILLS PROGRAM FOR AN INNER CITY HIGH SCHOOL

Gretchen M. Jones, M.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2007

APPROVED:

Trent Petrie, Major Professor
Bert Hayslip, Committee Member
Tim Lane, Committee Member
Scott Martin, Committee Member
Larry Schneider, Program Director
Linda Marshall, Chair of the Department of Psychology
Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Jones, Gretchen M., The evaluation of Project SCORE: A life skills program for an inner city high school. Doctor of Philosophy (Counseling Psychology), December 2007, 108 pp., 13 tables, references, 140 titles.

Project SCORE: Life Skills for Future Success, is a structured, 20-lesson curriculum, designed to help students develop academic and life skills, as well as self-responsibility, commitment, optimism, respect, and excellence. The curriculum was presented during 36, 90-minute class periods over the fall semester of the students' freshmen year. The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of Project SCORE at improving grades, learning strategies, self esteem and coping skills with freshmen students at an inner-city high school. In order to evaluate the program, students completed paper-pencil surveys at the beginning and end of the semester in which they were enrolled in the Project SCORE class. In addition, teachers completed evaluations on their perceptions of each student's peer relationships, classroom behavior, mood, and activity level. All teachers and students involved in the course were asked to complete an evaluation to determine their level of satisfaction with the course and areas in need of improvement. Lastly, information pertaining to grades, discipline and standardized test scores were used to determine the impact of SCORE. Participants were 333 9th grade students at a large 4A high school in Texas. Findings suggest that SCORE had a positive effect on coping resources, study skills and grades during the semester students were enrolled in the course. Specifically, students reported significantly higher levels of school self concept and improved coping resources at the end of the semester long course. Lastly, students and teachers believed SCORE to be helpful in easing the transition into high school and at teaching the various life and study skills.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

INTRODUCTION

High schools in the United States are under pressure from parents and government organizations to improve student achievement, prevent problem behaviors such as school violence, smoking and substance use, and graduate students with the skills necessary to be successful in college as well as in the work force. In 1990 President Bush created Goals 2000 to guide children's education into the new millennium. Although some progress was made toward the goals, they were not met within the established time-frame. There are many possible reasons that programs, such as Goals 2000, have not been more successful. Minority status, family income, self esteem, parental involvement, coping skills, study skills, and delinquent behaviors are all factors that influence the likelihood that students will successfully complete their high school education. Although these variables may affect students' academic behaviors, they do not completely explain or predict who will be successful. More importantly, students need to learn how to self regulate if they are going to manage personal problems and achieve consistently in school (Boekaerts, Pintrich & Zeidner, 2005). Teaching students to use various self regulatory strategies, such as self monitoring and learning strategies (defined as systematic plans that help learners encode information and perform a task), helps to raise self efficacy and achievement by helping students reach their goals and increase the belief that they are capable (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1989). Many programs have been developed to address separately the issues believed to influence students' academic success and self-regulatory strategies, but few have tried to incorporate all of this information into one comprehensive program. The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of Project SCORE, a life skills and study skills program, at improving grades, learning strategies, self-esteem and coping skills with freshmen students at an inner-city high school.

The Rationale for Project SCORE

Minority Status and Socio-Economic Status

Significant gaps exist between the high school graduation rates of minority and majority students (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 1995). Students of color and economically disadvantaged students do not achieve at the same level as advantaged students and often are excuded from educational opportunities that can lead to success in high school, college, and beyond (Cook & Kaffenberger, 2003). Even though this inequality is true for all disadvantaged populations, the odds of completing high school for Hispanic immigrants and those not proficient in English are substantially lower than other minority populations (Krashen, 1998; NCES, 1998). Studies have shown that English as a Second Language (ESL) students have substantially more learning problems, have lower academic self-concepts, and are more anxious and withdrawn in school than non-ESL students (Spamer & Cowen, 2001), thus possibly leading to declining academic achievement and an increasing likelihood of dropout. The dropout rate for Hispanics nationwide has been reported to be 2.5 times higher than blacks and 3.5 times higher than the rate for white non-Hispanics (Secada, Chavez, Garcia, Munoz, Oakes, Santiago, & Slavin, 1998). Without a high school education, making a successful transition into adult life is more difficult because many opportunities, such as above minimum wage jobs, are closed off. Even if these students graduate from high school, they do not posses the necessary skills to be successful in college or in the workforce (Cook & Kaffenberger, 2003). Poor school readiness is highest among families of low socio economic status (SES) and this low level of academic readiness leads to lower levels of school achievement, increased number of students being held back a year, and increased dropout rates (Ramey & Ramey, 1998). Further, children who enter school with few resources (e.g., social competence, self-control, and control over attention) have

more academic problems, get in trouble more often with teachers, are more likely to be rejected by peers, and are at greater risk for dropping out of school than those with all of these resources readily available (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). To help disadvantaged students, many schools implement programs or provide additional resources aimed at improving students' skills (e.g., mentoring and tutoring) so they can be successful in high school and beyond, regardless of their SES or cultural background. Even with these programs and additional resources, many minority students do poorly in school because they deny the importance and utility of academic success, or because their own life expectancies are very different from the majority student population's belief that one ought to exert effort in school (Graham & Taylor, 2002). Minority males, more than other adolescents must cope with dual stressors of academic challenge and negative stereotypes about their group. These stressors can have a negative effect on the perceived importance of academic achievement (Graham & Taylor, 2002). Graham and Taylor also reported that minority males perform more poorly than females on most indicators of academic success, and therefore may devalue behaviors they believe will have negative or poor outcomes and instead, place value on peers in their ethnic group who are low achievers.

Mood (Anxiety, Depression, etc.)

Recent studies estimate that more than 33% of students in elementary and secondary school experience test anxiety (Methia, 2004 as cited in Whitaker-Sena, Lowe, & Lee, 2007). Test anxiety, defined as "an individual's physiological, cognitive, and behavioral responses that stimulate negative feelings about an evaluation," interferes with a student's ability to perform up to his potential when taking a test (Nicaise, 1995 as cited in Whitaker-Sena, Lowe, & Lee, 2007, p. 360). These students perform poorer on tests than they should and often have difficulty learning new material in the classroom (Whitaker-Sena, Lowe, & Lee, 2007). Students who are

anxious tend to have poor study habits, are unable to organize their material sufficiently and are unable to focus their attention on the task at hand because they cannot stop wondering how they are doing or if they are being evaluated. Because of this they are not able to process the information presented in the classroom. Often, children's anxiety level is increased because of unrealistic expectations placed upon them by a parent, a friend, or themselves. Children who are anxious about evaluations can be more motivated to avoid failure than to approach success, causing students to avoid situations (e.g., skipping classes, missing a test) where failure might occur. When failures do occur because of anxiety, poor information processing skills, or poor study skills, the student's perception about his/her ability can deteriorate leading to shame and eventually depression. Wigfield and Eccles (1989) believed that anxiety is most likely to develop in students who do poorly in school and view their lack of ability in school as stable or unchanging. Meichenbaum and Butler (1980) reported that anxiety intervention programs focusing on the cognitive aspects, such as worry reduction, may be more successful in improving performance as well as reducing anxiety in comparison to programs focusing on the emotional component of anxiety. Decreasing negative self focus and training students on study skills and skills that help them manage difficult test mechanics more easily also have been found effective, especially when working with older children (Wigfield & Eccles, 1989). Thus, including these skills in a study skills and life skills curriculum would lead to improved academic performances.

Socio emotional factors are significant predictors of school performance for children and adolescents (Hamre & Pianta, 2001, as cited in Gumora & Arsenio, 2002). Both emotional dispositions and academically related affect are connected with school success for middle school students. Gumora & Arsenio (2002) also found that negative emotionality (i.e., anger and worry) predicts lower levels of social competence and is connected with lower levels of academic

performance as indicated by lower achievement scores and lower GPA's. Lastly, since WWII there seems to be an increased emphasis on the educational achievement of females, which brings with it increased stress. Evidence shows that women are more likely to blame themselves for academic failure (Szkrybalo & Ruble, 1998) and experience more anxiety about competency (Kashani, Orvaschel, Rosenberg, & Reid, 1989, cited in West & Sweeting, 2003) than their male counterparts. Overall, it is clear that mood and anxiety are influential in how students view themselves and their academic performance. By teaching students how to effectively manage their anxiety and improve their study habits, students will be able to better focus their attention and process information in the classroom.

Coping Skills

Coping style can be defined as the techniques used to meet life's many challenges. These coping styles can be as diverse as the people who use them and are influenced by the person's temperament, causing a person to be more inclined to withdraw from a stressful situation, to react with an emotional outburst, or to be more accepting of challenges and adapt to the situation (Carey, 1998). People who judge themselves ineffective in coping with environmental demands tend to generate high emotional arousal, become excessively preoccupied with personal deficiencies, and exaggerate potential challenges (Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach & Rosenberg, 1995).

One study on 10th grade students found that major sources of stress were relationships with family, work, and lack of money. Major ways of coping with these stressors included using drugs and alcohol and distracting oneself with other activities (Mates & Allison, 1992). Mates and Allison (1992) also found that many students complained that their stress was caused by their parents yelling or being verbally abusive and not treating them like adults. Another source

of stress for many students is the need to balance work and academics. Students, especially at lower socio economic levels, may have to work long hours, which can create conflicts because they also must attend school, do their homework, and sometimes attend extracurricular activities. In addition, many students have to deal with gangs, drugs, and girlfriends/boyfriends. Some of the stressors from relationships involve pressure to be sexually active, girls feeling pressure from their boyfriends to have their children, and the risks of verbal or physical abuse. During school students feel pressure to get all of their work completed, and often they complain that teachers treat them unfairly or do not respect them, which leads to conflict within the classroom.

If students can be taught how to better control their anxiety by learning more effective ways of coping with stress, and by monitoring and regulating their thoughts and behaviors, they will be able to think more clearly and seek the social support they need. Students who are able to regulate their own learning in the face of multiple distractions and difficulties in the classroom perform and learn better than students who lack self regulatory capabilities (Pintrich & Zusho, 2002). These skills will allow them to be able to improve their academic and job performances, as well as interpersonal relationships with family and friends. Schunk and Pajares (2002) found that parents who teach children ways to cope with difficulties and model persistence and effort strengthen children's self efficacy. With the right skills, high school students can learn how to use their anxiety to their benefit and as a motivating factor rather than a deterrent. Some skills that can help students cope with stress include positive self-talk, cognitive restructuring, imagery, and relaxation. A student who becomes anxious before math exams can learn how to use deep breathing to calm himself while using positive self-talk to remind himself that he studied hard and knows the information.

Delinquent Behaviors

In many urban settings gangs are a major problem. According to Arfaniarromo (2001) gang member population is estimated to be between 4 to 15 % of the urban Latino population. The occurrence of discipline and violence problems within schools affects academic achievement. Problem behaviors such as substance use, violence, and class cutting have been associated with an increased risk of school failure and involvement with the criminal justice system (Flay, Allred, & Ordway, 2001). Findings show frequency of offenses to be negatively related to achievement in math, reading, science, and social sciences (Barton, Coley, & Wenglinshy, 1998, as cited in Flay et al., 2001). In addition, 84% of principals from public schools reported that discipline problems were minor to moderate problems within their school (Flay et al., 2001).

According to the Department of Education (1998) the most frequent problems reported in schools were tardiness, absenteeism, class cutting, and physical conflicts. Other research found that between grades 8 and 10, poor school performance and behavior predicted cigarette smoking (Bryant, Schulenberg, Bachman, O'Malley, & Johnston, 2000). Some risk factors associated with increased levels of problem behaviors include poor social skills, low social competence, academic underachievement, lack of parental guidance, negative attitudes toward school, and low self esteem (Simons-Morton, Crump, Haynie, & Saylor, 1999). Students at a lower level of academic achievement displayed apathy and hopelessness about school rather than believing it to be a source of stress (Mates and Allison, 1992). Apathetic students will then resort to reactive methods of self regulation when the academic outcomes become too punishing, such as by joining deviant peer groups (Zimmerman, 2000)

Each of the aforementioned factors can be influenced and modified with appropriate interventions at the school level. It has been shown that enhancing cognitive and social competence in children and changing patterns of interactions in the family can have long-term cumulative protective effects resulting in prevention of antisocial behavior and delinquency (Yoshikawa, 1994; Zigler, Taussig, & Black, 1992, cited in Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). Lastly, those children who are more successful in school may be more likely to comply with social norms and associate with pro-social peer groups (Catalano & Hawkins, 1996).

Study Skills and Life Skills Programs

Research indicates that early intervention programs, those geared toward children as young as three years old, can have positive effects on children's cognitive and social development, emphasizing that those who participate most actively and regularly show the greatest progress developmentally (Ramey & Ramey, 1998). Other studies, geared more towards adolescents, have examined the effects of various life skills programs on retention rates, school absences, violence, and substance use, with participating elementary, middle school and high school students experiencing long-term benefits. Interventions in adolescence have been shown to prevent the onset of health compromising behaviors and allow for the introduction and reinforcement of healthful behavior patterns (Forneris, Danish, & Scott, 2007). For example, the "Going for the Goal" program (Danish, Petitpas, & Hale, 1993) was designed to teach adolescents how to become better citizens by improving their ability to make decisions and by increasing their sense of control and confidence. With high school students serving as teachers, middle school students learn about the importance of avoiding health compromising behaviors, such as drug use or dropping out of school, as well as important aspects of goal setting, such as identifying positive life goals, seeking and creating social support, and transferring skills from

one area of life to another. One evaluation found that those students who participated in the Going for the Goal program were less approving of drug use, had more positive expectations about their future, felt less distress in their lives and had higher self esteem than the control group (Danish et al., 1993). Additional studies have indicated that participants had better school attendance, fewer violent behaviors, and learned how to set achievable goals (Danish, 1996; O'Hearn & Gatz, 2002). Two more recent studies involving the Going for the Goal program also had positive results. Goudas, Dermitzaki, Leondari and Danish (2006) studied the effectiveness of the life skills training program taught as part of a physical education class. The researchers found that the students who participated in the class demonstrated an improved knowledge of goal setting and of the importance of life skills. Forneris, Danish, and Scott (2007) used the Going for the GOAL program to teach participants how to set goals, to problem solve effectively, and to seek the appropriate type of social support. Results indicated that the program was effective at teaching students to break goals down into smaller steps to maximize the probability of achievement and at teaching problem solving strategies. These findings support the notion that programs that incorporate life skills training are valuable (Forneis et al., 2007).

The Positive Youth Development Program was designed to promote personal and social competence in adolescents, specifically in the areas of stress management, self esteem, problem solving, health information, assertiveness, and social networks (Caplan, Weissberg, Grober, Siro, Grady, & Jacoby, 1992). Participants were from an inner-city middle school and a suburban middle school. The program, designed to promote personal and social competence, consists of a 20-session curriculum composed of six units: stress management, self esteem, problem solving, substances and health information, assertiveness, and social networks. Teaching techniques included didactic instruction, class discussion, videotapes, role plays, and homework

assignments over two 50-minute class periods per week over fifteen weeks. The majority of students who participated showed higher quality of coping strategies, learned new ways to resist drug and alcohol offers, and demonstrated improved problem-solving skills when compared to the control group.

D'Andrea and Daniels (1992) created a culturally sensitive program for black adolescents ages 14 to 17. The I Have a Future Program is a career development project created to meet the vocational and personal needs of at-risk youth. The program focuses on promoting career awareness, teaching pre-employment skills, increasing self discipline, and improving problem solving skills. The eight week course, held twice a week for two hours each session, used counseling and developmental strategies to help participants realize their vocational potential. The model used by the counselors was proposed for Black children in order to develop positive self images and discipline. At the end of the program, parents of many of the participants reported seeing improved self confidence, more cooperative behaviors, and an increased interest in careers after high school

All of the programs mentioned are similar in that their goal is to teach various life skills to adolescents in order to make them better, more productive people. Most of these programs were implemented in after school or in community based settings. Each of these programs were developed and implemented when the student population in question was found to be lacking in some way the skills necessary for success in school, in careers, and in life. Not only is it important to educate students about general life skills, but it seems necessary to include opportunities for participants to practice and apply these skills to real life situations, to make students aware of the possibility for change in their lives, and to teach them how to plan for it (Caplan et al., 1992; Lee & Simmons, 1988). In summary, skills training is recognized as an

important way for developing personal competence and improving the chances for academic success (Danish, Galambos, & Laquatra, 1983). Skills considered to be critical to school success include cognitive skills, such as goal setting and memory skills, social skills, such as interpersonal and listening skills, and self regulation skills, such as anger management, motivation and attention (Brigman and Campbell, 2003).

Theoretical Foundations for Academic Success

Self Regulation

According to Zimmerman (2000), self regulation refers to self generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted in order to attain personal goals. Effective self regulation enhances students' development of a sense of self efficacy for learning and performing well. Students must be able to use the feedback they receive from past performances as well as their surroundings to change and adapt their behaviors. Using this feedback loop will help students stay focused on the task and accomplish their goals.

In self regulation there is a constant feedback loop between the person, the environment, and the person's behavior. Each component of the loop is constantly changing during learning and performance, and can be influenced by ones self beliefs and emotional reactions. For example, if a student who typically has a difficult time in math gets a tutor who can explain the math concept in a new, more meaningful way, the student may begin to get more problems correct, thus changing her beliefs that she is not good in math. Self regulation is made up of processes, such as setting goals for learning, attending to and concentrating on instruction, using effective strategies to organize, code and rehearse information to be remembered, and holding positive beliefs about one's capabilities (Schunk & Ertmer, 2005).

Academic self regulation, a specific type of self-regulation, refers to students' proactive efforts to regulate their own academic learning and performance metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1989). These skills are often not taught in schools due to inadequate time, space, or funding or because administration believes students should have previously learned this information. This lack of training makes it more difficult for students who lack the knowledge of effective self regulatory processes or believe their own processes are good enough, to learn the appropriate strategies that would lead to success (Schunk & Ertmer, 2005). One of the goals of Project SCORE is to make the time and the space to teach students these self-regulatory strategies, thus improving knowledge and the belief that students can achieve academic success.

Considerable evidence shows that training students to use self regulated learning strategies, such as self-monitoring and goal setting, improves their perceptions of efficacy, motivation and learning (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). Self-regulation training also has been proven effective with students who are at risk academically because of passivity or feelings of helplessness (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). It also appears that high achieving students use self regulation strategies more consistently than low achieving students and those individuals who use these strategies have a greater chance of being successful academically, athletically or socially (Zimmerman, 1986, as cited in Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). According to Zimmerman (2000), no self-regulatory strategy will work equally well for all persons, and is of little value if a person cannot motivate himself to use it. The more valued these self regulatory skills are and the more efficacious a person feels about his academic abilities, the more positive the influence on academic learning strategies, time management, resisting negative peer pressures, self monitoring, self evaluation, and goal setting (Schunk & Ertmer, 2005).

According to Pintrich (1995), self regulated learners try to control their thoughts, feelings and behaviors, set goals for themselves when there is something they want to accomplish, and take responsibility for their own learning. Academic self-regulation is similar in that students who are self-regulated are proactively trying to monitor themselves and their surroundings in order to attain satisfactory results. Children with poor self-regulation tend to be disruptive in the classroom because they are impulsive, hypersensitive to change, and over reactive (Perry, 2007). For example, a self regulated learner may quietly do her in-class assignment and ask for assistance when needed, whereas her peer with poor self regulation skills is talking to his neighbor while becoming irritated at the teacher's request for him to do his work.

Self regulation consists of three specific strategies. When these strategies are applied together they are useful in regulating behaviors. The first strategy is self-monitoring, observing and tracking one's behaviors or performances. Self-monitoring is essential in allowing a person to attend to the external and internal cues so they can make necessary changes to their behaviors in order to reach their goal. Even though these strategies are commonly used to help improve athletic performances, they can be equally effective at improving academic performances. When applied to academics, self monitoring allows students to get feedback about the behaviors they are performing currently to see what and where improvements can be made. Self evaluation is the second process, and involves evaluating the performance against a standard that has been set by oneself or others. Finally, students use self reinforcement to reward or punish themselves depending on whether or not certain goals were met. For example, a student earns a C on her first algebra exam but is determined to make an A in the class. She begins to monitor her study patterns and realizes that she typically does her homework with the television on while lying on her bed. She decides to improve her study habits by turning off the TV and sitting at her desk.

The student earns a B+ on her second exam, leading her to believe that the changes she has made are helping, but there might be other things she can do to further improve her grades, like asking her teacher for additional help when needed. The student's hard work and improved study habits result in an A on the final exam. Because she met her goal, she rewards herself with the purchase of the new CD of her favorite band. This example illustrates how students can use self regulatory strategies to evaluate and improve their learning in order to help them achieve their goals. The more motivated students are to use these skills, the more likely it is that their efforts will be rewarded with academic and personal success.

Self Efficacy

Self efficacy is defined as "the beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (1982), self efficacy determines the amount of effort someone will put forth and how long that effort will be sustained when faced with obstacles. Self efficacy beliefs seem to provide the foundation for human motivation, well being, and personal accomplishment (Pajares, 2002). Schunk (1994) reported that students with high self efficacy were more likely to choose to engage in activities, work harder, persist longer when they encountered difficulties, use effective learning strategies, and demonstrate higher achievement than those students who doubted their academic capabilities.

Self efficacy is developed by providing students with opportunities to experience mastery over a given task, exposing them to successful models and delivering positive feedback (Boekaerts et. al., 2005). It also influences academic learning and goal setting in that the more capable people believe themselves to be, the higher the goals they set and the more firmly committed they are to those goals (Boekaerts et. al., 2005). Goals are important because they

can be a powerful influence on students' classroom behavior and academic accomplishments (Wentzel, 1992, as cited in Schunk & Meece, 1992).

Self efficacy can have an important impact on academic motivation and success by affecting an individual's choice of activities, effort and persistence (Schunk, 1991). If students believe they will have difficulty learning or comprehending material, they will have a low sense of efficacy for learning, and therefore put forth less effort and give up more easily if the task becomes challenging. Motivation and efficacy are enhanced when students perceive they are making progress in learning, thus it is important to give feedback and praise to students for their efforts and successes and to teach them how to monitor, evaluate and reward their own efforts. It also is important to help students see how to generalize their learning to other contexts. For example, even though a student may not be good in math, he can learn from prior accomplishments in his English class that by asking for support and persevering, he also can achieve success in his math class.

Self perception of academic efficacy, competence and control are critical in motivating students to self regulate their learning (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). Therefore, students with more positive self concepts are more likely to attend to, process, and use new information than those with negative self-concepts. There appears to be a bidirectional influence between these two forces in that the more efficacious individuals believe themselves to be, the more likely they are to regulate their behaviors to accomplish a given task, and by doing so, their sense of self efficacy is strengthened. Therefore, those students who have a knowledge and understanding of self regulatory strategies and believe themselves to be capable of learning and achieving success are more likely to persevere and overcome challenges in order to reach their goals. Students with a stronger belief in their ability to complete a task will likely persist when faced

with a difficult course or assignment, whereas those who do not feel confident will be more likely to give up or drop out of school. Although these findings show the interaction of self-efficacy, with academic achievement, research shows that the effect of specific academic self-esteem on global self esteem was three times greater for those who valued academic performance (Rosenberg et al., 1995).

Self Concept and Self Esteem

Self concept is defined as "the composite view of oneself that is presumed to be formed through direct experience and evaluations adopted from significant others" (Bandura, 1997, p. 10). It contributes to the understanding of people's attitudes towards themselves and how these attitudes in turn affect their general outlook on life. Thus, self concept appears to be a reflection of people's beliefs about their personal efficacy. On the other hand, self esteem is concerned with judgments of self-worth. Research has shown that people tend to invest their time and energy in activities that give them a sense of self worth (Bandura, 1997). To illustrate this difference, someone may judge herself to be inefficacious in a given activity, but because she does not value the activity or invest her self-worth in it, her self esteem is not damaged.

Self esteem and self-concept are important variables to focus on when creating a program for academic and personal success because if a student does not believe that he is competent or believe an activity will enhance his self-worth, he may not put forth the necessary effort. Unclear at this point is whether low self-concept or poor academic performance occurs first. It has been shown though that perceptions of general academic competence, along with children's interest in and value for academics, typically begin to decline by grade 7 or earlier (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). One researcher found that academic achievement affects self concept (Skaalivik & Valas, 1999). Yet, House (1993) found that self concept of overall academic ability is the

single most significant predictor of subsequent school withdrawal, especially for male students. Other researchers discovered that high school boys' general feelings of self worth are significantly affected by their perceptions of their intellectual abilities (Rosenberg et al., 1995), whereas girls tend to show lower levels of self efficacy than boys (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). Rosenberg, et. al. (1995) revealed that specific academic self-esteem is a much better predictor of school performance than global self esteem. Other research has shown that both male and female students' negative perceptions of their overall academic ability were significant predictors of school withdrawal (House, 1993). Gumora and Arsenio (2002) found that students who have stronger positive beliefs about their academic ability had higher GPAs and higher achievement scores, whereas those with negative moods were linked with lower GPAs and lower academic competence.

For those students who do not care about or value their education, self esteem will not be affected in the same way as someone who strongly values his or her academic achievements. By creating a program that focuses on improving self-regulatory skills, self-efficacy, self esteem, and thus the chances for academic success, it s hoped that all students, regardless of race, gender or SES could benefit. Students who feel competent and self-determined in an academic context become motivated about their education, which leads to higher GPAs (Fortier, Vallerand, & Guay, 1995). In addition, students who are more autonomous are less likely to drop out, have higher levels of conceptual learning, and are well adjusted academically (Fortier et al., 1995). Therefore, in order to directly improve students' performance in school, students' attitudes toward their own academic abilities must be improved as well. Research has shown repeatedly that merely teaching students learning strategies does not guarantee the motivation to use them. (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). Self-regulatory skills will not contribute much to

academic success if students cannot motivate themselves to apply the strategies consistently, especially when faced with challenges and distractions.

Motivation

Intrinsic motivation, motivation from within, is associated with success in academics, athletics and life. According to the social cognitive theory, the development of intrinsic interest is "fostered through affective self-reactive and self-efficacious mechanisms" (Bandura, 1997, p. 219). People tend to display interest in activities at which they feel efficacious and from which they derive self-satisfaction. Although the activity itself may not be rewarding, the personal significance and satisfaction are. Therefore, in order to continue improving performances and feelings of satisfaction, self regulation is necessary to help evaluate behaviors and set challenging goals. The satisfaction derived from accomplishing a goal builds intrinsic interest and motivation. In self regulation, a few strategies are used most often for improving student motivation. These are: goal setting (identifying what you want to accomplish then systematically working towards it), self efficacy beliefs (the confidence you have in your ability to perform a certain task or behavior), and attributions (how you explain the causes of your and others behaviors). As children proceed through school their motivation to self regulate declines. This decline is due to changes in school, classroom environments, and their self perceptions (Wigfield, 1997). For this reason it is not only important to help students understand how self regulation strategies can transfer and be beneficial in all areas of their lives, but to help them apply these skills in areas where they might not have previously. If a person does not feel efficacious or believe that he is capable of acting in a way necessary to attain a particular skill or task, he will not be motivated to regulate his behavior to achieve that task. The same person will not work toward something nor persist against the counter influences of significant others.

Oliver (1995) described several factors likely to reduce student motivation to perform well in school, including: boredom, pregnancy of self or family member, being behind in grade-level, poor academic performance, disciplinary problems, employment opportunity/necessity, welfare recipients and undiagnosed learning disability/emotional problems. All of these factors can influence what the student values or believes to be important. The people or things valued by the student will have the most motivational significance and will guide their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Graham & Taylor, 2002). Those students who are motivated tend to put forth the greatest effort and believe the effort will lead to a good performance (Oliver, 1995).

Physical and Social Environment

Recent thinking in the area of self regulation emphasizes the importance of taking contextual variables into account (Zeidner, Boekaerts, & Pintrich, 2000). The environment or context for students can strongly influence their performance or success. Self regulated learners try to manage their environment at all times so it can be used to their advantage. One way to do this is through environmental structuring, where students select and create the most effective learning environment for their learning style. Students who self regulate are able to determine when an environment is or is not conducive to learning or studying. They also are able to adapt their social environment by choosing specific individuals (a teacher, mentor, or student) or resources that can help them learn the material. By introducing students to the idea of self regulation strategies through a study skills and life skills program, such as Project SCORE, students will be better able to create a positive learning environment or adapt to their current environment by seeking appropriate resources.

Learning is a complex process that is affected by personal and contextual variables and that student's perceptions of themselves, teachers, and peers are influential during learning

(Schunk, 1992). Schunk (1992) reported that teaching can influence student perceptions, which can then affect achievement. Research has shown that there are four main ways teachers differently treat their students based on whether they have high or low expectations for the student (Rosenthal, 1974 as cited in Schunk & Meece, 1992). Examples might include giving students for whom they have low expectations less attention, demand less from them, and provide less emotional support. Eventually students will begin to understand what their teacher thinks of them and internalize the teacher's beliefs, ultimately affecting their self perceptions of academic efficacy. Researchers have shown that teachers with higher self efficacy are more likely to have a positive classroom environment, support student ideas, and meet the needs of all students (Schunk, 1991). These findings show how much of an impact teachers can have on their students and how important it is for the teachers to truly understand and believe in the material they are teaching.

Another important aspect of a student's social environment is their peer group. As students mature, peers become increasingly important (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). Brookhart (2001) found that some students believe that they cannot be popular if they get good grades, whereas others worry that students will dislike them if they are successful academically. As peers and social status becomes more important and valued, academic success seems to get pushed aside. These beliefs are especially true for adolescent boys who appear to value achievement in areas like athletics, instead of academics (Graham & Taylor, 2002).

All of these theories set the foundation for academic success. When creating a study skills and life skills program it is important to keep all of these pieces in mind so that the focus can be on teaching students not only the components of self-regulation but how to apply them to their everyday lives. Other components of academic success include self efficacy, which

provides the foundation for motivation and personal accomplishment, self concept, which is the belief about one's personal efficacy, and self esteem, which is the sense of self-worth. In order for a program to be successful and have a positive impact on students as well as the school environment, all of these components must be present.

Summary

According to the World Health Organization, teaching life skills is essential for the promotion of healthy child and adolescent development, and for preparing young people for their changing social circumstances (Goudas et al., 2006). Although most of the research described is correlational in nature and directionality is difficult to prove, self concept, behavior, and academic achievement of students all are correlated strongly. According to St. Leger (1999, cited in Flay, 2001) schools that respond actively to problem behaviors and cultivate positive environments have lasting effects on students' long term behaviors in adolescence and beyond. Many programs reviewed, addressed only one aspect of influence on students' academic performance (e.g., substance use, goal setting, or problem solving), and failed to focus holistically on the child and his or her environment. The studies reviewed in this paper indicate that comprehensive programs that involve a thorough curriculum and school wide climate change hold the most promise for having positive long-term effects on students. With carefully selected, sequenced lessons, students are able to acquire appropriate strategies to handle assignments (Berthiaume, 1995).

This program, Project SCORE, was developed with the theoretical and conceptual foundations of self-regulation. It was created to address most qualities (e.g., self-concept/self-esteem, violent/problem behaviors, study skills, etc.) believed to influence success academically, personally and socially. It is believed that by helping students become self-regulated learners

through Project SCORE, students will be able to make significant improvements academically, personally and socially by learning how to improve their environment, seek out support, and build their feelings of efficacy and sense of self-worth. Based on previous research (Caplan et al., 1992; Catalano & Hawkins, 1996; & Danish et al., 1983), it was believed that students participating in Project SCORE would have (a) improved study habits from the beginning to the end of the first semester, (b) fewer mental health issues, (c) increased self esteem and self concept both in and out of the classroom by the end of the semester, (d) improved coping skills, (e) decreased discipline problems, and (f) improved GPA and self responsibility.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 333 9th grade students at a large 4A high school in the Dallas Independent School District (DISD); 52.6% were male (*n* = 175) and 47.4% (*n* = 158) were female. The 9th grade students at the Experimental High School (EHS), where the program was implemented, ranged in age from 13 to 17 (*M* = 14.31, *SD* = .61). The majority of the participants from this school were Hispanic (82.6%), followed by African American (10.5%), Asian American (3.6%), and Caucasian (2.7%). EHS was the first public high school in the nation to be declared an "international school" by Congress because of the unique mix of students representing over 70 countries.

Only 10.0% of the sample (*n* = 29) had jobs at the beginning of the fall semester (Time 1) and of this small group, 36.7% worked 0-5 hours each week, 33.3% worked 5-10 hours, 16.7% worked 10-15 hours and 10.0% worked over 20 hours each week. At the end of the fall semester (Time 2), only 8.9% of the sample (*n* = 25) had jobs, with 28.0% of this group working 0-5 hours and 28.0% worked 5-10 hours weekly. At Time 1, only 30.8% of the sample participated in extracurricular activities (*n* = 89). Of that small sample, students reported that they participated in one or more activity including: athletics (65.2%), church (24.7%), drama clubs (2.2%), spirit clubs (1.1%), band (5.6%), and "other" activities (12.4%). At Time 2, 35.6% of the students participated in extracurricular activities (*n* = 100), including: athletics (53.0%), church (28.0%), drama club (8.0%), band (7.0%), spirit clubs (5.0%) student council (2.0%), speech (1.0%), and "other" (20.0%) were found.

Of the EHS sample at Time 1, 88.2% students (*n* = 255) stated that they hoped to attend college (girls = 91.4% and boys = 85.3%). At Time 2, 89.3% (*n* = 250) of those who completed

the survey indicated that they wanted to attend college (girls = 92.5% and boys = 86.4%). Of the students who indicated that they wanted to attend college, 22.8% wanted to attend a community college or junior college (girls = 24.4%, boys = 21.1%), 9.0% hoped to attend vocational or technical school (girls = 3.1%, boys = 14.8%), and 67.5% aspired to attend a four-year university (girls = 72.4%, boys = 62.5%). A small number of students indicated that they wanted to attend college but then did not choose the specific type of college or marked more than one type of college, therefore percentages may not add up to 100 %. The percentages at Time 2 were similar to these. Students also were asked about what they believed to be their easiest and hardest courses and how prepared they felt for their classes and tests. At Time 1, 38.1% indicated that math was their most difficult course, followed by history (23.5%), science (20.1%) and English (8.7%). Interestingly, math was reported to be the easiest subject for 38.8% of the sample, followed by English (26.3%), science (14.9%), and history (8.7%). At Time 2, math again was the most difficult course for 36.4% of respondents, followed by science (23.3%), history (20.4%), and English (12.7%). Similar to Time 1, math was again reported to be the easiest course for 46.3% of the students followed by English (22.1%), science (13.5%) and history (10.0%) at Time 2. Lastly, 72.1% of the students (girls = 77%, boys = 67.6%) reported that they felt prepared for their classes each day, whereas 56.6% (girls = 61.9%, boys = 51.7%) indicated that they felt prepared for tests. At Time 2, only 61.2% felt prepared for class each day, and 53.9% prepared for tests. Across the two times, more girls (75.4%) reported feeling prepared for class each day than boys (48.3%), $X^2(2, N = 172) = 23.61$, $p<.001$. For tests, again, more girls (61.9%) reported feeling prepared than did the boys (46.6%), $X^2(2, N = 151) = 6.64$, $p<.01$.

A second school in the DISD was chosen to be the control because of its similarity to EHS on the basis of age, race, and SES. The Control High School (CHS) was made up of 84.3%

Hispanic students, 11.2% African American students, 3% Asian students, and 1.5% Caucasian students. Forty-seven % of this sample was male, 45.5% was female, and 7.1% of the sample did not indicate gender. Although an initial agreement was in place for participation, students at CHS were not able to complete the surveys because of extenuating circumstances and miscommunications with the administrators at the school. Even though students at CHS failed to complete the researcher initiated questionnaires, they did supply data on their 622 9th grade students in regards to race, academic records, disciplinary actions taken, and TAKS scores. I was able to use this information to compare the two schools.

Measures

Demographic Information

The 14-item survey asked participants to provide information about their age, gender, and school experience, including: participation in extracurricular activities in and away from school, favorite and least favorite academic subjects, whether or not they have a job and how many hours per week they work, and general feelings of preparedness for classes and tests (see Appendix A).

Study Habits

The 40-item Cognitive Skills Inventory (CSI; Moreno & Di Vesta, 1991) assesses the study activities and habits that are related to theoretical assumptions about the information processing system (see Appendix B). The CSI has four subscales: Integration (activities for integration of ideas within the text books), Repetition (activities related to memorization and manipulation of information), Monitoring (awareness of goal setting, planning, and checking), and Coping (behaviors used to cope with frustrations or difficult or distracting situations). Total scores for each factor are obtained by averaging the item scores, and can range from 1, “never

use this procedure", to 5, "always use this procedure". Cronbach's alphas for the scales ranged from .55 to .84, and the internal consistency for the entire inventory was acceptable (.81; see Di Vesta & Moreno, 1993). The current sample also had a high internal consistency (r =.92 at T1 and .95 at T2) for the entire inventory. Cronbach's alphas for the scales at Time 1 ranged from .62 to .89 and at Time 2 from .72 to .91. Validity analyses indicate that the CSI correlates significantly with the Nelson-Denny Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary tests and GPA (Di Vesta & Moreno, 1993), and is applicable across cultural groups (Moreno & Di Vesta, 1991).

Self Concept

The 45-item Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (SPPA; Harter, 1988) measures specific perceptions of competence in eight domains as well as one for general feelings of self worth (see Appendix C). For this study, only five of the nine domains were included: school competence (how smart one feels while doing schoolwork); social acceptance (how popular and accepted the student is); job competence (feels has job skills and does well at jobs s/he has); behavior conduct (acts the way one is supposed to act, avoids trouble); and global self worth (likes oneself as a person, is happy with how leading life, judgment of one's worth as a person). These domains were included because they represented areas of self concept that would likely be influenced by the Project SCORE curriculum. Each subscale has five items and for each item, children are asked to first decide which half of the statement is most like them and then decide whether the statement is "really true of me" or "sort of true of me". Items are scored on a four-point scale with four meaning "most adequate self-adjustment" and one representing "least adequate self adjustment" (Harter, 1988). High validity and reliability have been established for this measure. For the original data, Cronbach's alphas for a 9th grade sample ranged from .55 for job competence, to .89 for athletic competence (Harter, 1988). Cronbach's alphas for individual

subtests at Time 1 and Time 2 ranged form .27 (job) to .76 (self-worth). Because of the low alpha for the job subscale, it was dropped from the analyses.

Coping Resources

The Coping Resources Inventory Scales for Educational Enhancement (CRISEE; Curlette, Matheny, Aycock, Pugh, Taylor, & Cannella, 1993) measures the coping resources of elementary, middle, and high school students. It is made up of 99 true or false questions that yield five coping resource scales: (a) behavioral control, (b) social confidence, (c) academic confidence, (d) family support, (e) peer acceptance, and an additional resource scale labeled "responsibility" that has not yet received research support. In addition, two items assess response validity and eighteen items measure external stressors (e.g., classroom is too crowded). For this study only the social confidence (ability to freely express their feelings and opinions, behave independently), family support (families are supportive, accepting and helpful), and external stressors subscales were to be used because of time constraints and overlap with items from the SPPA (see Appendix D). Research has shown substantial support for the construct validity of the six subscales as well as convergent and divergent validity between the scales and validating instruments (Matheny, Aycock, Curlette, & Junker, 1993). For the original data, alphas were .84 for social confidence and .83 for family support (McCarthy, Seraphine, Matheny, & Curlette, 2000). Because of strong skewness and kurtosis, and a lack of consistency with the factor structure of the original data, it was decided to combine all items to form one overall "coping resources" score. For the current sample, an alpha of .65 at Time 1 and .80 at Time 2 was found when combining all subscales.

Mental Health

The 53-item Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis, 1982) assesses the psychological symptom patterns of respondents (see Appendix E). For each item, participants rate their level of distress on a five point Likert scale ranging from 0, "not at all", to 4, "extremely". Total raw scores are found by adding the score of each item for a symptom dimension and then dividing by the number of endorsed items. The most basic wording was used for each item so as to be easily understood by those who take it. The BSI consists of 9 primary symptom dimensions and three global indices. For this study, only the somatization ("distress arising from perceptions of bodily dysfunction" – 7 items), interpersonal sensitivity ("feelings of personal inadequacy and inferiority" – 4 items), hostility ("thoughts, feelings, or actions that are characteristic of the negative affect state of anger" – 5 items), anxiety (signs of nervousness, tension, apprehension, and terror – 6 items), and depression ("dysphoric mood and affect, lack of motivation and loss of interest in life" – 6 items) subscales were to be used (Derogatis, 1982).

The overall alphas ranged from .55 to .76 at Time 1 and .69 to .84 at Time 2 for the subscales to be used in this study. Alphas for the original nine symptom dimensions ranged from .71 (Psychoticism) to .85 (Depression; see Derogatis, 1982). High correlations between the BSI and MMPI indicate high convergent validity, and predictive validity is shown in its ability to effectively screen a variety of populations including student samples. Once again because of strong kurtosis and skewness, as well as inconsistencies with the original factor structure, it was decided to combine all items into an overall "mental health" score. Even after items were combined, a square root transformation of the scores had to be done to correct for skewness. The alpha for the combined subscales at Time 1 was .91 and at Time 2 was .95.

Teacher Evaluation

The teacher evaluation form was based on the work of Allen, Weissberg, and Hawkins (1989; see Appendix F), and was used to obtain teachers' perceptions of each student's peer relationships, classroom behavior, mood and activity level. The three-item teacher evaluation survey uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "low" or "negative" (e.g., withdrawn and unhappy) to 7 "positive" or "high" (e.g., outgoing and confident). Cronbach's alphas for the original data ranged from .74 to .91 for each dimension (Allen et al., 1989), indicating a high degree of agreement between the teachers surveyed. The Cronbach's alpha for the current sample at Time 1 was .75 and at Time 2, .78.

Course Evaluation

At the end of the semester both the SCORE teachers and students in the course completed an evaluation of the curriculum (see Appendix G). The survey asked how satisfied they were with the class, whether or not they believed the course would help the students be more successful academically or personally in high school, how helpful on a scale of 1, "not at all", to, 5, "very much", each of the SCORE topics were for academic and personal success at EHS, which if any of the topics should be removed from the curriculum, and how the course could be improved.

Project SCORE

After speaking with several teachers, students, and administrators at a high school in the DISD it became obvious that the students at this school, and many like it, did not have the skills necessary to be successful in school and life. This deficit most likely existed because the students had never had the opportunity to learn the skills and strategies taught in life skills programs (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). Without these necessary skills, many students become

frustrated and dropped out. In addition, research has indicated that adolescence is a good time to teach life skills because of the numerous stressful life changes occurring (Danish & Nellen, 1997). It also is known that adolescents spend a large portion of their day in school, thus making it an ideal place to introduce and teach skills about behaviors, values and academics. Research indicates that interventions providing direct educational experiences show larger and more long lasting positive effects than interventions directed at training parents to become more effective in their interactions with their child (Ramey & Ramey, 1998).

After examining information and results on previous intervention strategies, it was determined that a program would be most effective if it was based on the theory of self regulation. This intervention included skills such as self-monitoring and self-evaluation, how to build self esteem, goal setting, study skills, career development and exploration, and critical thinking, all necessary for success academically, socially, and professionally. In order to be most effective, school administrators and I decided that the curriculum should be taught during the school day so all freshmen students could participate. This approach would allow all freshmen to receive approximately 4.5 hours of training each week. In addition, students would be expected to use the study skills and life skills in their other classes (Math, Science, English, and Social Studies), thus emphasizing the application of the skills to many aspects of their lives. Training the instructors thoroughly on the curriculum and on a variety of techniques to be used for program implementation also appears to enhance program effectiveness and therefore will be done prior to the implementation (Ramey & Ramey, 1998).

Project SCORE, which stands for Self responsibility, Commitment, Optimism, Respect and Excellence in school, sports, and life, is a life skills and study skills based program designed for high school students. The program combines various theories in order to encourage more

positive thoughts and subsequent actions. The course was designed to be introduced to all incoming students during the first semester of their freshmen year. This method of implementation provided students the opportunity to learn the social and academic skills necessary for them to be successful in high school almost immediately upon their arrival to campus. Ideally this curriculum would improve students' academic competence and attitudes about school because they would see improvements in their school performance which would then enhance their self perception about their academic abilities. Through this semester long course, students would have the opportunity to (a) develop effective self regulation strategies to be more proficient learners, (b) increase their understanding of how people change and develop, and (c) apply this knowledge across academic courses and in all areas of their lives to make positive, self enhancing changes.

Target School

The high school where the program was implemented was 98% minority, and attrition was one of the major problems for the school. According to the principal of the school only 40% of the entering freshmen will graduate, and those who do often do not believe that college is a realistic option for them (L. Dehart, personal communication, January 2001). Many reasons have been identified by the faculty and administrators for the low graduation rates of these students such as: (a) lack of support or encouragement for academic success by the family, (b) insufficient academic and study skills, (c) students working one or two jobs to help support the family, (d) an inability to cope with the variety of stressors encountered in high school, and (e) inadequate early childhood education (Dallas Morning News, 2002). Life skills based programs could provide academic and social support for the students in order to compensate for the lack of education provided in early childhood. Providing social support appears to be especially

important for improving academic achievement in the Hispanic culture (Lopez, Ehly, & Garcia-Vazquez, 2002). These programs would teach students the importance of believing in themselves and would educate them on the skills necessary to be successful academically and socially. Educating students on the importance of self regulation has been found to influence the development of competence and compliance, both necessary for appropriate social functioning at school and with peers (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998).

Program Structure

The program began its development two years prior to its school-wide implementation. Originally, Project SCORE was designed to be a four-year program, taking students through different lessons and experiences each year, ending their senior year with them mentoring the freshmen students. Since it was not possible for the school to invest in such a program at the time it was decided to focus on the life skills and study skills. Initially, I taught several study skills (e.g., test taking skills and note taking skills) and life skills (e.g., goal setting and emotional regulation) to varsity football players during their study hall. The program was well received and I was asked to create a program for the entire athletic department. All athletes at this school were supposed to be in the athletic period at the end of the day. Because the school works on the block schedule system, students either had 4th or 8th period for athletics. The athletic period was broken into study hall and athletics, thus allowing the athletes approximately thirty minutes twice a week to learn study skills and skills for improving their athletic performances. The female coaches were very accepting and enthusiastic of the program, and encouraged their athletes to participate fully. The male coaches were not as enthusiastic and therefore made it difficult to meet with the male athletes on a regular basis. Overall, on a scale of 1, “not at all”, to 5, “very

much", all coaches were satisfied ($M = 4.2$) with Project SCORE, but only somewhat committed ($M = 3.4$) to incorporating the program in to their daily routine.

For the program during the 2001-2002 year, I was able to do a pre-test measure for the female participants. I created a full curriculum including lesson plans, handouts and activities to be done throughout the entire academic year. At the end of the year, the seven girls who had participated in the class the entire year also completed a post-test measure to determine the effectiveness of the program as changing their self concept, various study skills and life skills. Overall, the program had a positive impact on those who had participated. Because of the small sample size it is difficult to say precisely how Project SCORE influenced the student athletes, but we were able to make generalizations about psychological well-being, study habits, and general feelings of self confidence and competence. Our results showed that there was a decrease in the athletes' perception of physical ailments such as nausea and numbness. We also found that the students generally perceived a lack of family support and an inability to disclose feelings to their peers. They also indicated that factors such as crowded classrooms and fighting in their neighborhoods were present in their lives as external stressors. When asked about study habits, students revealed that they "rarely use" techniques such as repetition, monitoring, and integration and that no improvements were made between time one and time two. Participants indicated that they do not take notes in class, nor do they study outside of class in preparation for their classes or tests. The majority of the students reported that they believed they would be made fun of and harassed for studying extra or for incorporating the various study strategies into their daily routines. Obviously, these external forces made it difficult for SCORE to have a positive impact on these students.

In addition, participants, as well as their coaches, were asked to anonymously complete a survey asking their opinion about each of the lessons, their overall impression of the program, whether or not they felt the program was helpful to them, and what they would like to add or subtract from the program. Coaches were also asked to evaluate the program as they thought it helped their student-athletes, the importance of each of the lessons to academic and personal success, and what they would like to change, add or subtract from the program. Both athletes and coaches reported that goal setting and positive thinking/positive self-talk were most helpful while note taking and test taking skills were seen as least helpful.

Both the student-athletes and the coaches were asked to be open and honest when completing the evaluation of the course. The feedback was used make improvements on the curriculum as far as lessons to change and improve and those to spend more time on in class. After the data from the 2001-2002 year were evaluated, a report was submitted to the principal, the athletic director, the dean of students and the head guidance counselor. I recommended that in order to make major changes within the school system, an entire class should be created so that all freshmen could have access to the information provided in Project SCORE. It was hoped that by doing this, the student population, teachers and administration would grow to be more accepting and encouraging of the use of study skills and life skills on a daily basis.

The administrators agreed that in order to effect a positive change at the school a "Project SCORE" class would need to be required for all freshmen their first semester of attending the high school. It was organized in this manner so the guidance counselors could place students in the SCORE class first semester, then during the second semester, all freshmen would take Health. This scheduling allowed the class to be taught by the four health teachers, one computer teacher, and myself without taking anyone away from his or her other duties. Each of the

instructors taught two sections of SCORE each day as well as having one planning period and one period to teach another class. Three of the teachers were coaches and therefore had athletics, one taught health to upper class students, and one taught a business computer course. I taught one SCORE class each day, thus allowing me time to observe the other teachers and to prepare future lessons, handouts, or activities.

For this study, the curriculum and guidelines were adapted from the athletic department version in order to be applicable to the entire freshmen class. Feedback from the coaches and student-athletes who had taken the class previously was considered as the curriculum was revised for the current project. In addition, teachers who taught primarily freshmen as well as administrators were given copies of the original curriculum and asked to provide feedback so that the lessons would be appropriate for the 9th grade students. This was also done in an attempt for the teachers and administrators to feel a part of the creation process and therefore be more invested in the final product. Table 1 provides an outline of the curriculum topics and objectives. The curriculum was taught through 20 units across 30-36 classes. Each unit consisted of a structured lesson plan, assessments to determine the level of understanding of a topic prior to it being taught, and numerous activities that could be done during the class or outside of the class in order to help the students understand and apply the newly learned material to real world situations.

The program, although developed by this author, was adapted from the PSYC 1000: Psychology of Personal and Academic Effectiveness course taught at the University of North Texas (Petrie, Landry, & Edwards, 1998), from the previous curriculum taught at the high school, and by incorporating aspects of several successful life skills and academic skills programs. Information on self-regulation strategies (Boekaerts et al., 2005); goal setting

(Danish, 1993); character development, etiquette, and career exploration (Procrastination Management Strategies, 2002), electronic resources (Using Electronic Resources, 2002); learning styles (Learning Style Preferences, 2002); general study skills (Basic Study Skills, 2002); note taking (The Cornell System, 2002); reading skills (Reading Text, 2002); self-monitoring (Strategies for Self Testing, 2002); memory and concentration (Improving Your Memory, 2002, Concentration Guidelines, 2002); writing skills (Writing a Term Paper, 2002; Developing Good Writing Skills, 2002; Galloway, 2002); problem solving and decision making (Guide to Decision Making, 2002; Packer, 1997); effective communication (Communication Skills, 2002); assertive versus aggressive or passive behavior (Assertive Behavior, 2002); stress management (Managing Stress, 2002; Davis, Eshelman, & McKay, 1995); building self-confidence and a positive attitude (Self Confidence, 2002; Positive Attitude, 2002); and financial and budgeting skills (Money Management, 2002); Active Learning, 2002) were all incorporated into the SCORE curriculum. The five instructors, including myself, taught the SCORE class. In order for the six classes to be consistent, each teacher was given a copy of the SCORE curriculum that consisted of lesson plans, activities, quizzes and exams. Instructors received these notebooks two weeks prior to the beginning of class to give them time to familiarize themselves with the information. They also received special training on how to deliver the material and on the material itself so to have a firm understanding of the curriculum before it was introduced in the classroom. A majority of teachers who worked primarily with 9th graders from the high school attended a one-day workshop in order to become familiar with the curriculum and to brainstorm ideas of how to integrate the curriculum into the daily lesson plans for math, science, English and social studies. By training the 9th grade teachers and encouraging them to use the curriculum, the students were able to receive consistent messages throughout the school

day about appropriate use of study skills and responsible behaviors. The SCORE teachers also attended the one-day workshop and received additional training on the specific lessons and activities done within the course. Lastly, SCORE teachers were required to attend weekly meetings to discuss the lessons and to give feedback about the course and their classes. This was done to ensure that all teachers covered the same material in the same manner. Unfortunately, only half of the SCORE teachers attended these weekly meetings consistently.

Program Implementation

The Project SCORE: Life Skills for Future Success curriculum is a highly structured, 20-lesson curriculum designed to help students develop academic and life skills, and to develop: self-responsibility, commitment, optimism, respect, and excellence. The course also promotes the discussion and exploration of diverse careers and healthy living. Teaching techniques included classroom instruction and discussion, work sheets, homework, and small group activities. A list of available videos also was given to the instructors to supplement the curriculum. In the first lesson (see Table 1) students were introduced to the objectives of the class, and then to the school and its guidelines and expectations. The instructors then moved into the three main parts of the course: (a) study skills (time management, resources, multiple intelligences and learning styles, note taking, reading skills, test taking strategies, memory and concentration), (b) life skills (motivation and goal setting, decision making and problem solving, character and personal development, attitude and positive thinking, stress and coping, communication), and (c) career exploration.

The curriculum was presented during thirty-six 90-minute class periods over the fall semester of the student's freshmen year. All 9th grade students who were not repeating freshmen and who were not in Sheltered classes (students who were new to the country and were

learning the basics of the English language) were required to take the course. Every effort was made by the administrators and the school counselors to schedule all 9th graders in the SCORE class. Due to problems with scheduling and students constantly transferring into or out of EHS, not all students were registered for the class.

Five health teachers and I taught the classes. I trained the teachers during a day-long workshop as well as through weekly meetings and consultations. In addition, I regularly visited classrooms, making observations and offering feedback to the teachers as a way to help ensure the integrity of the program delivery.

Assessment Procedure

During the first week of class, students enrolled in the SCORE course were given a letter to take to their parent or guardian, explaining the course and the curriculum. The letter, written in both English and Spanish, indicated that because this was the first time the course was offered, the students were going to participate in research to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The letter indicated that the research had been approved by the IRB from UNT and contact information for me, my supervisor, and the IRB committee, was given in case of question. The letter also explained how the testing material would be kept confidential and that scores on the surveys would not affect the student's grade in the course. Students were asked to read a similar letter during the class and sign it, thus indicating that they understood what would be expected of them during the class, that the questionnaires would not affect their grades, and that their responses would be kept confidential. Students and their parents or guardians were also notified that information regarding six-week and semester grades, TAKS scores, attendance, and behavioral problems would be gathered. Each questionnaire packet was coded using the student's six-digit ID number to ensure that all data from Time 1 and Time 2 could be matched

with the student's grades, TAKS scores and disciplinary information. The code number was used instead of the student's name to keep the information confidential from teachers, administrators and other students. Participants' confidentiality also was protected by having only me and my assistants handle the questionnaires which were kept in a locked office during the testing periods.

A battery of pencil-paper self report surveys including a demographics information questionnaire, the CSI, the SPPA, the CRISEE and the BSI was administered to students during their SCORE classes at both the pre and post assessment times. Pre-test measures (Time 1) were gathered during the two class sessions during the third week of classes. This time frame was chosen to ensure stability in class attendance. The order of the questionnaires, except for the demographic questionnaire, was counterbalanced so surveys distributed on A days were in the opposite order of B days. SCORE teachers also were asked to complete the teacher evaluation form (Allen et al., 1989) for each of his or her students during the fourth week of school. This time frame was selected to allow time for the teachers to interact with and to get to know the students. Students and teachers were asked to complete the same questionnaires at the end of the SCORE course. Post-test measures (Time 2) were taken with two weeks left in the semester, thus allowing for time needed for make-up days, course review, and final exams. Graduate and advanced undergraduate students from a nearby university assisted in the administration of the questionnaires to ensure that no biases occurred.

Student grades and disciplinary action counts were collected at the end of the fall semester (after the completion of Project SCORE) and again at the end of the spring semester. Therefore, Time 1 and Time 2 of the various questionnaires do not coincide with Time 1 and Time 2 grades or disciplinary problems. The scores earned on the math and reading sections of

the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test were gathered early in the spring semester.

Because the majority of the students were Hispanic, all of the surveys were available in Spanish to students who were more comfortable reading in their native language. A total of 40 students chose to complete at least one of the surveys in Spanish. Surveys were translated into Spanish by bilingual graduate students, and double-checked by two other bilingual graduate students. In addition, I, as well as one bilingual assistant, was present during each administration of the surveys in order to explain each set of directions as well as answer any questions.

Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations were used to study biographical information from Time 1 and Time 2 as well as to determine the level of satisfaction with the course. One correlation matrix was created for the EHS sample to examine the relationships between all variables used in the study. For CHS, a correlation matrix including grades, TAKS scores and days with disciplinary actions taken against students was created to analyze the relationships between the variables available. Alpha was set at .001 in order to control for error variance. Repeated measures ANOVA's with gender as the between subjects variable were also done to compare means at Time 1 and Time 2 for the EHS sample. One-way ANOVAs were used to compare means of variables for the students at EHS and GPAs for EHS and CHS. Lastly, in an attempt to determine which variables had the greatest influence on GPA at Time 1 and Time 2, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. A second hierarchical regression was run using GPA at the end of the spring semester as the dependent variable.

RESULTS

Descriptive Results

Pearson product moment correlations were conducted for all measures in this research and are presented separately by schools project (EHS, see Table 2, CHS, see Table 3).

Program Evaluation

Study Habits

Repeated measures ANOVAs, with time as the within subjects variable and gender as the between subjects variable, were used to examine the influences of time and gender on the use of various study skills (see Table 4). For the CSI "Monitoring" subscale, a significant time by gender interaction emerged, $F(1, 264) = 4.54$, $p < .005$, revealing that while girls' scores on this subscale were higher at both Time 1 ($M = 35.39$, $SD = 8.21$, Cohen's $d = .50$) and Time 2 ($M = 32.69$, $SD = 8.28$, Cohen's $d = .22$) than the boys' (T1 $M = 31.52$, $SD = 7.29$; T2 $M = 30.90$, $SD = 8.15$), the girls showed a greater decline in their use of this skill over time.

The "Repetition" subscale revealed no interaction effect, $F(1, 272) = 2.69$, $p = .102$, nor effect for time, $F(1, 272) = .334$, $p = .564$. There was however a significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 272) = 33.65$, $p < .001$. Girls reported greater use of the study skill repetition ($M = 28.08$, $SD = 7.33$, Cohen's $d = .61$) than the boys ($M = 23.65$, $SD = 7.24$), indicating a higher use of activities related to rote memory of information and coping with difficult or distracting learning environments.

For the "Integration" subscale, no time by gender interaction effect, $F(1, 267) = 3.32$, $p = .07$, nor main effect for time, $F(1, 267) = 3.64$, $p = .06$, was found. There was a significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 267) = 6.04$, $p < .05$. Girls ($M = 35.45$, $SD = 10.39$, Cohen's $d = .26$)

reported a greater use than boys (M = 32.80, SD = 10.01), suggesting that girls were more able to integrate ideas from their text books than the boys.

Last, for the "Coping" subscale, there was neither a gender by time interaction, $F(1, 271) = 1.66$, $p = .199$, nor main effect for time, $F(1, 271) = 1.82$, $p = .178$. A significant main effect for gender, however, emerged, $F(1, 271) = 7.17$, $p < .01$. Girls (M = 17.68, SD = 4.89, Cohen's d = .26) reported greater use of behaviors to cope with frustrations or distracting situations than the boys (M = 16.49, SD = 4.34).

Mental Health

A repeated measures ANOVA, with time as the within subjects variable and gender as the between subjects variable, was used to examine the EHS general mental health and well-being (see Table 4). For general mental health and well being, as measured by the BSI, there was no significant interaction, $F(1, 242) = .975$, $p = .324$, nor main effect for time, $F(1, 242) = 3.40$, $p = .067$. There was however, a significant effect for gender, $F(1, 242) = 5.34$, $p < .05$. Girls (M = 4.35, SD = 2.02, Cohen's d = .27) scored significantly higher than boys (M = 3.82, SD = 1.93), indicating that girls reported more symptoms of distress at both Time 1 and Time 2 than boys.

Self Esteem/Self Perception

For the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents, repeated measures ANOVAs revealed that there were no time by gender interaction effects for the school, $F(1, 244) = .320$, $p = .572$, social, $F(1, 244) = 2.46$, $p = .118$, behavior, $F(1, 246) = .045$, $p = .831$, or self worth, $F(1, 248) = .000$, $p = .984$, subscales. For the school subscale there was no main effect for gender, $F(1, 244) = 1.81$, $p=.180$, but there was a main effect for time, $F(1, 244) = 3.80$, $p<.05$. Students reported significantly higher scores at the end of the fall (M = 13.73, SD = 3.29, Cohen's d = .10) than at

the beginning of the fall (M = 13.39, SD = 3.19), suggesting that the students belief in their academic competence increased over the semester they were in the class.

For the social subscale there were no main effects for time, $F(1, 244) = 1.94$, $p = .165$, nor gender, $F(1, 244) = .127$, $p = .722$. On the behavior subscale, there was no time effect, $F(1, 246) = .158$, $p = .692$, but there was a main effect for gender, $F(1, 246) = 9.83$, $p < .005$. Girls (M = 14.57, SD = 2.80, Cohen's d = .38) perceived themselves as having better conduct than the boys (M = 13.51, SD = 2.73). For the self-worth subscale no main effects for time, $F(1, 248) = .010$, $p = .921$, or gender, $F(1,248) = .037$, $p = .848$, emerged.

Coping Skills

A repeated measures ANOVA for the CRISEE revealed no significant time by gender interaction, $F(1, 204)=.531$, $p = .467$. There were however, main effects for gender, $F(1, 204) = 5.09$, $p < .05$ and for time, $F(1,204) = 60.56$, $p < .001$. Overall, girls scored lower (M = 1.63, SD = .12, Cohen's d = .26) than boys (M = 1.66, SD = .11), revealing that girls did not feel as supported and able to cope with stressors as the boys. Coping resources at the end of the fall semester were higher (M = 1.68, SD = .12, Cohen's d = .61) than at the beginning of the fall semester (M = 1.61, SD = .11), indicating that at the end of the fall semester, students felt more free to express their feelings, that their families were supportive and accepting, and that they had more resources to cope with external stressors at the end of the semester.

Discipline Problems

Repeated measures ANOVAs were used to compare EHS and CHS students on the number of days of disciplinary actions across the two semesters (see Table 5). For this analysis, the number of days in the alternative education program (AEP) within the school and the number of days suspended from school were combined to create a total number of days with disciplinary

problems. There was a significant time by school interaction, $F(1, 949) = 13.72$, $p < .001$. These findings seem to indicate that more behavioral problems occur at EHS ($M = .46$, $SD = 1.19$, Cohen's $d = .42$) than CHS ($M = .08$, $SD = .46$), especially during the spring semester (EHS $M = .60$, $SD = 1.52$, Cohen's $d = .22$; CHS $M = .09$, $SD = .45$), even though the student populations appear to be quite similar in terms of number of students, race, gender, and SES. It is possible that the difference could also have to do with new administrators at EHS who were more inclined to use AEP and IHS for discipline.

GPA/Academics

Repeated measures ANOVAs also were used to look at the variability of grades from the fall to spring semesters for EHS students (see Table 6). The GPA was found by averaging grades earned in the four main categories (i.e., English, Science, History and Math). For EHS students, there was not a significant interaction effect $F(1, 260) = .954$, $p = .330$. There were however significant time effects, $F(1, 260) = 7.16$, $p < .01$, and gender effects, $F(1,260) = 15.42$, $p < .001$, for overall GPA. Higher GPAs were earned at the end of fall semester ($M = 77.54$ $SD = 6.21$, Cohen's $d = .116$) than at the end of spring semester ($M = 76.79$, $SD = 6.73$). It is possible that grades were higher at the end of the fall semester because of the support the students had during this semester or because the courses became more difficult in the spring. Girls earned significantly higher grades ($M = 78.64$, $SD = 6.27$, Cohen's $d = .45$) than did the boys ($M = 75.78$, $SD = 6.35$) over the course of the 9th grade. The difference between the grades earned by the boys and girls could be due to many factors such as girls feeling more support from teachers or family or because girls tended to use more study skills than boys.

When looking separately at each of the four classes, few significant effects were found. Science revealed no interaction effects, $F(1, 265) = .797$, $p = .373$, nor effects for time, $F(1, 265)$

= .856 , p = .356, or gender, $F(1, 265) = 3.898$, $p < .05$. For English, there was no interaction, $F(1, 265) = 1.79$, p = .182, nor effects for time, $F(1, 265) = .123$, $p = .726$. There was, however, a significant gender effect, $F(1, 265) = 16.71$, $p < .001$; the girls scores were higher (M = 78.37, SD = 8.88, Cohen's d = .46) than the boys (M = 74.41, SD = 8.50).

History was similar, revealing no interaction effect, $F(1, 264) = .026$, p = .872, nor effect for time, $F(1, 264) = 1.64$, p = .202. Again, an effect for gender was found, $F(1, 264) = 7.35$, $p < .01$; girls scored significantly higher (M = 80.13, SD = 7.79, Cohen's d = .28) than boys (M = 77.74, SD = 9.29). For math there was not a significant interaction effect, $F(1,262) = .265$, p = .607, but there were significant effects for both time, $F(1,262) = 23.26$, $p < .001$, and for gender, $F(1,262) = 6.196$, $p < .01$. Math scores were significantly higher at the end of the fall (M = 78.16, SD = 8.65, Cohen's d = .23) than at the end of the spring (M = 76.13, SD = 9.04) and, once again, girls scored significantly higher (M = 78.42, SD = 8.31, Cohen's d = .28) than the boys (M = 75.95, SD = 9.18). These gender differences could be due to support from teachers, greater use of study skills or because girls believed academics to be more important than the boys and therefore put forth greater amounts of effort to excel.

It was hoped that because of skills learned in Project SCORE, grades would improve throughout the 9th grade year. It is possible though that while the students were in the SCORE class they were reminded and encouraged to use the new study and life skills, which led to higher grades in that term. But in the spring semester, because the students were not being reminded on a regular basis to use the skills they had learned, their grades may have fallen. There also is the possibility that the lessons learned in the SCORE class kept grades in the spring semester from falling even more dramatically because there was some knowledge and understanding of what needed to be done in order to be successful in school.

For CHS there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 530) = .001$, $p = .971$ for semester grades (see Table 7). There were, however, main effects for GPA, $F(1, 530) = 15.12$, $p < .001$ and gender, $F(1, 530) = 19.54$, $p < .001$. Scores at the end of the fall semester ($M = 75.69$, $SD = 7.80$, Cohen's $d = .089$) were higher than at the end of the spring semester ($M = 74.96$, $SD = 8.48$), and grades for the girls were significantly higher ($M = 76.83$, $SD = 7.57$, Cohen's $d = .37$) than the boys ($M = 73.88$, $SD = 8.42$). Repeated measures ANOVAs revealed a significant gender by time interaction for grades in science, $F(1, 571) = 10.70$, $p < .005$, as well as main effects for time, $F(1, 264) = .026$, $p = .872$, and gender, $F(1, 264) = .026$, $p = .872$. Although both boys and girls earned higher grades in the spring semester, the girls ($M = 79.22$, $SD = 8.54$) did significantly better than the boys ($M = 76.25$, $SD = 9.48$). For the math, there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 572) = 5.76$, $p < .05$, nor main effects for gender, $F(1, 572) = 4.32$, $p < .05$. There was however, a significant time effect, $F(1, 572) = 63.07$, $p < .001$. Grades earned during the spring semester ($M = 72.04$, $SD = 11.24$, Cohen's $d = .21$) were significantly lower than those earned in the fall ($M = 74.34$, $SD = 10.29$). This decline may have been due to an emphasis on math skills during the fall semester in preparation for the TAKS test to be taken early in the spring semester. For History, there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 576) = .773$, $p = .380$. There were, however, effects for both time, $F(1, 576) = 78.96$, $p < .001$ and gender, $F(1, 572) = 63.07$, $p < .001$. These results showed that grades earned in history were significantly higher in the fall ($M = 75.68$, $SD = 10.28$, Cohen's $d = .28$) than in the spring ($M = 72.67$ $SD = 10.85$), and that the girls earned significantly higher grades ($M = 76.57$ $SD = 9.89$, Cohen's $d = .46$) than the boys ($M = 71.88$ $SD = 10.69$). For English, there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 539) = 1.23$, $p = .268$, nor main effect for time, $F(1, 539) = .249$, $p = .618$. There was, however, a gender effect, $F(1, 539) = 27.74$, p

< .001; girls scores were higher (M = 79.44, SD = 8.43, Cohen's d = .42) than the boys (M = 75.65, SD = 9.56).

Repeated measures ANOVAs also were used to look at the variability of grades from the fall and spring semesters for EHS and CHS students (see Table 8). For overall GPA, there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 867) = .643$, $p = .423$, but there were main effects for time, $F(1, 867) = 30.243$, $p < .001$, and school, $F(1, 867) = 11.273$, $p < .005$. EHS students had higher overall GPA's (M = 77.05, SD = 6.75, Cohen's d = .24) than the CHS students (M = 75.28, SD = 8.17), and that total GPAs for both schools were significantly higher at the end of the fall semester (M = 76.32, SD = 7.37, Cohen's d = *.10*) than at the end of the spring semester (M = 75.45, SD = 8.14). For science grades, a time by school interaction emerged, $F(1, 922) = 29.05$, $p < .001$, revealing that grades significantly improved from fall (M = 75.46, SD = 8.64, Cohen's d = .24) to spring semesters (M = 77.62, SD = 9.24), but only for the CHS students. For math, there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 919) = .000$, $p = .999$, but there were main effects for time, $F(1, 919) = 80.73$, $p < .001$, and school, $F(1, 919) = 29.48$, $p < .001$. These results indicate that math grades at both schools dropped significantly from the fall (M = 75.47, SD = 9.96, Cohen's d = .22) to the spring (M = 73.16, SD = 10.99) semesters, and that EHS math scores were significantly higher (M = 76.79, SD = 9.21, Cohen's d = .37) than CHS scores (M = 73.11, SD = 10.84). For history, a significant interaction effect was discovered, $F(1, 926) = 6.54$, $p < .01$, revealing that although grades for both schools declined over the course of 9th grade, the decline for CHS students was significant from the fall (M = 75.68, SD = 10.28, Cohen's d = .28) to the spring semester (M = 72.67, SD = 10.85). Last, for English, no interaction effect, $F(1, 884) = .43$, $p = .51$, or main effect for time, $F(1, 884) = 1.60$, $p = .21$, was found. There was, however, a main

effect for school, $F(1,884) = 4.24$, $p < .05$. CHS students earned higher grades ($M = 77.52$, $SD = 9.33$) than EHS students ($M = 76.26$, $SD = 9.44$, Cohen's $d = .13$).

Last, the pass/fail ratio was similar for EHS and CHS for the reading subtest of the TAKS, χ^2 (1, N = 307) = .002, p = .96; 56.6% for EHS students and 56.9% of the CHS students passed. For the math subtest, significantly more EHS students (57.02%) than CHS students (15.62%) passed, $\chi^2(1, N = 299) = 34.53$, $p < .001$. It is unclear why EHS students did significantly better on the math section. It is possible that because they were a low performing school more emphasis was placed on math skills, which could also explain why the math classroom grade was higher for EHS.

Exploratory Analyses

Teacher Evaluations

Repeated measures ANOVAs with time as the within subjects variable and gender as the between subjects variable were used to examine the influences of time and gender on teacher evaluations (see Table 9). For question 1, "quality of peer relationships", there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 157) = .50$, $p = .48$, nor was there a main effect for gender, $F(1, 157) = .3.91$, $p = .050$. There was however, a significant time effect, $F(1, 157) = 13.85$, $p < .001$, with scores at Time 1 ($M = 6.22$, $SD = .85$, Cohen's $d = .31$) being significantly higher than at Time 2 ($M = 5.92$, $SD = 1.06$). This finding suggests that as the SCORE teachers interacted with the students over the course of the semester their perception of the quality of the students' peer relationships decreased. It also could mean that peer relationships truly declined and the teachers were able to pick up on these changes.

Question 2, "classroom behavior" revealed no significant interaction effect, $F(1, 157) = .03$, $p = .87$, nor a significant effect for time, $F(1, 157) = .17$, $p = .68$, but did reveal a gender

effect, $F(1, 157) = 17.61$, $p < .001$. The SCORE teachers rated girls to be more controlled and respectful ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 1.34$, Cohen's $d = .62$) than the boys ($M = 5.07$, $SD = 1.73$). For "mood/activity level", question 3, there was no interaction effect, $F(1, 157) = 1.78$, $p = .184$. There was, however, a main effect for time, $F(1, 157) = 7.86$, $p < .01$ and gender $F(1, 157) = 9.42$, $p < .005$, revealing higher scores at Time 1 ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 1.15$, Cohen's $d = .25$) than at Time 2 ($M = 5.41$, $SD = 1.41$) and higher scores for the girls ($M = 5.83$, $SD = 1.22$, Cohen's $d = .41$) than the boys ($M = 5.32$, $SD = 1.28$). These findings indicate that the teachers may have perceived a decline in their students' confidence and eagerness over time or that as the semester ended, students had become less happy and less outgoing in the SCORE class. The higher score for the girls reveals that the teachers perceived them to be more outgoing, confident and eager than the boys.

Individual Differences

I examined the potential influences of individual student differences such as wanting to attend a four-year college, participating in extracurricular activities and feeling prepared for classes and tests on each of the variables. Results showed that these variables did not have a significant effect on grades, coping, self perception or discipline.

Predicting GPA

To determine which variables had the greatest influence on GPA at the end of the fall and spring semesters, two different hierarchical regression analyses were performed for the girls and boys attending EHS. The first used GPA at the end of the fall semester as the dependent variable. For the girls (see Table 10), individual student differences (e.g., wanting to attend a four-year college, participating in extracurricular activities and feeling prepared for classes and tests) were entered at step one. These variables accounted for just over 5% of the GPA variance, $F(4, 93) =$

1.26, $p = .29$. Academic factors measured by CSI (Integration, Repetition, Monitoring, and Coping) at Time 2 were entered at step two, and accounted for 10.50% of the GPA variance, $F(4, 89) = 2.77$, $p < .05$. The CRISEE was entered into the equation at step three, and did not account for a significant amount of additional variance, $F(1, 88) = .03$, $p = .87$. At step four, the SPPA scales accounted for an additional 19.50% of the GPA variance, $F(4, 84) = 6.32$, $p < .001$. At step five, the BSI accounted for a nonsignificant 1.60% additional variance, $F(1, 83) = 2.08$, $p = .15$. With the number of days of disciplinary actions entered in the last step, an additional 2.30% of the variance was accounted for, $F(2, 81) = 1.54$, $p = .22$. The final model accounted for 39.10% of the Fall GPA variance, $F(16, 81) = 3.25$, $p < .001$. Overall, only having a positive self concept regarding school ($\beta = .406$) was related to better grades.

For the boys (see Table 11), individual student differences were again entered at step one. These variables accounted for 16.6% of the GPA variance, $F(4, 83) = 4.14$, $p < .005$. Academic factors measured by CSI (Integration, Repetition, Monitoring, and Coping) at Time 2 were entered at step two, and accounted for 5.50% of the GPA variance, $F(4, 79) = 1.39$, $p = .25$. The CRISEE was entered into the equation at step three, and did not account for a significant amount of additional variance, $F(1, 78) = .35$, $p = .56$. At step four, the SPPA scales accounted for an additional 7.90% of the GPA variance, $F(4, 74) = 2.08$, $p = .09$. At step five, the BSI accounted for a nonsignificant 1.30% of additional variance, $F(1, 73) = 1.39$, $p = .24$. With the number of days of disciplinary actions entered in the last step, an additional 2.00% of the variance was accounted for, $F(2, 71) = 1.07$, $p = .35$. The final model accounted for 33.60% of the Fall GPA variance, $F(16, 71) = 2.25$, $p < .01$. None of the variables were significantly related to better grades.

The second round of hierarchical regressions was run using GPA at the end of the spring semester as the dependent variable (see Tables 12). For girls, GPA at the end of the fall semester was entered in the first step to control for prior academic performance and accounted for more than 54% of the variance of the spring GPA, $F(1, 93) = 112.31$, $p < .001$. Individual student differences were entered at step two and accounted for a nonsignificant 1.60% of the variance, $F(4, 89) = .80$, $p = .53$. The addition of the CSI variables at step three accounted for a nonsignificant 2.70% of the variance, $F(4, 85) = 1.40$, $p = .24$. The CRISEE, which was added into the equation at step four, was nonsignificant as well, $F(1, 84) = .24$, $p = .63$. At step five, the SPPA scales accounted for a nonsignificant increase of 2.90% of the variance, beyond that already explained by fall grades, $F(4, 80) = 1.54$, $p = .20$. At step six, with the BSI was entered and no additional variance was explained, $F(1, 79) = .00$, $p = .98$. Finally, with the addition of days of disciplinary actions, a nonsignificant addition of 2.00% of the variance was accounted for, $F(2,77) = 2.18$, $p = .120$. The final model accounted for 64% of the variance $F(17, 77) = 8.07$, $p<.001$. As expected, only GPA at Time 1 significantly and positively explained students' GPA at Time 2 ($\beta = .71$).

A second hierarchical regression also was run for the boys using GPA at the end of the spring semester as the dependent variable (see Table 13). For the boys, GPA at the end of the fall semester was entered in the first step to control for prior academic performance and accounted for more than 38% of the variance of the spring GPA, $F(1, 85) = 52.73$, $p < .001$. Individual student differences were entered at step two and accounted for a nonsignificant 7.50% of the variance, $F(4, 81) = 2.82$, $p < .05$. The addition of the CSI variables at step three accounted for a nonsignificant 1.20% of the variance, $F(4, 77) = .42$, $p = .79$. The CRISEE was added into the equation at step four and was nonsignificant as well, $F(1, 76) = 1.26$, $p = .27$. At step five,

the SPPA scales accounted for a significant increase of 11.40% of the variance, beyond that already explained by fall grades, $F(4, 72) = 5.05$, $p < .001$. At step six, with the BSI entered, only .20% additional variance was explained, $F(1, 71) = .37$, $p = .55$. Finally, with the addition of days of disciplinary actions, a nonsignificant addition of 2.60% of the variance was accounted for, $F(2, 69) = 2.34$, $p = .10$. The final model accounted for 62.10% of the variance $F(17, 69) = 6.64$, $p<.001$. As expected, only GPA at Time 1 significantly and positively explained students' GPA at Time 2 ($\beta = .51$) as did feeling prepared for classes each day ($\beta = .31$).

Course Evaluations

At the end of the fall semester the students at EHS completed a confidential course evaluation for Project SCORE. Because the students were not asked to give identifying information for the evaluation, more specific analyses could not be completed that linked there data to their scores on the other measures. Overall, the students reported that they were somewhat satisfied ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.11$) with the course. Students believed that the course would make them somewhat more successful in high school ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.09$) and that the course would help make the transition from middle school to high school easier ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.14$). Lastly, the students were only somewhat committed to the program ($M = 2.88$, $SD = .93$). Of the topics taught, Using the Library ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.03$) was found to be most helpful academically, followed by Memory and Concentration ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.13$) and Positive Thinking/Self-Talk ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.13$). These differences were not statistically significant. The topics thought to be most helpful for personal and social success were found to be Using the Library ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.29$), followed by Study Skills ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.17$) and Goal Setting and Motivation ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.19$). Again, these differences were not statistically significant. The only significant difference between topics thought to be helpful for personal success were

between Using the Library ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.29$) and Reading Skills ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.28$) $p < .05$

The teachers at EHS completed evaluations at the end of the semester as well, indicating their level of satisfaction and commitment to the program. Overall, the teachers reported being somewhat satisfied ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.41$) with the curriculum and believed that the program was only a little effective ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.00$) at teaching life skills and study skills to the freshmen. Introduction to EHS ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.50$), Time Management ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.50$), Stress and Coping ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.50$), and Character Development ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.50$) were seen by the teachers to be most helpful for students' academic success whereas Learning Styles ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .82$), Report Writing ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .82$), and Career Exploration ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .82$) were thought of as least helpful. Differences between academically most and least helpful were not significant. For personal success, Time Management ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.50$) and Stress and Coping ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.50$) were believed to be most helpful, whereas Report Writing ($M = 1.75$, $SD = .50$) and Career Exploration ($M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.26$) were least helpful. Again, these differences were not significant. Overall, the teachers indicated that the information was presented in a way that was "somewhat" organized ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.71$) and easy to understand ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 1.26$). The amount of commitment from the SCORE teachers ranged from "a little" to "extremely" ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 1.26$). Teachers indicated that they could see the positives in the curriculum but that it needed further "development" and "improved activities."

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the first year curriculum of Project SCORE, a multidimensional intervention class designed to provide students with fundamental academic and life skills over the four years of high school. The overall goal of Project SCORE is to help students be successful within academics, organized sports, jobs, families and their interpersonal relationships. The 9th grade coursework combines self-regulation, goal setting and other learning theories to encourage positive thoughts and actions, develop self-esteem and self-concept, inspire critical thinking, and improve memory and use of critical study skills. It was hypothesized that the 9th grade course would improve freshmen students' grades, learning strategies, information retention, self-esteem, and ability to cope with daily stressors, and decrease the number of disciplinary problems they experienced in comparison to freshmen at a control school who were not enrolled in the program. Unfortunately, due to circumstances beyond my control, (i.e., miscommunications with the administration and extenuating circumstances), the control school was not available for self-report data collection. This limitation meant that self report variables regarding self-concept, coping resources, study skills, and mental health were only compared at Time 1 and Time 2 within the experimental group. The control high school, CHS, was available for between group comparisons on grades, discipline and TAKS scores at the end of the fall and spring semesters. The control school was chosen because of its similarity to EHS in terms of student population, racial make-up, and socio economic status.

EHS Results

Study Skills

Overall, the girls reported using more study skills than the boys. In particular, they were more likely than the boys to apply rote memorization, deal effectively with difficult learning environments, and integrate information from their textbooks at both the beginning and end of the fall semester. This finding is consistent with Pintrich and Zusho (2002) who found that females show a higher use of self-regulatory strategies, such as study skills, than the boys and also tend to put forth more time and effort into their studies than male students (Sulaiman & Mahezar, 2006). In general, the study skills measured by the CSI (i.e., repetition, monitoring and integration) were found to correlate positively with the grades earned at the end of the fall semester in English and Science, as well as with the overall GPA. This correlation shows that even though the SCORE class did not have a significant effect on the use of study skills as measured by the CSI, students who used more study skills earned higher grades. In addition, students reported that the lesson on general study skills was one of the most helpful for them academically.

Mental Health

Although there were no significant differences across the semester, EHS girls had more mental health concerns and significantly higher levels of psychological distress than boys. This finding is consistent with previous research (West & Sweeting, 2003) that showed girls had an increased amount of discomfort and distress represented by skin problems, headaches, aches and psychological problems, and that women consistently scored lower than men on emotional stability (Nguyen, Allen, & Fraccastoro, 2005). In general, the girls in this sample truly may experience more physical symptoms and psychological distress than boys during adolescence, or they may have felt more comfortable expressing their feelings and mental health concerns than the boys. It also could be that the boys in this sample tended to be more guarded with respect to

their emotions than the girls and did not express their feelings as readily. This lack of openness is common for most boys, in that they are often taught to be tough and to hide behind an emotionless mask. It is likely that SCORE helped EHS students, especially the girls, feel more supported and more comfortable expressing their feelings, while encouraging them to find new ways of coping with various life stressors, even though the effect was not significant. SCORE's focus on life skills such as stress and coping and positive thinking did not seem to have a significant impact on students' mental health, but it may have helped keep their mental health and levels of psychological distress from deteriorating more rapidly across the semester.

Self Concept

In this study, self perception of academic abilities, as measured by the SPPA, was found to improve with time during the fall semester for both genders. Perhaps there was some initial fear in the ability to complete their academic work or to fit in at the high school level, but by the end of the fall semester, both boys and girls felt more capable and competent academically. For the EHS girls, this new found confidence predicted better grades at the end of the fall semester. This academic achievement positively affected self concept, and seemed to fit with the belief that people tend to invest their time and energy in activities that give them a sense of self worth (Bandura, 1997). It is believed that participation in SCORE encouraged the girls to use various life and study skills. Their academic success thus boosted their self esteem and helped the girls believe in their abilities and in the importance of education.

Coping

Coping resources, as measured by the CRISEE, were found to be higher at the end of the fall semester in comparison to the beginning, for the male and female students at EHS. Coping resources at the end of the fall semester also were found to correlate positively with self-

perceptions, showing that students with greater available resources to cope with various situations had more positive perceptions of their self worth and abilities academically, socially and behaviorally. This finding is consistent with Pintrich and Zusho (1992) who stated that students who are able to regulate their own learning in the face of multiple distractions perform and learn better than students who lack self regulatory capabilities. The CRISEE also was negatively correlated with the BSI, indicating that those students who had more coping resources, reported fewer mental health concerns. Greater coping resources may lead to greater emotional stability, and therefore more academic success (Nguyen, et.al, 2005). These findings suggest that SCORE helped students feel more socially and academically confident, free to express their feelings and opinions, and cope better with various external stressors. In addition, it is likely that support from teachers and the SCORE program, specifically the stress and coping and positive thinking lessons, protected some of the students, shielding them from social and environmental risk factors while enhancing self-efficacy and self-esteem (Bryan, 2005).

Discipline Problems

Overall, girls received fewer disciplinary actions than the boys. This result was expected because minority males tend to place value on peers who are low academic achievers and who try not to follow school rules (Graham and Taylor, 2002). In addition, Kenney-Benson, Patrick, Pomerantz and Ryan (2006) reported that girls tend to refrain from engaging in disruptive behaviors more than boys. For EHS students, regardless of gender, individual coursework grades were positively correlated with one another, and negatively correlated with disciplinary problems. In other words, students who performed well within one academic course, tended to do well in all of their coursework, and students who had more disciplinary problems performed more poorly academically. These findings support the notion that children who are successful in

school are more likely to comply with social norms (Catalano & Hawkins, 1996; as cited in Matsen & Coatsworth, 1998). The results also are consistent with previous research (Barton et al., 1998, cited in Flay et al., 2001) that reported that frequency of offenses is related negatively to achievement in math, reading, science and social studies. It is possible that those students who had more problems with discipline may have believed they did not have the skills to perform academically, and thus misbehaved or acted out as their way of enhancing their self esteem and fitting in with peers (Rosenberg, Schooler, & Schoenbach, 1989). Research has shown that many children respond to stress by disengaging emotionally, which may lead to them being confrontational and impulsive (Berlin & Davis, 1989 as cited in Martinek & Hellison, 1998). Other research (Ogbu, 1991, as cited in Lopez, Ehly & Vasquez, 2002) indicates that minority students purposefully fail in the classroom to avoid taking on characteristics of those believed to have oppressed them in the past. More likely though is that adolescents from minority groups fail to be successful academically because of differences in cultural values (Trueba, 1988, as cited in Lopez, et. al., 2002). It is perhaps for these reasons that SCORE did not have as much of an impact academically as was hoped.

For students who do not believe that earning good grades, doing homework, staying out of trouble and conforming to school rules and regulations are important, SCORE may not be enough to change their perception of themselves or their academic abilities. The Texas Education Agency (1985) stated that students needed to develop a positive attitude about the study skills and life skills they are taught so that the skills will transfer from school to real life. If students do not develop this more positive outlook, they will most likely continue to act out, join gangs and survive as best they can (Martinek & Hellison, 1998). Ogbu (1997, as cited in Martinek & Hellison, 1998), found that African Americans living in the inner city are especially resistant to

conforming to the school rules and developing a positive attitude toward academics. This resistance is due to the fact that the student sees few benefits for accepting and adopting these values and behaviors. It also is believed that youth who have developed negative expectations about their future are more likely to engage in behaviors that may compromise their health and their future (Danish & Nellen, 1997). In addition, some research has found that "the power of the street" and gang membership are too strong for any intervention to be successful (Martinek & Hellison, 1998), because gang membership is in itself an identity that means power and success to those involved. This resistance is similar to that displayed by many of the students at EHS. Although the majority of the EHS sample was Hispanic, the gang presence at the school was felt daily by both the girls and boys. According to the students, the gangs the students belong to or associate with become their family and the support they receive from the other gang members never pertains to academic enhancement, rather, it provides a source of identity and confidence.

GPA/Academic Success

It is important to note that the girls scored higher than the boys in all four of their core 9th grade courses across both semesters. This finding is consistent with Duckworth and Seligman (2006), who reported that girls earn higher grades than boys in all major subjects, including math and science. According to Viadero (2006), this gender difference is to be expected because boys have a difficult time in school and their problems tend to worsen as they move from elementary to high school. Other research indicates that this gender difference may be a part of a trend for boys who believe that school is not as important as it once was and therefore choose to "slide" through their academics (Viadero, 2006). It is possible though that the girls in this study, who were rated as more controlled, respectful and confident by their SCORE teachers, were able to obtain direct support with their schoolwork through SCORE, utilize various study skills, and thus

were able to cope with the multiple challenges of adolescence, giving them an academic advantage over the boys. These findings are consistent with Harter (1985, as cited in Lopez et. al., 2002), who found that girls perceived higher levels of support from family and friends and earned higher grades than boys. SCORE did not seem to have a direct impact on grades, possibly because the class focused on general study strategies as opposed to class specific skills such as punctuation or multiplication. Even though SCORE did not directly influence student grades, it is possible that the course helped to keep grades from falling more dramatically across semesters.

Between School Comparisons

Comparisons of academic performance measures revealed that EHS students earned higher overall GPAs than CHS students at the end of both the fall and spring semesters, suggesting that EHS students performed better academically. Results also show that overall GPAs at both schools were higher at the end of the fall semester than at the end of the spring semester for boys and girls. More specifically, math and history grades at EHS were found to be significantly higher than at CHS across the 9th grade year, whereas science and English grades were higher for CHS students. In addition to the SCORE class, the administration at EHS took steps to guarantee students were in math class every day, instead of every other day as would be expected in a normal block schedule. CHS students also attended math everyday. The SCORE curriculum did not specifically teach math skills, but it is possible that because SCORE helped students feel more confident academically and capable of dealing with stressors, students may have been more able to cope with math related anxiety, and therefore perform better in their math class. Based on information obtained from the EHS principal, steps were going to be taken during the following academic year to offer more support to students in English and reading, with the goal of improving grades and scores on the TAKS. It also is a possibility that SCORE

did not directly affect students' grades because of slight differences in the school environments, administrators, teachers and students at the two campuses. Because CHS students did not participate in the self report data collection, it may be impossible to determine the true cause for these differences.

Overall, during the semester the EHS students were enrolled in SCORE their grades were higher than the following semester when they were not enrolled in the course. It seems that during the fall semester students felt supported and encouraged academically by the SCORE class and thus were able to excel. Providing social support has been found to be especially important for improving academic achievement in the Hispanic culture, which was the predominant culture represented at EHS (Lopez et. al., 2002). Research has shown that when self esteem and the value of education are emphasized, as was the case during the fall semester for EHS freshmen who were enrolled in SCORE, students do well in school (Sampson, 2005). The focus on self-regulation skills, academic skills, such as note taking, study skills, and test taking strategies, as well as the life skills of self-confidence, positive thinking and coping, appear to have had a positive effect while the EHS students were enrolled in the course. By incorporating self regulation strategies into the SCORE curriculum, students were able to use feedback from their performances and their environment to change and adapt their behaviors in order to accomplish their goals during the fall semester. The EHS students' overall GPAs remained higher than CHS students across the entire freshmen year. So even though grades dropped from fall to spring semesters, the strategies learned in the SCORE course may have kept the grades from declining more drastically during the spring semester.

Regarding the state's annual assessment of learning, significantly more EHS students who were enrolled in SCORE passed the math portion of the TAKS test than did the CHS

students. There were no differences in the pass/fail ratio for the reading portion of the TAKS. This difference was expected since EHS math grades across both semesters were significantly higher than those of CHS students. Interestingly, for EHS students, both the reading and math scores correlated with self-perceptions of the students' academic abilities. These results indicate that the students who had more positive beliefs about their academic abilities were more likely to pass the TAKS test. According to Feld and Lewis (1969, in Wigfield & Eccles, 1989), poor self evaluation related stronger to children's achievement scores than did other test factors. This finding makes sense because those students who are more confident in their abilities are less anxious and therefore more apt to do well on standardized tests.

Students at EHS had significantly more school days that contained disciplinary actions than CHS students for both the fall and spring semesters. The numbers were especially high during the spring semester. It appears as if, even though SCORE did not reduce the overall number of disciplinary actions in comparison to CHS, the students involved in the SCORE course still benefited academically, as shown by the higher overall GPAs for EHS students. Disciplinary actions were related negatively to math and history grades at Time 1 and English and math grades at Time 2 for EHS students. These findings are similar to previous research that found an association between problem behaviors and academic underachievement (Simons-Morton et al., 1999, in Flay et al., 2001). One explanation for the higher GPAs for EHS students is that the school's administrators seem to respond actively to problem behaviors. This supports the belief that schools like EHS can have a lasting impact on student's long-term behaviors (St. Leger's, 1999, cited in Flay, 2001).

Predicting Semester Grades

Students' perceptions of their academic ability, as measured by the SPPA, predicted academic performance, revealing that a positive self concept regarding school was related to better grades at the end of the fall semester for the girls. For the boys, there were no significant predictors for fall grades. Frederickson, 2000 (cited in Flay, et al., 2001), stated when children feel positively about themselves and their abilities, they tend to engage in more positive behaviors. Repeated failures though, diminish children's perceptions of their abilities, and may lead some children to believe their failures are truly due to a lack of ability, causing feelings of shame and humiliation (Covington & Omelich, 1979 in Wigfield & Eccles, 1989). It is important to remember though that achievement in a particular domain will not have a positive impact on an individual unless the individual values success in that domain (Rose & Larkin, 2002). By improving the girls' feelings of academic self-concept and the belief in their ability to do well in school, the course was then able to have a positive affect on grades during the semester they were enrolled in SCORE. This finding is consistent with Gumora and Arsenio (2002) who showed that students who believe they are good at school perform better and feel more positive about academic tasks and challenges. Whitfield (1995) found that increased self-confidence enables the student to get the necessary energy and motivation to find solutions to problems instead of giving up as might be expected.

Spring semester grades were best predicted by the grades earned during the fall semester for both girls and boys. This finding makes it clear that the best predictor of performance is a past performance. Although no one thing (i.e., use of study skills, coping resources or self-concept) significantly predicted the spring grades of the EHS students, it is possible that the combination of tools and skills learned in the SCORE class were enough to help some students

continue their path to success, instead of allowing them to give in to peer pressure or the pressures of the environment.

Course Evaluations

EHS students' evaluation of the SCORE program suggested that the course was, in their opinion, helpful with their transition from middle school to high school. The EHS students endorsed SCORE as an asset toward their individual success in high school however; they also reported only a moderate level of commitment to the program. Of the twenty different topics discussed in the SCORE class, students reported that "Using the Library" was the most helpful lesson, followed by "General Study Skills" and "Goal Setting and Motivation".

EHS teachers also were given the opportunity to evaluate Project SCORE. Overall, they reported the program to be "somewhat" helpful to the students and only "a little" effective for teaching various life and study skills. EHS teachers believed the "Introduction to EHS", "Time Management", "Stress and Coping", and "Character Development" courses offered the most academic help to students' classroom success, whereas "Time Management" and "Stress and Coping" were thought to be most helpful for nonacademic or personal success. EHS teachers reported that the information was well organized and easy to understand, yet the level of commitment to the program and its success ranged from "very little" to "extremely," with most reporting they were only "somewhat" committed. Because teachers are in a position to positively influence their students, it was hoped that the teachers would be more committed and enthusiastic about the program so as to pass that along in the classroom. Based on the results of the student and teacher surveys, improvements are needed in the activities associated with each lesson and the curriculum in general if Project SCORE is going to produce consistent success. Previous research indicates that although study skills courses are effective in helping students

increase their GPA, this increase is not reliably related to "the course content, duration, or instructional method" (Entwisle, 1960 in Robyak, 1977). It is most important to remember that in order to modify behavior and improve GPAs, students must make a conscious decision to change their behavior (Robyak, 1977).

Limitations of the Study

The primary methodological limitation of this study was the lack of a control group for the self report data. To minimize this effect I gathered other information, such as grades, TAKS scores and disciplinary incidents, from a comparable school and used that in the study. These comparisons helped to determine the impact of the SCORE course for the freshmen students at EHS. In addition, although I was able to collect information about the students from both EHS and CHS during the 2003-2004 school year, it would have been ideal to have obtained information for all students dating back to their eighth grade year so comparisons could have been made between the two groups concerning their previous academic readiness.

Another limitation was that the student populations at the two schools were in flux. Within this large district it is common for students to move in and out of schools, thus leaving incomplete data for several students. The students who did not complete self report data at Time 1 and Time 2 and students who did not have demographic and academic information available for the entire 9th grade year were not included in the study, thus limiting power and generalizability.

The manner in which the SCORE curriculum was delivered must be considered a limitation. It was hoped that by creating a detailed curriculum, having weekly group meetings with the teachers to review the course material and expectations, and meeting individually with teachers would offer consistency between the teachers and classes. Unfortunately, the differences

between the six SCORE teachers' styles of instruction, level of commitment and amount of preparation, could not be controlled for and thus it was difficult to ensure the consistent delivery of the material. Contextual variables such as the teachers have an impact on students and can influence success (Schunk, 1992). Because the teachers in this sample were at different levels of commitment and knowledge, each may have had different expectations for the students and offered varying degrees of support, all pieces necessary if a student is to learn appropriate self regulation strategies.

Academic motivation, which has a positive influence on academic performance (Fortier, et. al., 1995), also could be considered a limitation for this study. Unfortunately, the majority of students at EHS did not seem motivated to succeed with academics and in many ways were negatively influenced by the opinions of their peers or even family members. According to Fortier et al. (1995), students' perceived academic competence serves as a motivational antecedent and directly and positively influences academic motivation. Robyak (1977) reminds us that in order to modify behavior and improve academic performance, students must make a conscious decision and put forth the effort to change their behavior. No self-regulatory strategy works equally well for all persons, and is of little value if a person cannot motivate himself to use it (Zimmerman, 2000).

This motivation or lack of it directly predicts school performance. Without a measure of motivation it is difficult to predict the possible impact on EHS students academically. Although many students believed that the SCORE class was easy, many chose not to do the work or assignments required. Students were given both in and out of class assignments to encourage and demonstrate practical applications of the material. Many students chose not to do all of the work asked of them reportedly because of negative peer pressure, lack of motivation, lack of

commitment, and other environmental factors. Specifically, the social environment of EHS made it difficult for students to excel academically. There is significant peer reinforcement for failing academics and little to none for success. A minority of the students enrolled in Project SCORE understood the importance and value for the skills being taught, whereas the majority of 9th grade students viewed the course with an attitude that assumed Project SCORE to be an elective course they "had to sit through." According to Rosenberg, Schooler, & Schoenbach (1989), people may attempt to resist change and purposefully make poor grades in school to protect their self esteem. The self-consistency principle explains that people may try to resist changing the images they have developed of themselves, keeping them from being able to perform at a higher level because they have already defined themselves as a "poor student" or a "trouble-maker" (Lecky, 1945 in Rosenberg et. al., 1989). According to this theory students may be motivated to maintain their current level of functioning and performing as a way to protect their self-esteem. This allows students to blame poor academic or athletic performances on lack of effort rather than a lack of ability, which is less damaging to one's self esteem. Making an effort to preserve a positive self-esteem is paramount rather than taking a chance that one could fail while attempting to succeed. Therefore, EHS students simply may not have put forth the effort to do well in school because they were afraid they might not succeed. This brings the study full circle, in that Project SCORE was developed to combat this struggle. Students must make a decision to change behaviors if there is to be any type of positive effect (Robyak, 1977), and if SCORE is to become successful, it is crucial that the students become actively involved in the program goals and procedures (Cook & Kaffenberger, 2003).

Ideally, the students would attend the SCORE class for one period each day. They would then be encouraged to use the skills from that class in their English, history, science and math

classes as a way to consistently reinforce the application and practical use of the SCORE skills. All of the 9th grade teachers were given the SCORE curriculum, but few were able to use it in their classrooms for various reasons. Many of the teachers reported being overwhelmed with teaching a set curriculum as well as teaching material aimed at success with the TAKS. Thus, incorporating additional information added more stress and was deemed implausible by the faculty. Although the EHS principal initially supported the program and encouraged its use in all 9th grade classes, there was no follow through on his part or the part of the administration to support teachers and allow for the successful integration of the Project SCORE curriculum.

A final limitation involves language differences. When people learn a new language it can take several years to become fluent (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Second language acquisition involves skills that are related to problem solving and critical thinking (Cummins, 1981). Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) are acquired in the first three to five years, whereas Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) occurs after five to seven years of learning a second language (Cummins, 1981). During the time someone is using BICS, she or he is able to speak English well, but it is not until she or he has acquired CALP that she or he is able to apply this knowledge in a classroom setting. Although the amount of time that EHS students had used English as a primary mode of communication was not asked as part of the demographic information, it is possible that the students involved in this study were not yet at the CALP level due to English being a second language or a language only spoken outside of the student's home. Therefore, even though the forty students who answered the self report surveys in Spanish were eliminated from the study, other students who completed the surveys in English could have had significant challenges with the questions being asked and thus impacted the overall results.

Summary

Gilbert and Orlick (1996) stated that life skills training should be a part of every school curriculum, taught alongside the core subjects of language arts, science, social studies and mathematics. Students of color and economically disadvantaged students are often excluded from the kind of educational opportunities that lead to success in high school, college, or the world of work (The Education Trust, 1999, 2001 as cited in Cook & Kaffenberger, 2003), making it even more important to include life skills and study skills training in the classroom, so that these sometimes forgotten students may still have a chance at success. One piece of this life-skills training is self-regulation, which can enhance students' development of a sense of self-efficacy for learning and performing well. Training students to use self-regulated learning strategies improves their perceptions of efficacy, motivation and learning (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992).

Academic officials in Texas assert that 9th grade is a decisive year. Many students drop out of school after 9th grade. Others get off to a bad start academically and are never able to recover ("Success", 2007). This study shows that Project SCORE has the potential to even the playing field for otherwise environmentally challenged students by improving self regulation skills and coping skills, enhancing the use of study skills, and building self esteem and self confidence in students' academic abilities. Project SCORE gives students a chance at achieving success by teaching life skills and study skills they might not learn elsewhere.

Future Directions

If school districts are serious about ensuring the academic and social success of every child, school-wide reform is necessary. Administrators and teachers must take ownership of a study skills program from the beginning to ensure that school wide learning is occurring, because

without their support, students will not learn how to transfer the skills they are developing to other classes or to their lives away from school (TEA, 1989). A change of this magnitude would entail a focus on curriculum, classroom instruction, famly involvement, as well as a shift in the attitudes and values of those students, teachers, and parents who are involved (Flay, et al., 2001). Most important is the need for students to learn how to self regulate so they can learn to manage personal problems and achieve consistently in school. Teaching these self regulatory strategies helps to raise self efficacy and achievement by helping students reach their goals and increase the belief that they are capable (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). In addition to training the students, training and support should be offered to teachers who may not have the appropriate knowledge in how to effectively discipline students and how to handle the many stressors of teaching, including the fast pace they must maintain in order to accomplish all that is required by their school district and state standards. This additional training is necessary because of how strongly teachers can influence students' perceptions, which can then affect achievement (Schunk, 1992).

Future studies might examine the long-term success and failures of students involved with Project SCORE. Specifically how many students of Project SCORE graduate, attain employment after graduation, or are accepted into college or university programs. The students who participated in the SCORE course their freshmen year should be graduating in May of 2007. It may be of interest to follow-up with these students to determine how their involvement in SCORE influenced them academically, personally and socially during their time in high school as well as what influence it may have had on their decision whether or not to continue with post secondary education or training. Further research also should include specific training for parents

or guardians of the students enrolled in Project SCORE and measures to determine the level and impact of parental involvement.

Finally, it is hoped that the manual for Project SCORE can be published, making it possible for high school teachers and administrators to incorporate the program into their curriculum. Although all schools feel increasing pressure to prepare their students to pass standardized tests, the SCORE curriculum can help the students by teaching them how to set appropriate goals, make decisions, cope with various stressors, and use other valuable fundamentals for success with academics and life. It is hoped that these skills will encourage students to reach their full potential.

Table 1
Project SCORE Curriculum and Objectives

Lesson #	Lesson Title	Objectives
I 2 Class Periods	Introduction to SCORE	Explain expectations of the course; understand how the skills learned in the course can be used in school, sport and life
II 1 Class Period	Introduction to NDHS	Learn about the high school; become familiar with faculty and offices; learn about school spirit and pride; identify faculty and staff to rely on for support
III 2 Class Periods	Time Management	Learn how to manage time effectively; learn how to plan and organize time over the long-term; learn how to prioritize; understand the importance of self-responsibility when managing time
IV 2 Class Periods	Using Resources	Understand different sections of a textbook; understand where to find different types of information; learn about the library and its many uses
V 2 Class Periods	How We Learn	Learn about multiple intelligences; learn about different learning styles; learn how to work with your own learning style to be a more successful student
VI 1 Class Period	Study Skills	Learn to establish an effective study routine; learn how to identify an environment free from distractions
VII 1-2 Class Periods	Note Taking Strategies	Learn how listening can improve note-taking; learn how to prepare in advance; learn to identify key points of a lecture; learn different note taking techniques
VIII 1 Class Period	Reading Strategies	Learn basic guidelines for reading textbooks; learn how to increase comprehension when reading
IX 1 Class Period	Test Taking Strategies	Learn how to prepare for an exam; learn what to do before and during the exam
X 1-2 Class Periods	Memory and Concentration	Learn techniques to improve memory and concentration
XI 1 Class Period	Report Writing	Learn steps to good report writing; learn techniques to improve your report writing skills

(table continues)

Table 1 *(continued)*

Lesson #	Lesson Title	Objectives
XII 1 Class Period	Motivation	Learn to recognize the motivators in life; to identify and resolve goal conflicts; learn how to overcome procrastination
XIII 1 Class Period	Goal Setting	Learn what a goal is and how to effectively set goals; learn how to reach goals with specific behaviors and how to identify potential obstacles
XIV 1 Class Period	Decision Making	Learn how to define critical thinking and problem solving; understand the stages of problem solving
XV 1 Class Period	Character Development and Personal Development	Understanding one's values; learning ways to build character; learning manners
XVI 1 Class Period	Attitude, Self-Esteem, Self-Confidence	Understanding attitude and self-esteem and how to improve them
XVII 1 Class Period	Positive Thinking	Learn how to change negative thoughts into positive self statements
XVIII 1 Class Period	Stress and Coping	Learn coping skills and how to apply them to many areas of life
XIX 1 Class Period	Communication	Learn about verbal and non-verbal communication; learn how to successfully resolve conflict; learn about assertive communication
XX 3 Class Periods	Career Exploration	Learn about abilities, values, and interests and how these relate to choosing a major or career; learn how to research different careers
XX	Financial Responsibility (If time allows)	Learn how to create and stick to a budget
XX	Community Service (If time allows)	Learn the importance of giving back to the community

Table 2
Intercorrelations Between Subscales for Students at EHS

	Teval1	Teval2	Teval3	BTeval1	BTeval2	BTeval3
Teval1		.487**	.679**	.453**	.290**	.429**
Teval2			.459**	.316**	.663**	.353**
Teval3				.284**	.256**	.386**
BTeval1					.487**	.767**
BTeval2						.491**
BTeval3						
Eng 1						
Math 1						
His 1						
Sci 1						
Eng 2						
Math 2						
His 2						
Sci 2						
GPA 1						
GPA 2						
TAKS Read						
TAKS Math						
AEP Fall						
ISS Fall						
AEP Spg						
ISS Spg						
CRISEE 1						
CRISEE 2						
BSI 1						
BSI 2						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI int 2						
CSI mon 1						
CSI mon 2						
CSI cop1						
CSI cop2						
SPPA sch1						
SPPA sch2						
SPPA soc1						
SPPA soc2						
SPPA beh1						
n	186	186	186	168	168	168
M	6.01	5.41	5.59	5.91	5.51	5.39
SD	1.02	1.52	1.19	1.06	1.67	1.41

(table continues)

Table 2 *(continued)*

	Eng 1	Math 1	His 1	Sci 1	Eng 2	Math 2
Teval1	.161	.119	.091	.132	.177	.088
Teval2	.318**	.303**	.177	.274**	.304**	.259**
Teval3	.203	.137	.063	.177	.167	.064
BTeval1	.337**	.263	.239	.104	.330**	.270**
BTeval2	.351**	.297**	.172	.295**	.272**	.281**
BTeval3	.475**	.384**	.248	.229	.386**	.418**
Eng 1		.520**	.295**	.440**	.659**	.509**
Math 1			.285**	.410**	.455**	.702**
His 1				.177	.244**	.253**
Sci 1					.399**	.333**
Eng 2						.535**
Math 2						
His 2						
Sci 2						
GPA 1						
GPA 2						
TAKS Read						
TAKS Math						
AEP Fall						
ISS Fall						
AEP Spg						
ISS Spg						
CRISEE 1						
CRISEE 2						
BSI 1						
BSI 2						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI int 2						
CSI mon 1						
CSI mon 2						
CSI cop1						
CSI cop2						
SPPA sch1						
SPPA sch2						
SPPA soc1						
SPPA soc2						
SPPA beh1						
n	269	269	267	269	267	264
M	76.27	78.14	79.24	76.33	76.27	76.13
SD	8.86	8.61	8.65	8.59	9.12	9.04

(table continues)

Table 2 *(continued)*

	His 2	Sci 2	GPA 1	GPA 2	TAKS Read	TAKS Math
Teval1	.074	.184	.162	.169	-.105	-.171
Teval2	.243**	.309**	.356**	.369**	-.174	-.159
Teval3	.033	.188	.189	.146	-.163	-.159
BTeval1	.390**	.370**	.336**	.462**	-.215	.230
BTeval2	.382**	.351**	.387**	.423**	-.168	-.185
BTeval3	.495**	.358**	.470**	.542**	-.300**	-.179
Eng 1	.373**	.456**	.787**	.654**	-.367**	-.190
Math 1	.368**	.334**	.769**	.626**	-.274**	-.288**
His 1	.404**	.200**	.612**	.367**	-.113	-.064
Sci 1	.404**	.200**	.612**	.367**	-.188	-.196
Eng 2	.460**	.523**	.613**	.816**	-.230**	-.124
Math 2	.442**	.421**	.623**	.789**	-.262**	.363**
His 2		.365**	.486**	.720**	-.264**	-.112
Sci 2			.568**	.735**	-.113	-.274**
GPA 1				.749**	-.322	-.253**
GPA 2					-.297	-.294**
TAKS Read						.317**
TAKS Math						
AEP Fall						
ISS Fall						
AEP Spg						
ISS Spg						
CRISEE 1						
CRISEE 2						
BSI 1						
BSI 2						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI int 2						
CSI mon 1						
CSI mon 2						
CSI cop1						
CSI cop2						
SPPA sch1						
SPPA sch2						
SPPA soc1						
SPPA soc2						
SPPA beh1						
n	267	267	267	263	216	222
M	78.54	75.94	309.79	307.25	1.40	1.42
SD	8.69	8.77	24.88	26.89	0.491	0.495

(table continues)

Table 2 *(continued)*

	AEP Fall	ISS Fall	AEP Spg	ISS Spg	CRISEE1	CRISEE2
Teval1	-.045	-.136	.277	-.131	.019	.158
Teval2	-.053	-.052	.049	-.219	-.012	.171
Teval3	-.137	-.171	.227	-.163	.070	.169
BTeval1	-.049	.040	.028	-.227	.232	.231
BTeval2	-.080	-.094	-.134	-.167	.146	.275**
BTeval3	-.093	.126	-.025	-.287	.127	.279**
Eng 1	-.088	-.002	-.071	-.256	.080	.139
Math 1	-.286*	.030	-.086	-.268*	.023	.049
His 1	.072	.223	-.120	-.114	.077	.081
Sci 1	-.087	.094	-.059	-.052	-.032	.102
Eng 2	-.046	.033	-.334**	-.346**	.010	.156
Math 2	-.050	.042	-.393**	-.236	.009	.038
His 2	.142	.317*	-.239	-.274	.081	.098
Sci 2	.067	.018	-.116	-.124	.005	.129
GPA 1	-.147	.116	-.118	-.250	.055	.130
GPA 2	.011	.116	-.383**	-.353**	-.010	.114
TAKS Read	-.160	-.225	-.057	.119	-.073	-.093
TAKS Math	-.049	-.127	.040	.028	-.205	-.156
AEP Fall		.121	-.156	-.045	.104	.123
ISS Fall			-.164	-.047	-.023	-.067
AEP Spg				.162	.192	-.064
ISS Spg					.150	-.016
CRISEE 1						.375**
CRISEE 2						
BSI 1						
BSI 2						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI int 2						
CSI mon 1						
CSI mon 2						
CSI cop1						
CSI cop2						
SPPA sch1						
SPPA sch2						
SPPA soc1						
SPPA soc2						
SPPA beh1						
n	92	92	92	92	229	264
M	0.6	0.47	1.36	0.54	80.34	83.82
SD	0.95	0.79	7.9	0.999	5.29	6.22

(table continues)

Table 2 *(continued)*

	BSI1	BSI2	CSIrep1	CSIrep2	CSIint1	CSIint2
Teval1	-.016	-.046	.003	.092	-.070	.067
Teval2	-.141	-.136	.003	.078	-.050	-.046
Teval3	-.007	-.037	.083	.122	-.039	.060
BTeval1	-.155	-.180	.052	.129	-.075	.072
BTeval2	-.209	-.141	.013	.169	-.025	.090
BTeval3	-.174	-.146	.185	.217	.070	.139
Eng 1	-.089	-.100	.187	.223**	.115	.182**
Math 1	-.118	.017	.104	.169	.097	.095
His 1	-.171	-.017	.136	.091	.132	.094
Sci 1	-.072	-.044	.172	.275**	.162	.214**
Eng 2	-.078	-.054	.134	.149	.061	.079
Math 2	-.100	.009	.029	.041	.008	-.013
His 2	-.154	-.062	.059	.113	.001	.029
Sci 2	-.062	-.050	.053	.110	.004	.081
GPA 1	-.166	-.054	.215**	.274**	.181	.211**
GPA 2	.137	.049	.102	.134	.033	.050
TAKS Read	-.057	.018	-.088	-.087	-.050	.017
TAKS Math	.069	.135	.078	.044	.148	.075
AEP Fall	.047	-.023	-.062	-.079	.012	-.100
ISS Fall	.078	.015	.141	.067	.107	-.024
AEP Spg	-.149	-.194	-.104	-.176	-.116	-.219
ISS Spg	-.027	-.046	-.222	-.070	-.163	.005
CRISEE 1	-.337**	-.273**	-.184	-.184	-.124	-.100
CRISEE 2	-.361**	-.509**	.034	.023	.066	.079
BSI 1		.555**	.065	.026	.026	.034
BSI 2			-.002	.086	.004	.087
CSI rep1				.544**	.830**	.410**
CSI rep 2					.519**	.827**
CSI int 1						.502**
CSI rep1						
CSI rep 2						
CSI int 1						
CSI int 2						
CSI mon 1						
CSI mon 2						
CSI cop1						
CSI cop2						
SPPA sch1						
SPPA sch2						
SPPA soc1						
SPPA soc2						
SPPA beh1						
SPPA beh2	276	252	289	276	287	273
SPPA wor1	4.19	3.99	25.9	25.75	33.57	34.79
SPPA wor2	1.83	2.26	7.61	7.57	10.01	10.47

(table continues)

Table 2 *(continued)*

	CSImon1	CSImon2	CSIcop1	CSIcop2	SPPAsch1	SPPAsch2
Teval1	-.017	.108	.024	.026	.051	.205
Teval2	.023	-.016	.045	-.107	.073	.139
Teval3	.001	.082	.096	.043	.039	.211
BTeval1	.010	.105	-.124	.058	.057	.227
BTeval2	.086	.100	-.009	-.004	.120	.192
BTeval3	.131	.149	-.017	.068	.203*	.328**
Eng 1	.237**	.181	-.006	-.014	.287**	.331**
Math 1	.181	.117	-.040	-.019	.256**	.313**
His 1	.107	.080	.033	-.041	.159	.134
Sci 1	.287**	.218**	.025	-.056	.217**	.273**
Eng 2	.160	.140	-.045	.028	.229**	.235**
Math 2	.065	.009	.021	-.033	.173	.250**
His 2	.053	.040	-.124	-.042	.212**	.190
Sci 2	.133	.094	.020	-.029	.162	.174
GPA 1	.285**	.216**	.008	-.049	.326**	.369**
GPA 2	.136	.083	-.014	-.011	.248**	.285**
TAKS Read	-.103	-.091	.061	.058	-.245**	-.232**
TAKS Math	-.010	-.006	.013	.030	-.221**	-.237**
AEP Fall	-.121	-.048	.018	-.078	-.017	-.087
ISS Fall	.041	.076	.056	.111	.202	-.050
AEP Spg	-.100	-.247	.016	-.200	-.068	.126
ISS Spg	-.151	-.041	-.013	-.133	-.110	-.042
CRISEE 1	-.062	-.075	-.281**	-.184	.206*	.269**
CRISEE 2	.165*	.106	-.253**	-.147	.368**	.384**
BSI 1	-.045	.123	.248**	.303**	-.290**	-.301**
BSI 2	-.143	.090	.166	.275**	-.298	-.294**
CSI rep1	.715**	.384**	.275**	.165*	.235**	.264**
CSI rep 2	.505**	.730**	.094	.347**	.160	.298**
CSI int 1	.771**	.447**	.191**	.144	.298**	.304**
CSI int 2	.460**	.815**	0.035	.441**	.138	.303**
CSI mon 1		.512**	.145*	.141	.413**	.401**
CSI mon 2			.026	.444**	.185	.349**
CSI cop1				.259**	-.180	-.108
CSI cop2					-.155	-.174
SPPA sch1						.638**
SPPA sch2						
SPPA soc1						
SPPA soc2						
SPPA beh1						
SPPA beh2						
SPPA wor1						
SPPA wor2						
n	289	266	289	275	269	267
M	33.57	31.78	17.32	16.89	13.34	13.72
SD	8.03	8.25	4.48	4.82	3.13	3.29

(table continues)

Table 2 *(continued)*

	SPPAsoc1	SPPAsoc2	SPPAbeh1	SPPAbeh2	SPPAwor1	SPPAwor2
Teval1	.063	.103	.118	.121	.094	.056
Teval2	-.069	-.004	.190	.238	.135	.124
Teval3	-.039	.038	.066	.119	.062	.123
BTeval1	.043	.055	.145	.177	.063	.169
BTeval2	-.027	.007	.240	.317**	.153	.285**
BTeval3	.032	.023	.247	.233	.114	.183
Eng 1	.022	-.013	.260**	.301**	.114	.186
Math 1	-.053	-.076	.286**	.304**	.130	.150
His 1	.037	.030	.171	.187	.158	.146
Sci 1	-.040	-.140	.197	.267**	.057	.101
Eng 2	.016	-.112	.265**	.307**	.088	.055
Math 2	-.104	-.122	.255**	.342**	.055	.112
His 2	-.026	-.103	.169	.208**	.084	.008
Sci 2	-.036	-.115	.232**	.231**	.042	.613
GPA 1	-.008	-.070	.321**	.371**	.162	.209**
GPA 2	-.046	-.151	.295**	.370**	.086	.083
TAKS Read	-.125	-.056	-.185	-.130	-.135	-.067
TAKS Math	.022	.087	-.182	-.068	-.100	-.047
AEP Fall	.027	-.061	.225	.020	.175	-.059
ISS Fall	.049	-.114	.150	-.107	-.022	-.114
AEP Spg	-.022	-.008	-.083	-.305	-.025	-.028
ISS Spg	-.061	-.130	-.194	-.257	-.168	-.091
CRISEE 1	.332**	.341**	-.031	.017	.264**	.199
CRISEE 2	.259**	.329**	.264**	.285**	.473**	.530**
BSI 1	-.087	-.114	-.199**	-.227**	-.320**	-.284**
BSI 2	-.083	-.192*	-.200**	-.237**	-.301**	-.391**
CSI rep1	.092	.054	.301**	.282**	.036	.047
CSI rep 2	.050	.055	.153	.258**	-.059	.064
CSI int 1	.184	.112	.283**	.285**	.081	.067
CSI int 2	.092	.166*	.114	.221**	.003	.128
CSI mon 1	.164*	.140	.275**	.267**	.143*	.140
CSI mon 2	.110	.145	.075	.174	.032	.094
CSI cop1	-.079	-.135	-.026	-.004	-.231	-.187
CSI cop2	-.065	-.103	-.105	-.114	-.126	-.158
SPPA sch1	.307**	.180	.435**	.357**	.448**	.373**
SPPA sch2	.274**	.308**	.298**	.452**	.293**	.457**
SPPA soc1		.573**	.094	.068	.411**	.238**
SPPA soc2			.009	.114	.273**	.415**
SPPA beh1				.581**	.439**	.298**
SPPA beh2					.287**	.424**
SPPA wor1						.556**
SPPA wor2						
n	269	267	271	267	272	268
M	14.58	14.94	13.95	14.11	15.21	15.33
SD	3.19	3.08	3.01	3.06	3.43	3.28

(table continues)

Table 2 *(continued)*

Note.
n = Numbers of participants
M = mean; SD = standard deviation
** $p < .001$.

Teval 1 = Question 1 at the beginning of the fall semester; Range = 1 to 7
Teval 2 = Question 2 at the beginning of the fall semester; Range = 1 to 7
Teval 3 = Question 3 at the beginning of the fall semester; Range = 1 to 7
B (variable) = measure taken at the end of the fall semester

Eng = English grade; Math=Math grade; His = History grade; Sci = Science grade
Range of grades = 50-100

1 = measure taken at the end of the fall semester
2 = measure taken at the end of the spring semester

GPA 1 = Grade Point Average at the end of the Fall Semester
GPA 2 = Grade Point Average at the end of the Spring Semester
GPA Range: 50-100

TAKS Read – Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills – Reading Subtest
TAKS Math – Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills – Math Subtest
Range: 1 = pass, 2 = fail

AEP Fall = Alternative Education Program measured at end of fall semester
AEP Spg = Alternative Education Program measured at the end of the spring semester
IHS Fall = In House Suspension measured at end of fall semester
IHS Spg = In House Suspension measured at the end of the spring semester

CRISEE – Coping Resources Inventory for Educational Enhancement
Score Range: 50-100

CSI - Cognitive Skills Inventory
CSI rep = CSI Repetition subscale - Score Range: 9-45
CSI int = CSI Integration subscale – Score Range: 13-65
CSI mon = CSI Monitoring subscale – Score Range: 12-60
CSI cop = CSI Coping subscale – Score Range: 6-30

BSI - Brief Symptom Inventory
SQ = square root
Range: 0-11.22

Self-Concept - Self Perception Profile for Adolescents
1 to 4 scale; Range: 5-20 for each subscale
SPPA sch = School Competence
SPPA soc = Social Acceptance
SPPA job = Job Competence
SPPA beh = Behavior Conduct
SPPA wor = Self-Worth

Table 3

Intercorrelations Between Subscales for Students at CHS

	Eng 1	**Math 1**	**His 1**	**Sci 1**	**Eng 2**	**Math 2**	**His 2**	**Sci 2**
Eng 1		.611**	.616**	.569**	.742**	.578**	.569**	.609**
Math 1			.553**	.493**	.553**	.796**	.456**	.507**
His 1				.574**	.613**	.539**	.701**	.601**
Sci 1					.544**	.506**	.555	.685**
Eng 2						.573**	.652**	.681**
Math 2							.515**	.592**
His 2								.639**
Sci 2								
GPA 1								
GPA 2								
TAKS Read								
TAKS Math								
AEP Fall								
IHS Fall								
AEP Spg								
IHS Spg								
n	620	621	621	617	581	618	621	621
M	77.53	74.21	75.8	75.46	77.43	71.95	72.77	77.58
SD	8.9	10.42	10.18	8.65	9.69	11.29	10.81	9.28

(table continues)

Table 3 *(continued)*

	GPA 1	GPA 2	TAKS Read	TAKS Math	AEP Fall	IHS Fall	AEP Spg	IHS Spg
Eng 1	.844**	.737**	-.006	-.223	-.052	0.052	.039	-.024
Math 1	.820**	.690**	.084	-.210	.169	.000	.250	-.156
His 1	.842**	.734**	.002	.017	-.078	.026	.016	-.156
Sci 1	.786**	.669**	.003	-.191	.041	.051	.143	-.134
Eng 2	.741**	.856**	.003	-.112	.137	-.101	.059	-.023
Math 2	.744**	.856**	.058	-.104	.123	-.139	.319	-.146
His 2	.695**	.836**	.110	.202	.084	-.158	-.003	-.126
Sci 2	.728**	.849**	.006	-.193	.067	-.033	-.056	-.163
GPA 1		.864**	-.031	-.269	.024	.038	.138	-.155
GPA 2			.063	-.052	.128	-.124	.100	-.133
TAKS Read				.205	-.174	-.174	-.333	-.174
TAKS Math					.123	-.570	.182	.123
AEP Fall						-.084	-.008	-.091
IHS Fall							-.087	-.058
AEP Spg								-.092
IHS Spg								
n	65	64	53	53	52	53	613	575
M	1.43	1.84	0.38	0.08	0.21	0.09	302.96	299.46
SD	0.5	0.37	1.04	0.33	0.57	0.35	31.46	34.06

Note.
n = Numbers of participants
M = mean; SD = standard deviation
**p*< .01. ** *p*< .001.
T Eval 1 = Range: 1-7
T Eval 2 = Range: 1-7
T Eval 3 = Range: 1-7
B (variable) = measure taken at the end of the fall semester

Eng = English grade; Math = Math grade; His = History grade; Sci = Science grade
Range: 50-100
1 = measure taken at the end of the fall semester
2 = measure taken at the end of the spring semester

GPA 1 = Grade Point Average at the end of the fall semester
GPA 2 = Grade Point Average at the end of the spring semester
Range: 50-100

TAKS Read – Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills – Reading Subtest
TAKS Math – Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills – Math Subtest
Range: 1=Pass, 2=Fail

AEP = Alternative Education Program (measured at end of fall and spring semesters)
IHS = In House Suspension (measured at end of fall and spring semesters)
1 = measure taken at the end of the fall semester
2 = measure taken at the end of the spring semester

Table 4

Repeated Measures ANOVAs for Each Subscale at Time 1 and Time 2 for Both Girl and Boy Participants

		T1		T2		TOTAL	
		M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
BSI							
	Girls	4.52	1.87	4.17	2.18	4.35*b*	2.03
	Boys	3.87	1.59	3.76	2.26	3.82*b*	1.93
	Total	4.19	1.76	3.96	2.23	4.08	2.00
CRISEE							
	Girls	1.59	.11	1.67	.13	1.63*b*	.12
	Boys	1.63	.10	1.69	.11	1.66*b*	.11
	Total	1.61*a*	.11	1.68*a*	.12	1.65	.12
CSI Rep							
	Girls	28.56	7.27	27.59	7.38	28.08*b*	7.33
	Boys	23.41	7.17	23.88	7.31	23.65*b*	7.24
	Total	25.93	7.65	25.69	7.56	25.81	7.61
CSI Int							
	Girls	35.42	10.56	35.47	10.21	35.45*b*	10.39
	Boys	31.64	9.39	33.96	10.63	32.80*b*	10.28
	Total	33.48	10.13	34.70	10.43	34.09	10.28
CSI Mon							
	Girls	35.39	8.21	32.69	8.28	34.04*c*	8.25
	Boys	31.52	7.29	30.90	8.15	31.21*c*	7.72
	Total	33.42*c*	7.98	31.78*c*	8.25	32.60	8.15
CSI Cop							
	Girls	18.13	4.71	17.22	5.06	17.68*b*	4.89
	Boys	16.50	4.13	16.48	4.54	16.49*b*	4.34
	Total	17.30	4.49	16.85	4.80	17.08	4.65
SPPA Sch							
	Girls	13.69	3.46	13.94	3.53	13.82	3.50
	Boys	13.09	2.87	13.53	3.04	13.31	2.96
	Total	13.39*a*	3.19	13.73*a*	3.29	13.56	3.24
SPPA Soc							
	Girls	14.82	3.41	14.75	3.61	14.79	3.51
	Boys	14.40	3.02	14.96	2.57	14.68	2.80
	Total	14.61	3.22	14.87	3.12	14.74	3.17
SPPA Beh							
	Girls	14.52	3.24	14.62	3.25	14.57*b*	3.25
	Boys	13.50	2.72	13.53	2.72	13.52*b*	2.72
	Total	14.01	3.03	14.08	3.05	14.05	3.04
SPPA Wor							
	Girls	15.34	3.66	15.32	3.65	15.33	3.66
	Boys	15.27	3.12	15.24	2.95	15.26	3.04
	Total	15.30	3.39	15.28	3.31	15.29	3.35

(table continues)

Table 4 *(continued)*

Note.
T1 = Time 1 (beginning of the fall semester); T2 = Time 2 (end of the fall semester)
a = time effect, p<.05
b = gender effect, p<.05
c = interaction effect, p<.05

BSI - Brief Symptom Inventory - Range: 0-11.22

CRISEE – Coping Resources Inventory for Educational Enhancement
Average Score Range: 1-2

CSI - Cognitive Skills Inventory
CSI Rep = CSI Repetition subscale - Score Range: 9-45
CSI Int = CSI Integration subscale – Score Range: 13-65
CSI Mon = CSI Monitoring subscale – Score Range: 12-60
CSI Cop = CSI Coping subscale – Score Range: 6-30

SPPA - Self Perception Profile for Adolescents
1 to 4 scale; Range for each scale: 5-20
SPPA Sch = School Competence
SPPA Soc = Social Acceptance
SPPA Job = Job Competence
SPPA Beh = Behavior Conduct
SPPA Wor = Self-Worth

Table 5

Comparison of Disciplinary Variables by School

		Fall		Spring		TOTAL	
		M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
# Days of Discipline	EHS	.31	.85	.60	1.52	.46*c*	1.19
	CHS	.07	.47	.09	.45	.08*c*	.46
	Total	.15*c*	.64	.27*c*	1.00	.21	.82

Note. ** $p \leq .001$
EHS *N*=330
CHS *N*=621
AEP = Alternative Education Program; IHS = In House Suspension

Table 6

Repeated Measures ANOVAs for Grades at the End of the Fall and Spring Semesters for Girls and Boys at EHS

	T1		T2		TOTAL	
	M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
GPA						
Girls (n=127)	79.16*a*	5.82	78.12*a*	6.73	78.64*b*	6.28
Boys (n=135)	76.02*a*	6.21	75.54*a*	6.50	75.78*b*	6.36
Total (n=262)	77.54*a*	6.21	76.79*a*	6.73	77.17	6.47
Math						
Girls (n=128)	79.55	7.94	77.30	8.68	78.43*b*	8.31
Boys (n=136)	76.85	9.10	75.04	9.26	75.95*b*	9.18
Total (n=264)	78.16*a*	8.65	76.13*a*	9.04	77.15	8.85
Science						
Girls (n=129)	77.53	8.61	76.71	9.31	77.12	8.96
Boys (n=138)	75.23	8.49	75.22	8.19	75.23	8.34
Total (n=267)	76.34	8.61	75.94	8.77	73.14	8.69
English						
Girls (n=130)	78.75	7.93	77.98	9.83	78.37*b*	8.88
Boys (n=137)	74.19	8.89	74.64	8.10	74.42*b*	8.50
Total (n=267)	76.41	8.73	76.27	9.12	76.34	8.93
History						
Girls (n=129)	80.46	7.12	79.81	8.45	80.14*b*	7.79
Boys (n=137)	78.16	9.78	77.32	8.80	77.74*b*	9.29
Total (n=266)	79.27	8.66	78.53	8.70	77.40	8.68

Note.
T1 = Time 1 (beginning of the fall semester); T2 = Time 2 (end of the fall semester)
Range for each grade: 50-100
a = time effect, $p<.01$
b = gender effect, $p<.01$
c = interaction effect, $p<.01$

Table 7

Repeated Measures ANOVAs for Grades at Time 1 and Time 2 for Girls and Boys at CHS

	T1		T2		TOTAL	
	M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
GPA						
Girls (n=261)	77.20*a*	7.05	76.46*a*	8.08	76.83	7.57
Boys (n=271)	74.24*a*	8.22	73.51*a*	8.62	73.88	8.42
Total (n=532)	75.69	7.80	74.96	8.48	75.33	8.14
Math						
Girls (n=282)	75.59*a*	9.86	72.58*a*	11.14	74.09	10.50
Boys (n=292)	73.13*a*	10.57	71.51*a*	11.34	72.32	10.96
Total (n=574)	74.34	10.29	72.04	11.24	73.19	10.77
Science						
Girls (n=279)	76.01*c*	7.77	79.22*c*	8.54	77.62	8.16
Boys (n=294)	74.98*c*	9.31	76.25*c*	9.48	75.62	9.40
Total (n=573)	75.48	8.60	77.70	9.15	76.59	8.88
English						
Girls (n=266)	79.35	8.16	79.53	8.70	79.44	8.43
Boys (n=275)	75.88	9.23	75.41	9.89	75.65	9.56
Total (n=541)	77.59	8.88	77.44	9.54	77.52	9.21
History						
Girls (n=283)	78.23*a*	9.32	74.92*a*	10.46	76.58	9.89
Boys (n=295)	73.23*a*	10.58	70.52*a*	10.80	71.88	10.69
Total (n=578)	75.68	10.28	72.67	10.85	74.18	10.57

Note.
T1 = Time 1 (beginning of the fall semester); T2 = Time 2 (end of the fall semester)
Range for each grade: 50-100
a = time effect, p<.005
b = gender effect, p<.005
c = interaction effect, p<.005

Table 8

Repeated Measures ANOVAs for School Subject at the End of the Fall and Spring Semesters

		T1		T2		TOTAL	
		M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
Math	EHS	77.94	8.50	75.64	9.92	76.79	9.21
	CHS	74.26	10.40	71.95	11.29	73.11	10.85
	Total	75.47	9.96	73.16	10.99	74.32	10.48
History	EHS	78.97	8.72	77.47	9.57	78.22	9.15
	CHS	75.80	10.18	72.77	10.81	74.29	10.24
	Total	76.85	9.83	74.33	10.64	75.59	10.24
Science	EHS	76.73	8.45	76.17	8.71	76.45	8.58
	CHS	75.46	8.65	77.61	9.24	76.54	8.95
	Total	75.88	8.60	77.14	9.09	76.51	8.85
English	EHS	76.51	8.66	76.01	10.22	76.26	9.44
	CHS	77.59	8.95	77.44	9.70	77.52	9.33
	Total	77.22	8.86	76.94	9.90	77.08	9.38

Note. Girls and boys were combined for each school
T1 = Time 1 (beginning of the fall semester); T2 = Time 2 (end of the fall semester)
Grade range for each class: 50-100

Table 9

Repeated Measures ANOVAs for Teacher Evaluations at Time 1 and Time 2 for Girls and Boys at EHS

	T1		**T2**		**TOTAL**	
	M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
Question 1						
Girls	6.32	.96	6.08	1.08	6.20	1.02
Boys	6.12	.73	5.77	1.03	5.95	.88
Total	6.22*a*	.85	5.92*a*	1.06	6.07	.96
Question 2						
Girls	6.01	1.21	5.99	1.46	6.00*b*	1.34
Boys	5.10	1.67	5.04	1.78	5.07*b*	1.73
Total	5.55	1.53	5.50	1.70	5.53	1.62
Question 3						
Girls	5.91	1.19	5.74	1.26	5.83*b*	1.23
Boys	5.55	1.08	5.09	1.48	5.32*b*	1.28
Total	5.73*a*	1.15	5.41*a*	1.41	5.57	1.28

Note.

T1 = Time 1 (beginning of the fall semester); T2 = Time 2 (end of the fall semester)
N girls = 78
N boys = 81
a = time effect, p<.01
b = gender effect, p<.01
c = interaction effect, p<.01
Question 1 – "Quality of peer relationships"
Range: 1=Child is generally ignored/has no friends to 7=Child is popular/gets along well with peers.
Question 2 – "Classroom behavior"
Range: 1=Child is disrespectful of the teacher to 7=Child shows excellent control and is respectful.
Question 3 – "Mood/Activity level"
Range: 1=Child is withdrawn and unhappy to 7=Child is outgoing, confident, and eager.

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Grade Point Average (GPA) at the End of the Fall Semester (Girls N=139)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Model 1			
Part. in School Act.	-2.21	1.26	-.178
Prep for Class	1.14	1.29	.10
Prep for Tests	.301	1.28	.03
4 Year College	.74	1.36	.06
Model 2			
Part. in School Act.	-1.21	1.31	-1.0
Prep for Class	1.17	1.26	.10
Prep for Tests	.03	1.09	.003
4 Year College	.15	1.33	.01
BCSI Rep	.11	.12	.14
BCSI Int	-.07	.12	-.12
BCSI Mon	.15	.13	.20
BCSI Cop	-.32	.12	-.28
Model 3			
Part. in School Act.	-1.22	1.32	-.10
Prep Class	1.13	1.28	.09
Prep for Tests	.02	1.30	.001
4 Year College	.16	1.34	.01
BCSI Rep	.11	.13	.15
BCSI Int	-.07	.13	-.12
BCSI Mon	.15	.13	.20
BCSI Cop	-.31	.12	-.28
BCRISEE			
Model 4			
Part. in School Act.	.45	1.24	.04
Prep for Class	.67	1.16	.06
Prep for Tests	-.24	1.18	-.02
4 Year College	1.16	1.23	.09
BCSI Rep	.05	.12	.06
BCSI Int	-.10	.12	-.16
BCSI Mon	.14	.12	.18
BCSI Cop	-.08	.13	-.07
BCRISEE	-6.32	4.75	-.15
BSPPA Sch	-54	.21	.34
BSPPA Soc	-.37	.17	-.23
BSPPA Beh	.49	.20	.26
BSPPA Wor	.25	.21	.15
Model 5			
Part. in School Act.	.88	.126	.07
Prep for Class	.93	1.16	.08
Prep for Tests	-.34	1.18	-.03
4 Year College	.98	1.23	.07
BCSI Rep	.06	.12	.07
BCSI Int	-.13	.12	-.23
BCSI Mon	.16	.12	.21
BCSI Cop	-.09	.12	-.08
BCRISEE	-3.72	5.05	-.09
BSPPA Sch	.61	.21	.39*

(table continues)

Table 10 *(continued)*

Variable	B	SE B	β
BSPPA Soc	-.36	.17	-.22
BSPPA Beh	.50	.20	.27
BSPPA Wor	.25	.21	.15
BBSI	.44	.30	.17
Model 6			
Part. in School Act.	.83	1.26	.07
Prep for Class	.80	1.17	.07
Prep for Tests	-.42	1.17	-.04
4 Year College	1.28	1.24	.10
BCSI Rep	.07	.12	.09
BCSI Int	-.14	.12	-.24
BCSI Mon	.14	.12	.19
BCSI Cop	-.06	.13	-.05
BCRISEE	-3.84	5.03	-.09
BSPPA Sch	.64	.21	.41*
BSPPA Soc	-.37	.17	-.23
BSPPA Beh	.43	.21	.23
BSPPA Wor	.24	.21	.15
BBSI	.39	.30	.15
# Days Disc Fall	-.17	1.08	-.15
# Days Disc Spring	-.24	.52	-.04

Note. R^2=.227 for Step 1; ΔR^2=.105 for Step 2; ΔR^2=.000 for Step 3; ΔR^2=.195 for Step 4; ΔR^2=.016 for Step 5; ΔR^2=.023 for Step 6.

*p<.005, **p<.001

Table 11

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Grade Point Average (GPA) at the End of the Fall Semester (Boys N =152)

Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Model 1			
Part. in School Act.	.77	1.29	**.06**
Prep for Class	5.03	1.54	.41*
Prep for Tests	-.24	1.56	-.02
4 Year College	1.24	1.31	.10
Model 2			
Part. in School Act.	1.17	1.32	.09
Prep for Class	4.64	1.55	.38*
Prep for Tests	.08	1.67	.01
4 Year College	1.00	1.31	.08
BCSI Rep	.20	.17	.23
BCSI Int	.08	.12	.13
BCSI Mon	-.19	.15	-.22
BCSI Cop	-.19	.17	-.12
Model 3			
Part. in School Act.	1.08	1.34	.09
Prep Class	4.56	1.56	.37*
Prep for Tests	-.003	1.69	.00
4 Year College	1.04	1.32	.08
BCSI Rep	.21	.17	.24
BCSI Int	.07	.12	.12
BCSI Mon	-.18	.15	-.22
BCSI Cop	-.16	.18	-.11
BCRISEE	3.33	5.61	.06
Model 4			
Part. in School Act.	.64	1.34	.05
Prep for Class	3.83	1.58	.31
Prep for Tests	.32	1.72	.03
4 Year College	1.25	1.32	.10
BCSI Rep	.19	.17	.21
BCSI Int	.06	.12	.09
BCSI Mon	-.18	.15	-.21
BCSI Cop	-.13	.19	-.09
BCRISEE	5.56	6.27	.11
BSPPA Sch	.19	.30	.09
BSPPA Soc	-.56	.26	-.24
BSPPA Beh	.33	.27	.15
BSPPA Wor	-.05	.30	-.02
Model 5			
Part. in School Act.	.69	1.34	.05
Prep for Class	4.20	1.60	.34
Prep for Tests	.22	1.72	.02
4 Year College	1.39	1.32	.11
BCSI Rep	.17	.17	.19
BCSI Int	.06	.12	.09
BCSI Mon	-.18	.15	-.22
BCSI Cop	-.13	.19	-.09
BCRISEE	9.27	7.00	.18

(table continues)

Table 11 *(continued)*

Variable	B	SE B	β
BSPPA Sch	.24	.30	.11
BSPPA Soc	-.55	.26	-.23
BSPPA Beh	.32	.27	.14
BSPPA Wor	-.06	.30	-.03
BBSI	-40	.34	.14
Model 6			
Part. in School Act.	.72	1.34	.06
Prep for Class	3.66	1.64	.30
Prep for Tests	.32	1.75	.03
4 Year College	1.22	1.32	.10
BCSI Rep	.21	.17	.23
BCSI Int	.05	.12	.07
BCSI Mon	-.20	.15	-.24
BCSI Cop	-.14	.18	-.10
BCRISEE	7.28	7.22	.14
BSPPA Sch	.28	.30	.13
BSPPA Soc	-.54	.27	-.23
BSPPA Beh	.18	.29	.08
BSPPA Wor	.01	.30	.00
BBSI	.32	.35	.12
# Days Disc Fall	-.43	.80	-.60
# Days Disc Spring	-.53	.45	-.14

Note. R^2=.408 for Step 1; ΔR^2=.055 for Step 2; ΔR^2=.003 for Step 3; ΔR^2=.079 for Step 4; ΔR^2=.013 for Step 5; ΔR^2=.020 for Step 6
*p<.005, **p<.001.

Table 12

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Grade Point Average (GPA) at the End of the Spring Semester (Girls N=139)

Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Model 1			
GPA 1	.81	.08	.74**
Model 2			
GPA 1	.84	.80	.76**
Part. in School Act.	1.19	.97	.09
Prep for Class	-.59	.96	-.05
Prep for Tests	.55	.95	.04
4 Year College	1.05	1.04	.07
Model 3			
GPA 1	.86	.08	.78**
Part. in School Act.	.95	1.03	.07
Prep for Class	-.38	.96	-.03
Prep for Tests	.52	.98	.04
4 Year College	1.26	1.04	.09
BCSI Rep	.08	.10	.10
BCSI Int	-.13	.10	-.21
BCSI Mon	-.03	.10	-.04
BCSI Cop	.16	.10	.13
Model 4			
GPA 1	.86	.08	.78**
Part. in School Act.	.96	1.03	.07
Prep Class	-.45	.98	-.04
Prep for Tests	.48	.99	.04
4 Year College	1.26	1.05	.09
BCSI Rep	.09	.10	.11
BCSI Int	-.13	.10	-.21
BCSI Mon	-.04	.10	-.05
BCSI Cop	.17	.10	.14
BCRISEE	1.67	3.44	.04
Model 5			
GPA 1	.78	.09	.71**
Part. in School Act.	1.45	1.07	.11
Prep for Class	-.55	.97	-.04
Prep for Tests	.59	.99	.05
4 Year College	1.56	1.06	.11
BCSI Rep	.04	.10	.05
BCSI Int	-.13	.10	-.21
BCSI Mon	-.02	.11	-.03
BCSI Cop	.22	.11	.18
BCRISEE	2.36	4.21	.05
BSPPA Sch	.25	.19	.15
BSPPA Soc	-.24	.15	-.14
BSPPA Beh	.21	.18	.10
BSPPA Wor	-.13	.18	-.08
Model 6			
GPA 1	.78	.10	.71**
Part. in School Act.	1.45	1.11	.11
Prep for Class	-.55	.99	-.04
Prep for Tests	.59	1.00	.05

(table continues)

Table 12 (*continued*)

Variable	B	SE B	β
4 Year College	1.56	1.07	.11
BCSI Rep	.04	.10	.05
BCSI Int	-.13	.10	-.21
BCSI Mon	-.02	.11	-.02
BCSI Cop	.22	.11	.18
BCRISEE	2.39	4.53	.05
BSPPA Sch	.26	.19	.15
BSPPA Soc	-.24	.15	-.14
BSPPA Beh	.21	.18	.10
BSPPA Wor	-.13	.18	-.08
BBSI	.01	.26	.002
Model 7			
GPA 1	.78	.10	.71**
Part. in School Act.	1.52	1.09	.11
Prep for Class	-.22	.99	-.02
Prep for Tests	.68	.99	.05
4 Year College	1.74	1.07	.12
BCSI Rep	.03	.10	.03
BCSI Int	-.12	.10	-.19
BCSI Mon	-.03	.11	-.03
BCSI Cop	.18	.11	.15
BCRISEE	3.20	4.48	.07
BSPPA Sch	.28	.19	.16
BSPPA Soc	-.22	.15	-.12
BSPPA Beh	.14	.18	.07
BSPPA Wor	-.13	.18	-07
BBSI	.06	.26	.02
# Days Disc Fall	.83	.93	.07
# Days Disc Spring	-.87	.44	-.15

Note. R^2=.740 for Step 1; ΔR^2=.016 for Step 2; ΔR^2=.027 for Step 3; ΔR^2=.001 for Step 4; ΔR^2=.029 for Step 5; ΔR^2=.000 for Step 6; ΔR^2=.020 for Step 7.

*p<.005, **p<.001

Table 13

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Grade Point Average (GPA) at the End of the Spring Semester (Boys N=152)

Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Model 1			
GPA 1	.59	.08	.62**
Model 2			
GPA 1	.50	.09	.52**
Part. in School Act.	.76	1.01	.06
Prep for Class	4.04	1.27	.35*
Prep for Tests	-1.68	1.22	-.14
4 Year College	-.85	1.03	-.07
Model 3			
GPA 1	.49	.09	.52**
Part. in School Act.	.82	1.07	.07
Prep for Class	4.26	1.30	.36*
Prep for Tests	-1.55	1.35	-.13
4 Year College	-.87	1.05	-.07
BCSI Rep	.03	.13	.03
BCSI Int	-.05	.10	-.09
BCSI Mon	-.01	.12	-.01
BCSI Cop	-.09	.14	-.06
Model 4			
GPA 1	.49	.09	.51**
Part. in School Act.	.66	1.08	.05
Prep Class	4.17	1.30	.36*
Prep for Tests	-1.71	1.35	-.15
4 Year College	-.83	1.05	-.07
BCSI Rep	.04	.13	.05
BCSI Int	-.07	.10	-.12
BCSI Mon	.003	.12	.004
BCSI Cop	-.06	.14	-.04
BCRISEE	5.03	4.49	.10
Model 5			
GPA 1	.41	.09	.43**
Part. in School Act.	.98	1.00	.08
Prep for Class	3.83	1.21	.33*
Prep for Tests	-1.61	1.29	-.14
4 Year College	-.20	1.00	-.02
BCSI Rep	-.05	.12	-.06
BCSI Int	-.07	.09	-.13
BCSI Mon	.01	.11	.01
BCSI Cop	.04	.14	.02
BCRISEE	7.68	4.66	.15
BSPPA Sch	.37	.22	.18
BSPPA Soc	-.05	.20	-.02
BSPPA Beh	.67	.20	.31**
BSPPA Wor	-.65	.22	-.30*
Model 6			
GPA 1	.40	.09	.43**
Part. in School Act.	1.03	1.01	.09
Prep for Class	4.02	1.25	.34*
Prep for Tests	-1.61	1.30	-.14

(table continues)

Table 13 *(continued)*

Variable	B	SE B	β
4 Year College	-.12	1.00	-.01
BCSI Rep	-.06	.13	-.06
BCSI Int	-.07	.09	-.12
BCSI Mon	.00	.11	.00
BCSI Cop	.04	.14	.02
BCRISEE	9.14	5.26	.18
BSPPA Sch	.38	.22	.19
BSPPA Soc	-.05	.20	-.02
BSPPA Beh	.67	.20	.31**
BSPPA Wor	-.66	.22	-.30
BBSI	.16	.26	.06
Model 7			
GPA 1	.38	.09	.40**
Part. in School Act.	.96	.99	.08
Prep for Class	3.67	1.25	.31*
Prep for Tests	-1.18	1.30	-.10
4 Year College	-.28	.98	-.02
BCSI Rep	.00	.13	.00
BCSI Int	-.07	.09	-.13
BCSI Mon	-.06	.12	-.07
BCSI Cop	.01	.14	.01
BCRISEE	6.46	5.31	.13
BSPPA Sch	.42	.22	.21
BSPPA Soc	-.12	.20	-.05
BSPPA Beh	.49	.21	.23
BSPPA Wor	-.55	.22	-.25
BBSI	.02	.26	.01
# Days Disc Fall	.36	.58	.05
# Days Disc Spring	-.71	.33	-.20

Note. R^2=.619 for Step 1; ΔR^2=.075 for Step 2; ΔR^2=.012 for Step 3; ΔR^2=.009 for Step 4; ΔR^2=.114 for Step 5; ΔR^2=.002 for Step 6; ΔR^2=.026 for Step 7.

*p<.005, **p<.001

REFERENCES

Active learning. (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.edinboro,edu/cwis/acaff/suppserv/academic_support/staar/CAT2.htm

Allen, J. P., Weissberg, R. P., & Hawkins, J. A. (1989). The relation between values and social competence in early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 25*(3)*,* 458-464.

Arfaniarromo, A. (2001). Toward a psychosocial and sociocultural understanding of achievement motivation among latino gang members in U. S. schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 28*(3), 123-136.

Bandura, A. (1978). Reflections on self-efficacy. *Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy, 7,* 237-269.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37,* 122-147.

Bandura, (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Barton, P. W., Coley, R. J., & Wenglinshy, H. (1998). *Order in the classroom: Violence, discipline and student achievement.* Princeton, MJ: Policy Information Center, Educational Testing Service.

Basic study techniques. (n.d.) Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.scs.tamu.edu.selfhelp/elibrary/basic_study_techniques.htm.

Berlin, R., & Davis, R. (1989). Children from alcoholic families: Vulnerability and resilience. In T. F. Dugan & R. Coles (Eds.), *The child in our times: Studies in the development of resilience.* (pp. 81-105). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Berthiamu, P. (1995). *Improving the academic achievement of high school students through the implementation of a study skills program.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.

Bloom, B. S. (1984). *Taxonomy of educational objectives.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P. R., & Zeidner, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of self-regulation.* San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Bradley, R. H., Rock, S. L., Caldwell, B. M., Harris, P. T., & Hamrick, H. M. (1987). Home environment and school performance among Black elementary school children. *Journal of Negro Education, 56*(4), 499-509.

Brigman, G., & Campbell, C. (2003). Helping students improve academic achievement and school success behavior. *Professional School Counseling, 7*(2), 91-98.

Brookhart, S. M. (2001). Determinants of student effort on schoolwork and school-based achievement. *Journal of Educational Research, 91,* 201-208.

Bryan, J. (2005). Fostering educational resilience and achievement in schools through school-family-community partnerships. *Professional School Counseling. 8*(3), 219.

Bryant, A., Schulenberg, J., Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M., & Johnston, L. D. (2000). Understanding the links among school misbehavior, academic achievement, and cigarette use: A national panel study of adolescents. *Prevention Science. 1*(2), 71-87.

Caplan, M., Weissberg, R. P., Grober, J. S., Sivo, P. J., Grady, K., & Jacoby, C. (1992). Social competence promotion with inner-city and suburban young adolescents: Effects on social adjustment and alcohol use. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60*(1)*,* 56-63.

Carey, W. B. (1998). Temperament and behavior problems in the classroom. *School Psychology Review, 27*(4), 522-533.

Carter, R. S. (2000). Parental involvement with adolescents' education: Do daughters or sons get more help? *Adolescence, 35*(137), 29-44.

Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (1996). The social development model: A theory of antisocial behavior. In J. D. Hawkins (Ed.), *Delinquency and crime: Current theories* (pp. 149-197). New York: Cambridge University Press.

College motivation and maintaining a positive attitude (n.d.) Retrieved from http://www.edinboro.edu/cwis.acaff/suppserv/academic_support/staar/CAT5.html.

Communication skills (n.d.) Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.unc.edu/depts/unc_caps/commskill.htm.

Cook, J. B., & Kaffenberger, C. J. (2003). Solution shop: A solution-focused counseling and study skills program for middle school. *Professional School Counseling 7*(2), 116-123.

Covington, M. V., & Omelich, C. L. (1979). Effort: The double edged sword in school achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 169-182.

Cummins, J. (1981). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Lingustics, 11*(2), 132-149.

Curlette, W. L., Aycock, D. W., Matheny, K. B., Pugh, J. L., & Taylor, H. F. (1992). *Coping Resources Inventory for Stress manual.* Atlanta, GA: Health Prisms.

D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (1992). A career development program for inner-city black youth. *Career Development Quarterly, 40,* 272-280.

Danish, S. J. (1996). Interventions for enhancing adolescents' life skills. *Humanistic Psychologist, 24*(3)*,* 365-381.

Danish, S. J., Galambos, N. L., & Laquatra, I. (1983). Life development intervention: Skill training for personal competence. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason, J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber, (Eds.), *Preventive psychology: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 49-61*).* USA: Pergamon Press.

Danish, S. J. & Nellen, V. C. (1997). New roles for sport psychologists: Teaching life skills through sport to at-risk youth. *Quest, 49,* 111-113.

Danish, S. J., Petitpas, A. J., & Hale, B. D. (1993). Life development intervention for athletes: Life skills through sports. *Counseling Psychologist, 21*(3)*,* 352-385.

Davis, M., Eshelman, E. R., & McKay, M. (1995). *The relaxation and stress reduction workbook.* Oakland, CA: New Harbinger Publications, Inc.

DeBono, E. (1985). *Six thinking hats.* Little, Brown and Company.

Derogatis, L. R. (1982). *Brief symptom inventory.* USA: National Computer Systems, Inc.

Developing good writing skills (n.d.) Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.edinboro.edu/cwis/acaff/suppserv/academic_support/staar/CAT8.html.

DiVesta, F. J. & Moreno, V. (1993). Cognitive control functions of study activities: A compensation model. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18* (1), 47-65.

Duckworth, A. L. & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Self-discipline gives girls the edge: Gender in self-discipline, grades, and achievement test scores. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(1), 198-208.

The Education Trust (1999). Ticket to nowhere: The gap between leaving high school and entering college and high-performing jobs. *Thinking K-16, 3*(2), 1-32.

Ellis, A. (1984). Rational-emotive therapy. In R. Corsini (Ed.), *Current psychotherapies* (3rd ed., pp. 196-238). Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Entwisle, D. R. (1960). Evaluations of study skills courses: A review. *Journal of Educational Research, 53,* 247-251.

Feld, S. C., & Lewis, J. (1969). The assessment of achievement anxieties in children. In C. P. Smith (Ed.), *Achievement-related motives in children* (pp. 150-199). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Folkman, S. (1984). Personal control and stress and coping processes: A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 839-852.

Forneris, T., Danish, S. J., & Scott, D. L. (2007). Setting goals, solving problems, and seeking social support: Developing adolescents' abilities through a life skills program. *Adolescence, 42*(165), 103-114.

Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., & Guay, F. (1995). Academic motivation and school performance: Toward a structural model. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 20,* 257-274.

Flay, B. R., Allred, C. G., & Ordway, N. (2001). Effects of the positive action program on achievement and discipline: Two matched-control comparisons. *Prevention Science, 2,* 71-89.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2000). Cultivating positive emotions to optimize health and well-being. *Prevention and Treatment, 3*(1).

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

General strategies for studying and self-testing (n.d.) Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.yorku.ca/cdc/lsp/ep/exam3.htm.

Gilbert, J., & Orlick, T. (1996). Evaluation of a life skills program with grade two children. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling. 31*(2), 139-151.

Goudas, M., Dermitzaki, I., Leondari, A., & Danish, S. (2006). The effectiveness of teaching a life skills program in a physical education context. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(4), 429-438.

Graham, S., & Taylor, A. Z. (2002). Ethnicity, gender, and the development of achievement values. In A. Wigfiled, & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 121-146). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Guide to decision making (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002. from http://www twu.rdu/o-sl/counseling/SH015/.html

Gumora, G., & Arsenio, W. F. (2002). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and school performance in middle school children. *Journal of School Psychology, 40*(5), 395-413.

Hamre, B., & Pianta, R. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eight grade. *Child Development, 72,* 625-638.

Harter, S. (1985). *Manual for the Social Support Scale for Children*. University of Denver. Denver, CO.

Harter, S. (1988). *Manual for the Self Perception Profile for Adolescents.* University of Denver. Denver, CO.

Helpful hints for assertive behavior (n.d.) Retrieved from July 8, 2002. from http://www.hsc.edu/studentlise/couneling/selfhelp/assert.html.

Helping your child use the library (n.d.) Retrieved from July 8, 2002. from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/parents/Library/index.html.

Hobbs, T. D. (2002, July 21). DISD hopefuls focus on dropouts. *The Dallas Morning News,* pp. 35A, 41A.

Holland, J. (1994). *The occupations finder*. Odessa, FL: PAR, Inc.

Holland, J. (1994). *The self-directed search.* Odessa, FL: PAR, Inc.

House, J. D. (1993). The relationship between academic self-concept and school withdrawal. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133,* 125-127.

Improving your concentration. (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.ksu.edu/counseling/concentr.html.

Improving your memory. (n.d.) Retrieved July 8, 2002. from http:www.scs tamu. edu/self help/elibrary/memory.htm

Kashani, J., Orvaschel, H., & Reid, J. (1989). Psychopathology in a community sample of children and adolescents: A developmental perspective. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 28,* 701-706.

Kenny-Benson, G. A., Patrick, H., Pomerantz, E. M. & Ryan, A. R. (2006). Sex differences in math performance: The role of children's approach to schoolwork. *Developmental Psychology, 42*(1), 11-26.

Kiewra, K. A. (1989). A review of note-taking: The endocing-storage paradigm and beyond. *Educational Psychology Review, 1,* 147-172.

Krashen, S. (1998). Bilingual education and the dropout argument. *Discover*, 4.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping.* New York: Springer.

Learning style preferences (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.edinboro.edu/cwis/acaff/suppserv/academic_support/staar/CAT13.html

Lecky, P. (1945). *Self-consistency: A theory of personality*. New York: Island.

Lee, C. C., & Simmons, S. (1988). A comprehensive life-planning model for black adolescents. *School Counselor, 36,* 5-10.

Lopez, E. J., Ehly, S., & Garcia-Vazquez, E. (2002). Acculturation, social support and academic achievement of Mexican and Mexican American high school students: An exploratory study. *Psychology in the School, 39*(3), 245-257.

Managing stress (n.d.) Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://counselling.massey.ac.nz/articles/stress.htm.

Martinek, T., & Hellison, D. (1998). Values and goal-setting with underserved youth. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 69*(7), 47-52.

Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments: Lessons from research on successful children. *American Psychologist, 53,* 205-220.

Mates, D., & Allison, K. R. (1992). Sources of stress and coping responses of high school students. *Adolescence, 27*(106), 461-474.

Matheny, K. B., Aycock, D. W., Curlette, W. L., & Junker, G. N. (1993). The coping resources inventory for stress: A measure of perceived resourcefulness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49*(6), 815-830.

McCarthy, C. J., Seraphine, A. E., Matheny, K. B., & Curlette, W. L. (2000). Factor Analysis of the coping resources inventory scales for educational enhancement. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 32*, 199-215.

Meichenbaum, D., & Butler, L. (1980). Toward a conceptual model of the treatment of test anxiety: Implications for research and treatment. In I. G. Sarason (Ed.), *Test anxiety: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 187-207). Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Moreno, V., & Di Vesta, F. J. (1991). Cross-cultural comparisons of study habits. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(2), 231-239.

Money management. (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002, from http://www.counseling.swt.edu/money_management.htm.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). *The condition of education 1995: Issues in focus: The educational progress of Hispanic students.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Issues in focus: The educational progress of Hispanic students.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Nguyen, N. T., Allen, L. C., & Fraccastoro, K. (2005). Personality predicts academic performance: Exploring the moderating role of gender. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 27*(14), 105-116.

O'Hearn, T. C., & Gatz, M. (2002). Going for the goal: Improving youths problem solving skills through a school based intervention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(3), 281-303

Ogbu, J. U. (1991). Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective. In M.A. Gibson & J.U. Ogbu (Eds.), *Minority status and schooling: A comparative study of immigration and involuntary minorities* (pp. 3-33). New York: Garland Publishing.

Oliver, H. (1995). Influence of motivational factors on performance. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 22*(1), 45-49.

Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy.* Retrieved August 6, 2007, from http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html .

Perry, B. D. (n. d.). *Self-regulation: The second core strength.* Retrieved August 6, 2007, from http://teacher_scholatic.com/professional/brucepettery/self_regulation.htm.

Petrie, T. A., & Denson, E. (1999). *A student athlete's guide to college success: Peak performance in class and life.* California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Petrie, T. A., Landry, L. P., & Edwards, K. B. (1999). *Achieving personal and academic success*. Denton, TX: RonJon Publishing.

Pintrich, P. R., & Zusho, A. (2002). The development of academic self-regulation: The role of cognitive and motivational factors. In A. Wigfiled, & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 249-284). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Pintrich, P. R. (1995). Integrating and contextualizing motivation: Ford's motivational systems theory. *PsycCRITIQUES, 40*(10), 999-1002.

Preparing for exams (n.d.) Retrieved on July 8, 2002 from http://www.ucc.vt.edu/examprep.htm.

Procedure for writing a term paper. (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002, from http://www.ucc.vt.edu/stdysk/termpapr.html.

Putting a stop to putting it off: Procrastination strategies. (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002, from http://www.unc.edu/depts/unc_caps/Procrast.html.

Ramey, C. T., & Ramey, S. L. (1998). Early intervention and early experience. *American Psychologist, 53*(2), 109-120.

Raygor, A. L. (n.d.) Procedure for writing a term paper. Retrieved July 8, 2002, from http://www.ucc.vt.edu/stdy/temper/termpapr.html.

Reading and highlighting written text (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.edinboro.edu/cwis/acaff/suppserv/academic_support/staar/CAT21/html.

Reading and study skills: Note taking the Cornell System. (n.d.) Retrieved July 8 from http://www.ucc.vt.edu/stdkysk/cornell

Robyak, J. E. (1977). A revised study skills model: Do some of them practice what we teach? *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56*(3),171-175.

Rose, E., & Larkin, D. (2002). Perceived competence, discrepancy scores, and global self-worth. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 19*(2), 127-140.

Rosenberg, M., Schooler, C., & Schoenbach, C. (1989). Self-esteem and adolescent problems: Modeling reciprocal effects. *American Sociological Review, 54,* 1004-1018.

Rosenberg, M., Schooler, C., Schoenback, C. & Rosenberg, F. (1995). Global self-esteem and specific self-esteem: Different concepts, different outcomes. *American Sociological Review, 60*(1), 141-156.

Sampson W. A. (2005). *Black and brown: Race, ethnicity, and school preparation.* Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.

Schacter, D. (1999). The seven sins of memory: Insights from psychology and cognitive neuroscience. *American Psychologist, 54,* 182-203.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 26,* 207-231.

Schunk, D. H. (1992). Theory and research on student perceptions in the classroom. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom* (pp. 3-23). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc., Publishers.

Schunk, D. H., & Ertmer, P. A. (2005). Self-regulation and academic learning: Self-efficacy enhancing interventions. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 631-649). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Schunk, D. H., & Meece, J. L. (Eds.). (1992). *Student perception in the classroom.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfiled, & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 15-31). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Secada, W., Chavez-Chavez, R., Garcia, E., Munoz, C., Oakes, J., Santiago-Santiago, I., & Slavin, R. (1998). *No more excuses: The final report of the Hispanic dropout project.* Washington, DC: Hispanic Dropout Project.

Self-confidence; (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2002 from http://www.couns.uiuc.edu/Brochures/self.htm.

Simons-Morton, B. G., Crump, A. D., Haynie, D. L., & Saylor, K. E. (1999). Student-school bonding and adolescent problem behavior. *Health Education Research, 14*(1), 99-107.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Valas, H. (1999). Relations among achievement, self-concept, and motivation in mathematics and language arts: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Experimental Education, 67*(2), 135-149.

Spamer, M. L., & Cowen, E. L., (2001). A comparison of the school mental health referral profiles of young ESL and English-speaking children. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29,* 69-82.

St. Leger, L. H. (1999). The opportunities and effectiveness of the health promoting primary school in improving child health – a review of the claims and evidence. *Health Education Research, 14*(1), 51-69.

Stevenson, H. W., Chen, C., & Lee, S. Y. (1993). Mathematics achievement of Chinese, Japanese, and American children: Ten years later. *Science, 259,* 53-58.

Sulaiman, A., & Mohezar, S. (2006). Student success factors: Identifying key predictors. *Journal of Education for Business, 4,* 328-333.

Szkrybalo, J., & Ruble, R. (1998). Childhood and gender role development. In E. Blechman & K. Brownell (Eds.), *Behavioral medicine and women* (pp. 39-44). New York: Guilford.

Taylor, D. (2001). Factors that influence student motivation. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 62*(4), 1331. 07

Texas Education Agency (1985). *A curriculum guide for the Texas competency based high school diploma programs.* Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). School effectiveness for language minority Students. *National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.* Washington, DC.

Trueba, H. (1988). Peer socialization among minority students: A high school dropout prevention program. In H. Trueba & C. Delgado-Gaitan (Eds.), *In school and society: Learning content through culture* (pp. 201-217). New York: Praeger Press.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools: 1996-1997 (NCES) 98-030).* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Viadero, D. (2006). Concern over gender gaps shifting to boys. *Education Week, 25*(27), 16-17.

Weinberg, R. S. (1996). Goal setting in sport and exercise: Research to practice. In J. L. Van Raalte & B. W. Brewer (Eds.), *Exploring sport and exercise psychology* (pp. 3-24). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

West, P., & Sweeting, H. (2003). Fifteen, female and stressed: Changing patterns of psychological distress over time. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 44*(3), 399-411.

Whitaker-Sena, J. D., Lowe, P. A., & Lee, S. W. (2007). Significant predictors of test anxiety among students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40*(4), 360-376.

Whitfield, D. (1995). Increasing interest and achievement motivation among adolescents: An overview. *High School Journal, 79*(1), 33-40.

Wigfield, A. (1997). Reading motivation: A domain-specific approach to motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 32*(2), 59-68.

Wigfield, A. & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Test anxiety in elementary and secondary school students. *Educational Psychologist, 24*(2), 159-183.

Yoshikawa, H. (1994). Prevention as cumulative protection: Effects of early family support and education on chronic delinquency and its risks. *Psychological Bulletin, 115,* 28-54.

Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M., & Pintrich, P. R. (2005). Self-regulation: Directions and challenges for future research. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 749-768). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Zigler, E., Taussig, C., & Black, K. (1992). A promising preventive for juvenile delinquency. *American Psychologist, 47,* 997-1006.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). Academic studying and the development of personal skill: A self-regulatory perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 33,* 73-86.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). San Diego: Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Perceptions of efficacy and strategy use in the self-regulation of learning. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom* (pp. 185-207). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc., Publishers.