CHARACTERISTICS OF DISADVANTAGED VOLUNTEERS AND NON-VOLUNTEERS FOR A FEDERAL YOUTH WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

Thesis for the Degree of Ed. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

ALBERT H. RITSEMA

1967

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Characteristics of Disadvantaged Volunteers
and Non-Volunteers for a Federal Youth Work
Training Program.

presented by

Albert H. Ritsema

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ed.D. degree in Counseling, Personnel
Services and Educational
Psychology

James W Costar
Major professor

Date October 30, 1967

O-169

ABSTRACT

CHARACTERISTICS OF DISADVANTAGED
VOLUNTEERS AND NON-VOLUNTEERS FOR A
FEDERAL YOUTH WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

By

Albert H. Ritsema

Because of increasing concern among the leaders of our nation for those who are economically disadvantaged, numerous federal, state, and local programs have been developed in recent years to assist them.

In this research an effort has been made to identify the characteristics of male students who volunteer to participate in a Federal Youth Work Training Program which is designed for economically disadvantaged students. An attempt was also made to identify reasons eligible students do not volunteer to participate.

Review of the literature did not reveal any previous research on this problem. However, the literature did reveal the position by some authorities that lower class people are usually not willing to take action which would improve their situation. This is in contrast to the evidence that some lower class people do volunteer for programs designed to help them.

One of the authorities took the position that the lower class people who do take action to ameliorate their situation are those whose reference groups are the upper classes. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the advantaged students would be higher than the non-volunteers on selected school performance and related socio-psychological variables.

For this research 231 male students in Grand Rapids, Michigan, with birthdates between May 1, 1949, and November 1, 1949, were studied prior to the time they would be eligible for the Work Training Program. These students were categorized as: advantaged (173 students), disadvantaged volunteers (34 students), and disadvantaged non-volunteers (24 students).

Data from school records, questionnaires, and interviews were gathered in Spring, 1965.

Analysis of the data revealed the following noteworthy findings:

1. The advantaged students were significantly higher than the disadvantaged students in regard to intelligence quotients; reading achievement; grade point average; school attendance record; self concept of academic ability; perceived parents' evaluations of academic ability; perceived friends' evaluations of academic ability; perceived teachers' evaluations of academic ability; and perceived norms for academic performance as indicated by perceived academic preferences of parents and favorite teacher.

2. The disadvantaged volunteers were not significantly higher than the disadvantaged non-volunteers on any of the variables used in this research.

3. Half of the non-volunteers held part-time jobs outside of the school system. Interviews with the remaining non-volunteers revealed that their reasons for not volunteering were either because they had no knowledge of the program or they were too busy with school work and school activities.

Seven recommendations were offered for consideration by the administrators of the program. Implications for further research were drawn.

CHARACTERISTICS OF DISADVANTAGED VOLUNTEERS AND NON-VOLUNTEERS FOR A FEDERAL YOUTH WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

By

Albert H. Ritsema

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Counseling, Personnel Services
and Educational Psychology

1967

Albert H. Ritsema

Candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Final examination: October 30, 1967, College of Education

Dissertation: Characteristics of Disadvantaged Volunteers and Non-volunteers for a Federal Youth Work Training Program

Outline of Doctoral Studies:

Major subject: School Counseling
Cognate area: Social Work

Biographical and Educational Information:

Born: May 15, 1930

Undergraduate studies: Calvin College
A.B. in Education
June, 1952

Master's program: University of Michigan
M.A. in Guidance and Counseling
February, 1954

Doctoral program: Michigan State University
Doctoral candidate: 1962-1967

Professional Experience:

Grand Rapids Public Schools
Grand Rapids, Michigan
School Social Worker 1956-1967
and Counselor

Member of The American Personnel and Guidance Association, The Michigan Counselor's Association, The Western Michigan School Social Worker's Association, and the Michigan School Social Worker's Association.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is deeply indebted to many people. Unfortunately, it is not possible to recognize here all of those who have helped to make this study possible. It is appropriate, however, to recognize those who have made special contributions.

Dr. James W. Costar, chairman of the author's Guidance Committee and director of this thesis, has provided invaluable counsel and encouragement during the past several years. His counsel and support have been deeply appreciated.

The writer wishes to express thanks to the members of his Guidance Committee: Dr. Norman Kagan, who ably served as chairman of the author's Guidance Committee prior to the initiation of this thesis; Dr. Lucille K. Barber, who has been a source of encouragement since the beginning of this candidate's doctoral program; and Dr. Wilbur B. Brookover, who has contributed significantly to the development of this study.

The author also wishes to acknowledge the contribution made by Dr. Richard C. Rank who served as chairman of the Guidance Committee prior to his appointment to the Faculty of Georgia State University in 1966.

A major contribution was made by Dr. Edsel L. Erickson who was on the staff at Michigan State University and presently is on the faculty of Western Michigan University. His professional knowledge and personal support have been invaluable to the author of this study.

Donald Bender, diagnostician for the Grand Rapids, Michigan Public Schools, provided able assistance in the collection of the data. The author is appreciative to him and other employees of the Grand Rapids Public Schools who were helpful in a variety of ways in this thesis.

The author wishes to thank Rodney Huntington, student at Western Michigan University, for his able assistance in the analysis of the data for this thesis.

Also, a word of appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Robert Cross for her efforts and patience in preparing this manuscript.

Finally, the author expresses deep appreciation for the endless hours of proofreading, encouragement and personal sacrifices of his devoted wife, Wilma Jane.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction of the Problem

Emerging social conditions and problems have caused many prominent educators, sociologists and government leaders to be concerned about poverty and its effect upon individuals and society in general. Havighurst[1], Conant[2], Riessman[3], and others have written a great deal about this problem. Recently, with federal, state, and local support, numerous educational and economic assistance programs have been developed to aid students characterized as economically disadvantaged. The main purposes of these programs are to minimize the effects of poverty and enable the disadvantaged students to develop those of his capacities which may go unused without such help. Many disadvantaged students avail themselves of such programs. However, there are also many who do not. Caro[4] has said that lower class young people tend not to take full advantage of opportunities which are available to them. In view of this fact, it is important to both

---

[1]Robert J. Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966)

[2]James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs (New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1961)

[3]Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962)

[4]Francis G. Caro, "Social Class and Attitudes of Youth Relevant for the Realization of Adult Goals", Social Forces, 44 (June, 1966), p. 492.

educators and non-educators that differences between disadvantaged young people who volunteer and disadvantaged young people who do not volunteer to participate in such programs when they are located in an academic setting be identified.

Purpose and Importance of the Study

If our society is to accomplish its goals of alleviating poverty and, more specifically, alleviating the negative effect poverty has upon young people in school, the development of a better understanding of the economically disadvantaged is essential. Since the disadvantaged are not a homogeneous group, it is particularly important that variations in the social-psychological characteristics of the disadvantaged in relation to certain behaviors be identified.

The main purpose of this study is to increase the amount of knowledge about the economically disadvantaged which is available. This will be done by examining some characteristics of disadvantaged students who volunteered to participate in a particular poverty program operating within an academic setting when compared with disadvantaged students who did not volunteer for the program.

In the criteria[5] established by the Federal government for the selection of students for the Work Training Program upon which this study is focused, a recommendation was made that every consideration be given to selecting school youth who have a "personal as well as an

---

[5]Program Standard No. 1-65, Subject: "Students for Enrollment of Youth in Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects." U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Washington, D.C., July 8, 1965, p. 2.

economic need for participation in the program". Students with a personal need are those characterized by: marginal school achievement, language deficiencies, poor school records, frequent disciplinary problems, lack of motivation, and emotional or attitudinal problems requiring personal adjustment assistance. These criteria have strong academic implications and are provided so that disadvantaged students with poor "life chances" will be involved in the program as well as disadvantaged students with more favorable "life chances"[6].

It is important to know whether students with these personal needs related to academic success avail themselves of such programs to the same extent as other disadvantaged students.

In summary, the purposes of this study are:

1. to determine what differences, if any, exist between advantaged and disadvantaged youth according to certain variables thought to be related to academic success.

2. to extend the knowledge about the disadvantaged by determining differences between those who volunteer and those who do not volunteer for a Work Training Program located in an academic setting.

3. to discover those factors which cause non-volunteers to refuse to participate in Work Training Programs located in an academic setting.

---

[6]"Life chances" are defined in terms of a student's ability and desire to improve his situation through education.

Theory

In view of the fact that no single formalized theory of human behavior has been applied to the behavior upon which this study is focused, it is necessary to identify several concepts in the literature which may be helpful in understanding the findings of this study.

There is a rather common feeling among advantaged people that "slaves enjoy being slaves". This attitude has caused some people to raise objections to programs which are designed to aid economically disadvantaged people. Caro[7], who was cited earlier, has indicated that lower class young people tend not to take full advantage of opportunities which are available to them. Hyman[8] in discussing this problem has stated that " . . . an intervening variable mediating the relationship between low position and lack of upward mobility is a system of beliefs and values within the lower classes which in turn reduces the very voluntary actions which would ameliorate their low position".

In relationship to these statements, however, there is evidence that many within the lower classes (the disadvantaged) do become involved in programs and activities which are designed to "ameliorate their low position". Hyman[9] attested to this fact when he stated that

---

[7]Caro, op. cit. p. 492.

[8]Herbert Hyman, "The Value System of Different Classes: A Social-Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification", in Class, Status, and Power. ed. Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953) p. 427.

[9]Ibid. p. 441.

"while the evidence thus far presented provides consistent and strong evidence that lower class individuals as a group have a value system that reduces the likelihood of individual advancement, it is also clear from the data that there is a sizeable proportion of the lower group who do not incorporate this value system". This statement hits at the heart of the problem of this study. What are these variations within the disadvantaged group, and why do they exist?

Hyman[10] attempts to answer this question by stating that the reference group of the individual may account for this variation within the lower classes. He states that "some of our lower classes may be identifying themselves with upper groups, and absorbing the value system of another class to which they refer themselves".

In this study an attempt has been made to utilize Hyman's explanation. It is assumed that the disadvantaged volunteers for the Work Training Program are those who identify with upper groups (the advantaged) to a greater extent than the disadvantaged non-volunteers.

In considering the variables which would be appropriate as indirect indices of such identification it was decided to select those which would be most closely related to the academic role of the student - in view of the fact that the Work Training Program is a program associated with secondary schools. The school performance variables are: intelligence, reading achievement level, attendance patterns, and grade point average. The socio-psychological variables are: academic self concept; perceived evaluations of academic ability by

---

[10]Hyman, loc. cit.

parents, friends, and teachers; occupational aspirations and expectations; educational aspirations and expectations; and perceived academic preferences of parents, friends, and teachers.

Because academic self-concept is a major variable and because recently it has received increased attention, a brief description of it is included in this section (a more complete review is contained in Chapter II). Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner[11] have derived this concept from studies of "role analysis, reference group theory, and symbolic interactionism". Academic self concept involves an individual's "self-other" relationships and is defined as follows:

> " . . . behavior in which one indicates to himself (publicly or privately) his ability to achieve in academic tasks as compared with others in the same task".[12]

In this study academic self concept was used as an indirect index of reference group identification. It is assumed that disadvantaged students who refer themselves to the upper classes in the formation of attitudes and appraisal of self have taken on positive attitudes toward academic behavior. These attitudes are presumed to lead to greater development of academic abilities, and, consequently, to a more positive academic self-concept. This, it is assumed, is not so true of disadvantaged students who do not refer themselves to the upper classes in the formation of attitudes and appraisal of self.

---

[11]Wilbur B. Brookover, Edsel L. Erickson, and Lee M. Joiner. Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement III, East Lansing: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1967, p. 5.

[12]Ibid. p. 8.

Definition of Terms

1. Economically disadvantaged students refers to male students who are economically disadvantaged (poor) as judged by school personnel (primarily counselors) using criteria provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity described in Appendix A.

2. Advantaged students refers to male students who are not economically disadvantaged as judged by school personnel using criteria provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

3. Disadvantaged volunteers refers to those male students who volunteered to participate in the Work Training Program during the first school year after they became eligible by age for the program.

4. Disadvantaged non-volunteers are male students who did not volunteer to participate in the Work Training Program during the first school year after they became eligible by age for the program.

5. Economic assistance programs are programs designed by the United States Federal government in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to enable the economically disadvantaged people of our nation to overcome their disadvantaged status with self help programs.

6. Intelligence refers to the most recent score students obtained on a standardized intelligence test administered in the school.

7. Reading ability refers to the percentile score students obtained on the most recent reading achievement test administered in the school.

8. Attendance pattern refers to the number of days of absence from school during the 1964-65 school year.

9. Grade point average refers to the grades the students obtained in their academic subjects during the 1964-65 school year.

10. Self concept is the image or picture a person has of his own adequacy as a result of social interaction with people who are significant to him.

11. Academic self concept refers to behavior in which a person indicates to himself his ability to achieve in academic tasks as compared with others in the same task.

12. Perceived evaluations of academic ability refers to the students' perception of the evaluations which parents, friends, and favorite teachers have of their academic ability. These are regarded as the sources of the academic self concept.

13. Occupational aspiration level refers to the socio-economic level of the occupation a student hopes to achieve as an adult.

14. Occupational expectation level refers to the socio-economic level of the occupation a student expects to achieve as an adult.

15. Educational aspiration level refers to the level of formal education a student hopes to achieve.

16. Educational expectation level refers to the level of formal education a student expects to achieve.

17. Perceived academic preferences (low) refers to the lowest academic grades which would satisfy parents, friends, and favorite teachers. These preferences provide norms for students' academic behavior.

Hypotheses

It is the major research hypothesis of this study that disadvantaged students who volunteer to participate in academically centered poverty programs are more like advantaged youth than they are like disadvantaged non-volunteers when compared on certain variables related to academic success.

More specifically, the hypotheses to be tested are:

H_1 - Advantaged students have a higher level of intelligence than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher level of intelligence than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_2 - Advantaged students have a higher level of reading achievement than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher level of reading achievement than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_3 - Advantaged students have a better school attendance record than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a better school attendance record than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_4 - Advantaged students have a higher grade point average than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher grade point average than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_5 - Advantaged students have a higher academic self concept than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher academic self concept than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_6 - Advantaged students have a higher perceived parents' evaluation of academic ability than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher perceived parents' evaluation of academic ability than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_7 - Advantaged students have a higher perceived friends' evaluation of academic ability than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher perceived friends' evaluation of academic ability than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_8 - Advantaged students have a higher perceived teachers' evaluation of academic ability than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher perceived teachers' evaluation of academic ability than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_9 - Advantaged students have higher levels of occupational aspirations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have higher levels of occupational aspirations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{10}- Advantaged students have higher levels of occupational expectations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have higher levels of occupational aspirations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{11}- Advantaged students have higher levels of educational aspiration than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have higher levels of occupational aspirations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{12}- Advantaged students have higher levels of educational expectations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have higher levels of educational expectation than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{13}- Advantaged students perceive their parents as having higher academic preferences than do disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers perceive their parents as having higher academic preferences than do disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{14}- Advantaged students perceive their friends as having higher academic preferences than do disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers perceive their friends as having higher academic preferences than do disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{15}- Advantaged students perceive their favorite teachers as having higher academic preferences than do disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers perceive their favorite teachers as having higher academic preferences than do disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Description of the Program

The Work Training Program upon which this study is focused is conducted under Title I-B, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

This program (described more completely in Appendix A) is designed for economically disadvantaged students between the ages of 16 and 21. This program makes available jobs within the school system to the participants. Participants are supervised by school staff members. The general purposes of the Work Training Program are " . . . to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed young men and women . . . so that their employability may be increased or their education resumed or continued . . ."[13]

The fact that students are involved in this program is known by other students because the jobs are located within the schools.

Plan of the Study

The students included in this study are male secondary students in four public high schools in Grand Rapids, Michigan. This city has a population of 177,313, according to 1960 census figures.

All male students in these schools with birthdates between May 1, 1949, and November 1, 1949, were asked to fill out questionnaires in the Spring of 1965. This group of boys included those students who would be eligible for the Work Training Program for the first time in Summer, 1965.

Both economically advantaged and disadvantaged boys comprised this group of students. In order to determine who were economically

---

[13]Section III, Part B, Public Law 88-452, 88th Congress, S. 2642, August 20, 1964.

disadvantaged school personnel were given the economic criteria established by the Office of Economic Opportunity (Appendix A). Using these criteria all students tested were rated as economically advantaged or disadvantaged.

Shortly after the testing was completed the Work Training Program was announced. For this study the disadvantaged volunteers were those who volunteered for the program during the Summer of 1965 or during the 1965-66 school year. The disadvantaged non-volunteers were those who did not apply for the Work Training Program during this same period.

Disadvantaged volunteers and disadvantaged non-volunteers were compared on the basis of measured intelligence, reading ability, attendance record, grade point average and scales measuring academic self concept and related socio-psychological variables.

Structured interviews were also conducted with the disadvantaged non-volunteers who did not have part-time jobs outside of the school.

Delimitations of the Study

1. There are variables in addition to those considered in this study which may be related in some way to volunteering for participation in a Work Training Program located in an academic setting. However, the variables selected were those which seemed most closely related to the theory which provides the basis for this

study; namely, disadvantaged volunteers are those who use as their reference group the advantaged students rather than their peers and will, therefore, be more like advantaged students than disadvantaged non-volunteers when compared on those factors thought to be associated with academic success.

2. This study dealt only with males because it was assumed that factors involved in their volunteering to participate in a Work Training Program may be quite different from those of females.

3. The results apply only to the Work Training Program as it operates in an academic setting in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Although the guidelines for the Work Training Programs are similar throughout the nation, there are local differences in attitudes toward school as well as differences in the interpretations made of the federal guidelines for selecting the participants which limit one's ability to generalize to other Work Training Programs or other poverty programs.

Limitations of the Study

1. The size of the groups was limited by the fact that only those students whose birthdates fell between May 1, 1949, and November 1, 1949, were tested. This was done because school authorities felt that it would be unwise to place an excessive demand upon the students, staff, and school facilities for testing purposes.

2. There was also a limited time period during which the students could volunteer to participate in the programs. If students did not volunteer by Spring, 1966, they were labeled as non-volunteers.

This was necessitated by the desire to conclude the gathering of data for the purpose of conducting this study. The result was a somewhat arbitrary definition of who was a volunteer and who was not a volunteer.

3. In comparing students on the basis of grade point average it is recognized that there may be differences in the criteria used for assigning letter grades to students. To the degree to which this is so it places a limitation upon the validity of the findings.

Summary

The main purpose of this study is to extend the knowledge about the economically disadvantaged by identifying those characteristics which distinguish those economically disadvantaged male students who volunteer to participate in an economic assistance program associated with public secondary schools from those who do not volunteer for this program. In Chapter I the purposes of the study were listed. The need and importance of the study were discussed. The theoretical basis for the study was presented along with the hypotheses which were developed from the theory. The basic plan of the study was also presented along with delimitations and limitations of the study.

In Chapter II the literature pertinent to this study will be reviewed. In Chapter III the design of the study will be described, and the data will be analyzed in Chapter IV. A short summary of the study along with recommendations and implications for further research will be presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

No studies could be found which deal with the specific problem focused upon in this study. However, much has been written regarding the major areas associated with this research. Therefore, the review of the literature includes reviews of: general concern about the disadvantaged, the disadvantaged in school, work programs for the disadvantaged, the attitudes of the disadvantaged toward improvement opportunities, reference group theory, self concept theory, and level of aspiration.

General Concern about the Disadvantaged

At the beginning of Chapter I mention was made of the fact that many authorities have become concerned about poverty and its effects upon individuals and society in general. Havighurst[1] has stated that " . . . one aspect of society which everyone agrees is pathological is poverty and its correlates. Along with poverty go unemployment, crime, juvenile delinquency, bad housing, broken families and residential segregation".

Conant[2] has called attention to this acute problem in our society by stating that in a large slum section (125,000 population) of one of our large cities about 70% of the young people between the ages of 16 and 21 were out of school and unemployed.

---

[1]Havighurst. op. cit. p. 72.

[2]Conant. op. cit. p. 34.

The problem of poverty and resulting deprivation is increasing, according to Riessman[3]. He has said that in 1950 one child in ten in the 14 largest cities of our nation was "culturally deprived". By 1960 this figure had risen to one in three who were deprived. By 1970 it is estimated by Riessman that one out of two children enrolled in the public schools in these large cities will be culturally deprived.

The Disadvantaged in the Schools

The plight of the disadvantaged in the schools of our nation has also received much attention recently.

Cole[4] has indicated there is some evidence that children from lower socio-economic levels are frustrated by their inability to establish themselves in the school community.

Sexton[5] has decried the way in which schools have discriminated against the deprived. She has asserted that the resulting failure in the school situation fosters a self concept which is negative.

Parsons[6] in commenting upon the pressure for achievement in school has stated: "It is understandable that a certain proportion in the disadvantaged positions simply give up and say, 'To hell with it. I'm just going to play because I'm licked before I start. I can't possibly succeed'. And, therefore, they turn to an alternative set of paths, of channels, of satisfaction".

---

[3]Riessman. op. cit. p. 1.

[4]Luella Cole, Psychology of Adolescents (New York: Rinehard Company, 1955), p. 358-360.

[5]Patricia Sexton, Education and Income (New York: Viking Press, 1961), p. 55,81.

[6]Talcott, Parsons, "Youth Behavior and Values", Guidance in American Education, III. ed. Edward Landy and Arthur M. Kroll (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 46.

Deutsch[17] has pointed out that among children of lower classes there is a high proportion of school failure, school drop-outs, reading and learning disabilities as well as life adjustment problems. As a consequence children grow up poorly equipped academically. In addition, the effectiveness of the school as a major institution for socialization is diminished.

Friedenberg[8] has stated that the most tragic thing which happens to lower class students is that they learn to accept the prevailing judgment of their worth.

Work-study Programs and the Disadvantaged

One of the identified needs of disadvantaged youth is employment opportunity. Neff[9] has stated that among the underprivileged youth of our nation the meaning of life is defined largely in terms of "job opportunities and bread and butter values".

Burchill[10] has indicated that boys want to grow up to gain the rewards of manhood as well as to satisfy the expectations of their parents, teachers and friends. He states that all kinds of boys want the status of young manhood which includes a job and money. Some boys

---

[7]Martin Deutsch, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process", Education in Depressed Areas. ed. Harry Passow (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 163.

[8]Edgar Z. Friedenberg, The Vanishing Adolescent (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1959), p. 117.

[9]Frederick C. Neff, "Let Them Eat Cake", The Schools and the Urban Crisis. ed. August Kerber and Barbara Bommerito (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 152.

[10]George W. Burchill, Work-study Programs for Alienated Youth: A Casebook (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1962), p. 9.

want these as soon as possible. Others are content to wait for these things while taking a slow journey through high school and college. Lower class boys tend to want the job and adult status as soon as possible.

Although there is need for jobs, society, according to Goodman[11], has failed by not making available to youth any significant number of worthwhile jobs.

Burchill[12] claims job opportunities for adolescents are scarce and, thus, some young people are being squeezed out of those experiences which may be "their only sources of gaining recognition, security and standing with peers, parents, and other adults".

Yablonsky[13] in considering the effects of poverty and other pathological factors in our society contends that a society which fails to find remedies for its own disorganization and institutionalized inequities will probably continue to suffer the consequences. He calls for governmental and private programs which are aimed at reducing social and economic inequalities.

Havighurst[14] in his concern about alienated lower class youth recommends that a government youth employment program be provided which can help reduce the number of alienated lower class youth. He states

---

[11]Paul Goodman, Growing up Absurd (New York: Vintage Books, 1960)

[12]Burchill. op. cit. p. ix.

[13]Lewis Yablonsky, The Violent Gang (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962), p. 237.

[14]Robert J. Havighurst, "Youth in Exploration and Man Emergent", Man in A World at Work. ed. Henry Borow (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1964), p. 233.

the need is for work experience which the private sector of society doesn't seem to wish to provide young people until they are at least 18 years of age.

The Work Training Program on which this study was focused, is a government youth employment program established to reduce the negative effects of poverty. As stated in the proposal to the federal government its purpose is: "to reduce the economic factor contributing to the likelihood that the participant would drop out of school and to provide such youth with an employment experience which would increase employability upon leaving school".[15]

The Disadvantaged and Opportunities for Assistance

The literature on the disadvantaged contains statements by recognized authorities regarding the tendency among the disadvantaged to do nothing to improve their situation. In Chapter I Caro[16] and Hyman[17] were cited in reference to this position. In addition to them, Hollingshead[18] has said lower class youngsters " . . . have limited their horizons to the class horizon, and in the process they have unconsciously placed themselves in such a position that they will occupy the same levels as their parents".

---

[15]Grand Rapids Work Training Program: A Proposal Under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Neighborhood Youth Corps) Title I. Part B. p. 1.

[16]Caro, loc. cit.

[17]Hyman, "The Value System of Difference Classes", loc. cit.

[18]A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949), p. 285.

Mizruchi[19] found that the objects and activities which the lower classes selected most frequently are those which contribute least to the attainment of success. They evaluated lowly the mechanisms instrumental in success.

In these statements the disadvantaged appear to be regarded as a homogeneous group. However, many of the disadvantaged do not fit these descriptions. It becomes important, therefore, to become aware of what these differences among the disadvantaged are.

The Concept of the Reference Group

The problem of this study as defined in Chapter II is that of distinguishing between the disadvantaged students who do avail themselves of programs designed to help them and those who do not avail themselves of such programs.

The reference group concept was used as a basis for explaining this behavior. Shibutani[20] has stated that the concept of the reference group has been useful in accounting for choices made among apparent alternatives.

Hyman[21] in the original use of the reference group concept spoke of reference groups as points of comparison in forming attitudes and judgments of one's self. Hyman[22] also said in a later article that

---

[19]E. H. Mizruchi, Success and Opportunity (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), p. 88.

[20]Tamotsa Shibutani, "Reference Groups as Perspectives", American Journal of Sociology, 40, (May, 1955), p. 562.

[21]Herbert Hyman, "The Psychology of Status" Archives of Psychology, No. 269, 1942, p. 94.

[22]Herbert Hyman, "Reflections on Reference Groups", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, p. 384.

Mizruchi[19] found that the objects and activities which the lower classes selected most frequently are those which contribute least to the attainment of success. They evaluated lowly the mechanisms instrumental in success.

In these statements the disadvantaged appear to be regarded as a homogeneous group. However, many of the disadvantaged do not fit these descriptions. It becomes important, therefore, to become aware of what these differences among the disadvantaged are.

The Concept of the Reference Group

The problem of this study as defined in Chapter II is that of distinguishing between the disadvantaged students who do avail themselves of programs designed to help them and those who do not avail themselves of such programs.

The reference group concept was used as a basis for explaining this behavior. Shibutani[20] has stated that the concept of the reference group has been useful in accounting for choices made among apparent alternatives.

Hyman[21] in the original use of the reference group concept spoke of reference groups as points of comparison in forming attitudes and judgments of one's self. Hyman[22] also said in a later article that

---

[19]E. H. Mizruchi, Success and Opportunity (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), p. 88.

[20]Tamotsa Shibutani, "Reference Groups as Perspectives", American Journal of Sociology, 40, (May, 1955), p. 562.

[21]Herbert Hyman, "The Psychology of Status" Archives of Psychology, No. 269, 1942, p. 94.

[22]Herbert Hyman, "Reflections on Reference Groups", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, p. 384.

individuals " . . . are complicated and varied in the ways they orient themselves to others in the groups they select".

Merton in discussing this concept has stated:

> "Reference group theory aims to systematize the determinants and consequences of evaluation and self-appraisal in which the individual takes the values and standards of other individuals or groups as a comparative frame of reference"[23]

Hyman[24], in trying to explain the voluntary actions of some of the lower class people to ameliorate their low position, has indicated that their reference group may be members of the upper classes.

Shibutani[25] has said that men " . . . sometimes use the standards of groups in which they are not recognized members. He goes on to state that " . . . reference groups, then, arise through the internalization of norms; they constitute the structure of expectations imputed to some audience for whom one organizes his conduct".

Sherif[26] discussed reference groups as anchoring points for a person's life to which he wants to attach himself psychologically. He thereby implied the concept that a reference group is not necessarily one of which a person is a member.

---

[23]Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 50-51.

[24]Hyman, "The Value System of Different Classes", op. cit. p. 441.

[25]Shibutani, op. cit. p. 565.

[26]Muzafer Sherif, "The Concept of the Reference Group in Human Relations", Group Relations at the Crossroads, ed. M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson (New York: Harper, 1953), p. 207-231.

As was indicated previously, there are not studies known to this author which have applied this aspect of reference group theory to the act of voluntary action to ameliorate one's low position in society. However, Hyman's[27] conjecture that the disadvantaged who try to ameliorate their position are those who attach themselves psychologically to the upper classes is explored in this study.

Studies of Self Concept

Much attention has been given in recent years to self attitudes and their relationship to human behavior[28]. Terms such as: "self regard", "self acceptance", "self image", "self esteem", "self concept", and others have been used in describing these self attitudes. Wylie[29] in her review of studies on self concept has stated that the theories on which previous research has been based are "vague, incomplete, and overlapping, and no one theory has received extensive, empirical exploration".

Some writers have thought of the self concept as an underlying structure such as a phenomonological self, as defined by Jersild[30] and Maslow[31].

---

[27]Hyman, "The Value System of Different Classes", op. cit. p. 441.

[28]See Ruth Wylie, The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961) Also, Don E. Hamachek, The Self in Growth, Teaching and Learning (The Glencoe Press, 1965)

[29]Wylie, op. cit. p. 317.

[30]Arthur Jersild, In Search of Self (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952)

[31]A. H. Maslow, "Self Actualizing People: A Study of Psychological Health," Personality, Symposium No. 1. 1950, p. 11-34

As was indicated previously, there are not studies known to this author which have applied this aspect of reference group theory to the act of voluntary action to ameliorate one's low position in society. However, Hyman's[27] conjecture that the disadvantaged who try to ameliorate their position are those who attach themselves psychologically to the upper classes is explored in this study.

Studies of Self Concept

Much attention has been given in recent years to self attitudes and their relationship to human behavior[28]. Terms such as: "self regard", "self acceptance", "self image", "self esteem", "self concept", and others have been used in describing these self attitudes. Wylie[29] in her review of studies on self concept has stated that the theories on which previous research has been based are "vague, incomplete, and overlapping, and no one theory has received extensive, empirical exploration".

Some writers have thought of the self concept as an underlying structure such as a phenomonological self, as defined by Jersild[30] and Maslow[31].

---

[27]Hyman, "The Value System of Different Classes", op. cit. p. 441.

[28]See Ruth Wylie, The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961) Also, Don E. Hamachek, The Self in Growth, Teaching and Learning (The Glencoe Press, 1965)

[29]Wylie, op. cit. p. 317.

[30]Arthur Jersild, In Search of Self (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952)

[31]A. H. Maslow, "Self Actualizing People: A Study of Psychological Health," Personality, Symposium No. 1. 1950, p. 11-34

Piers and Harris[32] have expressed concern over whether self concept instruments measure the real or phenomenal self. This concern seems to imply a position that self concept is a thing rather than a process.

Tuel and Wursten[33] have regarded self concept as an inner, intrapersonal trait which a person brings to the educational setting.

Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner[34] have expressed concern about the fact that loose definitions of self concept and instruments which are multifactor by definition have led some researchers to discard self concept as a relevant variable in understanding such behavior as achievement or dropping out of school.

The self conception of academic ability which was used in this present study is a result of an articulation of a theoretical basis provided by Mead[35] who stated: "There are all sorts of different selves answering to all sorts of different social reactions. It is the social process itself that is responsible for the appearance of the self, it is not there as a self apart from this type of experience".

---

[32]Ellen V. Piers and Dale B. Harris, "Age and Other Correlates of Self Concept in Children", Journal of Educational Psychological, LV, 2, 1964, p. 91-95.

[33]John K. Tuel and Rosemary Wursten, "The Influence of Intra-Personal Variables on Academic Achievement," California Journal of Educational Research, XVI, 16, March, 1965, p. 58-64.

[34]Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner, op. cit. p. 19.

[35]George H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 142.

Merton[36] has stated that it is a generally acknowledged fact that it is the groups of which one is a member that most prominently affect a person's behavior.

The social interaction basis of self concept is also described by Kinch[37] when he contends that "the individual's conception of himself emerges from social interaction and, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual".

The social interaction which provides the basis of self concept is with significant other people. Shibutani[38] has claimed that "significant others are those who are actually involved in the cultivation of abilities, values, outlook".

Brookover[39] has provided four basic assumptions which underlie the formulation of academic self concept theory:

1. Persons learn to behave in ways that each considers appropriate to himself.

2. Appropriate behavior is defined by each person through the internalization of the expectations of significant others. This hypothesizes the process through which each person defines his own motives or self image.

---

[36]Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 367.

[37]John W. Kinch, "A Formalized Theory of The Self Concept," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVIII, 1963, p. 481-486.

[38]Shibutani, op. cit. p. 568.

[39]Wilbur B. Brookover, "A Social Psychological Conception of Classroon Learning", School and Society, LXXXVII, 1959, p. 84-87.

3. The functional limits of one's ability to learn are determined by his self conception or self image as acquired in social interaction.

4. The individual learns what he believes significant others expect him to learn in the classroom and in other situations.

Based upon these four theoretical statements, Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner[40] formulated three propositions:

Proposition 1: A functional limit on a student's ability to learn in school is set by his "self concept of academic ability";

Proposition 2: A student's self concept of academic ability is acquired in interaction with his significant others through his perception of their "evaluations of his academic ability";

Proposition 3: A student's self concept of academic ability is an "intervening variable" between his perceptions of others and his attempts to learn in school.

From these propositions, general research objectives and hypotheses were formulated. In the longitudinal study and related research which was conducted, general support was provided for these propositions and the hypotheses which were developed from them.[41]

Level of Aspiration and the Disadvantaged

In recent literature much has been written about level of aspiration, particularly in regard to disadvantaged youth. Gardner[42] has defined

---

[40]Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner, op. cit. p. 44.

[41]Ibid. p. 146.

[42]John W. Gardner, "The Use of the Term 'Level of Aspiration'", Psychological Review, 1940, 47, p. 66.

level of aspiration as " . . . a quantifiable indication which an individual makes concerning his future performance in an activity".

Kausler[43] has shown that expressing a level of aspiration is a function of a person's frame of reference.

Haller and Miller[44] have referred to occupational aspiration as an attitude which " . . . may be interpreted in terms of a person's self concepts and in terms of his conception of certain roles he anticipates playing or desires to play in the future".

Weiner and Murray[45] in comparing the educational and occupational aspirations of lower socio-economic children and their parents with the educational and occupational aspirations of higher socio-economic children and parents found little difference. However, when they were asked how far they expected to go in school the higher socio-economic children and parents had much higher expectations than the lower socio-economic children and parents. In conclusion, it was stated that lower class children and parents express a desire to go to college and obtain a professional occupation as a wish, not as an expectation.

Riessman[46] has said that the aspirations of the deprived remain at the wish level rather than making them a definite intention.

---

[43]D. H. Kausler, "Aspiration Level As a Determinant of Performance". Journal of Personnel, 1959, 27, 346-51.

[44]Archibald O. Haller and Irwin Miller, "The Occupational Aspiration Scale: Theory, Structure, and Correlates (Technical Bulletin No. 288, Michigan State University Agricultural Experimental Station, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 1963), p. 15.

[45]W. Weiner and W. Murray, "Another Look at the Culturally Deprived and Their Levels of Aspiration". Journal of Educational Sociology, 1963, p. 319-321.

[46]Riessman, op. cit. p. 14.

Stephenson[47] concluded from his study of 1,000 ninth grade boys: " . . . the mobility orientation pattern suggested is one in which aspirations are relatively unaffected by class, and, hence, reflect the general cultural emphasis upon high goal orientations, while plans or expectations are more definitely class based, and, hence, may reflect class differences in opportunity and general life chances".

In this study the aspirations and expectation levels are assumed to be an index of the socio-economic level of the reference groups which individuals use in defining their goals.

Summary

In this chapter works were cited regarding the general concern about the disadvantaged and the plight of the disadvantaged in school. Authorities were quoted who recommended work programs for disadvantaged youth. A brief review of some of the literature regarding the desire of the disadvantaged to improve their situation was included. The concept of the reference group as a way of explaining the voluntary actions of the disadvantaged was explored. In conclusion, pertinent literature available regarding the two major variables (self concept and level of aspiration) were reviewed.

In Chapter III a description of the design of the study will be presented.

---

[47]Richard M. Stephenson, "Mobility Orientation and Stratification of 1,000 9th Graders". American Sociological Review, 22, 1957, p. 212.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A general outline of the plan of the study was presented in Chapter I. In this chapter more detailed information is given regarding the site of the study, population, instrumentation, and procedures which were followed in collecting and analyzing the data.

Site of the Study

This study was conducted in Grand Rapids, Michigan, which has a population of 177,313, according to the 1960 census. The city contains a variety of ethnic groups, including a non-white population of about 20,000 most of whom live in the same area of the city. The teen-age children of this area attend the secondary schools which are included in this study.

The public school system in Grand Rapids offers instructional programs extending from kindergarten through junior college level. There are about 34,000 pupils and 1,500 professional educators in the system.

Grand Rapids also has a non-public school enrollment which is about 35% of the total school enrollment for the city.

Description of the Population

The population studied consisted of male secondary students in 4 of the 5 Grand Rapids high schools whose birthdates fell in the period extending from May 1, 1949, to November 1, 1949.[1]

This population included male students who would be eligible for the first time for the Work Training Program in the Summer, 1965, and during the 1965-66 school year.

The total number of males included in this study was 231. Of this number 173 were designated by school personnel as economically advantaged and 58 were designated as economically disadvantaged, using criteria provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity described in Appendix A. Economically advantaged students were included so that the economically disadvantaged would not realize they were the subject of particular interest and to provide a "bench mark" against which to compare the economically disadvantaged on selected characteristics.

Of the 58 disadvantaged males, 24 were designated as volunteers and 34 were designated as non-volunteers. This status was determined on the basis of volunteering to participate in the Work Training Program during the Summer, 1965, and the 1965-66 school year.

---

[1]One high school was not included because of the anticipated low number of students eligible for the Work Training Program. Students who were absent from school at the time data was collected and students who did not return to the Grand Rapids school system during the 1965-66 school year were not included in this study.

Data Collection Procedures

Questionnaires

All male students whose birthdates fell between May 1, 1949, and November 1, 1949, were identified from school records by the author of this study.

The names of these students were announced the day prior to the day of testing and on the day of testing in Spring, 1965. The students were excused from class in order to be tested. This was done within one class period.

In three of the schools the cafeterias were used, and in one school the library was used for testing.

Students were told that the purpose of the study was to find out what high school students think about themselves, their school work, and their future plans. They were told their answers would not be shown to their teachers or anyone else except the research staff. They were assured their responses would in no way affect their school grades.

The students were asked to provide identifying information which included: name, birthdate, sex, name of school, school attended last year, and father's occupation.

The questionnaires were administered by the author of this study and his assistant in the Spring, 1965.

Only the normal number of students were absent on the day the tests were administered.

Interviews

An attempt was made to contact the eligible students who did not volunteer for the Work Training Program. Some of them had obtained jobs outside of school during the Summer, 1965, or during the 1965-66 school year. The latter were not interviewed. It was felt their reason for not volunteering to participate in the Work Training Program was in most cases simply the fact that they were employed elsewhere. The remaining non-volunteer students were interviewed, using a structured interview form, to ascertain awareness of the Work Training Program and to obtain their stated reason(s) for not applying for participation in the program (Appendix C).

Data Analysis Procedures

The information from the questionnaires and the school records was quantified and coded for computer analysis by staff members at the Center for Sociological Studies at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. The IBM 1620 at Western Michigan University was used to analyze the data.

Hypotheses 1 - 10 were tested with the use of the "t" test for uncorrelated data as described by Peatman[2].

Hypotheses 11 - 15 were tested with the use of the median's test[3] by chi-square as described by Siegel[4].

---

[2]John G. Peatman, Introduction to Applied Statistics (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 278-298.

[3]In this test students are dichotomized as those with scores which exceed the median and those with scores which do not exceed the median.

[4]Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 111-116.

For all hypotheses a = .05 was chosen as the level of significance.

Statistical Hypotheses

H_1 - Advantaged students have a higher mean score on tests of intelligence than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on tests on intelligence than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_2 - Advantaged students have a higher mean score on standardized reading achievement tests than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on standardized reading achievement tests than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_3 - Advantaged students have a lower mean number of absences from school during the 1964-65 school year than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a lower mean number of absences from school during the 1964-65 school year than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_4 - The advantaged students have a higher mean grade point average during the 1964-65 school year than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher grade point average during the 1964-65 school year than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_5 - Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the self concept of ability scale than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the self concept of ability scale than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_6 - Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived parents' evaluations of academic ability than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived parents' evaluations of academic ability than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_7 - Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived friends' evaluations of academic ability than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived friends' evaluations of academic ability than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_8 - Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived teachers' evaluations of academic ability than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived teachers' evaluations of academic ability than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_9 - Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring level of occupational aspirations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the scale measuring level of occupational aspiration than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{10}- Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring level of occupational expectations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the scale measuring level of occupational expectations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{11}- Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of educational aspirations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of educational aspirations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{12}- Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of educational expectations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of educational expectations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{13}- Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale measuring perceived parents' academic preferences (low) than do disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale measuring perceived parents' academic preferences (low) than do disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{14}- Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale measuring perceived friends' academic preferences (low) than do disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale measuring perceived friends' academic preferences (low) than do disadvantaged non-volunteers.

H_{15}- Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale measuring perceived teachers' academic preferences (low) than do disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale measuring perceived teachers' academic preferences (low) than do disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Instrumentation

The data for this research was obtained from standardized tests, school records, questionnaires, and structured interviews.

Standardized Test Data

Hypothesis 1 was tested by use of the most recent intelligence test scores for each individual. For most students group intelligence test scores on the Kuhlman-Anderson Test were used. (The Kuhlman-Anderson Test includes measures of quantitative and verbal intelligence. The correlations between the Kuhlman-Anderson and other tests of intelligence range from .62 to .89. Coefficients of reliability range from .83 to .92 on test-retest reliability.)[5]

The scores on the California Mental Maturity Test was used for some students who had not taken the Kuhlman-Anderson Test. (This test includes measures of verbal and non-verbal intelligence. It was designed to correlate with the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test. One study yielded a correlation coefficient of .88 with the Stanford-Binet. Reliability estimates are above .90.)[6]

---

[5]Technical Manual: Kuhlman-Anderson Test, 7th Edition, Personnel Press, Incorporated. Princeton, New Jersey, 1962.

[6]Oscar K. Buros, The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook (Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1959.)

The latest test which a few of the students had taken was the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. (This is an individual test which includes a verbal scale and a performance scale. Validity studies show that the WISC and the Stanford-Binet Test correlate fairly highly (.80+) and differ little in ability to predict academic attainment. The split half reliability coefficient is .94 at age 13.5 for the full scale.)[7]

Hypothesis 2 was tested by use of the percentile ranks on the national norms on standardized reading tests. The scores on the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (Test 5 - Ability to Interpret Reading Materials in Social Studies) were used for most students. (This test measures ability to interpret and evaluate representative reading selections taken from social textbooks and references, from magazine and newspaper articles on social problems, and from the literature of the social studies in general. Correlations of composite scores on the Iowa Test of Educational Development with measures on intelligence or scholastic aptitude range from .57 to .85. Split half reliability estimates for Test 5 was .90.)[8]

The Gates Basic Reading Test scores were used for a few students who did not take the Iowa Test. (This test includes measures of ability to appreciate general significance of reading material, understanding of precise directions, ability to note

---

[7]Ibid.

[8]Manual for School Administrators, Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois, 1963.

details, vocabulary, and comprehension. Validity estimates using the Stanford Reading Tests ranged from .72 to .84. Reliability estimates using alternate forms ranged from .80 to .90.)[9]

School Records Data

Hypothesis 3 was tested by obtaining the number of days of absence from school during the 1964-65 school year.

Hypothesis 4 was tested by obtaining the grade point average on academic subjects. These included: English, social studies, science, mathematics, foreign languages, speech and debate. The grade point average of each student was computed on the basis of: A - 4, B - 3, C - 2, D - 1, and E or F - 0.

Questionnaire Data

Instruments previously developed under USOE Cooperative Research Projects[10] were used to assess the academic self concept and related socio-psychological characteristics of the male students who were involved in this study. These instruments assess:

1. self concept of academic ability (SCA).
2. perceived parents' evaluations of academic ability (PPEV).
3. perceived friends' evaluations of academic ability (PFEV).
4. perceived teachers' evaluations of academic ability (PTEV).

---

[9]Manual and Supplement for the Gates Basic Reading Tests. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

[10]Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner, op. cit.; Wilbur B. Brookover, Don E. Hamachek, Edsel L. Erickson, Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, II, East Lansing: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1965; and Wilbur B. Brookover, Ann Paterson, and Shailer Thomas, Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, I, East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962.

5. level of occupational aspiration.

6. level of occupational expectation.

7. level of educational aspiration.

8. level of educational expectation.

9. perceived academic preferences by parents, friends, and teachers.

Hypothesis 5 was tested with the use of the Michigan Self Concept of Ability Scale[11] (Appendix D). This instrument has been shown to measure a major variable contributing to variations in student achievement[12]. The reliability and validity of this scale have been demonstrated. Hoyt's analysis of variance reliability coeeficients range from .852 to .865.[13]

The SCA scale consists of 8 multiple choice items. Each item is scored from 5 to 1 with the most positive self concept alternatives receiving the highest values. Each item asks the student to compare himself with others in his social system on the dimension of academic competency.

Hypothesis 6 was tested with the use of the scale measuring perceived parents' evaluations of academic ability (Appendix E). Hoyt's analysis of variance reliability coefficients range from .782 to .849.[14]

---

[11]Ibid.

[12]Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner, op. cit. p. 60.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid. p. 61.

The PPEV scale consists of 5 multiple choice items. Each item is scored from 5 to 1 with the most positive evaluations receiving the highest values. Each item asks the student to state how he thinks his parents would compare his academic ability with others in his social system.

Hypothesis 7 was tested with the use of the scale measuring perceived friends' evaluations of academic ability (Appendix F). Hoyt's analysis of variance reliability coefficients range from .755 to .880.[15]

The PFEV scale consists of 5 multiple choice items. Each item is scored from 5 to 1 with the most positive evaluations receiving the highest values. Each item asks the student to state how he thinks his closest friend would compare his academic ability with others in his social system.

Hypothesis 8 was tested with the use of the scale measuring perceived favorite teacher's evaluations of academic ability (Appendix G). Hoyt's analysis of variance reliability coefficients range from .912 to .927.[16]

The PTEV scale consist of 5 multiple choice items. Each item is scored from 5 to 1 with the most positive evaluations receiving the highest values. Each item asks the student to state how he thinks his favorite teacher would compare his academic ability with others in his social system.

---

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

Hypothesis 9 was tested with the use of the following single question item: (Appendix H)

"If you were free to choose any job you wanted, what job would you most like to have when you grow up?"

Duncan's Scale Value[17], an index of socio-economic status was assigned to the responses, with highest score assigned to the highest socio-economic level. (The range was from 1 to 99).

Hypothesis 10 was tested with the use of the following single question item: (Appendix H)

"Sometimes what we would like to do isn't the same as what we expect to do. What kind of job do you expect you really will have when you grow up?"

Duncan's Scale Value[18] was assigned to the responses.

Hypothesis 11 was tested by use of the following single question item: (Appendix H)

"If you were free to go as far as you wanted to go in school, how far would you like to go?"

There were 7 multiple choice responses ranging from: "I'd like to quit right now" to "I'd like to do graduate work beyond college."

In scoring this item highest scores were attached to the highest educational level.

Hypothesis 12 was tested by use of the following single question item: (Appendix H)

"Sometimes what we would like to do isn't the same as what we expect to do. How far in school do you expect you really will go?"

---

[17]Albert Reiss, Jr. et. al. Occupation and Social Status (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.)

[18]Ibid.

There were 7 multiple choice responses ranging from: "I think I really will quit school as soon as I can" to "I think I really will do graduate work beyond college".

In scoring this item highest scores were attached to the highest educational level.

Hypotheses 13, 14 and 15 were tested by use of the following single question items: (Appendix I)

1. "What would be the lowest grades you could get and still have your parents satisfied with you?" (Hypothesis 13)

2. "What would be the lowest grades you could get and still have your friends satisfied with you?" (Hypothesis 14)

3. "What would be the lowest grades you could get and still have your favorite teacher satisfied with you?" (Hypothesis 15)

Ten response options were listed from: "Mostly A's to "My grades do not make any difference to my parents" (friends or teacher). Highest values were assigned to the highest grades.

Structured Interviews

Appendix C is the form which was used to conduct these interviews to determine awareness of the Work Training Program and reasons for not volunteering for it.

Summary

In this chapter the site of the study and the population were described. The criteria were presented for designating students in the following categories: disadvantaged and advantaged, volunteers and non-volunteers. The data collection procedures and data analysis

procedures were described. The hypotheses were restated in testable form and the instrumentation was described. In Chapter IV the findings of the study will be presented.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter a report and analysis of the data are presented.

Data from Questionnaires and School Records

First the socio-economic status of the four groups of students were compared. Socio-economic level was determined from the father's occupation or the occupation of whoever supports the family. This information was coded according to Duncan[1]. Reports of these comparisons are found in Tables 4.1a and 4.1b.

TABLE 4.1a

Socio-economic Status of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	45.208	551.038	22.694			
				7.4159	229	.0005
Disadvantaged	22.293	112.035	10.585			

TABLE 4.1b

Socio-economic Status of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	22.558	115.042	10.726			
				-.2256	56	NS
Volunteers	21.917	112.341	10.599			

Table 4.1a shows that the socio-economic status of the advantaged students is significantly higher than that of the disadvantaged students.

Table 4.1b shows that there is no significant difference between the socio-economic status of the disadvantaged students who volunteered to participate in the Work Training Program and that of the non-volunteers.

---

[1] Reiss, op. cit.

Hypothesis 1 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher mean score on intelligence tests than the disadvantaged, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on intelligence tests than the disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_O: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_O: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.2a

Intelligence Quotients of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	105.277	130.213	11.411			
				7.2378	229	<.0005
Disadvantaged(Total)	93.414	75.931	8.714			

TABLE 4.2b

Intelligence Quotients of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	92.706	92.214	9.603			
				0.7334	56	NS
Volunteers	94.417	54.080	7.354			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will score higher than the disadvantaged students on tests of intelligence is accepted at the .0005 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will score higher than the non-volunteers on tests of intelligence is rejected.

Hypothesis 2 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher mean score on standardized reading tests than the disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on standardized reading tests than the disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_0: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_0: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.3a

Reading Achievement Percentile Scores of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	57.815	680.640	26.089			
				5.6971	229	<.0005
Disadvantaged(Total)	35.448	635.866	25.216			

TABLE 4.36

Reading Achievement Percentile Scores of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-Volunteers	35.382	705.031	26.552			
				.0234	56	NS
Volunteers	35.542	564.259	23.754			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will score higher than the disadvantaged students on tests of reading achievement is accepted at the .0005 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will score higher than the non-volunteers on tests of reading achievement is rejected.

Hypothesis 3 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a lower mean number of absences per student from school than disadvantaged students and volunteers have a lower mean number of absences per student from school than the non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_O: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_O: $M_{Advantaged} < M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_O: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} < M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.4a

Days Absent from School of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	8.763	108.403	10.412			
				2.3310	229	<.01
Disadvantaged(Total)	16.603	1647.121	40.585			

TABLE 4.4b

Days Absent from School of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	11.676	95.074	9.751			
				-1.1025	56	NS
Volunteers	23.583	3858.862	62.200			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students had fewer absences per student than the disadvantaged students is accepted at the .01 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers had fewer absences per student than the non-volunteers is rejected.

Hypothesis 4 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher grade point average than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher grade point average than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_0: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_0: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.5a

Grade Point Average of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	2.018	.875	.935			
				3.7862	229	<.0005
Disadvantaged(Total)	1.509	.512	.716			

TABLE 4.5b

Grade Point Average of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	1.529	.639	.799			
				-.2503	56	NS
Volunteers	1.481	.351	.592			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students had a higher grade point average than the disadvantaged students is accepted at the .0005 significance level.

The hypothesis that the volunteers had a higher grade point average than the non-volunteers is rejected.

Hypothesis 5 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the self concept of ability scale (SCA) than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers will have a higher mean score on the SCA than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_O: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_O: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.6a

Self Concept of Academic Ability of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	27.121	24.979	4.998			
				1.6472	229	<.05
Disadvantaged	25.897	21.112	4.598			

TABLE 4.6b

Self Concept of Academic Ability of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	26.618	20.607	4.539			
				-1.4357	56	NS
Volunteers	24.875	20.897	4.571			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher score on the SCA than the disadvantaged students is accepted at the .05 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher score on the SCA than the non-volunteers is rejected.

Hypothesis 6 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived parents' evaluation of academic ability (PPEV) than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the PPEV than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_O: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_O: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.7a

Perceived Parents' Evaluations of Academic Ability of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	18.630	15.060	3.881			
				2.7799	229	<.005
Disadvantaged(Total)	16.966	17.122	4.138			

TABLE 4.7b

Perceived Parents' Evaluations of Academic Ability of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	17.706	11.305	3.362			
				-1.6460	56	NS
Volunteers	15.917	24.254	4.925			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher mean score on the PPEV than the disadvantaged students is accepted at the .005 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher mean score on the PPEV than the non-volunteers is rejected.

Hypothesis 7 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students will have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived friend's evaluation of academic ability (PFEV) than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers will have a higher mean score on the PFEV than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_0: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_0: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.8a

Perceived Friend's Evaluation of Academic Ability of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	17.757	13.127	3.623			
				2.0130	229	<.05
Disadvantaged(Total)	16.707	7.895	2.810			

TABLE 4.8b

Perceived Friend's Evaluation of Academic Ability of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	17.118	8.834	2.972			
				-1.3341	56	NS
Volunteers	16.125	6.288	2.508			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher mean score on the PFEV than the disadvantaged students is accepted at the .025 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher mean score on the PFEV than the non-volunteers is rejected.

Hypothesis 8 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring perceived teacher's evaluation of academic ability (PTEV) than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the PTEV than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_0: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_0: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.9a

Perceived Teacher's Evaluation of Academic Ability of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	18.457	17.040	4.128	2.1902	229	<.025
Disadvantaged(Total)	17.138	11.840	3.441			

TABLE 4.9b

Perceived Teacher's Evaluation of Academic Ability of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	17.529	11.287	3.360	-1.0318	56	NS
Volunteers	16.583	12.601	3.550			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher mean score on the PTEV than the disadvantaged students is accepted at the .025 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher means score on the PTEV than the non-volunteers is rejected.

Hypothesis 9 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring level of occupational aspiration than the disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the scale measuring level of occupational aspiration than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_O: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_O: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.10a[2]

Level of Occupational Aspiration of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	62.936	722.583	26.881			
				1.1079	229	NS
Disadvantaged	58.362	794.165	28.181			

TABLE 4.10b

Level of Occupational Expectation of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	61.765	913.094	30.217			
				-1.0964	56	NS
Volunteers	53.542	616.694	24.833			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher mean score on the scale for occupational aspirations than the disadvantaged students is rejected.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher mean score on the scale for occupational aspirations than the non-volunteers is rejected.

---

[2]The following numbers of students did not respond to this open-ended question: advantaged (16), disadvantaged (6), non-volunteers (4), and volunteers (2).

Hypothesis 10 consists of the following 2 parts:

Advantaged students have a higher mean score on the scale measuring level of occupational expectation than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher mean score on the scale measuring occupational expectation than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_0: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_0: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.11a[3]

Level of Occupational Expectation of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Advantaged	48.249	881.699	29.693			
				.1753	229	NS
Disadvantaged	47.483	669.623	25.877			

TABLE 4.11b

Level of Occupational Expectation of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	$\bar{x}$	s^2	s	t	d.f.	p
Non-volunteers	48.735	731.594	27.048			
				-.4356	56	NS
Volunteers	45.708	604.216	24.581			

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher mean score on the scale for occupational expectations than the disadvantaged students is rejected.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher mean score on the scale for occupational expectations than the non-volunteers is rejected.

---

[3]The following numbers of students did not respond to this open-ended question: advantaged (33), disadvantaged (12), non-volunteers (3), and volunteers (9).

Hypothesis 11 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of educational aspirations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of education aspirations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_O: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_O: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.12a

Level of Educational Aspiration of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	Advantaged	Disadvantaged	Total
Above Median	46	15	61
At or Below Median	127	43	170
Total	173	58	231

$x^2 = .0118$
d.f. = 1
$p < .475$ (one tailed test)

TABLE 4.12b

Level of Educational Aspiration of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	Volunteers	Non-volunteers	Total
Above Median	2	13	15
At or Below Median	22	21	43
Total	24	34	58

$x^2 = 4.95$, d.f. = 1
$p < .025$ (one tailed test)
in direction opposite of that predicted

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher median score on the scale for educational aspirations than the disadvantaged students is rejected.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher median score on the scale for educational aspirations than the non-volunteers is rejected.

Hypothesis 12 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of educational expectations than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale measuring level of educational expectations than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, $H_O: M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

$H_A: M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

$H_O: M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$H_A: M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.13a

Level of Educational Expectation of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	Advantaged	Disadvantaged	Total
Above Median	82	24	106
At or Below Median	90	34	124
Total	172	58	230

$x^2 = .69$, d.f. = 1
$p < .25$ (one tailed test)

TABLE 4.13b

Level of Educational Expectation of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-Volunteers

	Volunteers	Non-volunteers	Total
Above Median	11	13	24
At or Below Median	13	21	34
Total	24	34	58

$x^2 = .01$, d.f. = 1
$p < .475$ (one tailed test)

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher median score than the disadvantaged students on the scale measuring educational expectations is rejected.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher median score than the non-volunteers on the scale measuring educational expectations is rejected.

Hypothesis 13 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale for perceived parents' academic preferences (low) than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale for perceived parents' academic preferences (low) than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_0: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_0: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.14a

Perceived Parents' Academic Preferences of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	Advantaged	Disadvantaged	Total
Above Median	82	10	92
At or Below Median	91	48	139
Total	173	58	231

$x^2 = 16.73$, d.f. = 1
$p < .0005$

TABLE 4.14b

Perceived Parents' Academic Preferences of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-volunteers

	Volunteers	Non-volunteers	Total
Above Median	6	4	10
At or Below Median	18	30	48
Total	24	34	58

$x^2 = .92$, d.f. = 1
$p < .25$

The hypothesis that the advantaged students will have a higher median score than the disadvantaged students on the scale measuring perceived parents' academic preferences (low) is accepted at the .005 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher median score than the non-volunteers on the scale measuring perceived parents' academic preferences (low) is rejected.

Hypothesis 14 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale for perceived friend's academic preferences (low) than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score

on the scale for perceived friend's academic preferences (low) than non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_0: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_0: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.15a

Perceived Friend's Academic Preferences of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	Advantaged	Disadvantaged	Total
Above Median	76	19	95
At or Below Median	97	39	136
Total	173	58	231

$x^2 = 2.24$, d.f. = 1
$p < .10$

TABLE 4.15b

Perceived Friend's Academic Preferences of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-volunteers

	Volunteers	Non-volunteers	Total
Above Median	9	10	19
At or Below Median	15	24	39
Total	24	34	58

$x^2 = .13$, d.f. = 13
$p < .40$

The hypothesis that advantaged students will have a higher median score than the disadvantaged students on the scale measuring perceived friend's academic preferences (low) is rejected.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher median score than the non-volunteers on the scale measuring perceived friend's academic preferences (low) is rejected.

Hypothesis 15 consists of the following two parts:

Advantaged students have a higher median score on the scale for perceived teacher's academic preferences (low) than disadvantaged students, and disadvantaged volunteers have a higher median score on the scale for perceived teacher's academic preferences (low) than non-volunteers.

Symbolically, H_O: $M_{Advantaged} = M_{Disadvantaged}$

H_A: $M_{Advantaged} > M_{Disadvantaged}$

and

H_O: $M_{Volunteers} = M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

H_A: $M_{Volunteers} > M_{Non\text{-}volunteers}$

$a \leq .05$

TABLE 4.16a

Perceived Teacher's Academic Preferences of Advantaged Male Students Compared with Disadvantaged Male Students

	Advantaged	Disadvantaged	Total
Above Median	93	18	111
At or Below Median	80	40	120
Total	173	58	231

$x^2 = 9.02$, d.f. = 1
$p < .005$ (one tailed test)

TABLE 4.16b

Perceived Teacher's Academic Preferences of Disadvantaged Male Volunteers Compared with Disadvantaged Male Non-volunteers

	Volunteers	Non-volunteers	Total
Above Median	7	11	18
At or Below Median	17	23	40
Total	24	34	58

$x^2 = .0009$, d.f. = 1
$p < .49$ (one tailed test)

The hypothesis that advantaged students will have a higher median score than the disadvantaged students on the scale measuring perceived teacher's academic preferences (low) is accepted at the .005 level of significance.

The hypothesis that the volunteers will have a higher median score than the non-volunteers on the scale measuring perceived teacher's academic preferences (low) is rejected.

TABLE 17

Summary of Significant Findings

	Variable	Hypothesis	Significance Level
1.	Intelligence	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .0005$
2.	Reading Achievement	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .0005$
3.	Absenteeism	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .01$
4.	Grade Point Average	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .0005$
5.	Self Concept of Ability	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .05$
6.	Perceived Parents' Evaluations	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .005$
7.	Perceived Friend's Evaluations	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .05$
8.	Perceived Teacher's Evaluations	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .025$
9.	Perceived Parents' Academic Preferences	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .0005$
10.	Perceived Teachers' Academic Preferences	$M_A > M_D$	$p < .005$

Key
A = Advantaged
D = Disadvantaged
V = Volunteers
NV = Non-volunteers

Data from the Interviews

In order to acquire a deeper understanding of why some disadvantaged students failed to participate in the Work Training Program, interviews were planned with the disadvantaged non-volunteers. It was found that 17 of the non-volunteers had taken part-time jobs outside of the school system.[4] It was thought that this might be the primary reason for failure to participate in the Work Training Program. Therefore, the interviews were started with the unemployed non-volunteers.

In regard to the question: "Are you aware of the Work Training Program?", it was found that 12 answered "yes" and 5 answered "no".

Those who answered "yes" were then asked: "Were you aware of the program last year (1965-66)?". Of those twelve, 6 answered "yes" and 6 answered "no".

The remaining six were asked "Did you apply for the program last year?". Only 1 answered "yes" and 5 answered "no". (The one who answered "yes" said he didn't get the necessary proof of age and therefore did not complete the application process).

Finally, the five who answered "no" to the above question were asked: "Why didn't you apply for the program last year?" All five felt they were too busy with school activities or school work.

In summary, it appeared that the unemployed non-volunteers fell into two basic categories: 1) those who did not seem to know about the program or didn't follow through in making application; and 2) those who were too involved in school activities or studies to participate in the Work Training Program. Nothing in the interviews with the

---

[4] It should also be noted that 2 volunteers did not actually participate in the Work Training Program. Contacts with these revealed that they decided to accept part-time jobs elsewhere.

unemployed non-volunteers led the researcher to believe that interviews with the employed non-volunteers would uncover evidence that they refused to participate in the program for any reason other than the fact that they were already employed.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem and Methodology

Because of increasing concern among the leaders of our nation for those who are economically disadvantaged, numerous federal, state, and local programs have been developed in recent years to assist them. The main purposes of these programs are to minimize the negative effects of poverty and to enable the disadvantaged to develop capacities which might otherwise go unused without such help.

Some authorities have taken the position that lower class people are not usually willing to take action which would improve their situation. On the other hand, there are many who do participate in special programs designed to help them. Thus, the fundamental questions which were raised in this research were: what are the differences between students who volunteer to participate in a federally sponsored Work Training Program in an academic setting and students who do not participate in such a program, and why did the non-volunteers fail to participate?

A review of the literature did not reveal any previous research on this problem. However, Hyman[1] has stated the position that the lower class people who do take action to ameliorate their situation are those whose reference groups are the upper classes.

---

[1]Hyman, "The Value System of Different Classes: A Social-Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification", op. cit., p. 441.

Based upon this position it was assumed in this research that the male students who would volunteer for a Work Training Program would be those whose reference groups are the upper classes. It was then hypothesized that the disadvantaged volunteers would be more like students in the upper classes (advantaged students) in regard to a variety of school performance variables and academically related socio-psychological variables than disadvantaged non-volunteers.

For this research 231 male students in Grand Rapids, Michigan with birthdates between May 1, 1949, and November 1, 1949, were studied prior to the time they would be eligible (by age) for the Work Training Program. These students were categorized by their counselors and other school personnel as economically advantaged (173 students) or economically disadvantaged (58 students). Data was collected in Spring, 1965. The disadvantaged students who volunteered to participate in the program in Summer, 1965, and those who volunteered to participate in the 1965-66 school year were categorized as volunteers (24 students). The remaining disadvantaged students were categorized as non-volunteers (34 students).

The data collected was obtained by the use of questionnaires, school records, and structured interviews.

Findings

First of all, it was found that the advantaged students were clearly in a higher socio-economic status than the disadvantaged students when measured according to the occupation of the person who supports their family. These groups were different at the .0005 level

of significance. This would seem to indicate that the school personnel were generally accurate in differentiating between economically advantaged and economically disadvantaged students according to the criteria recommended by the Office of Economic Opportunity (Appendix A).

No significant difference was found between the disadvantaged volunteers and the disadvantaged non-volunteers in regard to socio-economic status. Therefore, in regard to socio-economic status, the disadvantaged were viewed as a homogeneous group for the purpose of this study.

Significant Findings Regarding Advantaged and Disadvantaged Students

1. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on measures of intelligence. ($p < .0005$)

2. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on tests of reading achievement. ($p < .0005$)

3. The advantaged had significantly fewer absences from school than the disadvantaged. ($p < .01$)

4. The advantaged obtained significantly higher grades than the disadvantaged. ($p < .0005$)

5. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on measures of academic self concept. ($p < .05$)

6. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on measures of perceived parents' evaluations of academic ability. ($p < .005$)

7. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on measures of perceived closest friends' evaluations of academic ability. ($p < .05$)

8. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on measures of perceived favorite teachers' evaluations of academic ability. ($p < .025$)

9. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on measures of perceived academic preferences of parents.. ($p < .0005$)

10. The advantaged scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged on measures of perceived academic preferences of favorite teachers. ($p < .005$)

In this research the advantaged students scored significantly higher than the disadvantaged students in regard to: academic ability; academic performance; school attendance; self concept of academic ability; perceived parents' evaluations of academic ability; perceived teachers' evaluations of academic ability; and perceived norms for academic performance as indicated by perceived academic preferences of parents and favorite teachers. There were no significant differences found between the advantaged and disadvantaged in regard to occupational and educational aspirations and expectations. However, this may be due to the fact that there were many students who did not respond to these items.

Comparisons between Disadvantaged Volunteers and Non-Volunteers

All of the hypotheses which predicted that disadvantaged volunteers would score higher than the non-volunteers were rejected. In fact, the means and medians of the volunteers were somewhat

lower than those on the non-volunteers on 12 of the 15 variables used in this research.[2] Therefore, it is apparent that the underlying assumption upon which this research was based is wrong.

Summary of Responses in Structured Interviews with Non-Volunteers

It was discovered that 17 of the 34 non-volunteers worked on part-time jobs outside of school. These students were not interviewed. Of the remaining 17 non-volunteers, 11 said they were not aware of the program, 1 said he started to apply but didn't follow through, and 5 said they were too busy with school work and school activities.

Recommendations

1. In view of the sizeable number of disadvantaged students who claimed they were not aware of the Work Training Program, it is recommended that administrators of the program make certain that all disadvantaged students are aware of the existence of the program well in advance of their sixteenth birthday (the minimum age for participation on the program).

2. Because one half of the disadvantaged non-volunteers held part time jobs outside of school and because the Work Training Program is designed to improve attitudes toward school as well as provide money for the participants, it is recommended that efforts be made to make the program more attractive so that more disadvantaged students will seek to participate in it. This may be done by making

---

[2]See Appendix J.

available a greater variety of jobs and by paying students on the basis of the skill involved in the job they are performing.

3. Because the disadvantaged students were found to be less intelligent, to be poorer readers, to have more absences from school and to obtain lower grades than advantaged students, there is certainly a need for a program which will encourage these students to stay in school and prepare them for employment when they leave school. Therefore, it is recommended that the Work Training Program be continued and that efforts be made to measure its effectiveness, particularly as it relates to academic adjustment.

4. In view of the fact that the disadvantaged students had lower academic abilities and had lower grades than the advantaged students, it is recommended that specific remedial help be provided to enable students on the Work Training Program to improve their abilities and achievement.

5. In view of the higher absentee rate of the disadvantaged students, it is recommended that special provisions be made in the Work Training Program to provide services which are designed to deal with the problems of absenteeism.

6. Because the academic self concept and perceived evaluations of academic ability held by the disadvantaged are lower than those of the advantaged students, it is reasonable to assume that these students would have conflicts as a result of pressure to stay in school. Therefore, it is recommended that these disadvantaged students be given increased opportunities for individual and group counseling to help them resolve these conflicts.

7. Although the perceived parents' and teachers' academic preferences of the disadvantaged students were lower than those of the advantaged students, there was a wide range of perceived preferences. Because of this and because of the fact that there is a wide range in the actual abilities of these disadvantaged students, it is recommended that contacts be made with parents and teachers of students in the Work Training Program so that the parents and teachers can develop realistic academic expectations for them which take into consideration variations within the disadvantaged.

Discussion

As was indicated earlier, all the hypotheses comparing the disadvantaged volunteers with non-volunteers were rejected. In fact, there is evidence that there might have been some statistical support for hypotheses made in the opposite direction.[3]

On the surface it would appear that Hyman[4] was wrong when he asserted that the lower class people who are anxious to ameliorate their situation are those whose reference groups are the upper classes. However, upon investigation of the non-volunteers, many of them were found to be employed elsewhere or were too busy with school activities and studies to accept employment. Therefore, it is possible that many non-volunteers are concerned about improving their situation and because of this concern seek employment outside of school or become

---

[3]See means reported for hypotheses 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 listed in Appendix J, p. 93.

[4]Hyman, op. cit.

involved in school activities and studies which they feel will lead to self improvement.

Implications for Future Research

1. Replication of this research should be done with larger numbers of students and with hypotheses in the opposite direction from those tested in this study.

2. In the replication of this study it would be wise to use an instrument other than the open-ended questions which were used to measure occupational aspiration and expectation level. Possibly Haller's scale would be useful for this purpose.

3. It would be valuable to study female students to see if the results would be the same as with male students.

4. An attempt should be made to measure the impact of the Work Training Program upon those disadvantaged students who participated in it. Does the program in fact provide young people with the attitudes which will encourage them to remain in school and make them more employable upon leaving school? There is some evidence that students in this study who participated in the Work Training Program did improve in school attendance and did drop out less often than the disadvantaged non-participants.

5. It would be important to investigate the possible use of other variables which may be useful in measuring the effects of the program - such as: incidence of seeking advanced training beyond high school, performance on the job after leaving high school, and the degree to which these students become self supporting in adulthood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brookover, Wilbur B. "A Social Psychological Conception of Classroom Learning," School and Society, 87, Feb. 1959.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Patterson, Ann and Thomas, Shailer. Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, I, East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Hamachek, Don E., and Erickson, Edsel L., Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, II, East Lansing, Michigan: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1965.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Erickson, Edsel L., and Joiner, Lee M. Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, III, East Lansing, Michigan: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1967.

Burchill, George W. Work-Study Programs for Alientated Youth: A Casebook. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1962.

Buros, Oscar K. The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland, Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1962.

Caro, Francis G. "Social Class and Attitudes of Youth Relevant for the Realization of Adult Goals," Social Forces, 44, June, 1966, 492-498.

Cole, Luella. Psychology of Adolescents. New York: Rinehard Company, 1955.

Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Deutsch, Martin. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in Education in Depressed Areas, ed. A. Harry Passow New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, 163-179.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z. The Vanishing Adolescent. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1959.

Gardner, John W. "The Use of the Term 'Level of Aspiration'," Psychological Review, 47, 1940, 59-68.

Goodman, Paul. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Grand Rapids Work Training Program: A Proposal under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. (Neighborhood Youth Corps, Title I-B)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brookover, Wilbur B. "A Social Psychological Conception of Classroom Learning," School and Society, 87, Feb. 1959.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Patterson, Ann and Thomas, Shailer. Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, I, East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Hamachek, Don E., and Erickson, Edsel L., Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, II, East Lansing, Michigan: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1965.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Erickson, Edsel L., and Joiner, Lee M. Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement, III, East Lansing, Michigan: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1967.

Burchill, George W. Work-Study Programs for Alientated Youth: A Casebook. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1962.

Buros, Oscar K. The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland, Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1962.

Caro, Francis G. "Social Class and Attitudes of Youth Relevant for the Realization of Adult Goals," Social Forces, 44, June, 1966, 492-498.

Cole, Luella. Psychology of Adolescents. New York: Rinehard Company, 1955.

Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Deutsch, Martin. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in Education in Depressed Areas, ed. A. Harry Passow New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, 163-179.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z. The Vanishing Adolescent. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1959.

Gardner, John W. "The Use of the Term 'Level of Aspiration'," Psychological Review, 47, 1940, 59-68.

Goodman, Paul. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Grand Rapids Work Training Program: A Proposal under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. (Neighborhood Youth Corps, Title I-B)

Haller, Archibald O. and Miller, Irwin. "The Occupational Aspiration Scale: Theory, Structure and Correlates," East Lansing, Michigan: Technical Bulletin, No. 288, Michigan State University Agricultural Experimental Station, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 1953.

Hamachek, Don E. The Self in Growth, Teaching and Learning. Glencoe, Illinois: The Glencoe Press, 1965.

Havighurst, Robert J. Education in Metropolitan Areas. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Youth in Exploration and Man Emergent," in Man in a World at Work, ed. Henry Borow. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964, 215-235.

Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.

Hyman, Herbert H. "Reflections on Reference Groups," Public Opinion Quarterly, 24, Fall, 1960, 383-396.

Hyman, Herbert H. "The Value System of Different Classes: A Social-Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in Class, Status and Power, eds., Reinhard Bendis and Seymour M. Lipset. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953, 427-441.

Hyman, Herbert H. "The Psychology of Status," Archives of Psychology, 28, No. 269, 1942.

Jersild, Arthur. In Search of Self. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

Kausler, D. H. "Aspiration Level As a Determinant of Performance," Journal of Personnel, 27, 1959, 346-351.

Kinch, John W. "A Formalized Theory of the Self Concept," The American Journal of Sociology, 68, 1963, 481-486.

"Manual and Supplement for the Gates Basic Reading Tests." New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

"Manual for School Administrators for Iowa Tests of Educational Development", Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1963.

Maslow, A. H. "Self Actualizing People: A Study of Psychological Health," Personality Symposium No. 1, 1950, 11-34

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

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Mizruchi, E. H. Success and Opportunity. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Neff, Frederick C. "Let Them Eat Cake," in Schools and the Urban Crisis, eds. August Kerber and Barbara Bommerito. New York: Holt, Rinehard, and Winston, 1965, 147-156.

Parsons, Talcott. "Youth Behavior and Values," in Guidance in American Education, III, eds. Edward Lundy and Arthur M. Kroll. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966, 38-48.

Peatman, John G. Introduction to Applied Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Piers, Ellen V. and Harris, Dale B. "Age and Other Correlates of Self Concept in Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 55, No. 2, April, 1964, 91-95.

Program Standard No. 1-65, Subject: "Students for Enrollment of Youth in Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects," U. S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Washington, D. C., July 8, 1965.

Reiss, Albert, Jr. et. al. Occupation and Social Status. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.

Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper Brothers, 1962.

Section III, Part B, Public Law 88-452, 88th Congress, August 20, 1964.

Sexton, Patricia. Education and Income. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

Shibutani, Tamotsa. "Reference Groups as Perspectives," American Journal of Sociology, 40, May, 1955, 562-569.

Sherif, Muzafer. "The Concept of the Reference Group in Human Relations," in Group Relations at the Crossroads, eds. M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson. New York: Harper and Row, 1953, 207-231.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Stephenson, Richard M. "Mobility Orientation and Stratification of 1,000 9th Graders," American Sociological Review, 22, No. 2, April, 1957.

Technical Manual: Kuhlman-Anderson Test, 7th Edition, Princeton, New Jersey: Personnel Press, Inc., 1962.

Tuel, John K. and Wurston, Rosemary. "The Influence of Intrapersonal Variables on Academic Achievement," California Journal of Educational Research, 16, March, 1965, 58-64.

Wiener, W. and Murray W. "Another Look at the Culturally Deprived and Their Levels of Aspiration," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36, 1953, 319-321.

Wylie, Ruth. The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Yablonsky, Lewis. The Violent Gang. New York: The Mac Millan Company, 1962.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Description of the Work Training Program[1]

The Work Training Program is conducted under Title I-B, of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as part of a community poverty program under the general direction of the Planning Division of the United Community Services.

Purpose: The purpose of the Work Training Program is to provide useful employment to in-school youth, ages 16 to 21 to: 1.) reduce the economic factor contributing to the likelihood that the participant would drop out of school and 2.) provide such youth with an employment experience which would increase his employability upon leaving school.

Eligibility Requirements

At the time the study was conducted students were required to meet the following criteria:

1. the pupil must have economic need as defined by the United States Office of Economic Opportunity.
2. the pupil must not be otherwise regularly employed.
3. the pupil must be 16 through 21 years of age.
4. the pupil must meet special qualifications for specific jobs.

---

[1]This information was obtained from "The Grand Rapids Work Training Program, op. cit. and from memos sent to the schools by the director of the program.

The following chart contains the standards for eligibility provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity.[2]

POVERTY FAMILIES: INCOME BY INDIVIDUAL AND SIZE OF FAMILY

Family Size	Income (non-farm)	Income (farm)
Unrelated Individual	$1,540	$1,080
2	1,990	1,400
3	2,440	1,710
4	3,130	2,200
5	3,685	2,580
6	4,135	2,900
7 or more	5,090	3,560

In this study all the students were from non-farm families.

Since information concerning the family income may not be available or reliable, sponsors were also required to consider for selection enrollees who exhibited poverty as characterized by one of the following:[3]

1. eligibility of the family for public assistance.

2. enrollment of the youth in a school lunch program.

3. living in substandard housing with over crowded and unhealthy living conditions.

4. participation by the family in a surplus food stamp program.

5. persistent unemployment or underemployment by the head of the household.

---

[2]Program Standard No. 1-65, Subject: "Standards for Enrollment of Youth in Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects". U. S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Washington, D. C., July 8, 1965, p. 2.

[3]Ibid. p. 3.

Recruitment and Selection

The recruitment for the in-school Work Training Program is done by the school staff with most of it done by school counselors. However, the assistance of other agencies is also utilized. It is emphasized in the standards for enrollment[4] that all eligible youth must be considered for enrollment in the program. It is recommended that every consideration be given to selecting school youth who have a personal as well as an economic need for participation in the program. These youth may be characterized by one of the following descriptions:[5] marginal school achievement, language deficiencies, poor school attendance records, potential drop-outs, frequent disciplinary problems, lack of motivation, and emotional or attitudinal problems requiring personal adjustment assistance.

This is not to imply that youth from low income families who show the greatest potential for success should not be included in Neighborhood Youth Corps projects.

Any interested student who thinks he may be eligible must fill out an application form (Appendix B) on which a parent's or guardian's signature is required. The administrator of the program must decide if the applicant qualifies for the program and then proceeds to try to place him on the most appropriate job.

Nature of the Work

All enrollees of the program are employed by the School System's Board of Education and are assigned to jobs performing services within

---

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid. p. 4.

the school system. Enrollees are employed in the following jobs: audio-visual aide, bookstore aide, custodial aide, cafeteria aide, office aide, gym aide, shop aide, teacher aide, and warehouse aide. Therefore, the fact that they are involved in this program is apparent to the student body.

All enrollees are supervised on the job by an assigned regular employee of the Board of Education. In no instance does the job assignment displace an employed worker or impair any existing service contract. Work performed is designed to improve the quality and extent of the service on tasks accomplished within the current work standards of the various departments.

Hours of Work

The students work 5 to 15 hours per week during the school year and up to 40 hours per week during the summer.

Other Benefits

The program is designed so that there is close contact between the student and his supervisor. Additional counseling is also provided by the job coordinators.

Wages

The students are paid $1.25 per hour, the minimum wage set by the federal government.

Number of Students Involved in the Program

In the Summer, 1965, 70 girls and 135 boys were enrolled for a total of 205 students.

In the 1965-66 school year 115 girls and 135 boys were enrolled for a total of 250 students.

APPENDIX B

Neighborhood Youth Corps
Turner School
959 Turner N.W.
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Enrollee Qualification Form

Date _____

Name _____ Age ____ Grade ____ Sex ____ Telephone _____

Address _____ Zip Code _____ School _____

Date of birth _____ Place of birth _____

Social Security Number _____ Do you type? _____

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Your (son, daughter) has applied for work under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Work Training Program, of the Grand Rapids Board of Education. If eligible, he will work for the Grand Rapids Board of Education in a position under the direct supervision of an adult Board of Education Employee.

The purpose of this program is to provide a realistic work experience to youths, ages 16-21, and to provide some income to youths from families with economic need. Because this program is a part of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964, we must secure some information to determine the eligibility of your child to participate in the program. Will you please answer the following questions? Please fill out this form completely. Thank you.

Grand Rapids Board of Education

To be filled out by parent or guardian:

Name of parent or guardian _____

Address of parent or guardian _____

How many people are living at home? Father ___, mother ___, children (how many) ____, others (how many ____

Does family receive aid from Welfare? _____ Monthly amount _____?
A.D.C. _____ Monthly amount _____?

Place of employment of father, step-father, or guardian _____

_____

How long has he worked there? _____ Gross monthly income _____

Place of employment of mother _____

How long has she worked there? _____ Gross monthly income _____

What is the total amount of money your family will receive in one year?

I hereby agree that the above statements are true to the best of my knowledge.

_____
Signature of parent or guardian

nvh

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS ON WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

1. Are you aware of the schools work training program?

   Yes _____ No _____

2. Were you aware of the program last year? (1965-66)

   Yes _____ No _____

3. Did you apply for the program last year?

   Yes _____ No _____

4. Why didn't you apply for it last year?

APPENDIX D

Circle the letter in front of the statement which best answers each question.

1. How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with your close friends?

   a. I am the best
   b. I am above average
   c. I am average
   d. I am below average
   e. I am the poorest

2. How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with those in your class at school?

   a. I am among the best
   b. I am above average
   c. I am average
   d. I am below average
   e. I am among the poorest

3. Where do you think you would rank in your high school graduating class?

   a. among the best
   b. above average
   c. average
   d. below average
   e. among the poorest

4. Do you think you have the ability to complete college?

   a. yes, definitely
   b. yes, probably
   c. not sure,either way
   d. probably not
   e. no

5. Where do you think you would rank in your class in college?

   a. among the best
   b. above average
   c. average
   d. below average
   e. among the poorest

6. In order to become a doctor, lawyer, or university professor, work beyond four years of college is necessary. How likely do you think it is that you could complete such advanced work?

   a. very likely
   b. somewhat likely
   c. not sure either way
   d. unlikely
   e. most unlikely

7. Forget for a moment how others grade your work. In your opinion how good do you think your work is?

   a. My work is excellent
   b. My work is good
   c. My work is average
   d. My work is below average
   e. My work is much below average

8. What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting?

   a. Mostly A's
   b. Mostly B's
   c. Mostly C's
   d. Mostly D's
   e. Mostly E's

APPENDIX E

Please answer the following questions as you think your PARENTS would answer them. If you are not living with your parents answer for the family with whom you are living.

Circle the letter in front of the statement that best answers each question.

1. How do you think your PARENTS would rate your school ability compared with other students your age?

    a. Among the best
    b. Above average
    c. Average
    d. Below average
    e. Among the poorest

2. Where do you think your PARENTS would say you would rank in your high school graduating class?

    a. Among the best
    b. Above average
    c. Average
    d. Below average
    e. Among the poorest

3. Do you think that your PARENTS would say you have the ability to complete college?

    a. Yes, definitely
    b. Yes, probably
    c. Not sure, either way
    d. Probably not
    e. Definitely not

4. In order to become a doctor, lawyer, or university professor, work beyond four years of college is necessary. How likely do you think your PARENTS would say it is that you could complete such advanced work?

    a. Very likely
    b. Somewhat likely
    c. Not sure, either way
    d. Somewhat unlikely
    e. Very unlikely

5. What kind of grades do you think your PARENTS would say you are capable of getting in general?

   a. Mostly A's
   b. Mostly B's
   c. Mostly C's
   d. Mostly D's
   e. Mostly E's

APPENDIX F

Think about your closest friend at school. Now answer the following questions as you think this FRIEND would answer them.

Circle the letter in front of the statement that best answers each question.

1. How do you think this FRIEND would rate your school ability compared with other students your age?

   a. Among the best
   b. Above average
   c. Average
   d. Below average
   e. Among the poorest

2. Where do you think this FRIEND would say you would rank in your high school graduating class?

   a. Among the best
   b. Above average
   c. Average
   d. Below average
   e. Among the poorest

3. Do you think that this FRIEND would say you have the ability to complete college?

   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, probably
   c. Not sure, either way
   d. Probably not
   e. Definitely not

4. In order to become a doctor, lawyer, or university professor, work beyond four years of college is necessary. How likely do you think this FRIEND would say it is that you could complete such advanced work?

   a. Very likely
   b. Somewhat likely
   c. Not sure, either way
   d. Somewhat unlikely
   e. Very unlikely

5. What kind of grades do you think this FRIEND would say you are capable of getting in general?

   a. Mostly A's
   b. Mostly B's
   c. Mostly C's
   d. Mostly D's
   e. Mostly E's

APPENDIX G

Think about your favorite teacher--the one you like best; the one you feel is most concerned about your schoolwork. Now answer the following questions as you think this TEACHER would answer them.

Circle the letter in front of the statement which best answers each question.

1. How do you think this TEACHER would rate your school ability compared with other students your age?

    a. Among the best
    b. Above average
    c. Average
    d. Below average
    e. Among the poorest

2. Where do you think this TEACHER would say you would rank in your high school graduating class?

    a. Among the best
    b. Above average
    c. Average
    d. Below average
    e. Among the poorest

3. Do you think this TEACHER would say you have the ability to complete college?

    a. Yes, definitely
    b. Yes, probably
    c. Not sure, either way
    d. Probably not
    e. Definitely not

4. In order to become a doctor, lawyer, or university professor, work beyond four years of college is necessary. How likely do you think this TEACHER would say it is that you could complete such advanced work?

    a. Very likely
    b. Somewhat likely
    c. Not sure, either way
    d. Somewhat unlikely
    e. Very unlikely

5. What kind of grades do you think this TEACHER would say you are capable of getting in general?

   a. Mostly A's
   b. Mostly B's
   c. Mostly C's
   d. Mostly D's
   e. Mostly E's

APPENDIX H

Please write in answers to the following questions.

1. If you could be like anyone in the world, who would you want to be like?
   (Write the name of this person.)

   Who is this person?

2. If you were free to choose any job you wanted, what job would you most like to have when you grow up?

3. Sometimes what we would like to do is not the same as what we expect to do. What kind of a job do you expect you really will have when you grow up?

Please circle the letter in front of the statement which best answers each question.

4. If you were free to go as far as you wanted to go in school, how far would you like to go?

   a. I'd like to quit right now.
   b. I'd like to continue in high school for a while.
   c. I'd like to graduate from high school.
   d. I'd like to go to secretarial or trade school.
   e. I'd like to go to college for a while.
   f. I'd like to graduate from college.
   g. I'd like to do graduate work beyond college.

5. Sometimes what we would like to do isn't the same as what we expect to do. How far in school do you expect you really will go?

   a. I think I really will quit school as soon as I can.
   b. I think I really will continue in high school for a while.
   c. I think I really will graduate from high school.
   d. I think I really will go to secretarial or trade school.
   e. I think I really will go to college for a while.
   f. I think I really will graduate from college.
   g. I think I really will do graduate work beyond college.

APPENDIX I

What would be the lowest grades you could get and still have your PARENTS satisfied with you?

a. Mostly A's
b. A's and B's
c. Mostly B's
d. B's and C's
e. Mostly C's
f. C's and D's
g. Mostly D's
h. D's and E's
i. Mostly E's
j. My grades do not make any difference to my parents.

What could be the lowest grades you could get and still have your FRIENDS satisfied with you?

a. Mostly A's
b. A's and B's
c. Mostly B's
d. B's and C's
e. Mostly C's
f. C's and D's
g. Mostly D's
h. D's and E's
i. Mostly E's
j. My grades do not make any difference to my friends.

What would be the lowest grades you could get and still have this TEACHER[1] satisfied with you?

a. Mostly A's
b. A's and B's
c. Mostly B's
d. B's and C's
e. Mostly C's
f. C's and D's
g. Mostly D's
h. D's and E's
i. Mostly E's
j. My grades do not make any difference to my teacher.

---

[1]Favorite teacher

APPENDIX J

Summary of Means

Hypothesis Number	Variable	Advantaged	Non-volunteers	Volunteers	Dis-advantaged
1	Intelligence	105.277	92.706	94.417	93.414
2	Reading Ability	57.815	35.382	35.542	35.448
3	Absences	8.763	11.676	23.583	16.603
4.	Grade Point Average	2.018	1.529	1.481	1.509
5	Self Concept of Ability	27.121	26.618	24.875	25.897
6	Perceived Parents' Evaluations	18.630	17.706	15.917	16.966
7	Perceived Friends' Evaluations	17.757	17.118	16.125	16.707
8	Perceived Teachers' Evaluations	18.457	17.529	16.583	17.138
9	Occupational Aspirations	62.936	61.765	53.542	58.362
10	Occupational Expectations	48.249	48.735	45.708	47.483
	Summary of Medians				
11	Educational Aspirations	5.930	5.929	5.731	5.800
12	Educational Expectations	5.352	5.055	5.250	5.115
13	Perceived Parental Academic Preferences (low)	5.412	4.909	4.833	4.887
14	Perceived Friends' Academic Preferences (low)	4.216	3.962	3.900	3.944
15	Perceived Teachers' Academic Preferences (low)	5.867	5.038	4.875	4.976