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ABSTRACT

A STUDY TO EXAMINE LEARNER EFFICIENCY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AS MEASURED BY PERCEIVED SELF-CONCEPT AND LOCUS OF CONTROL OF BLACK STUDENTS IN SEGREGATED V. DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

(February 1978)

Yvonne L. Blanchard, B.A., Fisk University, M.A., Loyola University, Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Ernest Washington

This study investigated the effectantness of a segregated v. desegregated school environment as assessed by student perception on self concept and locus of control measures. An analysis of problems associated with desegregation accommodation, learner efficiency and school effectiveness as they relate to black children was made for the purpose of arriving at solutions to such problems.

One hundred sixty-eight black male and female students in fourth and sixth grades in segregated and desegregated school environments participated in the study. The instruments administered were the Crandall Locus of Control for Intellectual Achievement Reasoning (IAR) and the Self Observation Scale (SOS). The responses to these instruments were studied in reference to three independent variables: Area: desegregated v. segregated; Grade: sixth v. fourth; and Sex: male
v. female. Interactions were studied across six dependent variables: self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation, positive internal control and negative external control. Relationships across variables were determined. A 2x2x2 multivariate analysis of variance was operationalized yielding probability scores as significance tests across dependent measures. Statistically significant and non-significant relationships were identified.

Results suggest that the performance of students in the segregated school environment tended to be higher than that of students in the desegregated school environment. Likewise, the performance of fourth grade students tended to be higher than the performance of sixth grade students.

Comparison of effects for school environment noted significant relationships for: (1) fourth grade students on the positive internal control measure; (2) fourth grade student on the negative external control measure; (3) sixth grade students on the social confidence measure; and (4) fourth grade students on the teacher affiliation measure.

Comparison of effects for grade level noted significant relationships for: (1) desegregated students on the internal positive control measure; (2) desegregated students on the school affiliate measure; (3) segregated students on the
school affiliation measure; and, (4) segregated students on
the teacher affiliation measure.

Performance for students across sex was found to be not
significant.

Findings support a reexamination of the psychological
outcomes of school desegregation.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of public education in America the contribution of Blacks to the growth and development of major educational institutions in this country has not been acknowledged. Similarly, the educational needs of minority children have been ignored. Historically, American schools have been successful at this form of subjugation by implied inferiority and failure to create equally supportive social and academic opportunities and environments for black and white children alike. Regardless of racial identification or socio-economic status, a positive sense of self worth, belonging, achievement, and a clear sense of attainment are essential to the achievement of one's goals or the goals valued by the larger society.

By failing to create and offer supportive conditions to minority students, schools fail to accommodate their needs. Further, they violate social, educational and ethnic values by forcing children to internalize and adhere to the values of the majority society, and adjust to the expectations of the school, programatically and politically designed and defined by whites for whites.

The failure of American schools to provide meaningful educational experiences for minority children stems from a
lack of an improved definition of what schools should be about (Baratz, 1970). She writes:

... public schools, fail in the long run because they define educability in terms of a child's ability to perform within our alien culture; yet they make us attempt to teach him systematically new cultural patterns. ... Educability, for culturally different children, should be defined primarily as the ability to learn new cultural patterns within the experience and the culture with which the child is already familiar. Moynihan (1968) provides an argument which could lead one to believe that the school's inability to competently educate black children is due to political constraints and the pathology of black participation and intervention in defining policy. While describing the process which led to legislation for the 1964 War on Poverty, he wrote:

By and large the issue of Negro poverty ... have been defined and analyzed by white social scientists, and the subsequent programs have been administered by white political executives. ... the idea of community action in the context of opportunity theory was conceived by white social scientists, launched by white foundation executives and political activists, brought to Washington by the same, developed in the (White) President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth
Crime, sold to white economists in the Executive Office Building, and drafted into legislation by the White House Task Force on Poverty.

This contention suggests that the responsibility for programs which fail to meet the needs of black children should be assigned to the failure of Blacks to initiate formulations of public policy.

Moynihan's argument that pathology of black political participation is responsible for the incompatibility of black children with American schooling confounds equitable intervention theory. It leads one to believe that equity is implicit in opportunities for black intervention. This notion is ill founded. For more than 200 hundred years Blacks have been the contraband of struggle, yet well behaved: a self sufficient peasantry. Likewise since reconstruction Blacks have been denied legislative action, justice and political participation; while they have watched the joys of emancipation turn to despair.

For black children, the American public school system has successfully perpetuated a complex interlocking system of psychological, sociological and cultural inequities which smother educational capabilities, encourage wholesale conformity to institutional norms and expectations and reinforce skepticism. These complexities inhibit healthy social and psychological interaction and adjustment central
to their feeling comfortable and acceptable in school. Survival for black students within these institutional structures has been largely dependent upon their past experiences, powerful advocates and ability to adjust without losing their sense of self in the process.

**Background**

Five years after the end of the Civil War and twenty years before the Plessy v. Ferguson decision established the "separate but equal" doctrine, the California Supreme Courts upheld the denial of admission of an eleven year old child to a school nearest her home on the grounds that she was of African descent and that separate accommodations had been provided for those whose pigment was similar (Colley, 1971).

In the early 1800's, schools were established in many states for free Blacks, many of whom were the offspring of past masters. Admission criteria often included being "light, bright and damn near white." In 1865 the 39th Congress passed the fourteenth amendment which stated:

No state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

On July 28, 1868, the fourteenth amendment was ratified; its power however to be subjected to the test of prudence.
At the time of the fourteenth amendment the education of Blacks was forbidden in many states while in others criminal charges were levied against Blacks who were caught reading.

Opposition to education of Blacks was wide spread. J.H. Franklin (1968) points out that whites did not consider it necessary to include Blacks in any programs of public education, and that most white Southerners were against any education for Blacks. They were, in fact, relentless in their fight to oppose mixed schools despite equal protection guaranteed under the fourteenth amendment.

The issue of mixed schools was by and large avoided. After reconstruction the fourteenth amendment was further denounced and Blacks lost all rights that would have encouraged their social, political and economic equality.

Once Jim Crow was firmly established in the public schools of the South, the inequities persisted and increased; and the conditions most destructive to the education process in a democracy were created. White children were taught if not directly then indirectly by their superior advantages, that they belonged to some kind of a master race. Even the dull minded among them, moreover could see that they lived lives that contradicted the basic democratic tenents of equality and justice.
For the Negro children the task was an almost impossible one: to endure the badge of inferiority imposed on them by segregation, to learn enough in inferior Jim Crow schools to survive in a highly complex and hostile world, and at the same time keep faith in democracy. For both Negro and white children, one of the most effective lessons taught in Jim Crow schools was that even in institutions dedicated to training the mind a greater premium was placed on color than on brains (Franklin, 1968).

Segregated schools were the norm, and regression was the character which outfitted the judicial chambers throughout the country. In 1896 the Supreme Court upheld the principles of "separate but equal" facilities in Plessy v. Ferguson. The court sanctioned separation and segregation and all the behaviors inherent in that process.

The issue of segregation in every major social institution persisted while suits to enjoin statutory provisions were filed on increasing scale by prudent citizens who understood the genocidal effects of starving the mind, and requiring Blacks to consent to inferiority imposed by exclusion.

On May 17, 1954, 335 years after the first Negro slaves arrived in America in chains and 91 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, Earl Warren, Chief Justice
of the United States began reading the Supreme Court opinion in Brown v. Board of Education. . . . the reading of the unanimous decision ended at 1:20. The Supreme Court had spoken . . . the words uttered that day constituted 'the most controversial and far reaching decision of the twentieth century' (Blaustein & Ferguson, 1962).

The historic Brown decision decreed an end to legally enforced segregation—a system institutionally supported by racism, the oldest malady since the bureaucracy of slavery. However, the decision would, in years to come, more comprehensively define the challenge of non-compliance, the resistance to equitable school processes, and the appalling realities of the fight for equal status for Blacks.

The test of the constitutionality of the desegregation law is still an aggressive one, as displayed in the burning of school busses in Pontiac, Michigan, boycotts and marches in Louisville, Kentucky, the presence of Federal troops in Little Rock, Arkansas and Mississippi to protect black students, one way bussing in many southern states, resegregation in Inglewood, California, the murder of a desegregation planner in Dayton, Ohio, the stoning of N.A.A.C.P. counsel and black children in Boston. . . . and the atrocities continue, for what purpose, to what end?
The present study is influenced by the historical underpenning of inequality and persecution suffered by Black people. A historical review of the dimensions detailing the misuse of legislation to restrict the social and educational opportunities of Blacks and the present demands to review and reinstate equitable policy and practices dictates careful analyses of the equal educational opportunity agenda.

The recorded misuse of legislation against Blacks generally, and black children specifically, compels the present study of the effect of segregated v. desegregated public schools on the personality determinants, self concept and locus of control of black children.

Powell (1973) notes that the most exacting dimension of being a Black, in the intrapsychic sense, is that every hour of one's life is spent in "being" a Black, "existing" as a Black, defining and redefining that existence as a Black, and struggling to find the selfness and the individual identity as distinct from the group identity. She further states that the "feeling" quality of being black is an existential phenomenon. Existential to the extent that the searching into the black self includes the black self, other internal selves, an awareness of other external selves, white people and other black people, and eventually the reality of the "angst" of black existence--the anguish, the dread and despair.
This despair of which Powell speaks is equated to Kierkegaard's "sickness unto death," James Baldwin's phenomenon of namelessness, and Ralph Ellison's invisibility. It is this despair and historical persecution that requires the empirical assessment of the effects of schooling in America on black children.

This study will be comprised of (1) statements made by recognized authorities in education, social psychology and related fields concerning educational policy and the types of school environments (segregated v. desegregated) which influence positive v. negative self concept development and self control; and, (2) findings from research studies which have already been conducted on the major dependent variables.

Statement of the Problem

Black children in American schools, some segregated and some desegregated, have been denied the description of black self through literature, history, and social experience. They have been denied the sameness of social and educational opportunities accorded white children, powerful advocates who can expel the evils of one sided policies which exclude black participation, and the support of school personnel who consciously understand the multidimensionality of the black personality determinants and the effect of schooling on each of these issues.
The purpose of the study was to examine relationships between the scores on the self acceptance, social confidence, teacher affiliation and school affiliation sub scales on the Intermediate Self Observation Scale (SOS), and Internal v. External Control on the Intellectual Achievement Reasoning (IAR) Locus of Control Scale of black male and female students in grades four and six in segregated v. desegregated educational settings.

By examining the relationships between these scores, data may be developed to explain the comparative viability of segregated v. desegregated strategies. Once having generated data on the problems, successes, and attainments of fourth and sixth grade students as reflected in their scores, it is probable that a less extreme and more viable educational model may be a step closer. The problem studied was: Are black fourth and sixth grade male and female students better accommodated in segregated v. desegregated educational settings, as accommodation is reflected in measures of student perceptions regarding affective behavior?

**Equal Education Opportunity Strategies**

The equal status, equal educational opportunity arguments for black and white students in American schools have characterized the attempted modification of many educational programs and strategies which have been institutionally
initiated under the auspices of the Brown decision. The question of whether schools do dispense their services equally is implicit in the attitudes and behaviors of individuals associated with these schools who shape and maintain their policies, as is true of historical and social forces the world over. The answer to the question, however, is not readily forthcoming: in theory, equality is guaranteed by law; but every particular set of school equality circumstances represents a space into which failure can insinuate itself.

The cumulative psychological effects of racism in American schools often becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy where unequal status is internalized by the minority student population along with self-denigrating behavior and attitudes. Beyond this, majority groups have become highly skilled in benign neglect, in justifying the above-mentioned denigrating behavior by the minority child. Thus majority behaviors conform and correspond to institutional sanctions (Pettigrew, 1961).

Perhaps the most crucial question to be asked is: "What happens to Blacks specifically and to ethnic minorities generally when the majority society spends more than one hundred years degrading, ignoring, excluding, containing, institutionalizing, segregating, and dehumanizing them?"
The second question then is: "What strategies are available
to assess the extent to which American institutions generally
and educational institutions specifically accommodate to
the changing needs of black children in public schools?"

The two greater problems of twentieth century America
have been, first, the development of a philosophy that de-
mands equal education regardless of race or color, the
concept of one educational standard for everyone, and
second, the development of a strategy which gives realiza-
tion to that philosophy.

During the second half of the twentieth century, the
efficacy of strategies designed for the purpose of providing
America's children and youth with equal learning opportuni-
ties have tended to come increasingly under question. These
strategies may be viewed as falling into one of two cate-
gories: desegregation and segregation. The desegregation
strategy emerged from approximately twenty years of litiga-
tion testing the general prevailing legalist position that
a segregated school violates basic demands of the Constitu-
tion and, therefore, the rights of students as individuals,
and black students collectively. Desegregation as a stra-
tegy was employed as a corrective measure to every aspect
of American life, from the luncheon counter to representation
in the congressional bodies of the United States. So
revered was it as a strategy that regardless of the problem,
if it was one of race, desegregation was, ipso facto, the
solution.

The strategy of desegregation (as an approach to education) is based on the proposition that if black and white children share the same classrooms, the equal-opportunity-to-learn agenda will be satisfied. That proposition, however, rests on at least three critical assumptions:

(1) That sharing the same classrooms, interest and the press of rule systems governing the social behavior of the greater percentage of the students (white), will impact on the social behavior of the smaller percentage of black children and result in a changing learning behavior in the black students.

(2) That black students sharing the same classrooms with white students will no longer be penalized by their parents' and communities' lack of political acumen. (3) That black students will incur increased learning motivation in a predominantly white student body where status and position will only be achieved by excelling in social, physical and academic programs in which white persons purport to excel, and at corresponding levels, in order to achieve status.

Certainly a number of additional assumptions are at issue. However, the purpose here is not to exhaust that list. It is to sketch the anatomy of a set of assumptions that resulted in the proposition that the desegregation strategy will in turn result in the effective implementation of the nation's policies.
The segregated neighborhood school strategy on the other hand is based on a set of assumptions that directly conflict with those assumptions underlying the desegregation strategy. They include the following:

(1) In a segregated neighborhood school, the expectations held by the staff will be more congruent with those held by the school community;

(2) Black children can learn while enrolled in a school with a predominantly black student population; and,

(3) A segregated neighborhood school, adequately financed, will provide black children with opportunities to learn that are equal to those provided to middle and upper class white children.

Strategies designed in support of segregated v. desegregated education as it affects learner efficiency and school effectiveness have not, however, been operationalized under ideal conditions. Rather, the two decades subsequent to the 1954 Brown v. the Board of Education desegregation decision have seen the educational process engulfed in social and political turmoil. Much of this turmoil has resulted from efforts to desegregate public schools. This suggests the interesting question of how students, who have been exposed to one or the other of these strategies in a context that is crisis ridden, fare with respect to the equal opportunity
to learn agenda. Each of the two strategies, segregated v. desegregated, is argued by its proponents to lead to effectant institutional behavior. However, neither strategy purports to affect what happens to children once they are in the educational setting.

The efficacy of both strategies has been questioned by many students of this problem. However, these strategies are studied here insofar as they focus on black children. This study does not treat the behavior of the teachers of those children, the behavior of persons who supervise those teachers and manage and administer the schools, or the attitude of the society at large.

Relevant to this study, however, is the fact that a growing body of students of the problem have come to define it systematically. They argue that if Blacks and whites, poor and affluent, male and female, younger and older students are to have their educational needs met, persons responsible for meeting this diverse set of needs must have the training and knowledge to render them effective. Effectantness, the argument continues, results from the interaction of two phenomena: efficiency and effectiveness. The learner is said to be efficient when (s)he is motivated to bring appropriate experiences, skills, abilities, and knowledge that are already embedded in his or her repertoire to bear on social and educational problems. The institution is judged to be effective when agents of that institution present students
with educational problems which can be solved by the strategies and skills already available to the learner. It is only when efficient learner and effective school agents interact that institutions can be said to be behaving effectantly, and thereby approach a state in which they can accommodate students' needs.

Hypothesis of the Study

The effects of segregated schools on the social development of black children was examined in 1965 when President Lyndon Johnson requested the United States Commission on Civil Rights to conduct an investigation into the effects of segregation and to submit recommendations for assuring equality. The investigation found that black children suffer serious harm when their education takes place in public schools which are racially segregated whatever the source of such segregation may be. Black children who attend the predominately black schools do not achieve as well as other children, black and white. Their aspirations are more restricted than those of other children, and they do not have as much confidence that they can influence their own futures. The report also concluded that when black children became adults they are less likely to participate in the mainstream of American society and more likely to fear, dislike, and avoid white Americans.
Clark (1963) notes that the low levels of aspiration and defeatism so commonly observed in segregated groups are related to the level of self evaluation; but they are also, in some measure, related to one's expectations with regard to opportunities for achievement.

Armor (1973) asserts that segregation and inequality combine to cause psychological damage in children resulting in lower achievement, lower aspirations and less self esteem.

The negative experiences of black children in segregated and poorly desegregated schools foster and perpetuate a paranoid type of existence. In their repertoire of coping skills they accurately perceive hostile environments which mitigate against their success. Because this is their experience, it is therefore recorded as real.

Chesler, Wittes and Radin (1968) write:

School desegregation can enable Negro and white students to learn and live together, but the specific outcome depends upon the tactics each school utilizes to marshal the best of student, teacher, and community resources in the open admission and treatment of things that separate us now but may yet bring us together.

The basic inability of the desegregation strategy is thus exposed as, more often than not, superficial in its implication as controls and monitoring insure student interaction beyond redistribution of pupils.
The desegregated school environment without adequate support and controls--parent involvement, staff retraining, revised curriculum to reflect multi-ethnic contributions--is no different from segregated school environments. A truly desegregated school assures such programs as staff retraining and promises integration of curriculum, staff, and social experiences beyond mere pupil redistribution. The primary difference between a segregated school environment and a merely desegregated school environment is perhaps the redistribution of pupils creating a more racially balanced student body.

This merely desegregated strategy may heighten black students' feelings of inferiority, emphasize their assumed cultural deprivation, and further isolate them from the full benefits deriving from a system described as a "quality integrated system." In a school that is merely desegregated without integration of resources and controls beyond redistributing, one's group identity cannot help but be negative. This negative group identity coupled with the societal negative identity of low-income black children becomes even more debilitating.

Many whites believe that when a significant number of black children are admitted to their school, the educational standards will be lowered, and that they must provide specialized counseling to conform to their stereotyped notions
of the Blacks' inferior abilities and job opportunities. This results in the development of an actual inferiority in black children which appears to justify the original assumption of their inferiority. The burden on black children in an educational situation where they are regarded as peculiar, exotic, or inferior is intensified if they are rejected or ignored by teachers and classmates. To be regarded and treated as a problem tends almost inevitably to make a human being a problem (Clark, k. 1963, p. 89).

Is it any wonder the self esteem and assessed valuation of black children hangs in such a critical balance? Is it any wonder that black children are hostile and aggressive towards whites who invade their space and threaten them with ownership or displacement? Is it any wonder that as many Blacks have maintained their integrity and dignity in spite of the discrepancy which underlies the equality of education thesis?

A report published by the Children's Defense Fund (1975) examines the relationship between school attitude and student participation. One of the study's major findings emphasizes a positive relationship between the extent to which schools accommodate students and their level of participation. A second finding demonstrates that student behavior resulted in differential performance on cognitive tasks and differential treatment by the professional actors in the school.
Buswell (1951) notes that a significant relationship exists between intelligence and performance levels of rejected students. He further states that rejected youngsters, alienated from the learning environment, have reduced self esteem and are unable to concentrate on cognitive tasks. Schmuck (1969) found that in a classroom where the quality of interaction is demeaning and disrespectful, students have a greater feeling of rejection and generally lower self esteem.

Most research on school environment supports the view that a positive school environment is one which enhances a student's self esteem and academic performance, the quality of the social affiliation between the student, his peers, teachers, and the school, and facilitates the development of high esteem and maximize's participation in educational programs. The interpersonal power that students feel in relation to peers, schools, teachers, and the levels of skills and competence that a student perceives to be a part of the self, encourage positive feelings about the school and increased involvement in school tasks (Schmuck and Schmuck, 1969).

Coleman (1975), in his research on racial segregation in the schools, investigates the implications for desegregation policies. His study examines three major points: (1) segregation trends within school systems from 1968 to 1973; (2) segregation trends among or between school systems which arise through black and white children living in localities
served by different school systems; and (3) the relationship between school desegregation in central city systems and segregation between systems (white flight).

The research examines racial composition of central city schools, while illustrating how racial composition has been affected by school integration. An investigation of the findings reveals that between 1968 and 1972 desegregation changed the profile of Southern segregation so that it became similar to the north where high segregation existed in large cities, while much less of a problem in smaller school districts.

The policy implication of the study's findings is the necessity for metropolitan-wide desegregation through the courts. This would be accomplished by busing children to bring about racial balance over the metropolitan area. These results, however, raise the question of just how far in the quest for racial integration of schools it is wise to go. Once minority rights are protected, then school desegregation must be justified in terms of its consequences. Coleman maintains that achievement benefits do exist, but they are not substantial enough to warrant in and of themselves school desegregation regardless of other consequences. The focus should be on slowing the exodus of whites from central cities and facilitating the movement of Blacks to the suburbs.
The overall conclusions of this research favor eliminating segregation at the metropolitan level, a reassessment of the means and goals of desegregation, and an identification of means to realize social mobility through the expansion rather than the reduction of individual rights.

These conclusions seem to advance the "have your cake and eat it" philosophy, where opportunity exists on the books; but should not affect "our school." True commitment seems constrained because of the ambiguity and contradictions surrounding the equal educational opportunity agenda in school environments. The inference drawn from the equality of education thesis herein presented is that segregation restricts participation of Blacks, and the subsequent level and quality of black interaction in the American mainstream.

The context for this desegregation review lies within the dilemmas posed by the twenty-two year old Brown v. Board of Education decision, and its roots in the ambivalence of reasoning on which educational policy rests as derived from the 1954 Supreme Court decision and the 1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity study (Coleman, 1966).

The direction of the following hypothesis thus acknowledges segregation as a more neurotic, depressive strategy while desegregation, however curiously positioned, is described throughout the legal text as a more effective strategy. It is also deemed less restrictive on the interactional
milleu of children with social and achievement benefits that accrue to all children equally.

Therefore, the **first hypothesis** is that:
As a result of participation in a desegregated school environment, the self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation and locus of control scores for these students will be higher than the scores for those same measures for students who participated in segregated school experiences.

The **second hypothesis** is that:
Fourth grade male and female students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation and locus of control scores than fourth grade male and female students in the segregated school environment.

The **third hypothesis** is that:
Sixth grade male and female students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation and locus of control scores than sixth grade male and female students in the segregated school environment.
The fourth hypothesis is that:
Female students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation and locus of control scores than female students in the segregated school environment.

The fifth hypothesis is that:
Male students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, and locus of control scores than male students in the segregated school environment.

Definition of Terms
Accommodation: Martin and Franklin (1973) define accommodation as the process by which individuals and groups make the necessary internal adjustments to social situations which have been created by competitors and conflicts. By this definition accommodation is an individual or group adjustment response to a situation.

As used throughout this study, accommodation refers to the ability of school agents to behave in such a way that students attending that school are exposed to persons, data, and programs that enhance their healthy adjustment to the rule system or rituals of schooling. This definition, while not conflicting with Martins', is broader in that it includes institutional behavior (effectance) that results
when persons and groups are motivated to behave efficiently, and the agents and programmatic structures of the institutions behave effectively.

**Self acceptance:** how students perceive the self or attribute to the self qualities of happiness, importance and general competence or the converse.

**School affiliation:** manner in which the student perceives the effect of the influence that school exerts on the life of the student.

**Locus of control:** the extent to which a child believes he/she is able to influence the outcome of situations (internal: self attributed) or the extent to which the student believes the control is outside his/her own influence (external: environmentally attributed).

**Locus of control of intellectual achievement reasoning responsibility:** the extent to which a child believes in either internal or external control of reinforcements in intellectual academic achievements, and believes he/she is able to influence the outcome of intellectual reasoning or academic achievement.

**Desegregated school:** an educational setting within plus or minus fifteen percent of racial composition of the school district and where racial balance of students is introduced when distinctions, exclusions or restraints of participation based upon race no longer prevail and the benefits of educational programs accrue equally to all children.
Merely desegregated school: an educational setting modified through legislative mandates resulting, however, in mere redistribution of pupils to create a racially balanced student body.

Segregated school: an educational setting where racial composition of students is sharply out of line with the racial composition of the school system as a whole, plus or minus fifteen percent as allowed by the courts. Powell (1973) defines a segregated school as one with an all white or all black enrollment of less than ten percent.

In 1954 a segregated school system was one in which the state required or permitted separation of pupils on the basis of race (Ravitch, 1976).

Segregation: the process which sets Blacks apart and makes them easier to exploit--the ultimate in exclusion and nonassimilation (Ravitch, 1976).

Significance of the Study

The review of the literature focuses on sociological and psychological implications of the study for education. It reports findings and conclusions regarding the internal adjustments of children in general, and black children specifically, in public schools that are allegedly being modified.

The writers reviewed provide a strong case for the re-examination of educational processes which have damaging
effects on black children. These processes are purported to result from the proclivity of public schools to provide the same educational "opportunities" in the same way for all children. The literature review argues for the integration of diverse educational processes which are responsive to different educational needs.

**Justification of Delimitations**

While it is recognized that children, and youth, and youth other than black children, are more or less accommodated by the public schools, black children and youth were selected for study for the following reasons:

1. The researcher's personal concern and professional interest;
2. The limited resources available to the researcher which required focusing on one ethnic group; and,
3. The severity of problems associated with education of black children and youth.

**Limitations of the Study**

Two major limitations of this study are the inability to control a set of variables that obviously influence child attitude development and school policy modifications: teacher behavior and the socio-politics of the community. It is recognized that teacher personality traits (Gage, 1972; Flanders, 1960), teacher interest or lack thereof (Johnson, 1974), teacher lack of ability to perceive the actual
needs of students (Kozol, 1967; Guskin & Guskin, 1970), and the effects of the politics of the community on the psychosocial stimulation of children (Coleman, 1966) are extremely important variables. It is also recognized, however, that controlling such variables is, at best, difficult.

Summary

Throughout this chapter a number of questions were raised concerning equal status, equal educational opportunity agendas, individual efficiency and institutional effectiveness in segregated v. desegregated school environments as they relate to the total accommodation of the needs of black children by schools. These questions and concerns are closely tied to student perception of self, locus of control, and a number of dependent variables which influence academic achievement, the quality of school interaction and perceived self efficiency in that interaction. A more fundamental question to be addressed by this study concerns the manner in which students perceive the effectantness of institutions, i.e., the schools' ability or willingness to accommodate the needs of black students.

Beyond this lies the question "to what extent does the student perceive the segregated v. desegregated environment to be more accommodating, thereby encouraging a more healthy self acceptance and locus of control?" Another concern is the extent to which the student believes (s)he has control
over the quality of school interaction or to what extent that control is assigned by some external agent or stimuli.

These questions are pursued from the students' perspective simply because it is the investigator's perception that black male and female children in the fourth and sixth grades in segregated v. desegregated school environments are sufficiently sophisticated and perceptive to realistically respond to what their perceptual experience base has taught them.

Far too many of the strategies for solution to the equal opportunity to learn agenda in segregated v. desegregated school environments are derived from culturally irrelevant ethnocentric normative structures which improperly assess the educational needs and abilities of black children.

In order to identify viable courses, educational leaders may draw upon in drafting legislation or formulating policy certain to improve the education of black children, there must first be a compendium of knowledge which sets up the imperatives for a prescriptive strategy that will insure individual efficiency, institutional effectiveness, and a more effectant (adjustment) accommodation process. This investigation represents an effort to begin to develop such a compendium of knowledge in an area maligned by maltreatment and over-simplification.
CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is concerned with the relationship between segregated v. desegregated school environments for black children. A review of the literature illustrates that self-concept studies comparing Blacks and whites are more prevalent than self-concept studies comparing Blacks in desegregated schools with Blacks in segregated schools.

Many recent studies fail to achieve consensus on basic issues such as: (1) whether socio-economically advantaged children's self-concepts differ from those of socio-economically disadvantaged children (Lang, Henderson, 1968; Soares & Soares, 1969); (2) whether black children have lower self-concepts than white children (Katz, 1967; Zirkle, 1971); and (3) whether girls have stronger self-concepts than boys (Katzenmeyer & Stenner, 1975). Zirkle (1971), in a rather comprehensive review of the self-concept literature, cites several explanations for the "bewildering array" of definitions, instruments and research design implemented in measuring self-concept. He suggests that the inconclusive "evidence" regarding self-concept development may be attributed to any one of the following: (1) varying definitions of self-concept; (2) lack of standardized instrumentation with adequate reliability and validity;
(3) inadequate control of such variables as age and socio-economic status; and, (4) possibility of an acquiesce or other response set. Katzenmeyer and Stenner (1975), in their publication No. 84, have added two additional explanations: (1) failure to identify the underlying structure of self concept, and (2) failure to determine or demonstrate whether the assumed or empirically determined structure is replicable across random subsamples and invariant across criterion groups included in the population to which inferences are to be made, e.g., black males v. white males.

They further highlight the importance of first determining the underlying structure of the measure used in comparative research, and second, subjecting the obtained factors to replicability and invariance checks. They state:

The primary danger in ignoring the factor invariance question in comparative research is that profile level or shape differences may be observed between, say Blacks and whites and the differences explained (or not explained) with a set of independent variables when the majority of difference may be due to the fact that the instrument measures slightly (or greatly) different behaviors in the two racial groups. When the amount of factor invariance is not level and shape differences are open to criticism on the basis of non-equivalence and structural instability of the measurement procedure
across comparison groups (p. 3).

Conceivably the observed differences in findings among self concept studies which depend on scores between black and white children may be attributed to the factor structure on underlying multi-dimensionality. The following section examines the research in detail.

**Self Concept Research**

Self acceptance develops through the comparisons a child makes of himself and his competitiveness with other children and their competitiveness. Katzenmeyer and Stenner (1975) note that the environmental presses dictated by parents, church, school, peers and other socialization agencies combine to create an explicit age-appropriate set of standards against which the child compares himself-herself and is compared by others. The comparison process begins even before children learn to walk and talk; but the early school years provide frequent opportunities for self generated comparison and judgment by authority (p. 9.)

Allport (1963) notes there are seven central aspects of self which constitute a definition of self as perceived and acknowledged. These seven central aspects are: (1) a sense of bodily self; (2) a sense of continuing self identity; (3) self esteem, pride; (4) the extension of self; (5) the self image; (6) the rational coping self; and (7) the self as a properite striver. He notes that these are
continuing threads in the process of self discovery and are affected by life experiences. These experiences are often characterized by self assertion, goal achievement, opposition to others, self comparison with peers, self evaluation and approval by others.

Williams and Cole (1968) affirm that self concept and academic achievement determinants are requisite for school success while Coleman (1966) supports the relationship between self concept and school success as defined by academic achievement. Walsh (1956) postulates that deficiency in self esteem may be a significant determinant of underachievement.

General academic achievement is highly sanctioned by schools as a measure of school success that the mandate to achieve becomes a burden unaccepting of failure or inadequacy, both of which characterize the resulting condition of the self image, self acceptance of the child who has failed to accept the challenge of achievement. Often educators fall prey to tunnel vision as they fail to realize the strength of the relationship between social, cognitive, and affective achievement and the extent to which they dictate school success.

Despite increased school integration, many (if not most) black children remain in segregated or desegregated schools, primarily in urban ghettos or metropolitan areas where desegregation is virtually impossible. It is these same ghettos which appear to be the focus of black protest and which are most likely to contain adult Blacks whose attitudes
reflect the changes detailed by increased racial awareness, pride in race, independence from white control (Banks, 1970; Caplin, 1969).

Research now in progress suggests that the potency effects of a segregated environment in creating or facilitating a negative self concept are more powerful than previously realized, implicating all aspects of a child's existence. Katzenmeyer and Stenner (1975) state:

The typical Black disadvantage child in a predominantly segregated environment begins school with a self acceptance surely no different from the national norm on the self observation scale (SOS) instrument. They further speculate that it is interesting to consider what happens to the disadvantage child's self acceptance when moving from a segregated environment to a desegregated environment.

The researcher's belief, however, is that the feeling of low self esteem and poor self concept by black children stems from the general inferior subjection and anxiety which characterizes their very existence, as is differentially defined in segregated v. desegregated schools. This differentiation often observed causes one to quiry how black children conceptualize themselves within the context of segregated and desegregated schools.
Snygg and Combs (1949) argue that when a person feels anxious or fearful in the presence of another, he has difficulty in accurately perceiving the world. The greater the perceived threat, the more pronounced the restricting and distorting effect is on one's thought processes and perceptions of one's surroundings. Perceptions may become so disabled that one feels unable to behave efficiently.

It is not difficult to predict what might happen to a student who again and again is presented with interpersonal situations that are threatening to him. One of the possible effects of having others working in near proximity, especially others with whom the student feels insecure, is a reduced level of performance on cognitive learning activities. The extent to which such a student uses his intelligence is likely to be considerably reduced in such a threatening classroom situation. Douglas (1972) notes: "The attitudes and points of view pupils maintain regarding school and its personnel determines, at least in part, their ability to succeed academically."

A threatening classroom situation is one in which the teaching does not accommodate the needs of all the students; where the teacher is unaware of the cultural variables which dictate certain kinds of enthusiasm for participation, where the school is in a state of political turmoil surrounding the issues of racial balance and equality of education;
where the dominant peer system within the school as defined by the school is superior, relegating those at social, economic and cultural variance to positions of inferiority.

Each student's self image or self acceptance is on the line within the classroom environment where the quality of informal relationships can either be threatening or supportive and enhancing to the development of self esteem. The more threatening or supportive the interpersonal relationships in the classroom become, the more likely the individual student's learning and behavior will be affected. In short, the quality of the in-school experience dictates the strength of the student's self concept or self acceptance which in turn directly influences the intellectual and academic performance.

Most research on school climate and environment supports the view that a positive school environment is one which enhances a student's self esteem and academic performance. The quality of the social affiliation between the student, his peers, teachers and the school, facilitates the development of high self esteem and a maximized participation in educational programs. Schmuck and Schmuck (1969) state:

The interpersonal power that students feel in relation to their peers, or the levels of skill and competence
a student sees in himself also encourages positive feelings about school and increased involvement in school tasks. The relevance of positive classroom climate for the optimal school adjustment of students is not commonplace for most adults.

**Comparative Studies of Self Concept of Black and White Students**

Self concept studies comparing Blacks and whites between 1940 to 1960 illustrate inadequacy of self concept and self definition of Blacks (Dreger & Miller, 1960). Likewise, some recent studies using variable measuring instruments concur that Blacks have more negative self concepts than whites (in Dreger & Miller, 1960).

Ball (1960), in a comparison of Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Profile, studied the difference between black and white adolescents in an integrated school. Results indicated black students tended to have more serious difficulty than whites.

McDonald and Gynther (1963) examined differences relevant to sex, race and class using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory among black and white adolescents in a segregated school. White students scored higher than black students, again as in Ball (1960), indicating some psychological problems among black students.
Bunton and Weissbach (1974) studied black kindergarten and first grade children in a predominately black public school v. a community controlled school. The generalized findings indicate that black children relegated to segregated schools can still anticipate development of a positive self concept which includes pride in their race. Nothing in the study indicates that segregated, as opposed to integrated, settings are more amenable to the development of a positive self concept. The data only demonstrates that a segregated environment can and should be conducive to positive self worth. This should not be construed as an endorsement of segregated schools.

Williams and Byars (1968) studied self concept of black adolescents in a rural or small urban southern community in a period of increasing social and political consciousness. They administered the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to 134 black and 176 white senior high school students. On twelve of the seventeen self evaluation dimensions, black students' mean scores were significantly lower than their white counterparts. Black students were low in self confidence, defensive in self description, confused concerning
self identity and similar in performance to neurotic and psychotic people. Thirty-five of the 134 black students were in desegregated schools; however, black students in desegregated schools did not score significantly higher or lower than students attending segregated schools. Students attending newly desegregated schools had a greater leaning toward healthful self improvement and self esteem.

The investigators concluded that the civil rights movement may have accounted for the defensiveness. Other findings also note that black female students were more inclined than male students to accept self derogatory statements.

Under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, Simmons and Rosenberg (1965) measured self esteem of students in grades three through twelve. They found that black students had a higher self esteem than white students and that black students in secondary schools had higher self esteem if they attended more segregated schools (in Powell, 1973, p. 33).

Katz (1967) affirms that black children, isolated or segregated from whites, may find the approval of Blacks more crucial for the development of their self concept and academic abilities than the approval of whites. If this is true, the agenda for strengthening the self concept of Blacks in segregated settings is of the highest priority.
Rosenberg (1965), on the other hand, states that:
There is no indication that the distribution of self acceptance in a group is related to the social prestige of that group in American society. . . . Negroes, who are exposed to the most intense humiliation and crippling forms of discrimination in virtually every institutional area do not have particularly low self esteem (pp. 55-7).

Effects of Transition from Segregated to Integrated Environments

Among the questions to be answered is, "what happens to a positive self concept when an individual leaves the insularity of a segregated environment and enters a more integrated, cosmopolitan and pressurized atmosphere?"

Does a child from an environment culturally different from that in most schools necessarily suffer from the change? The researcher's hunch is that culturally different children do not always suffer from low self esteem as long as they are adequately protected from negative attitudes of others in neighborhood schools where desegregation has not been thoroughly implemented. Fitzgibbon (1970), however, states that when integrated into the majority group, difference in appearance, language and values, the benefits gained from the support of their own group standards and from the presence of adults and other children like themselves may not
hold up. Likewise, Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, et al. (1966) maintain that when minority and disadvantaged groups become part of an integrated school system, their self concepts diminish as do the self perceptions of advantaged students.

It would seem that the change from a segregated school environment to a more integrated one, based on (Coleman, et al., 1966) combined with greater competitiveness and less security by way of familiarity with curriculum and compassionate adults, contributes in some way to the lowering of self images for both disadvantaged and advantaged youngsters.

Soares and Soares (1971) conducted a study to determine whether disadvantaged children maintain their more positive self-images when they enter the more integrated environment with advantaged children. The results of the analysis consistently indicate significance between elementary and secondary students as well as between disadvantaged groups, except for the ideal concept sub scale. Results demonstrate no significant sex differences. The most important findings reveal that disadvantaged children view themselves and think that others look at them more positively than advantaged children view themselves, and do not necessarily reflect more negative self esteem than advantaged children. Elementary children exhibit higher self images than secondary children, which indicates some residual effects from age variables.
Shaw (1974) conducted two studies on self images of black and white pupils in a recently integrated southern school to determine whether the differences between disadvantaged children changed during the academic year. The preliminary study was conducted the first year after the schools had been integrated, and the second the following year. Self perceptions were measured by the Harvey Self Image Scale. Data from both studies show that: (1) boys perceived themselves as significantly less sociable but more independent than did girls; (2) Blacks perceived themselves as significantly more independent than did whites; (3) sociability generally increased whereas achievement orientation decreased as a function of grade level; (4) Blacks either decreased in sociability or showed no change or increased in sociability; and, (5) during the school year, pupils in grades two and three decreased in hostility, while those in grades four and five showed no change, while pupils in grades six increased in perceived hostility (in Powell, 1973).

Bennett (1971) conducted a study on the expressed acceptance of self and others among urban black high school students. The study attempted to determine if black students in racially integrated and segregated urban public high schools differ with respect to their expressed acceptance of self and others. The Berger Questionnaire was redesigned and
given to students in one segregated and three integrated Milwaukee schools. Findings indicate that students in the integrated schools do not differ significantly on self acceptance than students in the segregated schools, and that females express a stronger acceptance of others than males; twelfth graders expressed a stronger acceptance of others and self than the other two grades. Within some schools urban. Blacks who had attended an integrated or a private elementary school expressed a higher self acceptance than subjects who attended a private or segregated elementary school respectively. The conclusive evidence indicates there is a positive relationship between expressed acceptance of self and others in integrated and segregated high schools among Blacks.

Powell (1973) conducted a study on the effects of school desegregation on self concepts of southern children. The self concepts of black and white students in segregated and non-segregated schools were examined. Seventh through ninth grade students in New Orleans, Nashville and Greensboro indicate that black children in segregated southern schools have significantly higher self concepts than black children in desegregated schools. Black students in general
were reported to have higher self concepts than white children whether they attended segregated schools or non-segregated schools.

Walsh (1973) studied self concept of 120 black ten to eleven year olds varying in sex, socio-economic background and integrated or segregated schools. Two instruments were used—a Personal Data Sheet (PDS) and a Self Concept Rating Inventory (SCRI). A factor analysis of the original fifty-item (SCRI) revealed four rather than five self concept factors: (1) physical social, (2) academic schooling, (3) physical identification, and (4) racial status.

There were no significant differences between males v. females, between low v. high socio-economic groups, or between children attending segregated, integrated neighborhood or integrated transported schools. When socio-economic status was controlled across school setting, several significant differences emerged. Findings indicate that within segregated schools, children from high SES backgrounds have more positive self concepts on factors 1, 2, and 4 than do those from low SES backgrounds. Within integrated neighborhood schools, children from low SES backgrounds exhibit more positive self concepts than do their high SES counterparts.
Summary and Critique of Self Concept

The self concept literature develops out of an observed self acceptance as defined differently in different school environments. It is clear to the researcher that the constraints imposed upon self concept and social acceptance are closely related to some regionally imposed constraints, in this case in the North and South. In a critique of researchers presented in this study, Katzenmyer and Stenner (1975) in a discussion of environmental presses create standards against which a child compares self worth with the self worth of others. The social acceptance issue is an observed quantity which perceptually is registered differently in different school environments, as the diversity in environmental character, differences in culture (learned and unlearned), equip children with different behaviors, comparisons and expectations which are used to negotiate a healthful existence or acceptance in a given environment or institution.

A part of this equipment that children need (much of it being psychological) determines the ultimate success of the student as (s)he begs passage or acceptance into a specific school environment (segregated or desegregated). Allport (1963) on the other hand in his discussion of the seven central aspects of self which constitute a perceived self speaks of each as a continuing thread in the process of self
defining, a psychological discovery process. More profoundly perhaps, is the need to examine and discuss the feeling quality of self, the being, a feeling which evolves into a defined sense of self knowledge, a characterization shaped, guided and often misguided by the interaction quality of the participation in a given school environment. In other words, the school environment has power to determine success levels, the quality of interaction and demand a certain level of acceptance.

Williams and Cole (1968) in examining success determinants as dictated by academic achievement look at the systems as the cause, i.e., poor achievement results from poor self concept. This assertion requires that we carefully examine what creates and sustains poor self concept. This researcher's hunch is that poor self concept is closely correlated with the environment through a process by which the group identity, group attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, affiliation and expectations have yet a profound impact upon shaping the individual identity in a way which pleases the group. If this is so, a careful examination of cause and effect relationships is in order, thereby isolating symptoms from the disease as warranted in the research conducted by Coleman (1966), Walsh (1956), and others who examine the symptoms as the cause.
Katzenmeyer and Stenner (1975) in speculating on what happens to the disadvantaged or the culturally different child's self acceptance when moving from a segregated school environment to a desegregated school environment begins to cross the threshold of conflict and conflict resolution theory, which must consider the psychological images the child has access to, and the individual and group self determinents which are different. The feeling quality of blackness is certainly different from any other with the high visibility which sets the black child apart from others as being different, along with the method of emotional and motivational operations, thinking, intellectual programming, social malnutrition, i.e., starving the child of significant like images, denegation and de-legitimization of self and culture. These constraints create considerable conflict in black children and usually lead to debasement and low self esteem where environmental supports are not sufficiently strong to overrule the same.

The researcher feels it is the presence or absence of what she refers to as color conflict which the black child experiences when exposed to the negative perceptions of a racist and cruel environment. This environment is simply a combination of experiences created by someones or some groups mentality or knowledge predicated on their expectations then translated into terms of actuality and physical reality. The institutional mentality of the school often
aids and abets the conflict at early ages reinforcing and sustaining that conflict along a continuum through adolescence. The researcher believes this reinforcement begins at earlier ages for black youths than for other youths.

In the insularity of a segregated school environment it is very likely that one may never confront the experiences that perpetuate the conflict. This of course may depend on whether the segregated school environment is in the North or in the South, or a child may be quickly identified as inferior by institutionally sanctioned academic and social performance standards, and yet never be forced into competition with other children in that segregated school environment, thus not experiencing the conflict. Therefore an insolated, segregated school environment with social, education programs, and personnel supports can result in healthier self concepts which develop randomly in non insulated arbitrary desegregated school environments.

In examining the tenents of conflict resolution, the black child in order to overcome the conflict has to be equipped with strong self perceptions, intellectual strategies, behavior strategies and social experiences which are guided by a rather well outlined moral conscience which allows him or her to enlist sufficient energies to fight the conflict, maintain their self identity, and yet manage to achieve at social, academic, athletic, and psychological
tasks.

Snygg and Combs (1949) in examining how anxiety and alienation influence one's perception of the world assume that the feeling quality of anxiety or fears is perhaps less real that the cognitive thought process, the mental message. The inferiority sustained inadequacy starts with the feeling followed by a set of behaviors resulting in fear, anxiety, compromise, selling out, "Uncle Tomming," shuffling, militance, and placating; all of which are behaviors which are exercised at different evolutionary stages and tend to be engaged to help cope with or overcome feelings engendered by color conflicts in the self and racist sustained color conflicts in the society at large. This certainly threatens even the best learned, most secure and intelligent person's cognitive achievement repertoire. It seems to follow then that attitudes maintained by students regarding school, school programs and school personnel determines in large part their academic success. The primary role of the black child then is to define, develop, insulate, certify and maintain a strong sense of self. In order to achieve this more supreme task the black child has to adjust culturally speaking and with a profound sense of identity, schizoid imposed disposition of identity or anti identity. At either extreme the conflict can be resolved by alienation from the environment and social planning in spite of that
environment which is generally the demeanor taken on by the militant. Another strategy would be alienation from the self, an "oreo" character or self imposed neurotic, deluded by who he or she actually is or what they in reality represent. There is a mental health problem inherent in this choice.

Most of the self concept studies Dreger and Miller (1960), Ball (1960), and McDonald and Ginther (1963) simply indicate the psychological results as symptoms of color conflict and color racism. Other researchers Simmons and Rosenberg (1965) merely indicate the problem in the same measures tapping yet different bases of behavior and different cultures, different regions, at different grade levels. Rosenberg (1965) like many other researchers, after rendering quite factually and imperically the data, have a tendency to blur, distort, and often confound the results or conclusions. There has been a movement to exploit and manipulate results in racial attitude, achievement and I.Q. studies. The attitudinal manifestations often take on a behavior quality which appears racist in nature while becoming a part of the laws and rules systems which get communicated as the norm and become institutionalized and systematizes, and later organized into a knowledge and symbol base. The process as illustrated begins with knowledge, the cognitive qualities which get defined as academic achievement which
imply power and which is perceived to enhance one's ability to negotiate his or her existence in the face of ambiguous surroundings.

This power or cognitive quality when not shared enhances the opportunity of controlling entities to manipulate and exploit, denying access to knowledge in a systematic and institutionalized way using psychological and social strategies as a means to maintain and insure an inferior product, in this case the black student. Many researchers control variables and outcomes so that their conclusions can maintain and uphold the status quo, or at least that which they think is the status quo.

In carefully examining the knowledge as power issue which is very closely aligned with academic achievement as a measure of school success and even the I.Q. issue, this researcher finds it of grave importance to examine the parameters of intelligence which for Blacks are guided and directed by moral conscience which ultimately develops into a rational morality and is more important to academic achievement as defined by school success.

Intelligence or academic achievement should not be isolated as is done by many researchers in an attempt to assess it as a separate cognitive quality. It is not separate. Intellect must be looked at as a multidimensional construct. Failure to examine it in this way reinforces how researchers
often arrive at outrageous yet false conclusions.

Many of the research studies on self concept indicate high levels of percocity among black children at the early stages of their development, likewise higher self esteem. Extended exposure to color conflicts causes this self esteem to dissipate. Another observation regarding the color conflict issue notes that subtle color racism generally found in the cosmopolitan and sophisticated North is sometimes more difficult to combat and contain because it is more difficult to identify and isolate than that exhibited in the South where segregated behaviors and institutions have been historically identified and sustained.

A part of this difficulty in combatting the northern color conflict and northern segregation has been that the perpetrators have long been identified as friends, supporting liberals and general amicus curiae. These relationships make the issues more difficult to maintain because the participants are anynomous, disguised, and often present themselves as friends which makes for a more difficult identification of who and what you are combatting. More importantly, it makes it more difficult to determine how to best prepare for combat with perceived equals or equals who purport to have vested interests in the same struggles. In the South
on the other hand the institutions, perpetrators, controllers and significant actors identify themselves and explicate their issues detailing that which they like, dislike, are willing to compromise, change, or refuse to change. This makes negotiation of one's existence in this environment easier as one is clearly apprised of the issues and the rules and more importantly who the enemy is. This has broad implications for comparing and examining the character and regional differences outlined in the character of southern education versus northern education.
Locus of Control

The educational and psychological literature on locus of control is limited, and has had little impact on trends in education. However, locus of control as a construct has broad implications for enhancing academic achievement and fostering internality, social security, and self confidence in children. The construct has implications for interpreting observed differences between white and black school performance and academic achievement.

Locus of control, derived from social learning theory (Rotter, 1954), describes the belief an individual holds as to the source of his or her reinforcements. Reinforcement is seen as the consequence of one's own actions or characteristics (internal locus of control) or as a result of outside forces (external locus of control), such as fate, chance, or the action of powerful others.

In social learning theory, a reinforcement acts to strengthen an expectancy that a particular behavior or event will be followed by that reinforcement in the future. Once an expectancy for such a behavior-reinforcement is built up, the failure of the reinforcement to occur will reduce or extinguish the expectancy (Rotter, 1966, p. 1).

Rotter (1966) defines internal locus of control as the perception that positive and negative reinforcement is a
consequence of one's own actions and is thus under personal control, while external control is defined as perceiving that positive or negative reinforcement, is unrelated to one's own behavior and thus beyond personal control.

Early research on locus of control has found externality to be associated with children in lower class ethnic groups (Rotter & Rotter, 1963); and less involvement in civil rights and social action (Gore & Rotter, 1963; Strickland, 1965).

Several recent studies have shown significant relationships between locus of control and achievement. Norwicki and Roundtree (1971) examined correlates of locus of control in secondary school students. Significant correlation between locus of control and achievement were found for males; female student correlations were not found.

Norwicki and Strickland (1973) testing third through twelfth graders revealed consistent negative correlations between locus of control and achievement, while most of the significant correlations were found for the male groups.

Crandall, Katkosky and Crandall (1965), in an examination of children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual achievement situations, found that free-play achievement behavior and achievement test scores among boys were correlated with locus of control. Significant correlations were not found for girls.
Norwicki and Walker (1973) examined the inconsistent results found between locus of control and achievement for females. The results suggest that there are two groups of females who attain different levels of achievement within those groups scoring internally and within those scoring externally on the locus of control questions. The two groups were differentiated through the use of a social desirability questionnaire. These results suggest that the relative lack of consistent findings concerning the relationship between achievement and locus of control for females in prior studies may perhaps be due to the failure to obtain groups of "pure" internal and external females. This may be due still to the tendency of females to answer a locus of control questionnaire in a socially desirably manner, particularly because of the differential expectations and socialization of males and females by society. This differential causes a failure in females to respond to their actual personal behavior.

Results indicate internal females who scored in social desirability attained achievement scores higher than any other group. One reason suggests a combination of feelings of the internal control group over one's environment, with a resistance to the pressures of society, and resistance to depend solely on others. The "true" internal female, even more than the internal male, may feel that her achievements
are dependent on her actions alone and thus may work harder than the male who, while feeling in control, does not have to fight social pressures. The "true" external female on the other hand may achieve less because she does not feel in control of her environment. She thus conforms to the role the larger society defines for the women, which says that women do not feel they can or need to expend energies toward high achievement (p. 66).

This sense of powerlessness stems from that personality variable outlined in externality; from an inability to influence circumstances which impact on the social negotiation capabilities of the individual, or from a basic inability to influence powerful social or other institutions designed and defined by powerful others.

There are a number of significant studies in this area:

Sieman (1959) explored powerlessness in the sociological realm of alienation as it relates to ethclass.

Groves (1961) studied ethnic differences in an isolated multi-ethnic community. Findings show whites to be most internal, followed by Spanish surnames with native Americans the most external, i.e., alienated, powerless, as assigned by their own reinforcements or perceived abilities to influence their environment. Ethnicity and socio-economic status undoubtedly were important sources of variance after controlling for other factors.
Gore and Rotter (1963) examined the degree of commitment behavior manifested by southern black students to effect social change in the cause of desegregation.

Crandall, Katovsky and Preston (1962) assessed locus of control relative to achievement in children. Baxter (1961) developed the Bailer locus of control scale adopted from an earlier I-E scale developed by James Phares (1957). The Bailer scale was designed to examine developmental aspects of locus of control as well as the relationship to conceptualization of success and failure. Findings show relationships between maturity and internality in children, and a more intense response to success and failure.

James (1957) studied the effect of locus of control on behavior. He noted that externals had more "unusual shifts" in their expectancy for success. That is, they were more likely to expect success after having just failed, and to expect failure after succeeding. Findings also show internals have increasing assurance and certainty of success.

Battle and Rotter (1963) examined eighty sixth and eighth grade children from five metropolitan schools of diverse ethnic population and varying degrees of integration. The California Mental Maturity was used as a measure of intelligence and the Bailer locus of control questionnaire was administered as locus of control measure to one half the population. Results show significant interactions between
social class and ethnic group and triple interactions between ethnic groups, social class and I.Q.

The most significant relationship was between lower class Blacks and middle class whites, with middle class whites shown as most "internal" and lower class Blacks as most "external." The lower class black group differs most from all the others. Lower class black students with high I.Q. tended to be more external than middle class whites with low I.Q. This relationship reflects a greater need for value or greater stress on academic achievement. Deprivation due to low ethclass status causes one to develop a defense with an "external" attitude. The middle class white with a low I.Q. may have incorporated his/her class values of personal responsibility, and when faced with the fact of his/her low ability, (s)he responds characteristically by blaming self for the future. Neither age nor sex, however, were found to be significant.

The most interesting finding is the effect of interaction of social class and ethnicity. Results suggest that the middle class Black in this community might be raised to accept the white cultural beliefs in responsibility and opportunity. These results suggest that one can control his own destiny in the perception of opportunity to obtain the material rewards offered in a culture. The teaching of attitudes of internal
external control may also be involved (Battle & Rotter, 1963, pp. 486-88).

Rose (1956) in his condensation of Myrdal's *The American Dilemma*, notes that the ambition of black youth is cramped not only by segregation and discrimination, but also by low expectations from both white and black society. (In reviewing this literature, one cannot but find ironical the succession of racial designations applied to black Americans.) "... And if he is not extraordinary he will not expect it of himself and will not really put his shoulder to the wheel" (p. 218).

In view of these findings, it may be hypothesized that Blacks' poorer performance on intelligence tests reflects a withdrawal from middle class achievement goals. The externally oriented Black may well see these goals as being unobtainable through his (her) own efforts (p. 380).

Prinkle (1973) conducted a study to examine the relationship of Rotter's internal, external scale and the IAR questionnaire to the variables of grade, academic achievement, I.Q., race, and curriculum tract on 312 black and 404 white female high school students. Blacks scored proportionately higher on the IAR scale, which is limited to academic situations while the I-E scale is a more generalized measure of locus of control. There was no significant difference by grade, I.Q., curriculum, and race. The
validity of the findings are questioned because of the lack of significant differences by grade, cumulative I.Q., curriculum and race, and because the two measures failed to agree with each other in the measure of locus of control for the same population.

Sacks (1973), in a doctoral study, investigated the level of internalized black consciousness of black males as manifested by the projection of positive racial identity and its relationship to self regard, a sense of control over life's events and achievement. Subjects in grades nine through twelve were given a "draw a man" task, a modified Rotter I-E scale, and a self attitude inventory scored for self regard and self acceptance. Sixty percent of the drawings were judged black, significant relationship occurred between drawings and personal control, and between locus of control and self attitude. Self regard and self acceptance scores were higher for Blacks than the other groups. Overall black adolescents viewed themselves more positively, felt more control over personal events.

Vail (1973) studied I-E control, anxiety, frustration, and self concept of achieving and underachieving adolescent boys in middle class black and white groups from two integrated Catholic high schools. Five areas were assessed: maternal role, internal control, anxiety, frustration, and self concept. Findings indicated Blacks displayed the same
differences as whites within the two levels of achievement.

Davidson (1974), in a doctoral study, examined black and white twelfth graders of middle and low socio-economic status to determine if personality characteristics such as poise ascendency, self assurance socialization maturity, responsibility achievement potential, intellectual efficiency, intellectual modes, interest modes exist in black high school students. The Bateson-Jackson theory of double bend and the Harold Garfinkel Dramaturgic theory of states degradation were the bases for theoretical implications. The conclusion suggests that the difference between groups was influenced, however, by sex, race and/or socio-economic status. Results and therapeutic implications demonstrated that, even in the lower level of society, being black has unique consequences.

Epps (1975) studied the impact of desegregation on aspects of personality considered to be important outcomes of schooling. The factors examined included aspiration, self concept, sense of control over the environment, and achievement orientation. The study cited conflicting research but further concluded that: (1) low occupational and educational aspirations do not seem to be a major problem of black students; (2) there is little convincing evidence that minority control of their own schools would produce both high aspirations or high attainment; (3) Blacks
seem to have higher self esteem than whites, and each
group evaluates itself in different ways with Blacks
placing greater importance on peer influence than on school
achievement; (4) internal control of black students is
enhanced by attending desegregated schools; and (5) there
is evidence that minority children find desegregated
schools to be less congenial environments than do their
white peers. Further research was advocated.

Harris (1973) examined beliefs in internal-external
control of reinforcements among Blacks in segregated and
integrated high schools. Two groups of twenty-eight and
twenty-seven sixteen through eighteen year olds in
California of comparable age, SES, scholastic aptitude
and years in a particular high school were studied.
The Rotter I-E scale was administered. Results indicated
that Blacks in an integrated school feel they have no
power or authority to define themselves. It was also
recommended that an upgrading of schools in black
communities may facilitate redefinition of equality of
educational opportunity.
This review of locus of control in children concerns itself with the assignment of responsibility for internal or external controls, as well as the effect of sex, race, socio-economic status and type of school environment on the assignment of control beliefs to self (internal) or assignment to others (external).

The research findings studied in the above paragraphs suggest that (1) external behavior is most associated with lower class children; (2) a differential in socialization of males and females causes a failure in females to respond to their actual personal behavior; (3) ethnic difference in multi-ethnic communities indicate whites are more internal than other ethnics; and, (4) externals exhibit more unusual shifts in their expectancy for success.

Each of the major dictates of internal-external assignments--race, age, and socio-economic status--indicates a number of impending psychologic problems which accrue to the black child's self defining. These psychologic problems often create serious interaction deficiencies during the schooling process.
Locus of Control: Summary of Literature

The idea of reinforcement in locus of control is related to the role of the environment, its operating mechanisms, or the school itself, the atmosphere in the school, the expectations and the interaction of students and significant school personnel. Reinforcement is an all powerful concept in learning theory. It can be readily linked to sources of motivation in the environment. It can produce emotional states including neurotic states in the context of conditioned behavior.

Its manipulation is a central issue along with stimulus control, and how to use them in learning theory as well as in processes in behavioral psychology. The researcher suggests that the theoretic explanations of internal, external locus of control is related to perceived control of environment and comes through conditioning reinforcement history.

The research on socio-economic status reveals the conditioning history of different levels of a hierarchical society. Lower class and black children have fewer reinforcements, opportunities, rewards, or symbols visible in their often meager environment. Conversely, middle class
children have a history of success and models of success built into their environment. Therefore, success as defined by achievement is and can be programmed into the environment. Common expressions like, "it's not the distance, it's niggers" or "it's not the bus, it's us" are example of such programming which enhance or disturb success or achievement. The key perhaps is at the end of the bus ride and accommodation is the necessary strategy. It is fair to say that black children come to school with the same expectancies to learn and achieve as other children. This concept is either nurtured or destroyed by the school environment and those school experiences engaged at the end of the bus ride. The reinforcement history for Blacks, then, by and large has been one of negative reinforcement.

The problems of females responding to social desirability is related to the question of measurement (validity and reliability). The literature questions whether the instruments measure the same set of perceptions for different groups. This issue is still unresolved in the literature.
It appears that the internal, external locus of control issue is suggesting that whites are by conditioning more individualistic, more achievement oriented, and more power oriented which is viewed as the necessary, if not desired, model for school, occupational, and economic success.

**Summary**

This chapter has been divided into two major subsections. In the first subsection, outstanding behavioral scientists concurred that self concept is perhaps a pervasive force in the shaping of our nation's young, and that the responsibility of public schools is overwhelming as it seeks to equalize programs and environments to accommodate healthy self concept development as the schooling process emits tremendous pressures on students.

In this subsection, self concept and self acceptance of youngsters is examined to discern effects of environment.
An attempt has been made to examine which environment serves to either increase the level of participation in credible educational undertakings and which school environment inhibits and suppresses participation in qualitative and credible educational undertakings.

The second subsection deals with locus of control research which has been conducted in an attempt to determine the relative effect of locus of control measures on the efficiency of the learner or the effectiveness of the school in desegregated v. segregated school environments.

Since these studies evaluate different aspects of student and institutional interaction and the consequent accommodation to student needs, each utilizing different measuring instruments and contrasting different group responses under the influence of different environments, it is impossible to draw any absolute and affirmative conclusions as to the relative effect, positive or negative, that schools have on the development of a child's sense of self, sense of control, sense of equal opportunity
and equal participation. However, the majority of the studies reported here are in agreement that positive self concept and internal control make for academically efficient students. Furthermore, the studies agree that students with external control tend to have poorer self images or self perceptions and relatively negative school experiences. Beyond this the literature supports the concept that schools, the primary socializer, can and do make a difference by the manner in which they accurately perceive, define, and accommodate to the needs of black children as determined from a like referent group. This is opposed to accommodating the needs of white children to black children without due consideration for existing cultural, economic, linguistic, and participation differences inherent in the black child's interactional mode.

Likewise other studies suggest that the general low self esteem and self hate that grip the black psyche tends to result from internalization of inferiority feelings passed on by the larger society. Unequal educational opportunities and treatment are one of several factors that hinder the development of self pride and
determination, causing the low aspirations and achievement motivation so common to alienated circumstances (Pouis-

Some studies demonstrate the relationship of poor self concept to poor academic results and draw affirmative conclusions as to the relative effective (positive or negative) influence that schools have on the development of a child's sense of self, belonging, sense of control, sense of equal opportunity and equal participation.

The studies presented delineate the type and quality of perceptual achievement changes which may be forthcoming in a positive school environment with key programmatic, behavioral, attitudinal, and personnel support and sensitivities, and those which are likely to occur in a negative school environment. These data indicate statistically insignificant changes occurred in times of social change. However, where by-products were emergent in terms of increased self and school, higher expectations and reduction in racial conflict in school were evident. Certainly, these changes mandate that social scientists design educational and
social programs, alter treatments and policies, manipulate environments, and superimpose multivariate intervention strategies for more effectant relationships between learners and schools.

Recent studies since 1963 seem to indicate a reversal of the negative affection or afflicted racial acceptance as indicated by characteristics of skin color. Research demonstrates that the attitudes of black children in segregated v. desegregated school environments are at variance with each other.

However, in order to insure positive self concept development and school success in all types of school environments, it becomes necessary for schools and agents of learning to (1) humanize their perceptual instruments; (2) de-emphasize ethnocentric value attainment which is mismatched with the value structure and cultural repertoire of the minority child; and (3) acknowledge the legitimacy of those educational, social and cultural assets and learned experiences the minority child brings to school as part of a basic survival scheme. Such acknowledgement allows interaction on any level, cognitive and affective, and creates a more
responsive environment for inquiry testing and academic assertion free of denigration and the constant threat of failure.

If these strategies are implemented, environmental strengths and social change will effectively serve as determinants of increased feelings of competence and control as segregated and desegregated school environments are redefined into a character of effectantness.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Decisions pertaining to the scope and approach of this investigation were influenced by the nature of the research approaches and knowledge base of school desegregation. Additional factors critical to the study included processes and consequences of school accommodation and adjustment, learner efficiency and school effectiveness as determined by self acceptance and locus of control in segregated v. desegregated school environments.

Throughout the desegregation literature it is implied that the weakness of the existing knowledge base vis-a-vis accommodation and effectant schooling processes directly result from the nature of or lack of measureable theories specific to the effectant accommodation process in segregated v. desegregated schools. This study seeks to measure the self concept and locus of control consequences involved in the desegregation v. segregation strategy.

In the review of the literature it is noted that by and large the strategies used to promote the equal status, equal educational opportunity arguments differ substantially in process. Many such strategies include paring of schools, clustering of grades, magnet programs, ability grouping,
trickery, freedom of choice, redistributing, bussing and other methods. Some of these strategies do, in fact, create opportunities for desegregation while others continue segregation in classrooms and schools under the auspices and guise of desegregation.

The review of the literature further examines the types of conceptual frameworks implicit in the literature. Within these frameworks there appears to be some polygamy. This is illustrated in the marriage of political-legal; social-psychological-legal; economic-legal; and educational-legal domains, with each union representing divergent problems and underpinnings. All this in the context of one common partner, the legal machine. The literature review also identifies many problems which emerge in the research analysis of the desegregation strategy. Such an analysis points up the immeasurability of many of the effects of school desegregation v. segregation.

The sanctity of relevant data on so immediate a theme as equality in educational processes (effectantness) for all children generally and black children specifically makes a strong case for the re-examination of educational processes which have damaging social psychological effects on black children. Current processes are so closely based on Euro-American premises, and so at variance with valid black experiences, that they result largely in adverse educational programming as black children are forced to
respond to educational needs different from their own. This difference results in incongruent educational planning and psychological programming based upon existing theories which are often inappropriately ordered and tested and which generally violate ethclass.

This analysis of the consequences of segregated v. desegregated school environments as it affects self concepts and locus of control was derived from the Crandall Locus of Control for Intellectual Achievement Reinforcement score and the Self Observation Scale which measures seven related sub-scales which directly impact on a student's perception of the quality of his/her interaction in schools. There are many gaps in the self concept, locus of control and desegregation literature which increase the complexity of research in these areas. For the purposes of this study several instruments were studied prior to selection.

In this chapter, the selection of instruments, administration procedures, selection of school districts, population and data analysis procedures are described. The study was conducted in fourth and sixth grades in two schools in each of two cities, one in the northeast and one in the south. Each school represents a segregated and desegregated system with the former being in the north and the latter in the south.
The segregated school system has thirteen schools and a student population comprised of 12,827 minority students and 235 non-minority students. 37.5 percent are identified as within Title I defined poverty guidelines. The school is located in a city that has undergone tremendous decreases in non-minority population. A rapid increase in minority residents may have encouraged the flight of whites from this city and similarly the school district.

The desegregated school system is under court order to desegregate. It is the thirteenth largest school district in the country with 151 schools, 28,000 minority students and 92,000 non-minority students. Fifty-three percent fall within Title I specified poverty guidelines. The desegregation plan implemented in September 1975 specified that there would be no less than twelve percent black students in any school and no more than seventy percent black students in any school. A major portion of the desegregation plan is achieved by busing.

The criteria for selecting the school systems was the involvement of the desegregated system in problems incident to desegregation compliance; the high probability that the segregated system would not be desegregated because of overwhelming minority ratios; and the willingness of school officials from both systems to allow for the collection of data.
Population Selection

The subject population for this study was composed of 168 black male and female students randomly selected from the fourth and sixth grade classes in a desegregated and segregated school system.

Student I.D. numbers were assigned by the computer for randomization. The randomization was conducted from a complete list of fourth and sixth graders in two schools in the desegregated school system and two schools within the segregated school system. Out of a total of 200 students assessed, 168 male and female students in fourth and sixth grades in segregated schools as compared with desegregated schools were included in the data analysis. Students were assigned to sub-samples on the basis of type of educational setting, segregated v. desegregated schools, and sex and grade.

Instrumentation

Extreme care was taken to make certain that the instruments utilized for data collection consistently measured the variables at issue in this study. The SOS and IAR instruments were selected based upon the following criteria:

(1) The instruments had been normed on a population containing a significant number of black students;

(2) The instruments were normed on a population
containing a significant number of fourth and sixth graders; and,

(3) The instruments could be group administered.

The following is a brief description of each of the two instruments.

**Self Concept**

Self concept was measured using the Self Observation Scale (SOS), a direct, self-report, group administered instrument comprised of sixty items which measure self concept. The instrument has two forms--A and B--for primary and intermediate grades respectively. The SOS intermediate level (B) has sixty items and measures seven dimensions of children's affective behavior: (1) Self-Acceptance; (2) Self-Security; (3) Social Maturity; (4) Social Confidence; (5) School Affiliation; (6) Teacher Affiliation, and (7) Peer Affiliation. The seven sub-scales were developed factor analytically using the Maxplane rotation, a program originally developed by Cattell and Meurle (1960). For the purposes of this study only four subscales were examined.

Within each of the Self Observation subscales there are questions referring to the student referent, specifically to their perception of how they view themselves, and their relationship to teacher, school, and social confidence. The Self Observation Scale emphasizes the healthful independence of affective behavior.
Description of Scales

The intermediate level of the Self Observation Scale is designed for use at grades four and six. It measures seven dimensions of children's self concept. Each scale is labeled in a positive manner with high scores being most characteristic of the label. In the study, however, only four subscales are analyzed.

Scale I--Self Acceptance

Children with high scores view themselves positively and attribute to themselves qualities of happiness, importance, and general competence. They see themselves as being valued by peers, family and teachers. Children with low scores see themselves as unhappy, lacking in general competence and of little importance to others. Three items highly rated on this scale are: (1) I am a good person; (2) I am a happy person; and, (3) I am fun to be with.

Scale IV--Social Confidence

Children with high scores feel confident of their ability to relate successfully in social situations. They feel confident that they can make friends easily, and that they are valued and enjoyed by their friends. Children with low scores have difficulty making friends, do not feel valued by others and see others as being more socially adept than themselves. Three items highly related to the scale
are: (1) People are always picking on me; (2) Other children are often mean to me; and, (3) My classmates like me.

**Scale V--School Affiliation**

Children with high scores view school as a positive influence in their lives. They enjoy school and the activities associated with school. Children with low scores have adversely negative perceptions about school relationships. Three items highly related to this scale are: (1) I like to stay home from school; (2) Each morning I look forward to coming to school; and, (3) I feel good when I am at school.

**Scale VI--Teacher Affiliation**

Children with high scores like their teachers. They regard the teachers as helpful, attentive, understanding, and generous. Children with low scores see their teachers as arbitrary, inconsiderate of children and/or a source of emotional pain. Three items highly related to the scale are: (1) I like my teachers; (2) My teachers like to help me; and, (3) My teachers are mean.

**Sample Characteristics**

The validation and norming sample of the SOS included students from 150 schools nationally. In drawing the sample particular attention was paid to ethnic and socio-economic
characteristics of the participating schools. The norm group was comprised of 7,580 fourth to sixth grade students.

**Reliability**

The researcher reports that the split half reliability values were developed from items that were administered on two separate days. Therefore, although the values were corrected using the Spearman Brown Prophecy Formula, the reliabilities represent a lower bound estimate because of the additional variance contributed by a multiple day administration schedule. The split reliability coefficients for the SOS subscales under investigation in this study are self acceptance, .85, social confidence, .73, school affiliation, .79, and teacher affiliation, .74.

**Locus of Control**

Locus of control was measured using the Crandall Intellectual Achievement Reasoning Questionnaire (IAR) which yields measures of positive (internal) or negative (external) beliefs relative to internal v. external reinforcement as it relates to assignment of responsibility for intellectual and academic achievement. The Crandall IAR scale is composed of thirty-four forced choice items. Each item describes either a positive or negative achievement experience which routinely occurs in children's daily lives. The item is followed by one alternative stating that the event occurred because of the behavior of someone else in the child's immediate environment.
The IAR (Crandall, Katkovsky & Crandall, 1965) was developed to assess a child's belief in the control of intellectual academic activities, with the source of external control limited to parents, teachers, and peers. The scale provides a total internal score and separates scores representative of responsibility for success and failure respectively. Significant test-retest reliabilities are reported for total score and both subscores (I+ and I-).

**Sampling Characteristics**

The validation and norming sample of the IAR included 923 students in grades three through twelve from five school types: (1) a village school, (2) a small-city school, (3) a medium-city school, (4) a college laboratory school, and (5) a country school. The sample was chosen to be representative of children from diverse communities. In drawing the sample, particular attention was paid to the social, geographic, and socio-economic characteristics of the participating schools. Via telephone conversation with Virginia Crandall, author of the IAR, it was determined that black youngsters of diverse socio-economic status were a part of the sample.

**Test-Retest Reliability**

The researcher reports that for the younger children the test-retest correlations were .69 for total scores (I);
.66 for internal beliefs (I+); and, .74 for external belief reinforcement (I-). These correlations were all significant at the .001 level. There were no significant sex differences in any of the correlations.

**Internal Consistency**

Because the IAR contains two subscales, those sampling beliefs in self-responsibility for positive events and those posing negative events, split-half reliabilities were computed separately for the two subscales. Thus, responses to the eight even-numbered items of the I+ subscale were correlated with the nine odd-numbered items of that same subscale. The nine even-numbered I- items were correlated with the eight odd-numbered I- items. For a random sample of 130 of the younger children, the correlation is .54 for I+ and .57 for I- after correlation with the Spearman Brown Prophecy Formula, and .60 for both I+ and I- for older children.

**Hypotheses**

The five hypotheses tested were clustered around six dependent areas of investigation: (1) self acceptance, (2) social confidence, (3) school affiliation, (4) teacher affiliation, and (5) internal/ (6)negative locus of control for intellectual achievement reinforcement. These hypotheses are formulated around three two-level factors: (1) area:
desegregated v. segregated; (2) sex: male v. female; and, (3) grade: four v. six.

**Hypotheses One**

As a result of participation in a desegregated school environment the self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation and locus of control scores for these students will be higher than the scores for those same measures for students who participated in segregated school experiences.

Sub-hypotheses for each of the four subscales on SOS and locus of control are herein delineated for area factor: segregated v. desegregated. The sub-hypotheses restated in the null form will allow for careful examination of mean scores for subjects on each of the dependent variables represented by the subscales.

**Factor A. Area--Sub-Hypotheses.** (1) There will be no significant difference between the total mean scores of black students in segregated v. desegregated educational settings on the SOS self acceptance scale. (2) There will be no significant difference between the total mean students scores in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting on the SOS social confidence scale. (3) There will be no significant difference between the total mean students scores in a segregated v. desegregated educational
setting on the SOS school affiliation scale. (4) There will be no significant difference between the total mean students scores in a desegregated v. segregated educational setting on the SOS teacher affiliation scale. (5) There will be no significant difference between total mean students scores in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting on the locus of control (IAR) scale.

Hypotheses Two

Fourth grade male and female students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation and locus of control scores than fourth grade male and female students in the segregated school environment.

Hypotheses Three

Sixth grade male and female students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation, and locus of control scores than sixth grade male and female students in the segregated school environment.

For the hypotheses two and three, sub-hypotheses are delineated and restated in the null to represent expectancies implied in assumption as they relate to each of the self concept dependent variables as they are summed under one
self concept instrument and the locus of control variables as positive, negative, likewise subsumed under IAR instrument. Hypotheses two and three make assumptions relative to the sex factor and relationships with the dependent variables.

Factor B. Grade--Sub-Hypotheses. (1) There will be no significant difference between black fourth and sixth grade students mean scores on the SOS self acceptance scale in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (2) There will be no significant difference between black fourth and sixth grade students mean scores on the SOS social confidence scale in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (3) There will be no significant difference between black fourth and sixth grade students mean scores on the SOS school affiliation scale in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (4) There will be no significant difference between black fourth and sixth grade students mean scores on the SOS teacher affiliation scale in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (5) There will be no significant difference between black fourth and sixth grade students mean scores on the locus of control IAR scale in segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

The results of the statistical procedures represented in these hypotheses will provide the data for the conclusions and recommendations of the study.
Hypotheses Four

Female students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation, and locus of control scores than female students in the segregated school environment.

Hypotheses Five

Male students in the desegregated school environment will have higher self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation and locus of control scores than male students in the segregated school environment.

For hypotheses four and five, sub-hypotheses are restated in the null to delineate and represent expectancies for each of the four subscales on the Self Observation Scale and locus of control measure as they are correlated with the independent factor sex. This allows for more careful examination of assumptions as they relate to mean scores on each of the dependent measures subsumed under one instrument.

Factor C. Sex—Sub-Hypotheses. (1) There will be no significant difference between black male and female students mean scores on self acceptance in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (2) There will be no significant difference between black male and female students mean scores on the SOS social confidence scale.
in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (3) There will be no significant difference between black male and female students mean scores on the SOS school affiliation scale in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (4) There will be no significant difference between black male and female students mean scores on the SOS teacher affiliation scale in segregated v. desegregated educational setting. (5) There will be no significant difference between black male and female students mean scores on locus of control beliefs regarding responsibility for intellectual and academic achievement in segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data was collected from groups of students in the desegregated and segregated school systems at the beginning of school in September 1975. These data included: (1) scores on each of eight subscales of the Self Observation Scale (SOS), only four of the eight subscales were examined for this study; and, (2) two subscales on the locus of control of Intellectual Achievement Reinforcement Scale (IAR). Students were tested in groups of approximately twenty-five at one thirty minute sitting for each instrument. Both instruments were administered to all subjects in each school system over a period of five days by the researcher. The administration procedures were those prescribed by the
authors of the two instruments, SOS and IAR.

Data was analyzed using a 2x2x2 multivariate analysis of variance design which will cross three independent two-level factors: sex, grade, and area. The dependent variables analyzed were internal, external locus of control for achievement reasoning, self acceptance (ACCEPT), social confidence (CONFI), school affiliation (SAF), and teacher affiliation (TAF). These analyses were utilized to draw statistical inferences between self concept, and locus of control of intellectual achievement reinforcements as they relate to accommodation and learner efficiency. The analysis is also used to statistically adjust groups so that they are comparable.

The .05 level of significance was held critical for all tests administered
CHAPTER IV
REPORT OF FINDINGS

In this chapter, data yielded by the testing of the hypotheses in six major dependent variables formulated around three independent, two level factors—sex, grade, and area—are reported.

Design

Three independent variables were investigated using a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design. The variables were (1) School Area—desegregated or segregated, (2) Grade Level—fourth or sixth, and (3) Sex of students—male or female. Thus, the experimental design employed yielded eight independent cells or groups. A summary of the experimental design with the number of subjects in each group is presented in Table 1.

The dependent variables consisted of six measures of pupil performance including Locus of Control (Internal v. External measures), Self-Acceptance (accep), Social Confidence (confid), School Affiliation (SAF), and Teacher Affiliation (TAF). To evaluate the separate effects of the school area, grade level and sex on pupil performance as well as possible interactions among these variables, a generalized multivariate analysis was employed. This analysis was used because it yields an overall test with a specific level of significance and allows for all the
Table 1
Area by Grade: Cell Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>grade</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desegregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
usual univariate comparisons for each dependent variable examined separately.

The means and standard deviations on each of the six dependent measures of performance of the eight experimental groups are presented in Table 2. The summary of the multivariate analysis of variance is presented in Table 3. As can be observed in Table 3, the results of the analysis show the effects of school area and grade level were statistically significant at the .01 level. The effects of sex, however, failed to reach significance. In addition, except for the interaction between school area and grade level, none of the other interactions were significant.

**Intercorrelations Among Dependent Variables**

Before carrying out individual univariate comparisons to evaluate the main effects of school area, grade level, and sex on each of the dependent measures, it is important to assess the extent to which the six performance measures examined (Locus of Internal/External Control Self Acceptance, Social Confidence, School Affiliation, and Teacher Affiliation) covary. An intercorrelation matrix based on the residual scores is presented in Table 4. Observation of the table reveals low intercorrelation among the variables. Indeed many of the correlations are near zero and only two, the correlations between Teacher Affiliation and Acceptance and Teacher Affiliation and School Affiliation are significant at the .05 level. Thus, it appears that the six dependent variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>10.8823</td>
<td>8.7059</td>
<td>44.4118</td>
<td>38.5882</td>
<td>39.4118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.996</td>
<td>2.710</td>
<td>8.945</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>12.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>11.7361</td>
<td>8.8947</td>
<td>52.0947</td>
<td>41.1579</td>
<td>59.5789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>2.307</td>
<td>5.248</td>
<td>6.719</td>
<td>7.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>12.4500</td>
<td>9.2500</td>
<td>46.0500</td>
<td>42.0500</td>
<td>43.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>13.2000</td>
<td>9.9000</td>
<td>51.6000</td>
<td>38.6500</td>
<td>48.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.238</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>7.373</td>
<td>6.877</td>
<td>10.485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12.4343</td>
<td>10.6522</td>
<td>49.9130</td>
<td>41.8696</td>
<td>57.4348</td>
<td>50.7391</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.952</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>18.951</td>
<td>7.540</td>
<td>8.938</td>
<td>8.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12.4513</td>
<td>10.1030</td>
<td>50.4583</td>
<td>39.6250</td>
<td>59.5117</td>
<td>49.7083</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>8.495</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>8.444</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12.7391</td>
<td>10.4348</td>
<td>52.7626</td>
<td>44.5652</td>
<td>52.2609</td>
<td>46.3044</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13.1818</td>
<td>10.5000</td>
<td>52.9273</td>
<td>42.7273</td>
<td>52.1364</td>
<td>45.4091</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>2.502</td>
<td>8.149</td>
<td>7.983</td>
<td>11.886</td>
<td>10.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Sum of Products: Summary of Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Area Grade and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 59.07</td>
<td>139.73</td>
<td>251.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4 48.17</td>
<td>113.94</td>
<td>205.20</td>
<td>167.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 14.61</td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>50.74</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 83.64</td>
<td>197.90</td>
<td>356.30</td>
<td>290.54</td>
<td>88.11</td>
<td>504.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 59.52</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>93.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4 71.79</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>112.24</td>
<td>135.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 -259.84</td>
<td>-62.81</td>
<td>-406.24</td>
<td>-490.00</td>
<td>1773.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 -38.23</td>
<td>-9.24</td>
<td>-59.77</td>
<td>-72.09</td>
<td>260.92</td>
<td>38.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.77* 5.33* 5
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 64.31</td>
<td>30.08</td>
<td>418.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4 -28.05</td>
<td>-13.12</td>
<td>-182.61 79.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>211.70 -92.33 107.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>266.63 -116.30 134.80 169.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 -24.15</td>
<td>-24.13</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4 -26.07</td>
<td>-26.04</td>
<td>62.38 67.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4.25</td>
<td>-4.25</td>
<td>10.19 11.00 1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76.94</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td>-184.10 -198.70 -32.45 586.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 38.10</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>428.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4 8.71</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>98.04</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>85.76</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>25.51</td>
<td>441.00</td>
<td>100.90</td>
<td>88.23</td>
<td>453.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 -3.60</td>
<td>-4.20</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4 -4.73</td>
<td>-5.53</td>
<td>48.67</td>
<td>64.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.614</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>-7.47</td>
<td>46.84</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade x</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-12.51</td>
<td>-28.16</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>-2.49</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>-9.40</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Matrix of Correlation Indicating Relationship Among Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Control</th>
<th>External Control</th>
<th>Self Acceptance</th>
<th>Social Confidence</th>
<th>School Affiliation</th>
<th>Teacher Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.1578</td>
<td>0.2397</td>
<td>0.0647</td>
<td>0.0779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.0051</td>
<td>0.1123</td>
<td>0.0614</td>
<td>0.1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1165</td>
<td>0.4697</td>
<td>0.6774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.0526</td>
<td>0.2524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
selected for study are relatively independent measures of performance.

Univariate Tests of Significance

Exact significance tests were carried out to determine the separate effects of school area and grade level on each of the six dependent variables studied. The separate effects of sex were not considered since the results of the multivariate analysis of variance indicated that males and females probably did not differ in their performance as measured by the two scales administered in this study (see Table 3).

Effects of School Area

The overall means and standard deviations on each of the six performance measures for children in the desegregated and segregated school environments are presented in Table 5. As can be observed in Table 5, performance of students in a segregated environment tended to be generally higher on each of the six dependent measures.

The results of the univariate test of significance shown in Table 6, however, indicates that school area had a strong influence on measures of External Control and Teacher Affiliation. All other comparisons on measures of Internal Control, Self Acceptance, Social Confidence, and School Affiliation between children in desegregated and segregated schools were not significant.
Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for Students in Desegregated and Segregated Areas on the Six Dependent Measures of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>12.118</td>
<td>9.211</td>
<td>48.987</td>
<td>40.158</td>
<td>54.816</td>
<td>44.605</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>12.696</td>
<td>10.576</td>
<td>51.446</td>
<td>42.163</td>
<td>55.424</td>
<td>48.087</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean ( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>12.4342</td>
<td>9.9583</td>
<td>50.333</td>
<td>41.2560</td>
<td>55.1488</td>
<td>46.5119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.4462</td>
<td>2.6724</td>
<td>9.4892</td>
<td>7.4118</td>
<td>10.8654</td>
<td>10.3814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Summary of Univariate Test of Significance for Area Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>427.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>1100.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>251.61</td>
<td>251.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>14219.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>167.33</td>
<td>167.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>8726.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>17822.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>504.50</td>
<td>504.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>16702.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.
Effects of School Area by Grade Excluding Sex

The overall means on each of the six performance measures for children in the desegregated and segregated school environments by grade ignoring sex are presented in Table 7. As can be observed in Table 7, performance of students in both the fourth and sixth grades in segregated school environments tended to be higher on each of six dependent measures than fourth and sixth grade students in the desegregated school environments on each of the six dependent measures, except for sixth grade students in the segregated school environment whose mean performance on the teacher affiliation measure was lower than that for sixth grade students in the desegregated school environment on the same dependent measure.

Effects of Grade Level

The mean and standard deviations of fourth and sixth grade children summed over the factors of school area and sex for each of the dependent measures are presented in Table 8.

Based on the results of the univariate comparisons, the observed differences between fourth and sixth graders on the measures of Internal Control and School Affiliation were significant (Table 9). The differences on measures of External Control, Self Acceptance, Social Confidence and Teacher Affiliation failed to reach significance at the .05 level.
### Table 7
Area by Grade Excluding Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desegregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>11.333</td>
<td>8.806</td>
<td>48.889</td>
<td>39.944</td>
<td>58.361</td>
<td>42.944</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>12.825</td>
<td>9.575</td>
<td>49.075</td>
<td>40.350</td>
<td>51.625</td>
<td>46.100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>8.897</td>
<td>7.628</td>
<td>10.192</td>
<td>11.397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>12.447</td>
<td>10.681</td>
<td>50.191</td>
<td>40.723</td>
<td>58.511</td>
<td>50.213</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>12.956</td>
<td>10.467</td>
<td>52.756</td>
<td>43.667</td>
<td>52.200</td>
<td>45.867</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.225</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>8.502</td>
<td>7.781</td>
<td>12.517</td>
<td>11.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Means and Standard Deviations for Fourth and Sixth Grade Students
Irrespective of Area and Sex on the Six Dependent Measures
of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>11.964</td>
<td>9.867</td>
<td>49.626</td>
<td>40.386</td>
<td>58.446</td>
<td>47.060</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>12.894</td>
<td>10.047</td>
<td>51.024</td>
<td>42.106</td>
<td>51.929</td>
<td>45.976</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Summary of Univariate Test of Significance for Grade Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>6.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>927.47</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>1100.71</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>93.06</td>
<td>93.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>14219.94</td>
<td>87.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>135.37</td>
<td>135.37</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>8726.69</td>
<td>53.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1773.39</td>
<td>1773.39</td>
<td>16.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>17822.00</td>
<td>109.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38.39</td>
<td>38.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>16702.31</td>
<td>102.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level.
Generally, then, the results of the univariate comparisons indicate that children who attended segregated schools had significantly higher scores on each of the dependent measures then children who attended desegregated schools.

Furthermore, it appears that sixth graders tended to be generally higher on each of the dependent measures except school affiliation and teacher affiliation when compared to fourth graders. These findings, however, must be interpreted cautiously because of the significant interaction found between school area and grade level (Table 3). Thus, the generalizability concerning the overall effects of school area (desegregated v. segregated) and grade level (fourth grade v. sixth grade) is limited and hence, each factor must be interpreted separately in relation to a given level of the other. The section below presents data interpreting the interaction effects between school area and grade level for each of the six performance measures studied.

**Interaction Effects**

The means and standard deviations for fourth and sixth grade students attending the desegregated and segregated school areas for each of the six dependent variables are presented in Table 10. The interaction between school area and grade level for each dependent variable is also illustrated graphically in Figures 1 through 6 as follows.
Table 10
Means and Standard Deviations for Fourth and Sixth Grade Students for School Area and Grade Level Interaction Across Six Dependent Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desegregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>48.89</td>
<td>39.94</td>
<td>58.36</td>
<td>42.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>40.35</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>46.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>8.897</td>
<td>7.628</td>
<td>10.192</td>
<td>11.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>50.19</td>
<td>40.72</td>
<td>58.51</td>
<td>50.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>11.369</td>
<td>-- 0.721</td>
<td>8.660</td>
<td>8.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>52.20</td>
<td>45.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.225</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>8.502</td>
<td>7.781</td>
<td>12.517</td>
<td>11.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internal Control

Performance of the fourth and sixth grade students in the desegregated and segregated school areas for the internal control measure is graphed in Figure 1.

Figure 1
Internal Control

As can be observed in Figure 1, while the sixth grade students scored higher on this measure than the fourth grade students in both the desegregated and segregated school areas, the performance was significantly different only at the desegregated area (see Table 11). Indeed, in the segregated environment, performance for the two grade levels was essentially comparable. Examination of this interaction from the alternative point of view, that is, the differences between school area for each grade level, suggests that for sixth grade students Internal Control does not vary between the two areas (P .05). On the other hand, for the fourth
Table 11
Summary of Analysis for Simple Effects: School Environment by Grade Level Interaction, Internal Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Comparison of effects of school area for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>4.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Comparison of effects grade level at a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>7.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error/w cell</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level
Self-Acceptance

The interaction between school area and grade level for measure of Self-Acceptance is presented in Figure 3.

Figure 3
Self Acceptance

As can be observed, Self-Acceptance appears to be higher in the segregated area than the desegregated area. Although the difference in Self-Acceptance from the desegregated to the segregated area is much sharper for the sixth graders than it is for the fourth grade students, the comparisons failed to reach significance at the .05 level. Indeed, at the desegregated area the differences in Self-Acceptance scores between the two grades are relatively small while at the segregated area the differences appear to be large with the sixth graders exhibiting much higher scores. These differences however were not significant (see Table 13).
Table 13

Summary of Analysis for Simple Effects: School Environment by Grade Level Interaction, Self Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Comparison of effects of school area for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.59</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>286.87</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Comparison of effects of grade level at a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>151.14</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error/w cell</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>85.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Confidence

Figure 4 presents the Social Confidence scores exhibited by fourth and sixth grade students at the desegregated and segregated school areas. As can be observed, the results

![Figure 4](image)

are similar to those described above for the Self-Acceptance measure. It appears that for fourth graders, Social Confidence is not affected by the type of school area the student is attending ($P > .05$). However, sixth-grade students scored significantly higher on the Social Confidence scale when they were in the segregated rather than the desegregated area (see Table 14). Once again, performance between the fourth and sixth graders did not differ at the desegregated area.
Table 14
Summary of Analysis for Simple Effects: School Environment by Grade Level Interaction, Social Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Comparison of effects of school area for: Grade 4 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>232.95</td>
<td>4.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Comparison of effects of grade level at a: Desegregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>199.11</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level
although there performance appeared to differ at the segregated area, the difference just failed to reach significance (see Table 14).

**School Affiliation**

Figure 5 describes the performance of fourth and sixth graders at the desegregated and segregated school areas with regards to school affiliation. As can be observed, fourth graders scored significantly higher than sixth graders on the measure of school affiliation regardless of the area.
they were attending (see Table 15). Also, it appears that school area was not a factor for both fourth and sixth grade students on this measure since performance between the desegregated and segregated groups was essentially comparable (P. .05).

Teacher Affiliation

Measures of Teacher Affiliation exhibited by fourth and sixth grade students at the desegregated and segregated areas are described graphically in Figure 6.

Figure 6

Teacher Affiliation
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Table 15
Summary of Analysis for Simple Effects: School Environment by Grade Level Interaction, School Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Comparison of effects of school area for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Comparison of effects of grade level at a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>919.74</td>
<td>8.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>915.53</td>
<td>8.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error/w cell</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>111.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level
The degree of Teacher Affiliation for sixth grade students appears not to differ regardless of whether students are in the desegregated or segregated area (P.  .05). On the other hand, fourth grade students in the segregated area appear to like their teachers significantly more than fourth grade students in the desegregated environment (see Table 16). The results show once again that at the desegregated area the fourth graders scored lower on the Teacher Affiliation scale than the sixth graders, while the reverse was true at the segregated area where fourth graders scored significantly higher than sixth graders in the segregated area (see Table 16).

Summary of Findings

A 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design with independent measures on all three factors was employed to determine the effects of school area (desegregated or segregated), grade level (fourth or sixth), and sex (male or female) on six different measures of pupil performance including internal, external, Self-Acceptance, Social Confidence, School Affiliation, and Teacher Affiliation. The results of a multivariate analysis of variance indicated that school area, grade level, and the interaction between these two factors were significant at the .01 level. Sex and all other interactions failed to reach significance. Subsequent univariate tests of significance showed that External Control and Teacher Affiliation were strongly influenced by school area while
### Table 16

Summary of Analysis for Simple Effects: School Environment by Grade Level Interaction, Teacher Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Comparison of effects of school area for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1076.94</td>
<td>10.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Comparison of effects of grade level at a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188.67</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>434.23</td>
<td>4.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error/w cell</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>101.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level
Internal Control and School Affiliation were significantly affected by grade level. These overall findings, however are limited considering the non-additive effects as evidenced by the significant school area by grade level interaction reported earlier.

The interaction between school area and grade level was presented for each of the six dependents variables. In general, the results showed that (1) sixth grade students exhibited more Internal Control than fourth grade students especially at the desegregated area, (2) fourth grade students in the segregated area exhibit more External Control than fourth grade student exhibit in the desegregated area, (3) sixth grade students exhibit much higher Self Acceptance and Social Confidence scores in the segregated area than they do in the desegregated area, while performance between the two areas for the fourth graders remains relatively unchanged, (4) fourth grade students tended to score considerably higher than sixth graders in both the desegregated and segregated areas on school affiliation, and (5) fourth grade students scored higher in the segregated area on teacher affiliation than fourth grade students in the desegregated area, while performance for the sixth graders remained stable between the two school areas.

The final section of this chapter presents the results corresponding to each of the Null Hypotheses proposed in Chapter III.
Hypotheses

Factor A: Area (Desegregated v. Segregated)

Null Hypothesis One by Area

There will be no significant difference between the total scores of black students in segregated v. desegregated educational settings on the SOS Self Acceptance Scale.

The significance level for Self Acceptance by area factor was .087. Since this exceeds the .05 level we conclude that no significant difference exists between students in the segregated environment versus the desegregated environment on this variable.

Null Hypothesis Two by Area

There will be no significant difference between the total score in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting on the SOS Social Confidence Scale.

The significance level for Social Confidence by area factor was .075. Since this exceeds the .05 level we conclude that there was no significant difference between students in the segregated environment versus students in the desegregated environment on this variable.

Null Hypothesis Three by Area

There will be no significant difference between the total student scores in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting on the SOS School Affiliation Scale.
The significance level on the School Affiliation variable by area was .709 which was not determined to be statistically significant. We therefore conclude there was no significant difference between students in the segregated area versus the desegregated area on this variable.

**Null Hypothesis Four by Area**

There will be no significant difference between the total student score in segregated v. desegregated educational setting on the SOS Teacher Affiliation Scale.

The significance level on the Teacher Affiliation variable by area factor was .026 which noted a .02 level of significance between students in the segregated environment students in the desegregated environment.

**Null Hypothesis Five by Area**

There will be no significant difference between total student scores in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting on the Locus of Control IAR Scale.

The significance level for internal control by area factor was .116 which was found not to be statistically significant for students in the segregated environment v. students in the desegregated environment. Conversely, the significance level for external control by area factor was found to be statistically significant at the .001 level.
Factor B: Grade

Null Hypothesis One by Grade

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black fourth and sixth grade students on the SOS Self Acceptance Scale in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

The significance level for Self Acceptance by grade factor was .303 which was not found to be statistically significant.

Null Hypothesis Two by Grade

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black fourth and sixth grade students on the SOS Social Confidence Scale in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

The significance level for the Social Confidence variable by grade was .109 which was not found to be statistically significant.

Null Hypothesis Three by Grade

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black fourth and sixth grade students on the SOS School Affiliation Scale in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting.
The significance level for the School Affiliation variable by grade factor was found to be statistically significant at the .0002 level.

Null Hypothesis Four by Grade

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black fourth and sixth grade students on the SOS Teacher Affiliation Scale in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

The significance level for the Teacher Affiliation variable by grade factor was .548. This was not found to be statistically significant.

Null Hypothesis Five by Grade

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black fourth and sixth grade students on the Locus of Control IAR Scale in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

The significance level for internal control by grade factor was .010 which was found to be statistically significant; conversely, the external control was .573 which was not found to be statistically significant.
Factor C: Sex

Null Hypothesis One by Sex

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black male and female students' Self Acceptance in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

The significance level for the Self Acceptance variable by sex factor was .028 which was found to be statistically significant.

Null Hypothesis Two by Sex

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black male and female students on the SOS Social Confidence Scale in a segregated v. Desegregated educational setting.

The significance level for the Social Confidence variable by sex factor was .222 which was not found to be statistically significant.

Null Hypothesis Three by Sex

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black male and female students on the SOS School Affiliation Scale in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting.

The significance level for the School Affiliation variable by sex factor was .675 which was not found to be statistically
significant.

Null Hypothesis Four by Sex

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black male and female students on the SOS Teacher Affiliation Scale in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting. The significance level for the Teacher Affiliation variable by sex factor was .196 which was not held to be statistically significant.

Null Hypothesis Five by Sex

There will be no significant difference between mean scores of black male and female students' Locus of Control Beliefs regarding responsibility for intellectual and academic development in a segregated v. desegregated educational setting. The significance level for the internal control variable by sex factor was .186 while the significance level for the external control level was .579. Neither of the two dependent variables (internal control or external control) sub sumed in the locus of control measure was found to be statistically significant.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of segregated v. desegregated school environments as assessed by student perception on self concept and locus of control measures. From these measures an analysis of problems associated with school desegregation, learner efficiency and school effectiveness as they relate to Black children could be made for the purpose of arriving at solutions to such problems.

One hundred sixty-eight black male and female students in fourth and sixth grades in segregated and desegregated school environments participated in the study. The instruments administered were the Crandall Locus of Control for Intellectual Achievement Reasoning (IAR) and the Self Observation Scale (SOS). Responses to these instruments were studied in reference to three independent factors: area: desegregated v. segregated, grade: sixth v. fourth, and sex: male v. female. Interactions were studied across six dependent variables: self acceptance, social confidence, school affiliation, teacher affiliation, internal control, and external control. Relationships across variables were determined. A 2 x 2 x 2 multivariate
analysis of variance was utilized yielding probability scores as significance tests across dependent measures. Statistically significant and nonsignificant relationships were identified.

Inasmuch as the findings of this study raise major questions as to the effectiveness of school desegregation as a process, they likewise raise major questions as to the effect and consequences of the segregated school environment on the self concept, self evaluation of black male and female students in these environments.

Several assumptions at the beginning of the investigation suggested that the desegregated school environment would exert more powerful, self accepting, socially confident influences over male and female students in that environment. In this study, however, deficiencies in student perceptions were identified on almost every dependent variable for fourth and sixth grade male and female students in the desegregated school environment. Minor exceptions that require more intensive investigation are noted in figures one through six. A careful analysis of the area, grade effects, and the area by grade interactions with each dependent variable show the area by grade interactions to be at variance with many of the prominent studies on school desegregation.

The key to the analysis of the data lies in the summary of analysis for simple effects--area by grade interaction
across six dependent variables. The results of this study correspond to the consequences of segregated v. desegregated interactions while presenting the tragedy of desegregated students' poor self concept, poor school adjustment, and inability to construct efficient social and academic strategies in the face of social and academic intrasiege.

The consequences of interaction in a segregated or desegregated school environment are certainly at issue here. Traditionally desegregation was designed to certify the pursuit of interracial schooling, equal access to positive educational opportunities, and proposed as protection from extinction, isolation and intellectual enslavement.

The findings evoke from the researcher an ambiguous response because the intent of school desegregation legislation epitomizes the hope for effective school interaction, efficient learning, and quality of educational opportunity for Blacks. The findings also invoke a rather obvious inability of some desegregated school environments to insure some measure of success for students by way of improving self concept and the mastery and control of one's environment.

It is recognized throughout the literature that students in segregated and desegregated schools articulate and further define the meaning and quality of their experiences in school through their personal evaluations of self and ability to maintain control over the events in their lives. Yet
desegregation as a process has been less than enthusiastically endorsed, starting with Plessy v. Ferguson in 1896, and more recently, Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, a case which initiated and offered subsequent challenge to the legal superstructure which previously upheld state sanctioned non assimilation of nonwhites, white supremacy and deference toward Blacks.

It is documented that prior to desegregation mandates, Blacks experienced wholesale exclusions, insidious segregation, and personal degradation. The drama of school desegregation continues to unfold one step at a time, defining the assimilation of Blacks into public schools as a rather damaging psychological experience. This drama steeped in anxious mystery has presented itself as a recurrent ideal in American legal history.

Segregated education on the other hand, takes on yet another character: a double standard--a double character. Segregated white schools are generally accorded approval initiatives by some social architects and legislators alike while segregated black schools are plagued and stigmatized by the ingrained attitude that anything that is all black or "nouveu black rising" is inferior by virtue of its participants.

The question that should be asked perhaps is, "is ethnicity a qualified variable of defining inferiority or superiority in the face of social and academic adversity?"
this study race or ethnicity is a constant, yet more healthy response to self, and school is identified in response by students interacting in the segregated school environments.

Trends in the interaction comparisons indicate that the performance of fourth grade students as a total group and performance of segregated students is higher than the performance of other subjects. One reason for high scores among fourth grade students may be due to the fact that the younger the student, the greater the perceived importance. The age difference between fourth and sixth grade students also contrasts developmental levels and indicates different social and educational priorities.

The level of importance a student places on schooling is generally dictated by many factors. Among these are the freedom to choose activities, peer relations, student perceptions of the importance of their role in school interaction, cultural match or mismatch of students with "significant others" in the school environment and culturally and ethnically inclusive curricular offerings and materials. Other factors include expectations held by parents and teachers, value judgments imposed upon students related to color, high visibility and distinguishable pigment among students, and the manner in which the desegregation process is introduced. Environmental variance with black participants in the schooling process and students perceptions of white standards which measure and compare physical character
and fail to measure more intrinsic intellectual and social imperatives are equally important.

**Internal Control**

A comparison of scores for fourth and sixth grade students in the segregated school environment and the desegregated school environment on the Positive Internal Control measure indicates that higher scores were achieved by the students in the segregated school environment. The difference was not found to be statistically significant. The difference between fourth and sixth graders in the desegregated school environment was however statistically significant at P. .05 (see Table 11). The greatest difference in performance between grades is then seen in the desegregated school environment while grade performance in the segregated school environment is comparable. In addition, the difference between performance of fourth and sixth graders in the segregated school environment was statistically significant with students in the latter group scoring higher (P. .05, see Table 11).

This internal control variable assesses students' beliefs insofar as they feel that they, rather than others, are responsible for their intellectual and academic successes and failures. Subscale scores were generally independent of each other.
Students at the "internal" end of the continuum perceive outcomes to be a consequence of their own actions, while students at the "external" end believe outcomes are due to "powerful others" and other environmental stimuli, and therefore are beyond their personal influence and control. If students are convinced that they have little control over the rewards or punishments they receive, then they have little reason to modify their behavior in an attempt to alter the probability that those events will occur (Crandall, 1965).

Internal beliefs or responsibility generally denote less conforming attitudes and less behavioral conformity to group pressure (Crowne and Liveran, 1964).

A student's I+ score is generally obtained by summing all positive events for which the student assumes credit. The I- score is the total of all negative events for which the student assumes blame. A total I (internal) score is the sum of the I+ and the I- subscores.

The IAR scale notes the higher the score the greater the assignment of self responsibility.

Students in the segregated environment appear more "internal" than students in the desegregated school environment. This, however, was not found to be statistically significant. It could be assumed that the segregated school environment may have had the necessary continuity and stability which renders it a nurtured and supportive environment. In a nurtured environment there is less internal
conflict either within the environment or with the significant others in the environment, thus creating a feeling of internal wholeness. The desegregated environment, on the other hand, is less nurtured as data for this environment was collected during the implementation of a desegregation plan.

It is conceivable that the drama of boycotts, street barricades, and bussing made the desegregated environment more stressful, anxiety producing, and ambiguous, and conflicting with the internal self. This would account for the general low scores of students in this environment, and the statistically significant difference between the fourth and sixth graders. It could be assumed that the performance of the fourth grade students in the desegregated school environment was sufficiently lower than the performance of sixth grade students because of the age difference between the two groups, and because the older the student, the greater the tolerance for ambiguity and the greater the skill in coping with stressful situations.

External Control

The IAR self responsibility instrument limits the source of external control to those persons who most often come into contact with a student, i.e., parents, teachers and peers (Crandall, 1965). Scoring procedure shows that the lower the score the more external the belief or assignment of self responsibility.
In examining the external control measure in this study the trend indicates that fourth and sixth grade students in the segregated school environment had higher performance scores on this measure than fourth and sixth grade students in the desegregated environment. Higher performance represents a less external and more internal belief, while lower performance scores indicate more external beliefs. It can be assumed that the desegregated school environment produces a greater measure of externality than does the segregated school environment. This means that desegregated students are less dependent on self and more dependent on the school environment, parents and peers for emotional and academic support which may affect proper development. Problems can thus arise when the environment or school personnel fail to deliver the necessary supports.

Students in the segregated school environment had higher external scores which generally means they are less external and lean toward greater internality. Segregated students on this measure feel their own actions are influential in attaining the reinforcements they receive. This interaction between school environments, however, did not prove to be statistically significant.

In examining the comparison of effects of school area, the comparison for fourth grade students was found to be statistically significant at P. 05. The performance of fourth grade students in the desegregated school environment
was significantly lower than that of fourth grade students in the desegregated school environment.

These findings indicate that fourth grade students in the desegregated environment contribute considerable power and influence to teachers, parents, and peers suggesting a dependency on the environment, lack of self sufficiency, and dependence upon others for acquisition of independent problem solving strategies, all of which are necessary factors in healthy personality development. It appears that a lack of any one of these factors lends itself to poor self concept development, poor school adjustment, and assignment of influence over school success to external others.

The researcher notes that the locus of control measure would have been more easily understood if the data had accessed total I scores rather than subscale scores. This would have provided one measure with high and low performance scores as opposed to two sub measures each with high and low scores.

**Self Acceptance**

A comparison of effects of area and grade effects found no significant comparisons on the measure. An examination of trends in figure 3, however, illustrates that for grade effects performance of fourth grade students in the segregated school environment was higher than performance for fourth grade students in the desegregated school environment.
Likewise, sixth grade students in the segregated school environment exhibited higher performance than did their counterparts in the desegregated school environment. Again, the trend notes that subjects in the segregated school environment had higher self acceptance than students in the desegregated school environment.

The insularity and undisturbed status quo in the segregated environment seemingly exerts a powerful influence over students' self acceptance. Students seem to interact without the fear of rejection or alienation. As all of the students in the segregated school environment are black the students draw on each other for support.

**Social Confidence**

In examining the comparison of effect for area by grade interaction on the social confidence measure, the segregated students in grades four and six appear to score higher than their counterparts in the desegregated environment. Likewise, performance for fourth grade students in the segregated school environment was greater than that for fourth graders in the desegregated environment. This measure, however, was not statistically significant.

The performance measure for sixth grade students in the segregated school environment was significantly greater than that for sixth grade students in the desegregated school environment at P. < .05.
Social confidence measures ability to relate successfully to social situations such as ease in making friends and feeling valued by others. These findings demonstrate that the segregated environment supports reduced levels of anxiety and suggests that the social confidence of students in the segregated school environment is positively influenced. This influence conceivably is responsible for heightened aspiration and motivation on behalf of students whose social confidence levels are high.

Social confidence of students in the desegregated school environment is negatively affected as interracial constraints on social relations may be inhibited by negative perceptions of black students as remedial, low ability, and non-standard in terms of physical appearance, socio economic standards, demeanor and language. Black students in desegregated schools in this study may tune in to institutional comments, double standards and controversial evaluations of themselves that assign and impose negative adjectives to them reinforcing interracial cleavages and internal conflict within the student and in the school environment.

**School Affiliation**

In examining the comparisons on the school affiliation measure, trends suggest that fourth grade students scored higher than sixth graders regardless of school environment.
Likewise, across grade the scores were comparable for both fourth and sixth grade students regardless of school environment. (See figure 5.) The comparison of effects for school area for grade four and grade six students, however, failed to reach statistical significance.

The comparison of effects for grade level at the desegregated school environment found the differences in performance between fourth and sixth graders to be statistically significant. Likewise, the difference in performance between fourth and sixth grade students in the segregated school environment was found to be statistically significant P. .05. (See table 15.)

The school affiliation variable notes that high scores are equated with those students who view the schooling experience as a positive influence in their lives. Those scores indicate students like school and those activities associated with it. An analysis of the trends in the data indicates that fourth grade students in both the segregated and desegregated school environment view school as a positive influence on their lives. Sixth grade students, however, regardless of school environment, scored significantly lower suggesting that older students don't view school in the same manner and/or have more important socialization priorities. The comparisons, then, suggest that the higher
grade, or the longer students are in school, the less they view school as a primary influence in defining and influencing their lives. Also the age of sixth graders suggests that puberty and social development are more influential than the schooling experience.

The researcher believes sixth graders essentially agree with younger students on their attitude toward education, although they vary in the way they define how, when, and where that education is to be transmitted or delivered. It is also likely that sixth grade students are embroiled in two conflicting themes: the desire for freedom, self expression and independence in accord with the beliefs of self defining goals, and the recognition that peer pressures may force them to abandon or conceal enjoyment of school related activities while internally feeling the force of influence school exerts on them. Common in the attitudes of adolescents is a blatant contempt and dislike for "squares", and of not being accepted by the group. Thus, adolescent students often go underground concealing their positive pronouncements of the value and influence of schooling. Fourth graders, however, by virtue of their being younger are not sufficiently inhibited to conceal their positive or negative feelings about school.

School success may be viewed by sixth graders as a movement through a hierarchy of socially induced peer maneuvers where positive identification with school jeopardizes
social confidence, internal control and peer acceptance, all of which inhibit self acceptance, social confidence, and school affiliation.

Teacher Affiliation

In examining the teacher affiliation measure the comparison of effects of school environment for fourth grade students was statistically significant P. .05. The comparison for sixth grade students for area effect was not found to be significant. Likewise, the difference in performance between fourth grade and sixth grade students in the segregated school environment was statistically significant. The performance comparison between fourth grade and sixth grade students in the desegregated school environment failed to reach significance.

On the teacher affiliation measure, high scores indicate that students like their teachers, and see them as helpful, attentive, understanding, and generous. An examination of figure 6 indicates that fourth grade students in the desegregated school environment scored lower than all other students on this measure suggesting that they view teachers as arbitrary, inconsiderate, socially distant, and a source of emotional pain. It may be said that interaction of students in the desegregated school environment with teachers is defined as a more traumatic and painful part of their schooling experience. Conversely, this also suggests that by
virtue of the definition of arbitrariness teachers in this study in the desegregated school environment are seen as not bound by rules, are capricious, unreasonable, and socially distant.

Clark (1970) described the social distance maintained by teachers in their dealings with "those children." It is argued that no effort is made to establish a harmonizing atmosphere in the classroom or to interact with students on an individual basis. Haskins (1969) noted that faculty members in some desegregated schools do not speak to each other on a professional basis, therefore, their conversations are generally limited to social and racial put downs of students, and the sharing of unfounded, biased, and derogatory remarks about students, which are often overheard by students and their classmates alike.

Teacher attitudes towards students are perhaps the most profound and influential determination in how students develop and maintain internal control over environment and positive self acceptance, social confidence, and attitude toward school and teachers alike. Negative teacher attitudes short circuit positive school experiences and impose negative expectations for academic excellence and social development on students. Likewise, teacher attitudes are held responsible for low aspiration, motivations, diminishing self worth, increased anxiety, all of which contribute to the
development of a student as a school phobic.

Negative teacher attitude and low teacher affiliation also contribute to and are held responsible for the maintenance of segregated sub-structures within the desegregated school. This intraschool segregation is often purposely induced by students as a mechanism to maintain the sense of self and strengthen coping abilities in the face of arbitrary handling by school personnel. Often in the desegregation process intra school segregation is the only promise of mentally healthy functioning. As black students interact in desegregated school environments where cultural mismatch between students and teachers is evident, they limit their interactional nexus to other Blacks thereby simultaneously increasing the legitimacy of their status while defining a self attitude which allows them to better cope and negotiate the hazards of unaccepting school environments.

Discussion

Although the problem addressed in this study is an important one concerning many practitioners and investigators, it may have been more effective to narrow the focus. It is, therefore, recommended that if this study is replicated fewer variables be included at least until such times as the variables are better understood. In retrospect, the wide range of themes and issues explicated in the literature
review should have been perceived as a cue that the delimited problem area should have been further limited.

The objective of the investigation remains a worthwhile one and is clearly related to the problem statement. By design the objective was stated as a fairly broad generalization. This was done to increase the probability that the objective would lend itself to the generation of hypotheses. The stating of the suggested hypotheses as both research and null may have been an unwise decision in that both sets of hypotheses may confuse readers who are not familiar with this convention.

It is the judgement of the researcher that her biases are explicated for the reader. However, if the researcher were to replicate the study, she would pay more attention to the task of bias analysis.

The two instruments used in the study are fully described. A need also exists to make a further effort to elicit teacher responses to their perceptions of their students. This data could be correlated with student responses to more comprehensively assess desegregation outcomes to better define key variables in learning efficiency and school effectiveness. This, then, defines effectant relationships between students, teachers, and schools in desegregated school environments.
The population studied is described in the areas of definition, size and reasons for selection. If adequate resources were available, the population size would have been increased. An effort was made in the present study to examine a population that is Black as opposed to an integrated one. While this study should be repeated with similar populations, it should also be repeated using a population that is more ethnically diverse to assess differences in student perception across variables among groups.

The study design is fairly simple and straightforward. The data collection methodology is described, the variables identified, and utilization of statistical procedures described in sufficient detail so that they can be repeated at a future date. Where possible the findings are summarized and displayed on tables. In addition, limitations of the study are explored; examples of additional problems and hypotheses raised by this investigation are explained; and recommendations are offered to facilitate further and more extensive study.

In this chapter the findings are interpreted and discussed. No effort is made to rationalize the non-significant relationships, i.e., to extrapolate findings reported in the post hoc analyses of populations other than those for which there are data.
The researcher is plagued by many remaining questions still unanswered. The knowledge that students in the segregated school environment assign greater responsibility to their own learning, as measured by the IAR and across the six dependent measures, and are more positive about themselves is very significant. This is especially important as schools are in the process of desegregating in major metropolitan areas across the country. What this suggests is that black children are going to desegregated schools where they may be in dire psychological straits unless teacher retraining is designed as a part of that process. It is important for teachers to be reeducated to appropriately evaluate non-white children, to become institutionally sensitized and develop accommodation strategies for not only themselves, but for the school and community alike. If such training and sensitization is not undertaken, ethnic, cultural, sociological and economic mismatches may result creating a psychological stress so severe for black students that deviance becomes a coping strategy.

School desegregation as a process must therefore insure against basic complacency of educators in desegregated schools. The researcher is not sufficiently convinced that curriculum, teaching strategies, teacher training, counseling strategies, special education and learning disability evaluation procedures are sufficiently designed to accommodate
the basic differences between black and white children. Nor do they allow black children to mediate their educational experience to insure that they are natural, real, and practical for the white world which awaits them.

The findings provide valuable information as to the extent to which the desegregation process achieves the goal of ending segregation or separate but equal doctrines. They also demonstrate the extent to which the process without the required training and sensitization of school personnel creates an intraschool segregation as a coping strategy. In any case, it appears the process to achieve the goal of effectant school relationships, and the product, a psychologically stable and educationally efficient student, is not compatible as it currently exists.

Recommendations

The first and most obvious recommendation is that this study and similar types of research involving still other self concepts and locus of control changes for both black and white teachers and students be undertaken. If other research continues to bear out the findings of this study, a more critical examination of the school desegregation process should be undertaken and strong consideration be given to the feasibility of mandating intensive staff retraining and leadership training for desegregation, curriculum revision,
and coping skill development for students who will participate in the desegregation process.

Prior to the desegregation of any school, black students and their parents should participate in support seminars to understand the consequences of desegregation as they relate to anxiety, cross cultural relativism, racial awareness, institutional and teacher expectation, social stigma, and inferiority assigned to being black in a desegregated setting, and psychological and achievement outcome in the face of adversity.

More extensive research on the psychological effects of school desegregation and self concept development are also necessary to allow for establishing a model for proper school desegregation.

Certainly, positive self concept development, internal locus of control, social confidence, positive school affiliation, and positive teacher affiliation on the part of child development generally and black children specifically is a more worthwhile goal than that set forth for the mere sake of redistricting students.

Another important recommendation resulting from this study is teaching interracial understandings as a part of the total school program rather than as an isolated and often intermittent offering such as what is done with black studies courses throughout the country. Of course, research should be continuously conducted to assess the effectiveness
of educational achievement of black students in segregated and desegregated schools on a biennial basis to identify where students' academic achievement is in jeopardy. Black students will not enjoy effective relationships in desegregated schools until we certify the process by insuring that they are taught how to cope with the prejudice, exclusion and ambiguity surrounding the education of Blacks, which is generally designed to make them socially, psychologically and educational dependent. Blacks have too long been the subjects of cause and effect experimentation.

**Conclusion**

While the researcher attempted to maintain the rigor of the research and quantitative analysis there are indeed limitations in the study which did not take into account the social politics of the school, the community, the socio economic status of the subjects and/or the attitudes and expectations of school personnel. The researcher recognizes the need to make inferences from her own experiential encounter as a student, her intuition and her experiences as a school administrator as to why certain results come about. She fully recognizes the limitations of the data as assessed by the instruments described, yet supports these data and analysis that go beyond the data collected.
It is therefore concluded that the relationships investigated in this study are in need of further investigation to assess the effects of desegregated and segregated school environments on teachers and majority children.
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DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS
CRANDALL INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT
REASONING QUESTIONNAIRE

Administration

For subjects sixth grade and older, the examiner reads the instructions to the subjects as they follow along on their own copies. These are headed GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS on the first page of the keyed questionnaire to follow. It is helpful for the examiner to add that some of the questions will seem to be worded in a rather "childish" manner and that this is because the same questionnaire is also used for younger children: they are worded simply so that younger children can understand them.

For subjects fifth grade or younger, the examiner gives these instructions aloud before she (he) administers the scale orally and individually. It is actually preferable to tape record both instructions and items, if possible, to standardize administration. It also helps to add (for subjects of all ages) that sometimes both answers will seem to describe what happens to them, or that neither one exactly describes it. In such a case, they should choose the one, and only one, answer which comes closest, for them. (This is to prevent the subject from circling both or neither answer. This will happen anyhow in occasional rare instances. When so, our practice has been to retain the data if the subject has done that for only one item, and to score that
item with a .5. When it happens more than once, we discard that subject's data.) When individual administration is prohibitive, we have administered the scale to small groups of ten or twelve subjects, using the taped recording, and monitoring carefully to make certain all children are responding to the same item they are listening to on the tape.

Scoring

On the keyed questionnaire to follow, the internal response for each item is indicated with a circle around the A or B preceding the alternatives for that item. The scale is scored in the internal direction.

A + or a - precedes each item stem to denote positive outcome (+) or negative outcome (-) items.

The scale is regularly scored in the following ways:

I+ (Internality for positive events) is scored by summing the S's (INTERNAL responses for items keyed with +

I- (Internality for negative events) is scored by summing the S's INTERNAL responses for items keyed with -

I total is the sum of the I+ and I- subscores
THE IAR QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME ____________________________________________________
GRADE _____________________________________________________
BIRTHDATE __________________________________________________
SEX (MALE OR FEMALE) ________________________________________
FATHER'S OCCUPATION _________________________________________
MOTHER'S OCCUPATION _________________________________________

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire describes a number of common experiences most of you have in your daily lives. These statements are presented one at a time, and following each are two possible answers. Read the description of the experience carefully, and then look at the two answers. Choose the one that most often describes what happens to you. Put a circle around the "A" or the "B" in front of that answer. Be sure to answer each question according to how you really feel.

If, at any time, you are uncertain about the meaning of a question, raise your hand and one of the persons who passed out the questionnaire will come and explain it to you.

1. If a teacher passes you to the next grade, would it probably be
   A. because she liked you, or
   B. because of the work you did?
2. When you do well on a test at school, is it more likely to be
   A. because you studied for it, or
   B. because the test was especially easy?
3. When you have trouble understanding something in school, is it usually
   A. because the teacher didn't explain it clearly, or
   B. because you didn't listen carefully?
4. When you read a story and can't remember much of it, is it usually
   A. because the story wasn't well written, or
   B. because you weren't interested in the story?
5. Suppose your parents say you are doing well in school, is this likely to happen
   A. because your school work is good, or
   B. because they are in a good mood?
6. Suppose you did better than usual in a subject at school, would it probably happen
   A. because you tried harder, or
   B. because someone helped you?
7. When you lose at a game of cards or checkers, does it usually happen
   A. because the other player is good at the game, or
   B. because you don't play well?
8. Suppose a person doesn't think you are very bright or clever,
   A. can you make him change his mind if you try to, or
   B. are there some people who will think you're not very bright no matter what you do?

9. If you solve a puzzle quickly, is it
   A. because it wasn't a very hard puzzle, or
   B. because you worked on it carefully?

10. If a boy or girl tells you that you are dumb, is it more likely that they say that
   A. because they are mad at you, or
   B. because what you did really wasn't very bright?

11. Suppose you study to become a teacher, scientist, or doctor and you fail, do you think this would happen
   A. because you didn't work hard enough, or
   B. because you needed some help, and other people didn't give it to you?

12. When you learn something quickly in school, is it usually
   A. because you paid close attention, or
   B. because the teacher explained it clearly?

13. If a teacher says to you, "Your work is fine," is it
   A. something teachers usually say to encourage pupils, or
   B. because you did a good job?
14. When you find it hard to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it
   A. because you didn't study well enough before you tried them, or
   B. because the teacher gave problems that were too hard?
15. When you forget something you heard in class, is it
   A. because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or
   B. because you didn't try very hard to remember?
16. Suppose you weren't sure about the answer to a question your teacher asked you, but your answer turned out to be right, is it likely to happen
   A. because she wasn't as particular as usual, or
   B. because you gave the best answer you could think of?
17. When you read a story and remember most of it, is it usually
   A. because you were interested in the story, or
   B. because the story was well written?
18. If your parents tell you you're acting silly and not thinking clearly, is it more likely to be
   A. because of something you did, or
   B. because they happen to feel cranky?
19. When you don't do well on a test at school, is it
   A. because the test was especially hard, or
   B. because you didn't study for it?
20. When you win at a game of cards or checkers, does it happen
   A. because you play real well, or
   B. because the other person doesn't play well?
21. If people think you're bright or clever, is it
   A. because they happen to like you, or
   B. because you usually act that way?
22. If a teacher didn't pass you to the next grade, would it probably be
   A. because she "had it in for you," or
   B. because your school work wasn't good enough?
23. Suppose you don't do as well as usual in a subject at school, would this probably happen
   A. because you weren't as careful as usual, or
   B. because somebody bothered you and kept you from working?
24. If a boy or girl tells you that you are bright, is it usually
   A. because you thought up a good idea, or
   B. because they like you?
25. Suppose you became a famous teacher, scientist, or doctor, do you think this would happen
   A. because other people helped you when you needed it, or
   B. because you worked very hard?

26. Suppose your parents say you aren't doing well in your school work, is this likely to happen more
   A. because your work isn't very good, or
   B. because they are feeling cranky?

27. Suppose you are showing a friend how to play a game and he has trouble with it, would that happen
   A. because he wasn't able to understand how to play, or
   B. because you couldn't explain it well?

28. When you find it easy to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it usually
   A. because the teacher gave you especially easy problems, or
   B. because you studied your book well before you tried them?

29. When you remember something you heard in class, is it usually
   A. because you tried hard to remember, or
   B. because the teacher explained it well?
30. If you can't work a puzzle, is it more likely to happen
   A. because you are not especially good at working puzzles, or
   B. because the instructions weren't written clearly enough?

31. If your parents tell you that you are bright or clever, is it more likely
   A. because they are feeling good, or
   B. because of something you did?

32. Suppose you are explaining how to play a game to a friend and he learns quickly, would that happen more often
   A. because you explained it well, or
   B. because he was able to understand it?

33. Suppose you're not sure about the answer to a question your teacher asks you and the answer you give turns out to be wrong, is it likely to happen
   A. because she was more particular than usual, or
   B. because you answered too quickly?

34. If a teacher says to you, "Try to do better," would it be
   A. because this is something she might say to get pupils to try harder, or
   B. because your work wasn't as good as usual?
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- Use black lead pencil only (No. 2 or No. 2½).
- Do NOT use ink or ballpoint pen.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any response you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on this sheet.
- Answer each item Yes or No.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPROPER MARKS</th>
<th>PROPER MARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◯ ◯ ◯ ◯</td>
<td>◯ ◯ ◯ ◯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am about as nervous as other people.  ◯ ◯
2. This school is like a jail.  ◯ ◯
3. I often feel angry for no special reason.  ◯ ◯
4. I usually like my teachers.  ◯ ◯
5. I worry quite a bit over possible troubles.  ◯ ◯
6. My teachers listen to what I have to say.  ◯ ◯
7. I like to play only when I’m the leader.  ◯ ◯
8. Other children are often mean to me.  ◯ ◯
9. The other children in my class are not friendly toward me.  ◯ ◯
10. I always have to be boss.  ◯ ◯
11. I am easy to like.  ◯ ◯
12. I like to do school work at home in the evening.  ◯ ◯
13. My feelings are hurt more easily than most people’s.  ◯ ◯
14. My teachers make sure I always understand what they want me to do.  ◯ ◯
15. I can only do my work if someone helps me.  ◯ ◯
16. I feel good when I’m at school.  ◯ ◯
17. My teachers like to help me.  ◯ ◯
18. I am a happy person.  ◯ ◯
19. I don’t like most of the children in my class.  ◯ ◯
20. Grownups are often glad to help me.  ◯ ◯
21. At times I have been worried beyond reason about something that really didn’t matter.  ◯ ◯
22. My teachers are mean.  ◯ ◯
23. I usually treat my family as well as I should.  ◯ ◯
24. I am a very nervous person.  ◯ ◯
25. When I do something wrong, my teachers correct me without hurting my feelings.  ◯ ◯
26. I cause trouble to my family.  ◯ ◯
27. I want to be a very good student.  ◯ ◯
28. I can give a good report in front of the class.  ◯ ◯
29. I like my teachers.  ◯ ◯
30. I don’t have many friends.  ◯ ◯
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. At school other people really care about me.</td>
<td>41. I often get into trouble at home.</td>
<td>51. My teachers are not very friendly with the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am proud of my school work.</td>
<td>42. People are always picking on me.</td>
<td>52. I behave badly at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I feel that my family always trusts me.</td>
<td>43. I am a cheerful person.</td>
<td>53. Most of the time I feel sorry for someone who is hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. It is hard for me to make friends.</td>
<td>44. My teachers do not give me enough time to finish my work.</td>
<td>54. My classmates like me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am a good person.</td>
<td>45. I like to see other children happy.</td>
<td>55. Most people are much better liked than I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Usually I like to be with other children.</td>
<td>46. At times I lose sleep over worry.</td>
<td>56. I like school better than my friends do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I can't be depended on.</td>
<td>47. I like to learn about new things.</td>
<td>57. I often worry about what other children think of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Each morning I look forward to coming to school.</td>
<td>48. I often find myself worrying about something.</td>
<td>58. I would rather get books for my birthday than toys or clothes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Most things are too hard to do.</td>
<td>49. I like to stay home from school.</td>
<td>59. I am among the last to be chosen for teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I like to have my teachers ask me questions.</td>
<td>50. I am lonely very often.</td>
<td>60. I am fun to be with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>