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ABSTRACT

The following research paper was a study into change in student academic and general self-concept with increase in grade level and age. The majority of literature found by this researcher dealt with self-concept and its relationship to achievement and interactions with others. Review, then, was in these two areas—particularly within the academic setting, but outside of it as well. It was hypothesized that there would be a decrease in both academic and general student self-concept with increase in grade level and age.

Self-Appraisal inventories, measuring general and academic self-concept, and Inferential Self-Reports, measuring only academic self-concept, were the instruments used. Subjects were students, Grade 1 to 13, and ranging in age from 5 to 21. Although all Self-Appraisal inventories and all Self-Reports were very similar, they differed according to three grade levels: Primary (Grades 1 to 3), Intermediate (Grades 4 to 8), and Secondary (Grades 9 to 13). Students in the Primary division received only their respective Self-Appraisal inventory, while others were administered both inventories designed for their grade level.

Scores on the inventories were computed to percents and then mean percents were arrived at for each grade, each of the three grade levels, each age, and each of three age intervals. In all of these instances Spearman's rank order coefficients ("r") were calculated and significance, at the .05 level, was determined by referring to a table of critical values for one-tailed tests. Similarly "t" scores were computed, but only for individual grades and ages, and significance was determined at the .05 level. In only one instance, the General Dimension for individual grades, was significance of overall decrease found. Consequently the hypotheses put forth did not gain support. The "t" scores, however, revealed some isolated significant changes
for the Academic Dimension, which were generally decreases in mean percents from the last grade of one level to the first grade of the next. For age mean percents, significant changes generally took place at early (5 or 6) and late (20 or 21) ages.

A number of reasons for the results were presented and were generally based upon the student's encounters, or lack of encounters, with achievement or success. No definite conclusions, relevant to the hypotheses stated, could be made, although a number of isolated ones were drawn on the basis of significant "t" scores. As well, mention was made of the possible trends or tendencies that were revealed by the results, but that could not, or were not, proven significant by "t's" or "p's". Teaching methods stressing improvement in academic, as well as socially related, situations, were recommended and a model teaching approach was presented in Appendix B.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The following paper is a study into self-concept and its relationship to the academic setting. Generally, justification for this researcher’s efforts stems from personal experiences and concerns as well as those expressed by others. Such impediments to learning as student’s lack of effort, inattention, pessimism and negative attitude have been, and are, obviously present in some form in our classrooms. The assumption is that, in the majority of cases, such factors are the result of poor feelings of self or lack of academic confidence and feeling of worth. By making the enhancing of student self-concept a primary goal and an integral part of the learning situation, the educator can alleviate many of these problems.

According to Kenneth J. Gergen (1971), a person’s concept of self influences his social interaction, his efficiency of communications, his ability to learn, his performance at various tasks, and many other facets of his existence. Generally, the way in which a man conceives of himself will influence both what he chooses to do and what he expects from life. A person’s concept of self can be extremely important to his successful adjustment to, and coping with, all areas of his existence.

Another educator, in particular, who is much concerned with the student’s feelings of himself and their importance to his performance is W. J. Purkey (1970). As an example of the significance of feelings of self, he relates a story told by R. F. Lowry in an opening address he made at a conference in 1961. It is called the fable of "The House and Henry Carson" and deals with the influence of attitudes on academic achievement.

The story begins one evening in June when:
"...a mouse ran into the office of the Educational Testing Service and accidentally triggered a delicate point in the apparatus just
as the College Entrance Examination Board's data on one Henry Carson was being scored.

Henry was an average high school student who was unsure of himself and his abilities. Had it not been for the mouse, Henry's scores would have been average or less, but the mouse changed all that, for the scores which emerged from the computer were amazing ...800's in both verbal and quantitative areas.

When the scores reached Henry's school, the word of his giftedness spread like wildfire. Teachers began to reevaluate their gross underestimation of this fine lad, counsellors trembled at the thought of neglecting such talent, and even college admissions officers began to recruit Henry for their schools.

New worlds opened for Henry, and as they opened he started to grow as a person and as a student. Once he became aware of his potentialities and began to be treated differently by the significant people in his life, a form of self-fulfilling prophecy took place. Henry gained in confidence and began 'to put his mind in the way of great things'...Henry became one of the best men of his generation." (Page 1)

The major proposition here, of course, is that how one sees himself and how others see him are primary factors in his success.

Before more specific rationale for the study of self-concept in the school setting, this researcher feels that reasons for concern with self-concept in general are required; and innumerable ones exist. Five of the more important grounds for interest are outlined here. Probably the most important one is the assumption that self-concept is a prime motive behind all behaviour. Combs and Snygg (1959) feel that, the basic need motivating behaviour is the enhancement of feelings of self and the maintenance of those that are positive. Further support for this belief comes from Philips (1964) and Diggory, Klein, and Cohen (1964).

Another reason is the fact that one's view of self generalizes through other areas of self-evaluation. Diggory (1966) and Ludwig and Maehr (1967) have found that when a person feels highly about his ability in one area and then experiences failure in this area, there appears a decrease in self-evaluation of apparently unrelated abilities. The converse is also true. Similarly, according to Combs and Snygg (1959), concepts of self are acting to affect how a person reacts in different situations or experiences; what behaviour he displays, how he handles objects at hand, and so on.
A further important reason for concern is the fact that a person's treatment of others, and vice versa, is often a reflection of how he sees and feels about himself. A definite positive correlation exists between self-esteem and acceptance of others and by the same token how one feels about himself can crucially influence how others treat him. Fromm (1939) and Rogers (1959), according to Gergen (1971), discovered, through observations of their patients, that those least capable of accepting themselves found it hardest to accept others. Fox, Luszki, and Schmuck (1966), who point out that a person's self-concept is a good indicator of their mental health, provide additional backing. They also believe that how one feels about himself is an important determinant of how he behaves towards others. A positive self-image, for example, tends to lead a person to be positive in his attitudes towards others. Furthermore, Scott (1959) demonstrated that positive response to an individual's presentation of a role is likely to cause a change in his attitude in the direction of the presentation. It is important to note that, on the other hand, this does not mean that disapproval will produce the opposite effect. A study by Cohen (1959) shows that under certain circumstances disapproval may only cause the person to identify even more closely with his behaviour or attitude.

Finally, concern with overall self-concept stems, in part, from the belief that it can directly or indirectly affect the decision making process and the amount of actual effort put forth. In other words, one's conception of himself can highly influence his aspirations; what he chooses to do and how much effort he expends in doing it. Gergen (1971) refers to an experiment done by Rackman and Secord (1968) to support the effect self-concept has on decision making. In this study females ordered their preference for three major roles: wife-and-mother, companion role, and partner role. These were explained in
more detail for the subjects. On a separate occasion they were asked to judge themselves in relation to a variety of traits and then a group of independent raters judged each of the role models on the same series of traits. The findings showed that the closer the subjects' self-descriptions were to the characteristics of a given role the greater their preference for that role.

In a study done by Biggory, Klein, and Cohen (1964), a close relationship is shown between self-conception and actual behaviour. Through a laboratory experiment with naval personnel, they were able to show that those given a feeling of success displayed increased feelings of success and greater signs of effort. Those given a feeling of failure showed a continuous drop in their estimates of success and fewer signs of effort. That the conception of oneself is detrimental to actual behaviour was clearly evident.

The study into self-concept in the academic situation, as compared with the study of overall self-concept, is highly warranted mainly because of the implications—in the form of reevaluating teaching methods and attitudes—it has for teachers. It is the individual teachers who measure, or judge, student performances which so greatly determines their self-concept. Furthermore, teachers are the most influential part of an environment—the classroom and school—which presents more success-failure situations than can be found any place else.

When considering the effect, then, of schooling on the student's self-concept as he progresses from level to level, the onus is on the teacher. His position is one of great significance, basically because of the amount of interaction he has with the student, coupled with the assumption that attitudes in one situation often generalize over a wide variety of circumstances.

Gergen (1971) outlines a number of specific conditions under which an appraiser is most influential. Many of these apply directly to the
teacher, strongly supporting the importance of the individual teacher's responsibility for enhancing self-concept.

First of all, to the student, the teacher is a very credible person. When an appraiser appears to have expertise in any given situation, persons tend to put more trust in his evaluations and consequently the greater the impact on the conception of self. If the teacher communicates to a student, for example, that he is responsible, the chances are that he will come to see himself as such.

Secondly, teachers are often personalistic, particularly in the lower grades. By personalistic it is meant that they are sincere, uncalculating, and aware of their students' actions and behaviour and modify their appraisals accordingly. With such personalism comes greater influence over the student. One experiment to demonstrate such an effect was conducted by Gergen (1965). He found that there was a strong increase in self-esteem for persons who received positive personal appraisals and little if any increase for those who received positive impersonal appraisals. These results were in comparison with a control group which received no reflected appraisal.

The third relative reason rests on the assumption that the greater the number of confirmations of any specific appraisal the greater its effect and its salience on any future occasion. Thus, the teacher with his credibility and time with the students, and particularly if he is personalistic, will have a profound effect on their self-concept. His appraisals will have more long term effects. With continuous long term exposure to appraisal, such as a teacher could give, the student's relevant view of himself could be determined for years, if not for life.
A great deal of research has been carried out in the area of self-concept, much of it being studies into two basic relationships: self-concept and achievement or performance, and self-concept and interactions with others. The emphasis here will be on the review of literature dealing with self-concept and achievement as this is a prime scholastic concern. As well, with the teacher-student relationship in mind, work dealing with self-concept and reactions of others will be summarized. Although a great deal of the review may not appear directly related to the academic setting, its importance and relativity lies in its indirect effects. First, however, a look at three particularly interesting general works: Thompson (1972), Williams and Cole (1963), and Purkey (1970).

In his 6th Monograph, "Correlates of the Self-Concept", "arren Thompson deals with self-concept in general and outlines numerous studies attempting to determine if certain groups have characteristic self-concepts. All made use of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (T.S.C.S.), which measures self-concept in eight areas: what a person is, how a person feels about himself, how a person acts, a person's physical self, a person's moral ethical self, a person's personal self, a person's family self, and a person's social self. Overall findings showed that age and race are important factors in self-concept and that although certain groups of people have characteristic self-concept, wide individual differences do occur.

Studies into age as a factor in self-concept yielded scores reflecting a person's general level of self-esteem (ordered so that high scores represented high levels of self-esteem) below average for junior high (Grades 7, 8, and 9) and high school students (Grades 10, 11, and 12), average for college students and adults, and above average
for elderly people. As well, the collective data indicated a high degree of consistency across samples within each age group. Of further interest was the fact that the older subjects scored higher in tendency towards denial. This lead to the conclusion that the increase in self-satisfaction with age may have been a function of defensiveness and a disinclination to make negative statements about oneself, rather than of actual increase in self-esteem.

Studies utilizing disadvantaged people from highly selected populations, rather than random samples, have shown that the self-concept of the socioeconomically disadvantaged is enhanced as the person grows older. More specifically, the self-concept scores of junior high school students were consistent across samples and closely resembled those of their non-disadvantaged peers.

Those of the high school, young adults, and adult groups tested showed less consistency across samples and less similarity to the scores of their non-disadvantaged peers. Thompson attributes such findings to the fact that as the disadvantaged person grows older he/she is faced with an increasing number of responsibilities. The person's disadvantagement may make him feel ill-equipped to cope with these. In conclusion, he states that the self-concept scores of the adult are likely a measure of how effectively he/she has coped with disadvantagement rather than the actual degree of disadvantagement itself.

Throughout his written perusal of these and other studies, Thompson continually mentions that there exist so many variables that it is next to impossible to sort out the effect of any single one. Furthermore, whereas age, race, and socioeconomic status all have some systematic effect upon the self-concept, age is the only variable which accounts for much of the individual differences in the self-concepts of people.
An interesting study into the relationships between self-concept and a series of variables assumed to be necessary for school adjustment, was conducted by Williams and Cole (1968). Their experiment involved 60 Sixth Grade students who were administered the following instruments:

1. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale to assess the various dimensions of self-evaluation.

2. A descriptive rating scale to determine attitude towards school; school concept was determined by scores of discrepancy between perceived school experience and desired school experience. The lower the discrepancy the more positive school attitudes.

3. A social esteem scale to establish each child's social status.

4. The California Test of Personality to determine emotional adjustment.

5. The California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity to determine intellectual ability.

6. The Reading and Arithmetic sections of the California Achievement Test Battery to determine reading and mathematical achievement.

Although results produced few high correlations between self-concept and various areas of achievement or adjustment, all were significant. A correlation of -.28 was obtained between scores on the school concept measure. This indicated a positive relationship between self-concept and attitude toward school. Positive relationships were found between self-concept and social esteem (.22r), self-concept and emotional adjustment (.62r), self-concept and mental ability (.31r), self-concept and reading achievement (.31r), and self-concept and mathematical achievement (.33r).

William Purkey (1970) stresses the academic environment as an
important variable affecting self-concept. He feels that a large number of schools employ a primitive approach to education and that there is little concern for avoidance of negative self-concepts. Students face rejection, humiliation, failure, and reminders as to their limitations. Competitive situations, (grading for example) a major source of these negative factors, often begin with the first grade and continue throughout school. Another, says Purkey, is that of ability grouping, which has been overdone and which may be more humiliating for a student than being put in a regular classroom and receiving low grades. He adds that the school image grows gradually less positive with time for many students.

Support for this point comes from a study done by Morse (1964). Morse measured the shifts in the self-concept of 600 elementary school students. He found a gradual decrease in professed positive or negative feelings of self with time. More specifically, there was a sharp decrease in overall positive or negative self-regard from Grades three to five, with some recovery appearing in Grade eleven. Eighty-four percent of third graders were proud of their work in school, whereas fifty-three percent of those in grade eleven were not. Similar results were found for nearly all other items on the self-esteem inventory he administered.

The largest area of this review is based on the feeling among educators that students must experience and be credited with some form of achievement. It is over this concern and its relationship to self-concept that many studies have been conducted and much literature has been written. Generally, what has been found is, that experiences of success or achievement enhance feelings of self, and vice versa, while experiences of failure or underachievement diminish feelings of self, and vice versa.

Alexander (1964) and Horner (1971) support such facts. The former
feels that the key for understanding poor achievement is understanding of the students' self-perception. Simply speaking, a student enters school with a certain predetermined self-concept. Success and failure operate on this self-concept either to enhance or to depreciate it. This is one reason why stressing improvement is so important. It is sometimes more difficult for a teacher to give the poor ability student a good experience than to give one to a good student, particularly if a credit system is based on a grade or class standard. Furthermore, it is well known that the student that experiences too much failure begins to perceive himself as a failure. As a natural consequence, he becomes defensive and may, for example, avoid the academic situation and increase involvement in non-academic experiences such as hostility towards others or excessive involvement in sports. This all means that, by recognizing individual improvement and ignoring a "standard" of performance, it is easier to give students of all abilities positive experiences. This leads to a strengthening of self-esteem which in turn helps to decrease discipline problems and increase the chances for success.

Matina Horner (1971) believes that the strength of motivation to undertake and do well at achievement orientated activities is a much more complexly determined function than has been previously believed. Achievement directed activities are not simply the direct expression of the motive to achieve success, but of many other situational factors as well. Horner feels that the most important of these situational determinants is the individual's expectancy of success. This in turn is a function of the objective difficulty of the task and the individual's feelings of competence in that task.

Numerous studies, such as done by Bruck and Bodwin (1962) and Campbell (1965) in Purkey (1970), have shown a definite positive relationship between poor self-concept and underachievement and posi-
tive self-concept and achievement. Bruck and Bodwin experimented to determine to what extent positive self-concept was present or absent in underachieving students whose intelligence was normal or higher than average. Their sample was 60 students divided into three subgroups each containing 10 boys and 10 girls: those in the third grade, the sixth grade, and the eleventh grade. A projective self-concept scale was used as the instrument. A positive and very significant correlation (.60) was found, indicating a positive relationship between immature self-concept and underachievement. However, no cause and effect relationship was investigated.

In the study done by Campbell (1965) involving fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students, a positive relationship ($r = .308$) was found between self-esteem and achievement. It was also discovered that:

1. This relationship decreases as grade level increases and is higher for boys than for girls.
2. Mean school-related self-concept scores were higher for girls.
3. There was no differing degrees of relationship between self-esteem and achievement for high, middle, and low intelligence groups.

Diller (1954) gives direction to this relationship and provides agreement with Alexander's (1964) view that success and failure significantly affect self-concept. He used 60 male college students to determine unconscious and conscious self-attitudes after success and failure. The subjects rated themselves and 12 friends on 10 personality traits selected by college students as valuable. In addition, each subject judged four samples of handwriting which were presented to him in a disguised fashion and containing a sample of his own handwriting. The subjects were then submitted to a success, failure, or neutral experience after which the original procedures were repeated.

"It was found that:
1. The self-concept operates in a global fashion and is related to the value system of the individual.
2. After a failure experience, the defensive function of the self-concept is demonstrated in the absence of a decrease in overt attitudes towards the self and others and the presence of a change in covert attitudes.
3. After a success experience, on the other hand, attitudes towards the self are definitely enhanced on a covert level.
4. After failure, self-attitudes are not positively correlated with attitudes towards others. A disrupted pattern of attitudes appears.
5. After success, self-attitudes are positively correlated with attitudes towards friends at various distances from the self."

In another study Kurtz and Swenson (1951) investigated to determine factors related to school achievement. Five types of students were selected:

1. High achievers of high ability.
2. Medium achievers of medium ability.
3. Low achievers of low ability.
4. "Plus achievers", students whose achievement was well above expectation on the basis of ability rating.
5. "Minus achievers", students whose achievement was definitely below expectation on the basis of ability rating.

The basis for selection was Ranked Otis Intelligence Test scores and achievement scores on the Iowa Every Pupil Test of Basic Skills.

Only results for the plus and minus achievers were presented. The plus achievers generally exhibited leadership qualities, originality, and self-confidence, as well as a good appearance. Furthermore, they were well-liked by others. On the other hand, the minus achievers were restless, unhappy, and were not so careful about their appearance. They tended to lack self-confidence and were not highly regarded by others.

In a study to determine the effects of ability grouping—more often than not a means of instilling feelings of success or failure—on self-concept, Mann (1960) found that high and low ability groupings are related to positive and negative feelings of self respectively.
The experimenters sample was 102 fifth grade children who had been placed in ability groups since the first grade. Four groups were identified: the highest group, or Section One, the second highest group, or Section Two, the second lowest group, or Section Three, and the lowest group, or Section Four. These sections had 30, 29, 25, and 18 students respectively. A questionnaire, adapted from a previous study, was used to obtain the necessary information as to how the children saw themselves in terms of ability or achievement.

Twenty-five students in Section One gave positive responses with no negative responses recorded. Similarly Section Two yielded no negative responses with seven positive responses. In Section Three only five students responded positively, three negatively. Section Four had fourteen students answering negatively and none positively.

Finally, Borislow (1962)-in an attempt to determine the importance of self-evaluation as a nonintellectual factor in scholastic achievement-found that students who underachieve scholastically have a poorer view of themselves as students than do those who achieve.

Borislow's sample was 197 college freshman who were given pre-semester and post-semester tests for self-evaluation (general self, student self, ideal self, ideal student) and then classified according to the extent to which they achieved or failed to achieve a first semester grade point average concordant with aptitude test scores. Four groups were arrived at: achievers and underachievers who were intent on academic attainment (SA-High groups) and achievers and underachievers not so orientated (SA-Low groups).

It was discovered that:

1. The difference between achievers and underachievers in general self-evaluation in the SA-High group was not significant prior to or after a semester's work. This also held true for the SA-Low groups.

2. SA-High achievers as a group showed a significant increase
in general self-evaluation from pre-to post semester assessment, whereas the SA-High underachievers showed no change.

3. SA-High achievers began their semester with general self-evaluation lower than that of SA-Low underachievers. This increased to that of the SA-Low underachievers at post-semester assessment.

4. Prior to the semester, SA-High achievers rated themselves significantly higher on student self-evaluation than did SA-high underachievers. This also held true at the end of the semester.

5. SA-Low achievers appeared significantly higher on student self-evaluation than SA-Low underachievers on post-semester assessment.

Many studies also support the position stressed by Horner (1971), Mussen, Rosenzweig, Aronson, Elkind, Murdock, and Wertheimer (1971), and Campbell (1967) that underachievement in school is often caused by students' poor self-concept. An early study by Robert K. Roth (1959) gives some indication that self-concept works to influence achievement. He used reading improvement at a college level to provide the necessary pressure for change and as his vehicle for improvement. The experiment was based on two assumptions: if a person perceives a demand as a threat he will defend against it and maintain his self-concept and if the demand is not seen as a threat, he may change his self-concept integrating the new experience.

Roth used a class of 45 freshman males and 9 freshman females ranging widely in age, academic status, and scholastic aptitude. This group was drawn from reading improvement classes at the University of Texas and the only requirement for each subject was that the student read a minimum of 250 words per minute and have a comprehension of 75 percent on the Diagnostic Reading Test (DRT).
Before and after actual reading improvement, subjects were administered the DRT, the Sentence Completion Technique (SCT), a Self Sort, and an Ideal Sort. Self Sort and Ideal Sort were two orientations of a measure consisting of 80 self-reference statements. The orientations respectively interpreted the self-perceived by the subjects at that particular time and the self subjects would like to be. There were four dimensions to the measure: Self as a Self, Self in Relation to Authority, Self as a Student, and Self as a Reader. Each of these dimensions was assigned 20 statements, 10 with the intensional orientation, and 10 with the extensional orientation. The Sentence Completion Technique (SCT) contained statements to be completed and responses were analyzed on a five point scale from intensional (1) to extensional (5).

The students were also compared on a measure of academic aptitude, the American Council of Educational Psychological Examination, and on the following achievement measures: The Co-operative English Test, vocabulary scores from the DRT, grade-point averages before and after the program, and a measure of reading effectiveness derived from the DRT rate and comprehension measure.

At the conclusion subjects were divided into three groups, Improvers (those subjects whose standard scores on the DRT from pretest to posttest increased), Non-improvers (those students whose standard scores on the DRT from pretest to posttest decreased), and Attritions (those who started the program but who discontinued before the seventh session, which was the halfway point).

Roth proposed that there would be significant differences among the self-perceptions of these three groups such that the three groups would appear in the following order from most defensive to least defensive: Attritions, Non-improvers, and Improvers. Overall results were in support of this proposition and showed a direct relationship
between defensiveness in the self-concept as a reader and relative performance in the reading improvement situation.

More specific findings were:

1. Non-improvers showed stable self-ideal correlations from start to finish while the improvers showed a decrease. Inspection showed that this latter finding was the result of an increase in defensiveness in areas originally revealing defensiveness.

2. The Non-improvers' scores were superior to the other two groups on almost all the aptitude and achievement measures. However, scores were less after the program than before.

3. Grade-point averages for the Improvers—the highest for the semester previous to the one in which the program was conducted—declined while for the other two groups they increased slightly.

Wattenberg and Clifford (1964) conducted a study into the relationship between self-concept and achievement in reading. Their purpose was to discover the direction of causality and their basic assumption was that if early measures of self-concepts were predictive of reading achievement, then self-concept has direct relation to reading achievement.

Their subjects were 128 children in the first semester of kindergarten. They were drawn from two different schools and from two different socioeconomic classes: working and middle. At the onset measures were made of:

1. Mental Ability, done through the Detroit Beginning First Grade Intelligence Test.

2. "Quantified Self-Concept (Competence)" and "Quantified Self-Concept (Good-Bad)", done via remarks made by the children while drawing pictures of their families, responses to an
incomplete sentence test devised for the purpose, and
ratings by teachers and a clinically trained interviewer.

Two and one-half years later, the self-concept measures were
repeated and reading achievement scores derived. The latter were
obtained by administering tests distributed by the individual test-
book series publishers.

The researchers put forth the following hypotheses:

"1. Measures of self-concept and ratings of self-concept taken
in the first semester of kindergarten will be predictive of
later achievement in reading.

2. The correlation between measures and ratings of self-concept
on the one hand and a mental test score on the other will
be low. (In effect, the measures of self-concept will add
significantly to the predictive efficiency of an intelligence
test.)

3. The association between reading achievement and changes in
measures of self-concept from kindergarten to second grade
will be positive but low. (In effect, the self-concept is
more important as a determinant of learning efficiency than
learning experiences are in the formation of the self-
concept.)

4. Ratings of ego strength will show a high positive correla-
tion with achievement in reading.

5. There are different aspects to the self-concept which can
be measured separately and which will show only moderate
inter-correlation. (Specifically, for kindergarten children,
self-concept as to competence will be more related to success
in academic achievement than in self-concept as to goodness
versus naughtiness.)

6. The self-concept will display some characteristics of defen-
sive reactions. (Specifically, children verbalizing a high
ratio of self-references will show lower success in reading
than those not evidencing a preoccupation with self-character-
istics.)" (Page 463)

Rank-order correlations confirmed these statements in every
instance except in the case of number six, which did not hold true for
the good-bad references. The experimenters concluded that: (a) in
general, the measures of self-concept and of ego strength made at the
beginning of school were somewhat more predictive of reading achieve-
ment two and one-half years later than was the measure of mental abil-
ity, (b) the self-concept has a positive relationship with reading
achievement.

Hamachek (1963) specifically states that failure in basic school
subjects, as well as lack of academic involvement, is due, in part, to poor perceptions of the self and the world. Further, he says that among other things experiments have found:

1. In terms of their perception of self, individuals have a definite commitment to perform as they do. Other things being equal, those who do not achieve choose not to do so, while those who do achieve choose to do so.

2. A significant positive relationship between immature self-concepts and reading disabilities in third and sixth grade classes.

3. A significant positive relationship between high self-concept and school achievement in fifth and sixth grade children.

4. A significant positive relationship between self-concept of ability and school achievement over a six-year period from grade six through grade twelve.

5. Measures of self-concept and ratings of ego-strength made at the beginning of kindergarten are more predictive of reading achievement two and one-half years later than are measures of intelligence.

6. Male achievers feel more positive about themselves than do male underachievers.

7. Underachieving academically capable high school boys have more negative perceptions of self and of others and are less emotionally stable than achievers.

Hamachek also feels that when a person develops a low opinion of himself this, in turn, affects what he thinks others expect of him, as well as how they actually view him. What follows from these feelings is the second part of the review, which deals with self-concept and interactions with others. Basically, what has been found, and what has been expressed, is that how one feels about himself determines
how he feels about and reacts to others, and how one feels about himself is affected by his experiences with others.

Katherine Omwake (1954) found a marked relation between how one sees himself and how he sees others. One hundred and thirteen college students were given personality inventories (anonymous to them at the time) to measure self-acceptance and acceptance of others, attitudes toward the self and others, and adjustment and values for self and for others. Subjects were not required to identify themselves on the inventory, hopefully adding to the frankness in answering.

Correlations showed that the three inventories agreed significantly, however, slightly less for those measuring attitudes towards others as compared to self-acceptance. Specifically, those who accept themselves tend to be acceptant of others and to perceive others as accepting themselves, while those who reject themselves similarly have a low opinion of others and perceive others as being self-rejectant.

Further support comes from a study by Berger (1952) in which a variety of subjects were used: 183 day-session college students, 33 evening-session college students, 33 prisoners, 38 stutterers, 18 adults in a class at the YMCA, 7 speech problem cases in a rehabilitation program, and 3 counselees. Two scales, one measuring self-acceptance and one measuring acceptance of others, were administered. In some cases they were given by Berger, and in others, by persons directly related to the subjects (e.g., prison psychologist). All correlations arrived at were significantly positive except in the case of the "Y" group. This correlation just missed significance at .06. It was concluded that expressed acceptance of self is positively related to expressed acceptance of others.

The importance that others have on an individual, particularly his self-concept, is pointed out by Jenkins (1961). He stresses that the image of self is something that gradually develops through experi-
ences with others and thus, parents and teachers have a crucial responsibility, particularly, he says, because a child's ability to succeed depends a great deal on his self-concept. This process of becoming is referred to by W. Beatty and R. Clark (1963) as "aware-ing", the essential outcome being the construction and continuous reconstruction of a concept of self in relation to the world. Two basic concepts are thus formed: the "perceived-self-in-the-world", which includes such things as what person can do and what he looks like, and the "concept of an adequate self", the concept of what he should be. When there is a discrepancy or lack of harmony between these two, a motivational state develops.

Support, for the belief that how one feels about himself is, in part, due to his experiences with others, comes from many sources. Ludwig and Maehr (1967) and Videbeck (1960) found that self-concept is a function of the reaction of significant others. In a study using reading skills in elementary and secondary grades, Videbeck was able to conclude that:

"self-conceptions are learned and that the evaluative reactions of others play a significant part in the learning process" (Page 359)

Thirty students read six poems aloud in the presence of a visiting expert in oral communications. On the same qualities, half were given a positive appraisal (e.g. superiority in voice control, ability to convey meaning, and so on) and half were given a critical appraisal. Both before and after the experiment, subjects made a number of self ratings on a series of nine point scales of their adequacy in oral communications. Estimates covered the areas specifically appraised by the expert, areas related to those appraised but not specifically covered by the expert, and areas not related to abilities appraised. (e.g. social conversation).

Results showed that there was a general increase in feelings of
self-adequacy on the part of subjects receiving positive appraisal. This score was strongest for attributes directly appraised and weakest for unrelated aspects. On the other hand, subjects receiving negative appraisal revised their self-estimates in a negative direction with the strength of this revision being directly related to the relevance of the content to the appraisal.

In a study done by Helzer (1958), small but positive correlations were found between parental evaluations of their children and their children's self-evaluations. He suggested that such findings indicate that parental evaluation may have very great consequences on the child's personality.

Seventy-four 8th and 9th grade children and one or both of the parents of 53 of them were involved in the study. To gain the children's self-ratings, and the parents' ratings of their children, subject favourability scores were computed—sum of the raw ratings on fifteen unselected items—in each instance to yield Child-Favourability and Self-Favourability scores. Secondly, by computing the discrepancy both on the "actual" ratings on another group of items and the "ideal" ratings on the same items, Self-Acceptance and Child-Acceptance scores were derived. Finally, an estimate of each child's acceptability to his peers was established from a sociometric study.

It was found that parental favourability has a significant relationship only with the child's self-favourability. Parental acceptance was related much more consistently to children's self-acceptance than to children's self-favourability. Study of separate groups of families—one characterized by high parental favourability and one characterized by low parental favourability—revealed only one significant result. In the families where parental favourability was low, children receiving low acceptance from the mother had lower self-acceptance than did those receiving high acceptance from the mother.
Results from the sociometric study revealed that the popular boys expressed a significantly higher degree of self-acceptance than the unpopular boys.

Haas and Maehr (1965) conducted two experiments which lend further support to Helper's conclusions. However, their studies helped to establish the durability of the reactions of others and the effect of dosage on self-ratings. Subjects were Grade eight boys who were administered the Physical Self-Test containing three subtests each having 10 items: The Criticized scale, (those items directly related to the tasks performed in the experiment and to the evaluations given by the experts after the tasks were done), The Related scale, (items conceived with general athletic ability), and The Unrelated scale, (items concerned with general physical fitness).

Both experiments began with the boys rating themselves on the above test. A week later they were individually given actual simple physical tests in the presence of one of a number of physical development experts. After all subjects received this treatment, each was brought back where the expert responded with a series of standardized approval or disapproval statements. These were administered without regard for the actual performance of the subjects. It is at this point that the two experiments differed.

In order to determine durability over time subjects were divided into two matched groups on the basis of total pretest scores. One was given the approval treatment and the other disapproval treatment. Posttests were then given one hour later, one day later, six days later, and six weeks later. Changes on the criticized scale were still significant at the end of six weeks, for both approval and disapproval treatment. This established that changes in self-ratings are durable over time.

To determine the effect of dosage on self-ratings, the second
experiment was carried out. Thirty subjects were given approval treatment twice, the second 48 hours after the first. The posttest was administered immediately following each treatment, six days later, and six weeks later. The expected change on the Criticized scale occurred following the first treatment with a much less spread of effect to the other scales than found in the first experiment. After the second trial, change in this area again occurred while the Related and Unrelated scales showed no significant increase. On the following posttests mean self-ratings on the Criticized scale changed only slightly. However, the mean scores on the Related and Unrelated scales went from a significant change from pretest ratings at the six day mark to no significant change at the six week point.

Upon comparison of Experimental Group 1 with Experimental Group 2, it was found:

1. The groups did not differ significantly on the Criticized scale before treatment.
2. After one treatment, the mean self-ratings for both groups were identical.
3. After Experimental Group 2's second treatment, the means for the Criticized scale had increased significantly.
4. These same means showed increases again after six days and again after six weeks.
5. There was no difference between the two groups on the Related scale at any point.
6. On the Unrelated scale, they differed significantly only at the end of six weeks. (Experimental Group 2 had a high mean.)

It was concluded that self-ratings are subject to dosage; that greater amounts of approval produces greater and more durable changes in self-ratings.

Finally, Maehr, Mensing, and Natzer (1962) found that a dis-
approving reaction from significant others results in a significant decrease in self-regard and a significant decrease in self-regard results in disapproving reactions from significant other. Their study, much the same as the previous one, involved 31 males ranging in age from 14 to 16 years of age. These subjects experienced four phases, all involving physical attributes:

1. A pretest phase in which students were given a self-rating test in order to obtain a measure of their self-rating on their physical attributes. Students rated themselves on three areas, one (criticized items) which corresponded directly to the evaluations made by the experts in phase three.

2. Performance of several physical tasks.

3. After which one of six experts (significant others) randomly responded with standardized statements of approval or disapproval (13 subjects received approval and 18 received disapproval.

4. A posttest phase in which the self-rating test of phase one was repeated.

It was established that those given approval increased in their ratings of self on the criticized items following the experimental treatment while the disapproval group showed a corresponding decrease. As well, results showed a spread of effect to areas of self-regard not directly praised or criticized.

SUMMARY

Literature dealing with the overall effects of schooling, and of age, on a student's self-concept was seldom encountered. That which was found, indicates that, in the area of general self-concept, (and particularly from the initial adolescent years on, one experiences) an enhancement of feelings of self as one grows older. However some evidence shows that from a person's first years in school until ado-
lescence these feelings become less positive.

Review of relevant literature was in the area of self-concept and its relationship to achievement and interactions with others. This was particularly in the academic setting, but outside as well and basically indicated:

(a) Positive self-concept is closely related to achievement or enhancement of performance, while negative self-concept is related to poor performance or underachievement.

(b) Experiencing achievement or improved performance is closely related to the enhancement of self-concept, while experiencing underachievement or poor performance has a positive relationship with negative feelings of self.

(c) Self-concept influences how a person reacts to and treats others. The poorer one's feelings of self, the more negative are his reactions to, and treatment of, others. The opposite is also true.

(d) The reaction and treatment one receives from others will influence his self-concept. The more negative this behaviour of others, the poorer one's feelings of self. The opposite is also true.
CHAPTER 111
THE SPECIFIC RESEARCH PROBLEM

The specific research problem investigated was to determine the effect of years in school—known in Southern Ontario—on student self-concept. Much of the rationale for this rests on the reason, expressed in the introduction, for concern over self-concept in general and in the academic setting. More specific, is the consideration of the increasing dangers to self-concept that exist in North American school systems. Right from the time the child first enters school and is grouped with subtle, but descriptive, labels such as steerboats, rowboats, and barges, till he reaches university where he experiences the ultimate in educational impersonality, he must fight off the numerous attacks to his self-esteem.

As has been previously proposed, the school environment has significant effects on one's self-concept for a number of reasons. One is simply the great amount of time spent in school and with school related activities. Another is the assumption that a person faces more success-failure situations in this setting, than anywhere else. Furthermore, as Darrow (1967) feels, the teacher is basic in the acquisition of an adequate student self-concept (i.e. significant other). This applies particularly to academic perceptions, but also to a great extent to all other aspects of self.

Granted, even at the very onset of a child's education, his self-concept is very real and affects performance in class even though the classroom situation has had little chance to influence student feelings of self. Turkey (1970) states that:

"It is evident that children come to school with all sorts of ideas about themselves and their abilities. They have formed notions of their value as human beings and of their ability to cope successfully with their environment. Like an invisible price tag, the child's self-image is with him wherever he goes, influencing whatever he does. For some children, the tag reads 'Damaged goods'. For others it may read 'A fine value', or 'An excellent buy', or even 'Top value, one of a kind'. Unfor-
tunately many read 'Soiled, marked down' or 'Close out, half price'. Each of these tags is a social product given to children by the significant people in their lives. Some children enter school with the feeling that they are helpless, unable to cope. Others enter already carefully calibrated...and they respond carefully to classroom instruction. For still other children, the opposite is true for they have never been encouraged to be careful, accurate, neat, or even honest." (Page 37)

However, once a child is in school his self-concept can be drastically altered one way or the other; it is neither global nor fixed! It is thus a definite responsibility of all those concerned to have some understanding of how schooling in general can alter self-concept and how self-concept varies from grade to grade. The implications of a study into such an effect, reach all levels of education-administration and particularly teaching. Teachers are dealing with students whose self-concepts have been influenced, altered, and established by other teachers. The latter are, in more cases than not, under the same board and system, and thus possibly follow similar classroom policies.

Finally, enough research into the overall effect of schooling on self-concept has not yet been done. Most studies deal with the specific effect that self-concept has on immediate achievement and performance, and vice versa, and the relationship between self-concept and interactions with others.

The study here has thus been based on the effects of years in school on student self-concept. Generally, this researcher's experience in education has given rise to the belief that the longer a child spends in school the less positive his feelings of self. It appears that there are more factors acting to decrease student self-concept—particularly academic, but general as well—than there are acting to enhance it. Relevant literature gives some backing to this assumption in that it points out the many critical areas in the school that have a bearing on self-concept. Consequently the following hypotheses were made:
(a) There is a decrease in student academic self-concept with increase in Grade level.

(b) There is a decrease in student academic self-concept with increase in age.

(c) There is a decrease in student general self-concept with increase in Grade level.

(d) There is a decrease in student general self-concept with increase in age.
CHAPTER IV
METHODOLOGY

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Academic Self-Concept is an individual's perception of his academic skills and abilities as measured by the academic dimension of the Self-Appraisal Inventories and the Inferential Self-Reports. In other words, his perception of his ability to handle scholastic tasks.

Decrease in Self-Concept occurs when there exists a drop in mean scores on the Self-Appraisal Inventories and the Inferential Self-Reports.

General Self-Concept is an individual's perception of overall social, emotional, and physical self as measured by the general dimension of the Self-Appraisal Inventories. It is basically the same as self-concept except that it does not refer to how one sees himself in relation to scholastic endeavours.

Grade refers to one of the years of academic development found in the Grade levels. Grades are distinguished from one another by numerals assigned consecutively from 1 to 13, each representing the corresponding successful academic year.

Grade Level refers to a division of the school system encompassing no less than 3 different consecutive years of successful academic development. The system is divided into the Primary level, years 1 to 3; Intermediate level, years 4 to 8; and Secondary level, years 9 to 13.

Increase in Self-Concept occurs when there is a rise in mean scores on the Self-Appraisal Inventories and the Inferential Self-Reports.

Negative Self-Concept is a self-concept that decreases one's feeling of self-esteem.

Overall Self-Concept is synonymous to self-concept. More specifically, when used in the "Conclusions and Recommendations" section, the term refers to the combination of academic and general self-concept as
measured by the Self-Appraisal Inventories and the Inferential Self-Reports. Perceptions, or Feelings, of Self-is synonymous to self-concept. Positive Self-Concept—self-concept that enhances one's feeling of self-esteem. Self-Concept—is an individual's perception of and attitudes towards, all aspects and areas of himself. Unless otherwise specified (e.g., academic self-concept) this term will always be used to indicate overall feelings towards one's self; all self-concepts. Self-Esteem—is an individual's feelings of overall worth. It is the overall product of all self-concepts. However, it is not used to refer to overall self-concept scores as measured by the Self-Appraisal Inventories and the Inferential Self-Reports. Significant Level—is the level of difference below which results are attributed to chance. The level of significance is .05. Trend or Tendency—these terms are used to indicate differences or changes that are not significant as determined by rank order correlations and t-tests.

THE INSTRUMENT

Six different inventories were administered to elementary and high school students in the county of Wentworth. The pupils were divided into three groups according to grade level and because of instrumental design; Primary, for those in kindergarten through to Grade 3, Intermediate, for those in Grades 4 to 8, and Secondary for those in Grades 9 to 13. Inventories were given by each individual classroom teacher, to only one heterogeneous class per grade as chosen by the principal of each school involved. The exceptions were grades 7 and 8 where inventories were administered by this researcher, in his school and to heterogeneous classes of his choice. Students in each group, except those in the Primary division, received two tests:
one containing items measuring both general and academic self-concept and the other measuring only academic self-concept. The former is a direct self-report which solicits the learner's opinions in a straightforward question-answer fashion. The latter is an inferential self-report; its chief purpose is camouflaged. With this measure inferences regarding a person's attitudes and interests are made from an individual's responses to more oblique test items. It is then more difficult to fake answers on this inventory than on the direct self-report.

In some cases classes above the Primary level—Primary students received only the direct self-inventory—which completed the one test also completed the other. In other instances, one class at a particular grade completed one of the tests while a different class at the same grade was given the other test.

Accompanying each inventory, and presented prior to the items (questions or statements), are directions and one example. Teachers doing the administration were instructed to read these to their class and to give further explanations where necessary. Items were then read by the individual students, unless circumstances caused otherwise, as in the case of very poor readers. The only full time exception to this was in the case of the Primary inventory, where all items were read aloud by the teacher while the students recorded their answers. In all cases the perceived and real anonymity of the respondent was increased by requesting that names not be used. Only age, sex, and grade were recorded.

These measures were developed and designed, for group assessment purposes, by the Instructional Objectives Exchange* (IOX) and presented.*

* IOX was established in 1963 by the UCLA centre for the study of Evaluation and works out of Los Angeles California. It was set up to:
  1. Serve as a clearinghouse through which the nation's schools can exchange instructional objectives.
  2. Collect and develop measuring techniques suitable for assessing the attainment of the objectives available through the exchange.
  3. Develop properly formulated instructional objectives in important areas where none currently exist.
in "Measures of Self-Concept K=12" (1972). The following is a detailed description of each measure and the scoring methods used. The actual inventories, accompanying teacher and student directions, and answer sheets are presented in Appendix A. In the case of the direct self-reports, certain items were omitted because they pertained directly to peer groups and family aspects of self-concept, considered irrelevant to the specific study. Otherwise, the measures were identical to those devised by IOX.

THE PRIMARY SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY

This inventory consists of 18 questions read aloud by the teacher and responses are made by putting an "X" through "yes or no" on the response sheets. The direct self-report attempts to obtain a child's responses to questions which pertain to two aspects of the self-concept. The one dimension reflects a general global estimate of self-esteem, while the other measures self-concept in the scholastic arena.

Items which represent each subscale are as follows:

General: Questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15,

Scholastic: Questions 1, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18.

Teachers administering the test are instructed to give students practice activities and suggestions are included in the section for teacher directions. Answer sheets are constructed so there are two methods of identifying the response boxes provided. Each box is numbered and, as well, contains a picture (e.g. star, cat, etc.) in its upper left corner. This is to allow for children who are unable to read numerals.

The test assumes that students will evidence a positive self-concept by: indicating agreement with questions that reflect positive perceptions of the self in relation to scholastic achievement, and about the self in general; and by indicating disagreement with questions that reflect negative perceptions of self in these areas.
Thus, scores were simply obtained by counting one point for each response indicating a positive view of self (Table 1, Appendix A).

INTERMEDIATE INVENTORIES
Self-Appraisal Inventory

This inventory is much the same as the Primary one, with 39 items to which students respond by simply circling "True" or "Untrue" in answer to statements made. Items which represent the general and scholastic subscales are as follows:

General: Questions 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 39.

Scholastic: Questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 38.

The rationale for this inventory is exactly the same as that for the Primary. Table 2, Appendix A, gives the response to each statement which indicates positive self-concept. Scores are established by totalling the number of these responses chosen.

How About You

This inventory consists of 9 items, each with three alternatives that describe a person in relation to school and school work. The respondent is asked to imagine he is writing an essay about himself and to select one of the descriptions numbered, A, B, and C, which best describes him. The items present school situations and the alternatives reflect a continuum of success/failure behaviour or perception of self.

The assumption is that the individual with a positive self-concept will see himself as successful in scholastic endeavors or as a person with the ability to perform with some ease. Thus, he will select positive responses to situations involving perception of self in the following areas: ability to get good grades, ease in learning something new, actual performance of a role or job, ease in performance of
jobs, and how others perceive him.

The alternatives to each item are of three kinds: one reflecting a negative perception of self, one reflecting neither a positive nor a negative image, and one reflecting a positive perception of self. All are assigned points ranging from 1 to 3 respectively, so that individual scores are the total of the points assigned to the alternatives they choose. Table 3, Appendix A, shows the allocation of these points for each item.

SECONDARY INVENTORIES
Self-Appraisal Inventory

Design of the secondary self-appraisal scale is very similar to the others. The inventory contains 29 statements which are to be responded to by students circling one of A, B, C, or D, to indicate strong agreement, agreement, disagreement, or strong disagreement respectively.

Items which represent the general and scholastic subscales are as follows:

General: Statements 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29,
Scholastic: Statements 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27.

The rationale for the study is based on the same assumptions as the Primary and Intermediate Self-Appraisal Inventories. Scores were obtained by assigning points, 4, 3, 2, or 1, to each response as indicated in Table 4, Appendix A. Responses receiving 4 points were those indicating the strongest—strongly agree or strongly disagree—favourable perception of self, while those receiving 1 point were those indicating the weakest perception of self.

FOR ALL I KNOW

This inventory consists of ten hypothetical situations which describe background for achievement in school, scholastic integrity, confidence in school work, scholastic initiative, etc. The person
completing the inventory is asked to choose one of the four alternatives-numbered A, B, C, and D,—that is most like what he would think or do. The alternatives present two positive behaviours and two negative behaviours in respect to these areas.

The rationale for this devise is the assumption that a person with a positive self-concept will perceive himself as successful and confident in scholastic endeavours, and thus positive alternatives will be selected.

Scoring is based upon one point for each positive response. Subjects circle only one alternative so that a total of 10 points is the maximum score possible. Table 5, Appendix A shows those responses allotted a point; the positive responses.

SUMMARY

Two self-concept inventories, designed by the Instructional Objectives Exchange, were administered to one class per grade in the Intermediate and Secondary grade levels. One test was the Self-Appraisal Inventory, measuring both academic and general self-concept, while the other was the Direct Self-Report, measuring only academic self-concept. One class per grade in the Primary level received the Self-Appraisal Inventory only. Self-concept scores were attained by totalling points assigned to responses to questions or statements. Responses showing the most favourable perceptions of self received the greatest number of points.
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Self-concept inventories were administered during the month of October and all results were calculated and tabulated by hand. For ease of understanding and tabulation, results were categorized under the following dimensions or subscales:

(a) The General Dimension—that part of the Self-Appraisal Inventory measuring general feelings of self.

(b) The Academic Dimension—that part of the Self-Appraisal Inventory measuring academic self-concept plus the Inferential report in its entirety.

Three hundred and forty-four students, Grades 1 to 13 and ages 5 to 21, yielded scores for the General Dimension while five hundred and eighty-eight students, Grade 1 to 13 and ages 5 to 21 yielded scores for the Academic Dimension. All Inferential Inventories from the Grade 13 class were missing age and sex information, thus yielding only grade and grade level scores. Furthermore, even though all other subjects in all other cases indicated their sex, it was decided that results would not be arrived at or analysed according to gender. The scope of this study—relative to the hypotheses and time expended—did not require nor necessitate this. The first step in dealing with the results was to mark all inventories and convert individual total scores to percents. This was necessitated by the fact that, although all scales have similarities, there are differences particularly in the content of the questions or statements, among the three grade levels. Mean percents for each dimension were then calculated according to grade, grade level, age, and age interval. Finally, "t" test scores ("t") and Spearman's rank order correlation coefficients ("p") were computed. The actual calculations for the "p's" are presented in appendix A pages 26A to 31A.
ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

All results were analysed using a .05 level of significance and with reference to the critical scores presented in Table 1 and Table 2, for "t's" and "p's" respectively. Scores are presented and analysed here according to the hypotheses to which they relate.

The first hypotheses stated was that student academic self-concept decreases with the increase in grade level. Results do not support this statement and tend to indicate that the opposite may be true. A look at Table 3 shows an increase in mean percents for the Academic Dimension, with a large jump from 53.2 in the Primary level to 65.2 in the Secondary level. However, rank order coefficients (Table 4) can not properly be dealt with due to the extremely low number of scores being considered. Interestingly, though, is the perfect negative correlation ("p"= -1) which indicates a relationship between academic scores and grade level, which is the exact opposite of what was expected.

Mean percents for the Academic Dimension for individual grades are presented in Table 5 and do not evidence a consistent increase as the grades get higher. When reference was made to the critical scores in Table 2 the "p" of -.43 (Table 4) proved insignificant and indicates a possible tendency toward a general decrease in means. The computation of "t" scores, presented in Table 6, yields five significant isolated changes. These are presented in Table 7 under increases (negative "t" scores) and decreases, (positive "t" scores) revealing significant increases in mean percents from the last grade of one level to the first of the next. Significant decreases of 5.3 and 9.4 occur from Grades 6 to 7 and 11 to 12 respectively. A look at Table 5 shows an insignificant decrease of 3.2 from Grades 2 to 3 adding to this tendency of decreasing means toward the latter part of each level.

The hypotheses that a student's general self-concept also de-
CRITICAL VALUES OF "t" AT THE .05 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ONE-TAILED TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>6.314</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1.717</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1.679</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1.662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6957</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.6944</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.6931</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.6818</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.6905</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.753</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.6892</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.6879</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.6866</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.6853</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.680</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1**
Critical Values of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficients ("r")
At the .05 Level of Significance for One-Tailed Test

n
3  can't be dealt with statistically
13  .431
17  .412

TABLE 2

Grade Level Mean Percents For
The Academic and General Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Academic Dimensions</th>
<th>General Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank Order Correlation Coefficients for Mean Percents for Grade Level, Grade, Age Interval, and Age for the Academic and General Dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Rank Order Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>+.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Interval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>+.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>+.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4

Grade Mean Percents For The Academic and General Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Academic Dimension</th>
<th>General Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
Grade Mean Percent "t" Scores for the Academic and General Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Academic Dimension</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>General Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-3.745</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.135</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-1.101</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.992</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-.580</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-1.868</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6

Significant Changes in Mean Percents for Consecutive Grades for the Academic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Significant Increase</th>
<th>Significant Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7
creases with the increase in grade level cannot find support. It is interesting to note, though, that the occurrences of decreases in mean percents, outweighs the number of decreases. Table 3 reveals decreasing mean percents of 75.1, 71.0, and 70.1 for the General Dimension for the Primary, Intermediate, and Secondary levels respectively and, although a "p" of +1 was calculated (Table 4), significance is not computable. Again this is due to the fact that 3 cases is too few. Consideration of individual grade means, Table 5, shows no consistent decrease or increase. Nonetheless, a "p" of .56 was arrived at and proves to be significant (Table 2). The "t" scores, given in Table 6, when checked with Table 1, reveal no significant isolated changes at all. However, it is interesting to note that there occur decreases of 4.7 and 1.5 from Grades 3 to 4 and 8 to 9. This is the opposite of what occurred with the Academic Dimension. On the other hand, and similar to this latter dimension, decreases take place toward the latter part of the Primary level and the Intermediate level. These changes are 3 for Grades 2 to 3 and 5 for Grades 6 to 7. The change in means from Grade 11 to 12 is an increase of 3.4, and an increase of 1.7 takes place from Grade 12 to 13. Compared to changes for the same consecutive grades for the Academic Dimension, both are of much less magnitude.

A third hypothesis, that student academic self-concept decreases with increase in age, also fails to gain support from results. Means appear to take the opposite route and generally increase with increase in age. Consideration of Academic mean percents for the age intervals 5 to 9, 10 to 14, and 15 to 21 (Table 8) shows an overall increase which is not consistent from interval to interval. Worthy of note, however, is the fact that the changes that occur are very large. The mean percent increases 9.4 from interval 5-9 to interval 10-14 and decreases 6.3 from interval 10-14 to interval 15-21. A "p" of -.5
Mean Percents for Three Consecutive Age Intervals for the Academic and General Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Interval</th>
<th>Academic Dimension</th>
<th>General Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8

Age Mean Percents for the Academic and General Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Academic Dimension</th>
<th>General Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
(Table 4) was computed for the three intervals but can not be dealt
with statistically. The "p" of -.29 for individual ages can be dealt
with but proves to be insignificant. The "t" scores arrived at for
individual age mean percents (Table 9) are presented in Table 10 and
reveal only a few significant isolated changes (Table 11). These are
increases of 6.3 and 8.7 from ages 10 to 11 and, 15 to 16 respectively
and decreases of 6.1 and 13.4 for ages 13 to 14 and 14 to 15 respec-
tively. Some rather large, yet insignificant, increases do occur
and should be acknowledged. These are 8.1, 9, and 14.3 from ages 5
to 6, 18 to 19, and 20 to 21 respectively.

The final hypotheses drawn by this researcher was that general
self-concept would decrease with increase in age. Again mean percents
do not lend support, although they evidence a slight overall decrease
with age. An overall slight decrease is seen when mean percents for
the General Dimension for the age intervals 5-9, 10-14, and 15-21 are
considered (Table 8). The "p" computed (Table 4) for these intervals
is +.5, however, because of the few scores dealt with, significance
can not be determined. On the other hand, the "p" for individual ages
for the General Dimension is insignificant at +.17. Only one isolated
significant change, for individual age mean percents (Table 9), occurs,
as evidenced by "t" scores in Table 10. This is a decrease of 11 from
age 11 to age 12 (Table 11). As in the case of Academic Dimension,
there are some notable but insignificant changes. These are an in-
crease of 11.1 from age 5 to 6, and decreases of 7.2 and 7.5 from age
7 to 8 and 19 to 20.

DISCUSSION

Analysis of results for grade levels, individual grades, age
intervals, and individual ages, indicates a tendency toward an overall
decrease in mean percents for the General Dimension and an overall in-
crease in mean percents for the Academic Dimension. However, only in
Age Mean Percent "t" Scores for the Academic and General Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Academic Dimension</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>General Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-1.002</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-1.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-2.733</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-1.139</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1.745</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10

Significant Changes in Mean Percents for Consecutive Ages for the Academic and General Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Significant Increases</th>
<th>Significant Decreases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Dimension</td>
<td>General Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11
the case of individual grade mean percents for the General Dimension are the results significant.

Ignoring the teacher-student relationship, which is particularly individual, and keeping in mind that self-concepts may generalize from area to area, the following assumptions are offered as some explanation for a few of the results:

1. There is an increase in academic means with age and Grade level because the student, in spite of himself, has increased in knowledge as well as skills. In comparison with previous years—not comparison with others or immediate accomplishments—he sees himself as having achieved. As well, the trend in the last few years has been to increase opportunities for success, or at least feelings of success, through different course offerings and appropriate grading systems.

2. There is a decrease in general means with age and Grade level because the older one gets the greater the pressures to act maturely and perform well socially. This pressure comes from society in general, and specifically parents, peers, and teachers. To a great extent younger children are expected to be awkward and restless and act with spontaneity and abandon-

ment. But, as the child grows older and passes from grade to grade, such behaviour becomes more and more frowned on. Once in high school, in particular, this is the case. As well, parents and teachers, are "pushing" the child toward adulthood, so that much inconsistency exists between what is expected of him and how he feels. This all works—through pressures, criticisms and the like—to diminish the child's feelings of social, emotional, and physical worth.

3. There are increases in means from Grades 3 to 4, and 8 to 9, because the students have successfully made it to the next
grade level—and in the case of this study a new school and
generally an older group of students, all of which the stu-
dents are well aware of—and thus feel more positive and
optimistic about their academic abilities. Similarly these
feelings of self increase in Grade 13, both academically and
in general, because the student has managed to attain the
highest grade possible, and is socially in the most prominent
group. To him this says something about his abilities.
Furthermore, in all three of these instances, because advance-
ment of some kind has been made, significant people in their
lives (teacher, friends, parents) have been giving them more
positive recognition or rewards. In other words, the student
is getting acclaim for his achievements.

4. There is a decrease in means in Grades 3 and 7, because
graduation to another level is still a year and a half away
which to them is not very close. In addition the student has
become less motivated through similarity with the majority
of work in his level and with the social aspects. What he
lacks is challenges such as those he faces at the beginning
of new grade levels. (i.e. Grades 4 and 9). Similarly this
explanation can be used to explain the decrease in the latter
parts of many Grade levels.

5. There are increases in means from age 5 to 6 because the stu-
dent's concept is rather low at age 5. This is his first
year-Grade 1—in a regular classroom setting and he is unsure
of himself socially and emotionally. As well, he is faced
with learning of many new skills: printing, reading, etc.
By Grade 2, when he is approximately 6, he has gained in his
confidence and has made significant academic gains.

6. There are increases in means from ages 18 to 19 because the
student is now well established in the age of majority group (in Ontario, the voting and drinking age is 18). The year of extra privileges and responsibilities he has experienced has increased his feelings of self: he feels of more worth and has gained in confidence. Such perceptions generalize to the academic setting.

When considering the results of this study, one must bear in mind five important factors that could influence results:

1. Subjects were students within the same board and area. Students in other boards and areas might experience somewhat different teaching atmospheres and techniques. The assumption here is that these factors influence their self-concepts.

2. There was no control for the exactness of administration of the inventories for they were done in individual classrooms far from the watchful eye of this researcher. Again, there is a basic assumption; and that is that the administrator can influence student response via what he says or does. If the administrator is an influential person, such as a teacher, this is more so. It thus would have likely been better to have had a stranger present the inventories. But this was not possible.

3. There is no way to control an individual's recent experiences. The supposition is that these are important for they may distort a person's response. For example, a student's recent high mark on a test may create a more than usual confident and positive attitude, which is reflected in self-concept scores.

4. People tend to respond so as to place themselves in a more favourable light. No matter what precautions are taken in formulating test items, one can never completely eliminate
such a variable.

5. There were a number of students who were repeating, or on a transfer (are conditionally in their grade and liable for demotion to the previous grade if their work is not satisfactory), and there was no allowance made for those who had dropped out of school entirely. For the schools in which the elementary grades were tested, those students in class as repeaters or transfers ranged from 5 to 8 percent. According to the principals there were no dropouts. In the case of the high school tested the drop-out rate was 7.7%. The transferring of students in this school is not practised and students fail only individual subjects. Similarly Grade 13 is a special case because of the fact that Grade 12 is a graduating year as well. Those students in thirteen were those most likely with the highest academic abilities and feelings of academic self-concept.

SUMMARY

Results were presented and analysed on the basis of the Academic and General Dimensions as found in the inventories administered. This was done for three grade levels, individual grades, three age intervals, and individual ages. In each of these cases mean percents were calculated and generally yielded decreases for the General Dimension and increases for the Academic Dimension. Spearman's Correlation Coefficients ("ρ") were established for the four areas of analysis for both dimensions. Coefficients revealed significance only for the expectation of decrease for the General Dimension when analysed on the basis of individual grades. For individual grades and ages "t" tests were carried out to determine more specific significant changes. Under the Academic Dimension, "t" scores showed significant increases in mean percent from the last grade of one grade level to the first
grade of the next. No similar significant pattern was revealed for the General Dimension; however, "t" scores yielded notable significant changes in mean percents between ages 13 and 16.

A number of assumptions were made as explanation for many of the results. Most were based in some way on the fact that the students had or had not experienced some form of success or achievement. Factors that were not accounted for, and thus put limitations on the study, were the fact that students were from the same board, there was no control for the exactness of administration of the inventories, there was no control for an individual's recent experience, people tend to respond in such a way as to put themselves in a more favourable light, a number of students were repeaters and transfers and there was no allowance made for those who had dropped out of school entirely.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study, then, does not support the assumptions that student academic and general self-concept decrease with the increase in grade level and age. It is interesting to note that, although next to no relevant significant changes occurred, analysis of mean scores revealed overall increases for academic self-concept and overall decreases for general self-concept. Nonetheless, so specific conclusions can be made according to those of significance and mention can be made of certain possible trends or tendencies. Significant conclusions have been drawn because they gained significant support from "t" scores. The mention of tendencies have been based on noticeable changes in the same direction in more than one instance. They have been noted because of their implications on future studies about student self-concept.

SIGNIFICANT CONCLUSIONS

It can be concluded that there is:

1. An increase in academic self-concept from Grades 3 to 4, 8 to 9, and 12 to 13.
2. A decrease in academic self-concept from Grades 6 to 7, and 11 to 12.
3. An increase in academic self-concept from ages 10 to 11 and 15 to 16.
4. A decrease in academic self-concept from ages 13 to 14 and 14 to 15.
5. A decrease in general self-concept from ages 11 to 12.

TENDENCY CONCLUSIONS

It can be concluded that there is a trend towards:

1. A decrease in general self-concept from the Primary Grade level to the Secondary Grade level.
2. An increase in academic self-concept from the Primary grade level to the Secondary grade level.

3. A decrease in general and academic self-concept toward the latter part of each grade level.

4. An increase in academic self-concept from age 5 to 10.

5. A decrease in academic self-concept from age 10 to 21.

6. An increase in academic self-concept from ages 5 to 6, 18 to 19, and 20 to 21.

7. An increase in general self-concept from ages 5 to 6, 10 to 11, and 16 to 17.

8. A decrease in academic self-concept from ages 6 to 7 and 17 to 18.

9. A decrease in general self-concept from ages 7 to 8, 17 to 18, and 19 to 20.

Space for indicating sex—male or female—was provided on all inventories and was included with the possibility of analysing results along this line. However, the scope of this study, as has been previously stated, did not permit such a task and it is one that requires future consideration. It is more crucial that added research following the same purpose as this study be done with a more controlled sample and extensive tests of significance. As well, the use of different instruments is recommended. Other future areas of study would be those attempting to answer the "whys" of what may be found. Why does general self-concept decrease with age and grade level, while academic self-concept increases with age and grade level? It may, for instance, have nothing to do with schooling, but simply be a result of the maturational process, or maybe even child-rearing practices.

The significant findings of this researcher have been very few. However, those that have been noted combined with the trends pointed out have implications in the thoughts and ideas they may instigate in
the area of curriculum and environmental change. It is not a question of whether teachers should strive to enhance self-concept or not, but whether teaching techniques are having a long term positive or negative effect on the student's feelings about self and how they can ensure enhancement of self-concept. Hamacheck (1963) makes a number of general suggestions for teachers along this latter line:

1. Understand that we teach what we are, not just what we say. We teach our own self-concepts far more often than we teach our subject matter.

2. Understand that anything we do or say could significantly change a student's attitude about himself for better or for worse. Further, we must understand the implications to students if we are to utilize that role properly.

3. Understand that students, like us, behave in terms of what seems to be true, which means that many times learning goes on, not according to what the facts are, but according to how they are perceived.

4. Be willing not just to teach subject matter, but to deal with what the subject matter means to different students. In the truest sense of the word, we must be willing to deal with the information about it.

5. Understand that we are not likely to get results simply by telling someone he is worthy. Rather, we imply it through trust and the establishment of an atmosphere of mutual respect. One good way to start is to take time to listen to what the students have to say and to use their ideas when possible.

6. Understand that teacher behaviour which is distant, cold, and rejecting is far less likely to enhance self-concept, motivation, and learning than behaviour which is warm, accepting, and discriminating.

Purkey (1970) outlines a number of teaching aspects that require further teacher attention if student self-concepts are to be enhanced. First of all, teachers must present their students with a high degree of challenge he says. But, in so doing, they must convey their confidence and trust in the pupils and the learning must be relevant to their world of experience.

Secondly, an atmosphere of freedom must prevail in the classroom so that students are allowed to choose and to make decisions. For this type of freedom it is necessary that mistakes be an accepted part of daily learning and threat be in obvious absence. Such factors greatly increase the student's faith in his own judgments and thoughts.
Feeling for the worth and dignity of students is the third prerequisite put forth by Purkey. A teacher's genuine expressed respect for his students is extremely important in building their self-concepts. He says that:

"No aspect of education is more important than the feeling on the part of the teacher that the student is important, valuable, and can learn in school." (page 52)

The warmth—consideration, understanding, friendliness, and tolerance for some release of emotional feelings—expressed by a teacher is also considered to be a factor in developing positive student self-concepts. An important part of this warmth is a commitment, on the part of the teacher, to the task of making each student feel he belongs, and of showing his teacher cares what happens to him. It is an atmosphere in which praise is used over punishment, courtesy over sarcasm, and consultation in preference to dictation.

The fifth suggestion for teachers is that they maintain fair but firm control over their students. Not control via ridicule, embarrassment, and fear, but through preparation for class, consistency, politeness, awareness, and clear communications with students. Purkey does not say that punishment is a completely avoidable part of the control process, although he does suggest it often is. What he does stress is the fact that the type of punitive action taken, when it is necessary, be carefully considered. For example, withdrawal of privileges is recommended over such poor control procedures as punishing an entire class, using corporal punishment, and using school work as punishment.

Finally—what Purkey states as possibly the single most important consideration—teachers must provide an atmosphere of success rather than failure.

Because success-failure experiences, or feelings of achievement, are so detrimental to self-concept, this researcher strongly recommends the development of teaching techniques based upon stressing improvement
consistently and in all aspects of classroom experience. This means emphasizing the students' positive aspects and behaviour while playing down mistakes and comparisons with others. Such would presumably enhance student general, as well as academic, self-concept and increase performance.

Although this section is not a review of literature, because of the importance this researcher places on this recommendation, the following supporting evidence and opinions are presented. Sidney B. Simon (1970) and Siegfried Engelmann (1970) both support such an approach. In his book "Preventing Failure in the Primary Grades", Engelmann states his position on situations in which a student is not learning. The teacher, he says, should not show displeasure or give the child the idea he has done something wrong unless there is lack of effort and/or attention. The teacher should remind the child to keep trying and eventually he will learn. He further states that tasks should be so arranged as to allow the child to succeed.

Gergen (1971) refers to Leon Festinger's (1954) "Theory of Social Comparison Process" as support for the fact that experiences have a negative and detrimental effect upon self-concept. He also conducted a study to show the effects of comparison on the self-conception of University students. He was able to conclude that one's level of self-regard may be vitally affected by the social surroundings in which he finds himself. Specifically, it was found that persons with high inconsistency in their self-view were more susceptible to the effects of social comparisons and that comparison with others, supposedly intellectually and socially superior, lowers one's self-esteem. Similarly, comparison with others inferior enhances one's self-esteem. Students, for example, in lower ranking positions—such as those in an academically orientated high school who would be more suited to a trade orientated school—often suffer irreparable damage to their self-esteem.
By avoiding situations in which comparisons are made, and by giving the student solid sincere factual appraisal, the teacher can contribute toward positive healthy student self-concept.

Gergen further states that appraisals made by the teacher should always stress the positive aspects of the student. Besides promoting a positive self-concept, studies being positive in evaluative connotation are learned more rapidly and less quickly forgotten than those of a negative nature. As well, people tend to be attracted more to those who evaluate them positively than to those who evaluate them negatively. The implications of such for the teaching situation should be obvious. Jones, Gergen, and Davis (1962) found support for this in an experiment with university students. A group of undergraduate students were interviewed by advanced graduate students. Half were then told that their interviewer had a very positive opinion of them, while the remaining were informed that their interviewer disapproved of many of their personal characteristics. Subjects then evaluated their interviewer on a number of dimensions. Undergraduates receiving positive appraisal were overwhelmingly more positive in their evaluations of the interviewer.

Similarly, students' reactions to their teachers will often depend on their own self-concept. Support for this comes from Deutsch and Solomon (1959) and is reported on by Gergen (1971). In this study subjects worked together in groups to complete a task. At a specific point during the task, half the subjects were told that they were one of the outstanding contributors, while half were told they were the poorest performers in the group. Although they were privately appraised, subjects were led to believe that the others in their group knew of the rating. The purpose of these procedures was to produce one group of subjects with feelings of diminished self-esteem. Following this, each subject received a written evaluation from a team member
who actually was an experimental collaborate. Half the subjects re-
ceived a positive appraisal in that the fictitious member praised them
and expressed his satisfaction at having them on the team. The remain-
ing subjects received negative appraisal when the member criticized
them and told them he did not want them to continue on the team. The
major purpose of the experiment was to discover how attraction was
affected by acceptance or rejection in states of high and low esteem.

Subjects in the group containing those with enhanced self-esteem,
reacted much more favourably to the person who gave them positive
appraisal than to the critic. Furthermore, those who were in the low
self-esteem group were attracted more to the critic than to the admirer.
Gergen feels that a central and probable reason for this latter result
is the fact that when subjects have failed and are praised the apprai-
sor has been grossly inaccurate. On the other hand, when those sub-
jects with the same feelings of self have been criticized the appraiser
has been accurate.

Finally, Robert F. Mager (1968) says that emphasis on improvement
stresses the fact that when the student is in a learning situation,
he should be in the presence of positive conditions. In other words,
in any subject area, the learning or experiences that take place should
be pleasant and carried out in a pleasant atmosphere. With emphasis on
improvement, the teacher is contributing to the positive conditions
that surround learning and decreasing aversive ones.

Teaching models emphasizing improvement must be encouraged! In
all classrooms and learning environments it should be evidently clear
that this is the key. For example, such things as displays of student
work-on bulletin boards or wherever-must continually contain the work
of students who have improved in some way, not just those who have
maintained an overall standard of excellence. As well, the teacher's
verbal interactions and responses (e.g. subtle reactions such as tone
of voice and facial expressions), must reinforce improvements and the
sincere efforts that are their prerequisite.

Previous to this study, this researcher developed and used a model based on these and other factors necessary for enhancing student self-concept. Presented in Appendix B, it is hoped that it will be of some value and assistance to those readers in educationally applicable positions.

SUMMARY

Few conclusions could be made from the results of this study. The hypotheses—that there is a decrease in student general and academic self-concept with increase in grade level and age—could not be supported. However, noting trends in tendencies, the value being in the implications for future studies—allowed this researcher to point out that for both age and grade level there was a tendency toward decrease in general self-concept and a tendency toward increase in academic self-concept. Future research and study was recommended:

1. To determine the direction of change, if any, in student self-concept as grade level and age increase. In this case it was recommended that more control be established over the sample and that more extensive tests of significance be applied.

2. Into the difference in self-concepts of boys and girls as their years in school increases.

3. To determine reasons for changes in feelings of self-concept.

The implications of this study lie, in particular, with individual teachers, but also with administrative personnel. There is much literature (Manachek 1963, Purkey 1970, Gergen 1971) outlining suggestions as to how teachers can ensure the enhancement of student self-concept. The development of teaching techniques based upon stressing improvement was recommended by this researcher and supported by such studies as those done by Jones, Gergen, and Davis (1962), and Deutsch and Solomon (1959).
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SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY
Primary Level

Description
This inventory consists of 18 questions to be asked of children. Children respond to each question as it is read by putting a mark through "yes" or "no" on their response sheets. It can be seen that if a child wished to answer untruthfully, in such a way that he would be viewed in a better light, it would not be too difficult to do so. Such tendencies to supply false responses can be minimized by administering the inventory in such a way that the anonymity of the respondent is both real and perceived. It has been found that children of kindergarten age and above are able to complete the entire inventory (that is, eighteen items) in approximately twenty minutes after practice activities are used as recommended. The following practice activities should be used prior to beginning the measure to ensure that the children understand the procedure for indicating their responses.

1. On the chalkboard, draw a series of response boxes similar to those on the response sheets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Do not distribute the actual response sheets until the children are ready to begin the inventory.)

2. Clearly identify the written words "yes" and "no" for the children. Have individual children identify the words; confirm the correctness of each child's response.

3. Demonstrate the proper marking of the responses (yes, no). Emphasize that only one word is to be marked in each box.
4. Have different children come to the board to answer as many of the following practice items as are deemed necessary. With the children who can already discriminate between "yes" and "no" responses, few, if any, of these practice exercises may be needed. Note that on Items C, E, and F, all children are NOT expected to answer identically. Confirm the correctness of each child's responses.

(a) Are you a child?
(b) Are you a train?
(c) Do you have a brother?
(d) Do birds fly?
(e) Do you have a sister?
(f) Do you like to sing?

To complete the inventory, each child will need the following materials:

1. Two response sheets, each of a different colour (for purposes of scoring as well as ease of administration). It may be helpful to fold each sheet in half lengthwise, printed side out, so children can see only one column at a time.

2. A crayon or pencil.

Two methods of identifying the response boxes are provided. The pictures on the left in each box may be used with children who are unable to identify the numerals. If the pictures are used, they should be identified before beginning the inventory. The pictures are: face, star, bell, cat, telephone, flower, clown, house, dog, umbrella.

When administering the instrument, the administrator should check on each item to make sure children are responding "in the box with the...." Children who are able to read numerals may prefer to use these rather than the pictures: they are located on the right of each box. The administrator should identify the correct numeral before and after each question.
Remind the children that for many questions, either answer may be correct, although only one answer will be true for a particular child. Therefore, they need not worry if another child's answer is different from their own.

Do not permit the children to verbalize their answers when responding. In some cases, administration may be easiest if conducted with a small group of students at a time rather than with the entire class at once.
SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY
Primary Level

1. Can you give a good talk in front of your class?
2. Do you wish you were younger?
3. Do you often feel that you are doing badly in school?
4. Do you like being just what you are?
5. Do you wish you were someone else?
6. Can you wait your turn easily?
7. Is it easy for you to do good in school?
8. Do you often break your promises?
9. Are the things you do at school very easy for you?
10. Are you smart?
11. Do you know a lot?
12. Can you get good grades if you want to?
13. Do you forget most of what you learn?
14. If you have something to say, do you usually say it?
15. Do you often feel ashamed of yourself?
16. Do you like the teacher to ask you questions in front of the other children?
17. Are most children able to finish their school work more quickly than you?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>COLOUR &quot;A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON THE PRIMARY SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY INDICATING POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSE INDICATING A POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1
For the Teacher

SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY
Intermediate Level

Description

This inventory consists of 39 statements to which students respond "true" or "untrue" to indicate whether each statement is true or untrue about them. The statements may be read independently by the students or orally by the teacher, depending on the students' reading abilities.

It can be seen that, if a child wished to answer untruthfully in such a way that he would be viewed in a better light, it would not be too difficult to do so. Such tendencies to supply false responses can be minimized by administering the inventory in such a way that the anonymity of the respondent is both real and perceived.

Directions for Administration

It is expected that students will be able to complete the entire inventory in approximately 20 to 30 minutes. If the administrator feels that the students' reading abilities will prohibit their completing the measure in this time period, the statements should be read orally to the students.

After distributing the booklets to the students, carefully read the directions provided with the inventory aloud. Provide ample time for students to ask questions concerning the response procedure. Emphasize that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Remind the students that they are NOT to write their names on the answer sheets.

If additional information is needed from students, for example, their class or school, be sure to have them add this information on the answer sheet.

If students ask questions regarding interpretations of the statements, emphasize that the inventory calls only for general impressions regarding each statement.
SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY
Intermediate Level

DIRECTIONS

Please show whether each statement in this booklet is true or untrue for you by circling one of the answers provided to the right of each question.

For example: 1. I like cherry pie.  TRUE  UNTRUE
2. I want to be a movie star.  TRUE  UNTRUE

There are no right or wrong answers, so respond to each statement as honestly as you can.

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME on the booklet or on the question/answer sheet.

1. School work is fairly easy for me.  TRUE  UNTRUE
2. I am satisfied to be just what I am.  TRUE  UNTRUE
3. My teachers usually like me.  TRUE  UNTRUE
4. I am a cheerful person.  TRUE  UNTRUE
5. I often feel upset in school.  TRUE  UNTRUE
6. I'm not very smart.  TRUE  UNTRUE
7. I can get good grades if I want to.  TRUE  UNTRUE
8. I can be trusted.  TRUE  UNTRUE
9. I forget most of what I learn.  TRUE  UNTRUE
10. I am easy to like.  TRUE  UNTRUE
11. I often volunteer to do things in class.  TRUE  UNTRUE
12. I'm not a very happy person.  TRUE  UNTRUE
13. I am a good student.  TRUE  UNTRUE
14. I can't seem to do things right.  TRUE  UNTRUE
15. I often get discouraged in school.  TRUE  UNTRUE
16. I wish I were younger.  TRUE  UNTRUE
17. My teacher makes me feel I am not good enough.  TRUE  UNTRUE
18. I like being the way I am.  TRUE  UNTRUE
19. I am slow in finishing my school work.  TRUE  UNTRUE
20. I am often unhappy. TRUE  UNTRUE
21. I can give a good report in front of the class. TRUE  UNTRUE
22. I am not as nice looking as most people. TRUE  UNTRUE
23. I am proud of my school work. TRUE  UNTRUE
24. If I have something to say, I usually say it. TRUE  UNTRUE
25. I am a good reader. TRUE  UNTRUE
26. I can usually figure out difficult things. TRUE  UNTRUE
27. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to. TRUE  UNTRUE
28. I have a lot of self-control. TRUE  UNTRUE
29. I find it hard to talk in front of the class. TRUE  UNTRUE
30. I often feel ashamed of myself. TRUE  UNTRUE
31. I am good in my school work. TRUE  UNTRUE
32. I am a good person. TRUE  UNTRUE
33. I don't like to be called on in class. TRUE  UNTRUE
34. I wish I were someone else. TRUE  UNTRUE
35. My classmates think I am a poor student. TRUE  UNTRUE
36. I often feel uneasy. TRUE  UNTRUE
37. I would like to drop out of school. TRUE  UNTRUE
38. I can do hard homework assignments. TRUE  UNTRUE
39. I can't be depended on. TRUE  UNTRUE

BOY   GIRL (CIRCLE ONE)

AGE       
GRADE      
RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS ON THE INTERMEDIATE SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY INDICATING POSITIVE SELF-CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSE INDICATING A POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>UNTURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
For the Teacher

HOW ABOUT YOU?
Intermediate Level

Description
This inventory consists of 9 items, each with three alternatives that describe a person in relation to school and school work. The respondent is asked to imagine he is writing an essay about himself and to select the descriptions which best describe him. The items present school situations; the alternatives reflect a continuum of success/failure behaviour or perception of the self. The rationale for this device is based on the assumption that the individual with a positive self-concept will see himself as successful in his scholastic endeavours or as a person with the ability to perform with ease.

Directions for Administration
This inventory can be administered in 5 to 10 minutes. If students question the situations or alternatives, instruct them to respond as best they can to the information at hand. In most cases, only their general reaction is necessary.
HOW ABOUT YOU?
Intermediate Level

Directions
You are writing an essay about yourself in school. Read each item carefully and choose the description which best describes you. Circle the letter you choose, as follows: A B C

1. Some people get report cards with straight A's or Outstandings. For you to get a report card like that, it would be:
   (a) hard
   (b) not so hard
   (c) easy

2. "Magandage umaga. Kumusta ka. Mabuti, salamat, at ikau?" is Filipino for "Good morning. How are you? Fine thanks and how are you?"
   How long do you think it would take you to learn this?
   (a) a long time
   (b) An average amount of time
   (c) a short time

3. You have to give a report in front of the class tomorrow. You will probable get:
   (a) a good grade
   (b) an average grade
   (c) a poor grade

4. Your class is putting on a play and your teacher wants good pupils to take the leading roles. If you had one of the leading roles, you would be:
   (a) outstanding
   (b) good
   (c) not so good
5. Next week you will start a special unit in arithmetic. There are many things you have never heard of before. It will most likely be:
   (a) hard for you to catch on
   (b) not so hard for you to catch on
   (c) easy for you to catch on

6. You can probably remember most of your teachers. Most of them probably remember you as:
   (a) a good student
   (b) an average student
   (c) a poor student

7. Your class is dividing up into 4 committees to work on separate social studies projects. If you are chosen to be your committee chairman, you would expect the job to be:
   (a) hard for you
   (b) not so hard for you
   (c) easy for you

8. Your school sometimes gives out awards to good pupils. If your principal came in to talk to your teacher, he would probably say you were:
   (a) a smart pupil
   (b) an average pupil
   (c) a below-average pupil

9. Everyone in class is doing a report on a famous person. For you to do better than most of your classmates, it would be:
   (a) hard
   (b) not so hard
   (c) easy
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GRADE
ALLOCATION OF POINTS FOR EACH ITEM OF "HOW ARE YOU"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
For the Teacher

SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY
Secondary Level

Description
This inventory contains 29 statements which are to be responded to by the students to indicate strong agreement, agreement, disagreement, or strong disagreement with each.

It can be seen that, if a student wished to answer untruthfully in such a way that he would be viewed in a better light, it would not be too difficult to do so. Such tendencies to supply false responses can be minimized by administering the inventory in such a way that the anonymity of the respondent is both real and perceived.

Directions for Administration
It is expected that students will be able to complete the entire inventory in approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

After distributing the instrument to the students, carefully read the directions provided with the inventory aloud. Provide ample time for students to ask questions concerning the response procedure.

If students ask questions regarding interpretations of the statements, emphasize that the inventory calls only for general impressions regarding each statement.

Emphasize that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Remind the students that they are NOT to write their names on the answer sheets. If additional information is needed from students, for example their class or school, be sure to have them add this information to the answer sheet.
SELF-APPRAISAL INVENTORY
Secondary Level

Directions

Please show whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by circling one of the letters provided:

A - strongly agree            C - disagree
B - agree                      D - strongly disagree

For example: I want to be a movie star.   A  B  C  D
I like chocolate cake.        A  B  C  D

There are no right or wrong answers, so respond to each statement as honestly as you can.

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME on the answer sheet. Mark whether you are a boy or girl and write your age and grade on the bottom of the last page before you begin.

1. School work is fairly easy for me.   A  B  C  D
2. I am satisfied to be just what I am.   A  B  C  D
3. Getting good grades is pretty important to me.   A  B  C  D
4. I can be trusted as much as anyone.   A  B  C  D
5. I forget most of what I learn.    A  B  C  D
6. I am often not a happy person.    A  B  C  D
7. I sometimes feel upset while I'm in school.   A  B  C  D
8. I often let other people have their way.   A  B  C  D
9. I often do things that I'm sorry for later.   A  B  C  D
10. I am not a very good student.    A  B  C  D
11. I often get discouraged in school.   A  B  C  D
12. I often wish I were younger.    A  B  C  D
13. My teacher makes me feel I am not good enough.   A  B  C  D
14. I always like being the way I am.    A  B  C  D
15. I am slow in finishing my school work.   A  B  C  D
16. I often am not as happy as I would like to be.   A  B  C  D
17. I am not as nice looking as most people. A B C D
18. I am a good reader. A B C D
19. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to. A B C D
20. I find it hard to talk in front of the class. A B C D
21. I sometimes feel ashamed of myself. A B C D
22. I am not very good in my school work. A B C D
23. I am not as good a person as I would like to be. A B C D
24. I wish I were a different person. A B C D
25. People think I am a good student. A B C D
26. I am not very sure of myself. A B C D
27. There are times when I feel like dropping out of school. A B C D
28. I can always take care of myself. A B C D
29. I can't be depended upon. A B C D
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**
For the Teacher

FOR ALL I KNOW
Secondary Level

Description
This inventory consists of 10 hypothetical situations which describe backgrounds for achievement in school, scholastic integrity, confidence in school work, and scholastic initiative, etc. The alternatives present two positive behaviours and two negative behaviours in respect to these areas.

The rational for this device is based on the assumption that a person with a positive self-concept will perceive himself as successful and confident in scholastic endeavours.

Directions for Administration
This inventory can be completed in approximately 10 to 15 minutes. If questions arise regarding the interpretation of an item, remind the students that they should respond to the general impression. It may happen that a student would not select either of the four given alternatives for a particular situation. In this case, instruct the student to select the alternative that is closest to what he might do. Emphasize that only one alternative is to be selected for each item.
FOR ALL I KNOW
Secondary Level

Directions
For each item in the test, mark an answer (A, B, C, or D) by circling one of the four descriptions which is MOST LIKE what YOU would think or do.

For example:
1. Your brother has just asked you if he may borrow your new shirt.
   You would:
   (a) loan it to him without question
   (b) ask him when he intends to return the shirt
   (c) suggest that he borrow one from a friend
   (d) refuse to loan the shirt
   If description "B" is most like what you would do, you should mark the answer as follows: A B C D
   There are no right or wrong answers, so respond to each item as honestly as you can. Do not write your name on your sheet.

1. You have been given a class quiz. The instructions for one part of the quiz are not clear to you, although the other students have already begun the test. You would probably:
   (a) Call the teacher over to your desk and ask for help
   (b) Begin to take the test as well as you could
   (c) Ask the person sitting in front of you for help
   (d) Complete all parts of the test except the one that is unclear to you
   A B C D

2. Your teacher has handed back an essay test on which you have received a poor grade. After looking the test over, you feel that some errors were made in the scoring of your test. You would probably:
(a) Wait until the end of the semester to see if the teacher finds the mistake.
(b) Go to see the teacher as soon as possible to discuss the test
(c) Read your test again because the teacher probably didn't make an error
(d) Leave your teacher a note after class asking her to take another look at your test

A B C D

3. One of your teachers has assigned an extra credit project. Students are NOT required to complete the assignment, but they may wish to increase their grade in the course by doing the project. So far, your grade is above average, so you would probably:
(a) Complete the project anyway
(b) Choose an interesting project since you don't have to worry about your grade
(c) Decide not to do the project
(d) Wait to find out how many of the good students are doing projects

A B C D

4. One of your teachers has asked for several volunteers to talk to the P.T.A. about class activities and experiences. You would probably:
(a) Not volunteer because you don't feel comfortable speaking in front of people
(b) Volunteer if you could plan your own talk
(c) Not volunteer because you don't think you would enjoy talking about what goes on in class
(d) Ask for more information before you volunteer

A B C D

5. During class, your teacher has surprised you by calling on you to answer a question that you don't know. You explain that you don't
know the answer, but you would probably:

(a) Feel embarrassed because you didn't study the material
(b) Be interested in hearing the answer because you felt you studied the material well
(c) Make sure that you remember the answer to the question
(d) Think that it was unfair to call on you because you didn't have your hand up

A B C D

6. Your cousin from another city has come to visit you and your family. He is one grade ahead of you in school and offers to help you finish your homework one night. You would probably:

(a) Accept the help because you can get finished sooner and do more interesting things
(b) Accept the help because you usually spend more time on homework than most kids
(c) Finish the work yourself but talk to him about the things you were studying
(d) Finish the work yourself because it would take too long to explain the work to him

A B C D

7. You have just received your score for a national reading test that you took two months ago. Your score would probably be:

(a) Among the highest in the class
(b) Among the lowest in the class
(c) Better than the average score
(d) Lower than average score

A B C D

8. Your family has dinner guests this evening. Your parents have asked you to tell their friends about your term project this semester. You would probably:

(a) Be pleased to tell them about the project
(b) Talk about the project as well as some of your other interesting school activities
(c) Tell them about the project just to please your parents
(d) Try to talk about something else
A B C D

9. You have been given a difficult assignment in one of your classes. Most of the students are having trouble completing it, so some of the students decided to get together to discuss the problems they are having. You would probably:
(a) Not be asked to join the group because they don't think you know as much as they do
(b) Not be asked because they don't know how good a student you are
(c) Be asked to join because you know as much as anyone in the class
(d) Be asked to join because you keep up with the work in the class
A B C D

10. The school counsellor has asked you to drop by the office after school. The counsellor will probably:
(a) Talk to you about how poorly you are doing in school
(b) Talk to you about attending college
(c) Praise your work in school
(d) Tell you that you are not doing as well in school as you could.
A B C D
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POSITIVE RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS ON "FOR ALL I KNOW"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>POSITIVE RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
Computations for Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficients (p)

Formula

\[ p = 1 - \frac{6 \sum D^2}{N(N^2-1)} \]

Where

- \( D \) = difference between the expected rank and the mean percent rank
- \( N \) = the number of pairs of scores
- \( p \) = Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient

For Grade Level Mean Percents for the Academic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Grade Level Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum D^2 = 8 \]

\[ p = -1 \]

For Grade Level Mean Percents for the General Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Grade Level Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum D^2 = 0 \]

\[ p = +1 \]
For Grade Mean Percents For the Academic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum D^2 = 519.50 \]

\[ p = -0.43 \]
For Grade Mean Percents for the General Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\sum D^2 = 162$

$p = +.56$
For Age Interval Mean Percents for the Academic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Interval</th>
<th>Age Interval Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\sum D^2 = 6$

$p = -0.5$

For Age Interval Mean Percents for the General Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Interval</th>
<th>Age Interval Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\sum D^2 = 2$

$p = +0.5$
For Age Mean Percents for the Academic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum D^2 = 1056 \]

\[ p = -.29 \]
For Age Mean Percents for the General Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age Rank</th>
<th>Mean Percent Rank</th>
<th>Rank Difference</th>
<th>Squared Rank Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>210.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\sum D^2 = 676.50$

$p = +.17$
THE VICTORIA SCHOOL PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

The following program was successfully administered to this researcher's Grade 4 class at Victoria School in Carlisle Ontario, during the school year 1974-1975. The success of the Victoria School program may well have been due to the fact that the teacher had an exceptional group of students. It may not work for other teachers, or with other pupils. The value to others then lies in the specific aspects that can be fit into their situation and in the thoughts and ideas concerning the development of student self-concept that it may instigate.

Its birth was the result of the recognition of the following factors and needs of the teacher and students:

1. Need to allow for greater development in the student's abilities (a) to handle responsibility, 
   (b) to make decisions, 
   (c) to work well independently as well as with others, 
   (i.e. to give assistance and accept assistance), 
   (d) to practice honesty or trustworthiness.

2. Need for more immediate reinforcement and correction of errors.

3. Need for more flexible scheduling to allow for less restricted teacher assistance and guidance.

4. Need for a less restricted environment so that there is freer movement for all concerned.

5. Need for greater time in the application and practice of skills.

6. Need for greater recognition of individualized rates of work.

7. Need for more individualized assistance.

The program was designed in such a way as to give recognition to necessary constraints and guidelines while stressing a situation relatively free and initiative of responsibility; one in which the enhancement of individual student self-concept was of prime concern. What
follows, then, is not a description, but an exposition, in the present tense, of sequential steps and guidelines as one might find in a lesson plan. The program was carried out for the entire morning of each school day.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

1. Give the students increased responsibility.
2. Reduce the amount of time used for presentations by the teacher.
3. Provide for increased interaction experiences among students. (e.g. helping and accepting help)
4. Provide for greater individual differences in the rate of learning and execution of application of skills.
5. Provide for an increase in the time spent by the teacher with individual students.
6. Provide for an increase in student enthusiasm via the planning of his own schedules, which gives some contiguity between subject activity and individual interests.
7. Reduce the teacher's image as an authority and promote it as that of a resource person facilitating learning.
8. Provide immediate reinforcement of learning.
9. Provide an opportunity for the students to exercise their decision-making skills.
10. Provide an atmosphere in which trust and honesty are given daily recognition and use.
11. Provide for more immediate reinforcement and correction of errors.

STUDENT PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

1. Upon entering the classroom at 8:25 in the morning, the pupils sharpen their pencils and generally get ready for class.
2. Opening exercises are then carried out and followed by current
3. The students fill in their schedules—schedule the (Figure 1) order and time for all subjects dealt with in the morning only—based upon a maximum time plan. (Figure 2)

4. At approximately 8:45, any new concepts that are not brought out in the mornings activities, need review, and so on, are introduced by the teacher.

5. Activity or work begins at 8:55 and ends at 11:25, with a 20 minute recess break from 9:45 to 10:05.

6. Upon completion of each activity or at the end of the maximum time allotted for each subject, the student checks his work. All answers are posted at the back of the room on an "Answer" board. He then makes his corrections seeking out the reason for his error if that is possible. (e.g. In math drills it is not and the student just makes note of the correct answer).

7. Poorer students must have their work checked by the teacher immediately after carrying out step #6.

8. All lessons or activities—teacher expectations (i.e. objectives) and lesson procedures—are found on the side or master board. (Figure 3)

9. Examples and further details are found on the front board and on the front chart paper. (Figure 4)

10. All student work that is done on separate or loose paper is filed in individual folders. These are kept at the student's desks and their schedules are paper clipped to them for easy viewing. At 11:25, the folders are put on a shelf at the back of the room to give the teacher easier access for checking and evaluation.

11. Students who finish—mark and correct—an activity before the scheduled time of completion must work on incomplete work in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:35-9:45</td>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>9:35-9:45</td>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:05</td>
<td>RECESS</td>
<td>9:45-10:05</td>
<td>RECESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05-10:25</td>
<td>10:05-10:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25-10:45</td>
<td>10:25-10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:05</td>
<td>10:45-11:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05-11:25</td>
<td>11:05-11:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE I
MAXIMUM TIMES FOR EACH
SUBJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>MAXIMUM TIME IN MINUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELLING/PHONICS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAGINATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE USAGE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>A SPELLING PHONICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The group numbers 1, 2 and 3, represent the different reading groups; those containing students with highly developed, moderately developed, and poorly developed skills in reading, spelling/phonics, and Language Usage respectively.*

FIGURE 3
previously encountered subjects. After this time, they have a choice among:

(a) Reading their novel.
(b) Working with one of a number of word banks.
(c) Working in their imagination books.
(d) Doing an activity sheet found at the Math centre.
(e) Carrying on with another of the mornings subjects if they feel it needs their extra time and effort.

TEACHER PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

1. All master planning is recorded on a special plan sheet, identical to the master board and then transferred to the side board or master board.
2. Schedules for daily notebook checks, marking, group guidance, concepts to be introduced and so on, are recorded—with consideration for pupils' suggestions—in the teacher's daybook on a very simple, and flexibly designed sheet. (Figure 5)
3. Often the 10 minute time slot allotted for teaching new concepts will be too short. It is then necessary to omit current events or writing.
4. The teacher's basic purpose, besides planning the activities or lessons is to guide and assist the students and act as a resource person if necessary. It is important that he ensure that the students follow their schedules—five or take five minutes—and that movement is not for social purpose, but is related to the learning situation.
5. The teacher must keep in mind that the poorer and less responsible students must be given added assistance and guidance in making and correcting work, following lesson procedures, and in planning and following their schedules.
6. The teacher must familiarize the students with certain stan-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DUTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 5**
dards, but he must put the stress on the individual improvement. Whether the child is up to the grade level expected in a certain area is of little importance if he is making continual progress in that direction.

7. The teacher must continually move about the room reinforcing learning and crediting the students with their efforts and improvements.

8. Allow the students to place their desks in any reasonable (i.e. does not block an exit or is not restricting movement at a work centre) place they wish. The teacher should only take steps to place a student if the student's choice would interfere with his work.

9. A student and teacher evaluation period in the form of open discussion and questioning is held every Friday afternoon.

10. About two weeks after starting the program:
   (a) Allow students—on a rotational basis—to create and record (i.e. put on board) such work as math review, math drill, and writing.
   (b) Choose two students who will be able to neatly and correctly fill in the master board from the master plan sheet.

EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT

All tests are given a mark which is the total number of points the student has acquired (i.e. total number correct). If the total number of possible marks on a spelling test is 25, for example, and a student acquires 20, he is given a mark of 20. Each mark is also given a letter equivalent to correspond with the letters below. These are used in reporting to parents on the report cards.

A outstanding
B above average
C average
D below average
On assignments such as composition, where evaluation not measurement, is carried out, (e.g. creativity, neatness and/or accuracy) the student is given one of these A to D ratings. (It is essential to note that this researcher does not agree with the above form of reporting. It does not recognize individual progress and effort, and stresses student comparisons. However, as a teacher this researcher had to follow administrative direction. Student improvements and effort were stressed during specific evaluation sessions with the student and on a daily and weekly basis: (a) verbally; (b) through comments on notes, tests, and assignments and; (c) through a good work bulletin board where good means improvement of some kind, not a high rating or mark).

The program's overall effectiveness is judged via an evaluation scheme utilizing a number of criteria relating back to the program objectives. If at any point the program or parts of it are determined to be ineffective, detailed analysis of each criteria is made in order to locate the weakness or weaknesses. For example, if there is a decrease in the quality of work, then close scrutiny is made of such things as frequency and accuracy of work checks, standards of work expected, (i.e. the teacher may be setting standards that are too low) and time limits set for work completion. Below are the criteria and the methods of evaluation and/or measurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>METHOD OF EVALUATION AND/OR MEASUREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(The program is said to be effective if it meets these criteria)</td>
<td>(In all cases, comparisons are made with previous evaluation or measurements whether daily, weekly or monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. An improvement, or at least no decrease in marks and/or ratings in the subject areas concerned-Math, Writing,</td>
<td>1. Test at the end of each unit in math.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Weekly or monthly assignments as in composition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spelling, Phonics, Reading, Language Usage, and Composition.

2. An improvement or a least no decrease in the quality of work. Quality is evaluated by considering:
   (a) Organization (e.g. spacing).
   (b) Writing (e.g. letter formation).
   (c) Accuracy (e.g. proper number formation).

3. An increase in and/or maintenance of responsible and honest behaviour. This is determined by considering that the student:
   (a) Follows his schedule.
   (b) Checks (marks) work accurately and immediately upon completion.
   (c) Makes sincere attempts to correct errors immediately upon detection.
   (d) Maintains a steady effort while carrying out the activities scheduled.

1. Daily notebook and assignment checks.

1. Daily observations and arbitrary work checks. In the case of poorer students or those that require close supervision, work in all subjects is checked over by the teacher immediately upon completion of their marking and correcting.
4. An increase in and/or maintenance of interaction among students. This is measured by observing the:
   (a) Frequency of students seeking assistance from other students.
   (b) Frequency of students assisting other students.
   (c) Frequency of students working together such as they can with flash cards.

5. An increase in student (i.e., student self-concept) and teacher satisfaction and enthusiasm in coming to school and participating in the program.

1. Daily observations
2. Daily discussions with individual students and a weekly discussion with the class as a whole.

1. Daily incidental discussion with students.
2. Daily observations of the attitudes of the students towards their work, teacher, and fellow students.
3. Weekly discussion sessions with the class as a whole.
SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The program progressed remarkably well. There were definite signs of improvement in responsible behaviour and enhanced feelings of confidence in individual students, and there was increased student interaction. As well, notable academic gains were made. In mathematical skills, many of the poorer students caught up to the others and there was marked improvement in overall written work. Marks and ratings in all subjects concerned improved or at least remained constant. Through weekly and daily discussions with individuals and groups the students showed to be more enthusiastic about their work and coming to school in the first place. They felt that they had some control over their environment and the activities they indulged in.

For the teacher, the program meant a great deal more time for evaluation, assisting and reinforcing students; more time for example for:

(a) Checking notes.

(b) Evaluating skill development.

(c) Reteaching concepts in a one to one or small group situation.

(d) Stressing individual improvement.

In conclusion, the flexibility created produced a less stressful, more productive morning. There existed fewer—actually none—frustrated pupils for help was immediately available through the teacher or another student and mistakes were accepted as part of life. Furthermore, those who had grasped a concept were no longer bored with its reteaching—this was for the most part done on an individual basis.

In general, it appeared that the students felt better about themselves, socially, emotionally, and intellectually.