#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 785

RC 005 679

AUTHOR TITLE Valenzuela, Alvaro Miguel The Relationships Between Self-Concept, Intelligence, Socio-Economic Status and School Achievement Among

Spanish-American Children in Omaha.

PUB DATE

64p.; Thesis submitted to University of Nebraska,

Omaha Nebraska.

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29 Academic Achievement; Anglo Americans; Comparative Testing; Correlation; Equal Education; Expectation; \*Grade Point Average; \*Intelligence Quotient; Norm Referenced Tests; Secondary School Students; \*Self Concept; \*Socioeconomic Status; \*Spanish Americans;

Statistical Studies

**IDENTIFIERS** 

Nebraska

#### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this 1971 study was to see if there was sufficient evidence at South High School of the Omaha Public School District to support any of the following hypotheses: (1) controlling for intelligence quotient (IQ) and socioeconomic status (SES), Spanish American children have a significantly lower self-concept than Anglo children; (2) controlling for IQ and SES, Spanish American children have a significantly lower grade point average (GPA) than Anglo children; (3) self-concept is related in a positive and significant way with IQ and SES; and (4) self-concept is positively and significantly correlated with GPA. Self-concept was measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales; SES was assessed via the Index of Status Characteristics; GPA was taken from the last 2 consecutive semesters for each student; and IQ was taken from school records. Spanish American and Anglo 10th, 11th, and 12th graders (n=40) were matched for high or low SES as well as f r low h of the IQ, and 5 children from each ethnic group were draw 4 resulting classifications: high SES, high IQ; high SES, low IQ; low SES, high IQ; and low SES, low IQ. To determine the significance of the difference between the Spanish American and Anglo groups (hypotheses 1 and 2 above), the t-test was used; the index of correlation between variables (hypotheses 3 and 4 above) was established by the Pearson product-moment. None of the 4 hypotheses was adequately sustained to conclude that any of them held. (BO)



THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT, INTELLIGENCE, SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT AMONG SPANISH-AMERICAN CHILDREN IN OMAHA

AHA CO AL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. PCINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Field Project
Presented to

the faculty of the Graduate College University of Nebraska at Cmaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

ъy

Alvaro Miguel Valenzuela August 1971



Accepted for the faculty of The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education.

Graduate Committee

Railes M. Wilson, Educational Idenius.
Name
Menard Sallen Sec. Education

Januar Kallans Ed Ha



### TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Introduction                            | ,   |
|---|---|
| Statement of the Problem                | 6   |
| Discussion of the Problem               | 7   |
| Assumptions                             | •   |
| Hypotheses to be Tested                 | 11  |
| Definition of Terms                     | 12  |
| REVIEW OF LITERATURE                    | 12  |
| PROCEDURE                               | 27  |
| General Design                          | 27  |
| Population                              | 27  |
| The Setting                             | 28  |
| Data and Instrumentation                | . 29  |
| Collection of Data                      | 30  |
| Treatment of Data                       |   |
| FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS                | 32  |
| Findings                                | 32  |
| Discussion                              | 41  |
| Summary                                 | 47  |
| Y                                       | 49  |
| • | 55  |
|   | 60  |
| _                                       | Statement of the Problem  Discussion of the Problem  Assumptions  Hypotheses to be Tested  Definition of Terms  REVIEW OF LITERATURE  PROCEDURE  General Design  Population  The Setting  Data and Instrumentation  Collection of Data  FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS  Findings  Discussion  Summary |



#### CHAPTER I

#### INTRODUCTION

The 1970 U.S. census is expected to show that Mexican-Americans total more than six million. Mexican-Americans plus about four million of Latin-American origin, are the second largest minority, trailing 20 million of Afro-Americans. 1

In the context of the American nation the Spanish contribution has been an important one. The whole infrastructure of the American Southwest is Mexican and Indian in its origin. They were there before the "anglos". The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo by which four provinces were annexed to the Union respected their religion, language, and culture. More recently the Middle Word and wast have seen the Mexican-Americans filling the areas of Denver, Chicago and Detroit. New York is almost a bilingual city, and at the tip of the nation, Florida has become a new land for thousands of refugees fleeing the Castro regime. Nevertheless, this so important group has pressing and grave problems. But unlike the Afro-Americans, the Spanish-Americans are badly divided, pollitically weak a

The Omaha World Herald, Oct. 14, 1970, Sec. II, p.17, c ls. 1-4.



only beginning a struggle for recognition.

At the root of their problems are those related to education. Many writers have delineated some of the various problems of Spanish-American youngsters with regard to education. George Demos (1962) summarized these problems as follows: "(a) Low Level of aspiration resulting in failure to achieve commensurate with ability; (b) lack of parental aspiration and support of educational effort; (c) excessive early dropouts; (d) bilingualism and inadequate facility in the use of the English language; (e) biculturalisms or dualisms in cultural values between the Spanishspeaking and dominant group; (f) excessive peer identification and formation of gangs; (g) economic insecurity; the sed to contribute to family support; and (h) attitudinal differences that are contrary to the Anglo-American feeling toward education."2 So far, this is the view of an "Anglo" on the problems that Spanish-Americans have. They see their own problems in a somewhat different light.

They are fully in accord that the biggest handicap is the lack of an adequate education. But in their view this is not the result of their bilingualism or biculturalism or even of a lack of interest in the family. This is the result of an inadequate educational system. "The history of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>George D. Demos, "Attitudes of Mexican-American groups toward education," The Journal of Social Psychology, 57, (Aug. 1962), 249.



educational neglect of the Spanish-speaking is overwhelming. Our median of education is two years behind that of the "Anglo,"3 said Armando Ramirez (1970). "Schools are failing in not recognizing the unusual sensitivity of Mexican-Americans and the need to instill confidence in them when they go out into the jungle we call national economy."4 said Alarico Ortega, Mayor Sam Yorty's Director of Latin-Americans Affairs (1970). "The educational statistics on Mexican-Americans are shocking. Their dropout rate is more than two times the national average, and estimates of the average number of school years completed by Mexican-Americans (7.1 years) are significantly below figures for black children (9.0 years) or Anglo children (12.1 years). "In Texas, 39 percent of the Mexican-Americans have less than a fifth grade education, and Mexican-Americans 25 years of age or older have as little as 4.8 years of schooling."5 the different attitude of the family which rauses such a high drop out rate? A 1968 study by James Anderson and Dwight Johnson points out that, "there appears to be little

<sup>5</sup>Philip D. Ortego, "Schools for Mexican-Americans: Between Two Cultures," Saturday Review, April 17, 1971. p. 63.



<sup>3</sup>Armando Ramirez, "The Challenge for Education," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. L, No. 2 (Nov. 1970), p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Cmaha World Herald, loc. cit.

difference between Mexican-American families and other families with respect to amount of emphasis on the education that the child experiences in his home." Moreover, "these children experience the same high degree of encouragement and assistance at home as do their classmates."

A partial explanation of the problem may be the linguistic disadvantage. According to Philip D. Ortego, "existing education programs (with the exception of pilot or experimental model programs) make no allowance for the fact that many Mexican-American children come to school either (a) knowing a fair amount of English but being psychologically reluctant to use it, (b) knowing little English, or else (c) knowing only Spanish." As a result Spanish-Americans are from the beginning under a tremendous psychological tension. Basically it is a problem of loyalty as Manuel Ramirez III (1970) put it: "At school he is told in essence: 'If you do not reject the Mexican-American culture you cannot succeed.' At home and in the barrios, the appeal is different: 'If you become Anglicized you are a traitor; you come to feel you are too good for your people.'"

Ofhilip D. Ortego, op.cit. p. 63.

<sup>7</sup>Manuel Ramirez III, "Cultural Democracy: A New Philosophy for Educating the Mexican-American Child," The National Elementary Frincipal, vol. L, no. 2 (Nov. 1970) p. 45.

Among the various elements that are the conditions of behavior, self-concept is one of the most important. The investigator's selection of this aspect was originated in a direct contact with people with Spanish background in Omaha. In differing degrees they accutely feel the fact of being "second rate citizens." Perhaps this is not a general phenomenon, perhaps it depends on the economic success or failure of the family. The question is: to what extent does the image that the student has of himself and as a part of an ethnic group condition his success or failure in school life. In other words, is there a relationship between Self-Concept and School Achievement?

The potential for such a study in Omaha seems well founded because there is no research done in this field, and because Spanish-Americans in Omaha are an important minority, increasingly aware of their problems. Moreover, the educational system seems favorable and open to consider educational problems of minority groups in Omaha. A Committee for the study of Curricular Problems of Minority Groups in Omaha, has recently been set up by the Omaha Public School District. In this Committee Mexican-Americans are represented. In the same spirit the University of Mebraska at Omaha as an "Urban University" has been gearing its attention to the inner city areas, and has began to approach the educational problems of Mexican-Americans. Dr. Joseph Soshnik,



President of the Lincoln Campus, saidin Jan. 10, 1971 that the "University of Nebraska would study recommendations for Mexican-American courses developed at a weekend meeting of Chicano leaders." At the same time in a press conference, the Rev. Robert Navarro, pastor of the Gethsemane American Lutheran Church in Omaha, said that the course would be geared "to sensitizing teachers to the characteristics and life style of Mexican-American children so the teachers could understand that being bilingual, biracial, and bicultural is an asset and not a handicap."

These ideas were the ground on which this research was born. It was not a merely academic exercise, it was an answer to real problems of a group in Omaha. Nevertheless, there was a need for focusing in a more specific area and that was the purpose of the next paragraph, the statement of the problem.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study was designed to investigate the relationships between Self-Concept, Intelligence, Socio-Economic Status and

.9

<sup>8</sup>Sunday World Herald, Cmaha, Jan. 10, 1971, Sec. II-B, col. 3.

Sunday World Herald, Ibid.

School Achievement among Spanish-American children in Omaha. Initially our questions were related only to Self-Concept and School Achievement. They were: To what extent does the fact of belonging to an ethnic group, in this case the Spanish-American, have a bearing on Self-Concept building? Have the Spanish-Americans a significantly lower Self-Concept than the Anglo group? Do they achieve differently? And if they do, is related to their being a member of an ethnic group?

After this first set of questions, another set of variables appeared to the researcher to be important. To what extent Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were related to a change in Self-Concept and School Achievement? To what extent they were related to a change in Self-Concept and School Achievement inside the ethnic group?

At this point it was decided to study the interrelationships of both sets of variables, as the better way to obtain more accurate and close to reality results. Once stated in this very general way the problems were more challenging and open to discussion than ever.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

Self-Concept is a psychological construct that can be considered from two different points of view. First, as a result of some influences upon the person; second, as the explanation or reason for behavior. In the first case we



consider Self-Concept as effect, in the second as cause. In this study the investigator is interested in both. How is Self-Concept developed in children belonging to a minority group? To what extent does the fact of being a member of the group affect the Self-Concept of the group members? And secondly how does this self-image explain certain types of behavior, in this case, school achievement and in a more general way, school adjustment?

Among the elements that appear to condition Self-Concept, two seemed more important than the others, they were: Socio-Economic Status and Intellectual Ability. At this point the researcher was working with several Independent and Dependent Variables. Independent Variables were: Race, Intellectual Ability and Socio-Economic Status. Dependent Variables were: Self-Concept and Socio-Economic Status. The idea was to have a Spanish-American group matched to an Anglo group in terms of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status. Then measurements on the Dependent Variables would yield light on the ethnic component. If Spanish-Americans and Anglos differ significantly we could conclude that the ethnic component was the reason of the differences.

The focus of the study was Self-Concept among Spanishamericans but almost as important as to determine levels of Self-Concept, was to study relationships among the other variables among themselves and with Self-Concept, however,



no statistical study of interaction effects was intended.

By the same token no longitudinal study was attempted, students were going to be contacted only once and no record of their previous measurements was planned to be established. Very aware of these limitations the researcher attempted to set at a theoretical frame of reference for his hypotheses.

This is the topic of the paragraph.

#### ASSUMTTIONS

For the purpose of this study the following assumptions are considered:

- 1. There is a lack of awareness among educators that the number of children with Spanish background in Omaha is significant.
- 2. Spanish-American children have special curricular needs.
- 3. Spanish-American children have distinctive cultural values.
- 4. Ethnic minorities and their cultural values represent an important element in the life of the American people that need to be preserved.
- 5. Awareness and solutions for educational problems are more pressing when the group has been neglected or has been treated with prejudice or segregation.
- 6. Spanish-American people, especially if they are Mexicans, have the feeling of "second rate citizens." They



- perceive of themselves as being at the margin of the main stream of the American life.
- 7. Spanish-Americans in the United States have a different set of values from both the Anglo: the Spanish people (Iberic Peninsula).
- 8. Mexican-Americans have not only to compone the linguistic disadvantage of speaking a foreign language at the disadvantage of visibility, of looking like a Maxican.
- 9. For the average American, Mexicans are to prototype of Latins.
- 10. Models to imitate are one of the most important elements in Self-Concept building. Until recently, schools had not presented to Spanish-American children models brought from their own people
- 11. Self-Concept develops as a learned pattern. Other's opinions and perceptions are paramount in the formation of Self-Concept. Dominant and dominated groups interact and mutually condition their images.
- 12. Positive Self-Concept development is a difficult task for spanish-American children in Omaha, because there exists racial segregation of some Latin groups in areas such as housing, jobs and admission to certain clubs and institutions.
- 13. To measure Self-Concept as an expression of the whole personality is a sound decision according to research that



- backs the idea that Self-Concept is extremely important in the life and behavior of a person.
- 14. It is assumed that the Tennessee Self-Conce, Scale is a valid and reliable instrument to measure Self-Concept in adolescence, either in the case of Spanish Americans or Anglos.
- 15. It is assumed that the Index of Status Characteristics and the I.Q. test given in the Cmaha Public School District are both valid and reliable instruments, and that the last one is valid as a measure of Intelligence Quotient, even when it is closely connected with reading ability.

#### HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

- 1. Spanish-American children have a significantly lower Self-Concept than children belonging to the Anglo group with the same Intellectual Ability and Socio-Economic background.
- 2. Spanish-American children have a significantly lower Grade Point Average than children belonging to the Anglo group with the same Intellectual Ability and Socio-Economic background.
- 3. Self-Concept is correlated in a positive and significant way with Intelligence Quotient and SocioEconomic background.

14



4. Self-Concept is correlated in a positive and significant way with School Achievement.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

#### Spanish-American Children

Students in the Omaha Public School District who have a Spanish surname.

#### Anglos

All Caucasians who are no longer identified with their respective ethnic group,

#### Self-Concent

"The Self-Concept is a psychological construct used to describe the person's private perception of himself and of his perceptions of his relationships to others in the environment. This Self-Concept includes three components: the Perceptual - the way in which the person sees himself - the idea of his body image and the idea he has of the impression he makes on others; the Conceptual - the person's idea of his own peculiarly distinctive characteristics, his abilities, his limitations, and Attitudinal - his own feeling of identity in the environment, his attitude regarding the present and the future, and his degree of self-esteem."10

<sup>10</sup> Dorothy Peters, "Self-Concept as a factor in over and under achievement (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of Indiana, 1968), p. 13.



## Social A evement

Success or failure at school as it is expressed in school grades.

# Socio-Economic Status

Status level defined in reference to four elements: Ocupation, Source of Income, House Type and Dwelling are... This Status level is a way of life with definite characteristics and values.



#### CHAPTER II

#### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A considerable amount of research has been done related to Self-Concept and its implications. The researcher has studied literature dealing with: what Self-Concept is, the relationships between Self-Concept and School Achievement, the relationship between Self-Concept and Group Interaction. A second important set of research has been done on cultural and identity problems of the Mexican-American community. The third field of related literature has to do with the validity and reliability of instruments used to measure Self-Concept.

#### SELF-CONCEPT

### What is Self-Concept?

Generally speaking, Self-Concept is the opinion of an individual about the kind of person he perceives himself to be. Nevertheless the authors vary and come up with different definitions. Rogers (1942) feels that it lies at the very core of the personality and gives consistency to his behavior as an individual. Raimy (1948) defines the self as "the complex organization made up of many perceptions of greater or lesser degrees of importance to the individual



and defining his relationship to the world as he sees it."11 James (1910) comes up with three classes of ME, namely: the material me, the social me, and the spiritual me. He explains them as follows: the Spiritual me - the entire collection of my states of consciousness, my psychic faculties ard dispositions taken concretely; the social me - the recognition which I get from my mates, and strictly speaking, I have as many social selves as people who recognize me; the material me - the body, its clothes, my property, etc. James says that in each ME we distinguish an actual and potential self. The Notential social self is the most interesting in his opinion. 12 Turner (1968) holds that Self-Conception is a "vague but vitally felt idea of what I am like in my best moments, of what I am striking toward and have some encouragement I may achieve, or of what I can do when the situation supplied incentive for unqualified effort."13 In the section of Definition of Terms of this paper we have included Dorothy Peters' definition of Self-Concept. The awareness of the complexity of the Self-

<sup>13</sup>Ralph H. Turner, "The Self-Concention in Social Interaction," in "The Self in Social Interaction, as edited by: Gordon, Chad and Gergen, Kenneth J. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), op. 93-106.



<sup>11</sup> Victor C. Raimy, "Self-Reference in Counseling Interviews,"

Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1948, (May-June) 12:

153-153.

<sup>12</sup>W. James, Psychology: The Briefer Course (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910), op. 177-183.

Concept moved the researcher to choose the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales. According to the theory that sustains this instrument, there are five main aspects of the Self: physical, moral-ethical, personal, family and social. But at the same time the TSCS takes care of the "dynamics" associated with each of these: what the person is, how he accepts himself, and how he acts.

# Self-Concept and School Achievement

There has been a considerable amount of research in this Several authors have obtained positive relationships between Self-Concept and academic achievement, (Coopersmith, 1959; Fink, 1962). Others, Bruck & Bodwin (1962), have postulated that deficiency in self-esteem may be a significant determinant of under-achievement. Some other investigators have made interesting contributions. Combs (1964) concluded that "Under-Achievers" were shown significantly different from Achievers in that they perceived themselves as less adequate and less acceptable to others; considered their peers and adults as less acceptable and showed inefficient and less effective approach to problems. His findings were in agreement with Shaw and Alves's (1963) who showed that male under-achievers had: a more negative Self-Concept than achievers, were less acceptable to themselves, and attributed the same lack to their peers. Ro. at L. Williams and Spurgeon Cole (1968) worked with 80 sixth grade students, and found significant correlations between the measures of



the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales and the following variables: conception of the school, social status at school, emotional adjustment, mental ability, reading achievement, and mathematical achievement.

Interestingly enough, there have been certain studies that have yielded somewhat different results. The investigator has especially studied two papers. The first is a Doctoral Thesis: "Self-Concept as a factor in over-under achievement" by Dorothy Peters (1968). In this thesis, the hypothesis that there would be a significant relationship between self-concept scores and over-under achievement was not confirmed. The explanation that the author gave for this finding against the previous literature, was that the sample was not representative enough, the distribution of over-under achievers in the social classes was not even enough, and finally sex as a variable was not studied as a part of the survey. Miss Peters used the T.S.C.S. as an instrument to measure Self-Concept. The second study is Barbara Polk Walton's "A Study of differences in School Achievement and Self-Concept of Culturally Deprived and Middle Class Adolescents" (1966). Her findings were: 1) School Achievement was significantly lower for the culturally deprived group than for the middle class group. 2) There was no difference between the two groups in overall level of self-esteem, nor in any of the sub-categories of the



internal and external frames of reference for the Self-Concept. 3) Two differences were found in the conflicts shown by the students as they indicated their Self-Concepts. The culturally deprived group over-affirmed the positive attributes of their Self-Concept; whereas the middle-class did not. Also, among the culturally deprived group there was more confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self perception than in the middle-class group. Her findings on "Conflict Scores" have been very interesting, but will not be checked in the present study because the researcher decided to limit his statistical analysis of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales to its Positive Scores.

Self-Concept and Group Interaction

Self-Concept is one of the most personal states of mind that an individual can experience, and nevertheless that self-image is obtained more from his interaction with the group than from self-evaluation. Benjamin (1950) says that an individual is led to construct his behavior in a manner which he sees as being consistent with the conception he has of himself and that...he strives to maintain his integrity as the sort of person he conceives himself to be. "14" Cartwright (1969) wondered how the group influenced self-esteem and failures depend upon the "level of aspiration"

<sup>14</sup>James Benjamin, "Changes in Performance in Relations to Influence upon Self-Conceptualization," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45: 473-480.



one has set for himself. He says: "now, if we try to discover how the level of aspiration gets set, we are immediately involved in the person's relationship to groups. The groups to which he belongs set standards for his behavior which he If his capacities must accept if he is to remain in the group. do not allow him to reach those standards, he experiences failure; he withdraws or is rejected by the group and his selfesteem suffers a shock."15 Sheerer (1949) found that one's attitudes toward others are related to a decidedly significant degree to the attitudes one holds toward one's self. Williams & Cole (1968) found that a student's self-appraisal was significantly related to the group appraisal of him. Williams' lphaCole's comments on these findings are "that communication from significant others affects the Self-Concept and suggests the feasibility of altering the Self-Concept by changing the conditions of social status. 116 Stotland, Thorley, Thomas, Cohen and Zander (1957), summarized their findings saying: "The group's expectations appear to have been more potent as a scale



<sup>15</sup>Darwin Cartwright, "Achieving Change in People: Some Applications of Group Dynamics Theory," <u>Readings in Group Counseling</u> as edited by: Muro, James J. and Freeman, Stanley L. (Scranton: International Textbook Co. 1969), p. 26.

<sup>16</sup>E. Stotland, S. Thorley, E. Thomas, A. R. Cohen, and A. Zander, "Group Expectations, Self-Esteem, and Self-Evaluation." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 54, Jan. 1957, n 1, pp. 55-64.

of reference than the individual's self-esteem in determining his evaluation of his performance. When the influence of the group was weakest (task was non relevant) persons high in self-esteem, compared to those who were low, differed in the way they evaluated their performance. When the influence of the group was strongest (task relevant) there was no difference in the way that persons high or low in self-esteem rated their achievement."

#### SPANISH-AMERICANS

As part of the general movement of American Minority Groups toward a better place in the American scene, a significant amount of literature has accompanied the Spanish-Americans and more specifically the Mexicans in their plea. Generally speaking, they point to the main elements of the Spanish American culture and its historical background, the problems they face and their hopes. Horacio Ulibarri (1970) pointed out that several factors tend to make the Mexican-Americans different from group to group and from region to region, but at the same time concluded that there were certain areas of commonality. He says, "We do find that the Mexican-American as a group is characterized by impoverishment, living in relatively poorer areas of the cities and living in poorer housing. We find that the Mexican-American as a group is in the process of acculturation with all the traumatic experiences this entails. We find that the Mexican-American 23



has developed the complexes of minority group status very similar to the complexes found among the Blacks and the Indians. We find also, the Mexican-Americans are becoming increasingly impatient with the slow pace of solution attempts to their poverty, deprived conditions, and poor educational opportunities."17

Among the many interesting studies related to cultural characteristics of the Mexican-Americans, Carey Mc Williams (1949) pointed out the fact that the Mexican-American culture can be depicted as a "fclk culture," quoting Dr. Robert Redfield who said that a folk culture is "a small, isolated, non-literate, homogeneous society. Intimate communication of the acceptant matched by a lack of communication with acceptant matched by a lack of communication among the members. The exterior world." 18 Zurcher (1965) in a cross cultural study of values described the U.S. as a "universalistic oriented society." By the contrary, Mexicans were described as belonging to a "particularistic society", where value orientation toward obligations of friendship and stress on the personal quality of human relations were the rule. Studies related to identity conflicts among

<sup>18</sup> Carey McWilliams, North from Mexico (New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1949), p. 212.



<sup>17</sup>Horacio Ulibarri, "Education of Mexican-Americans: Problems and Issues." University of New Mexico, 1970, pp. 7-8.

(Mimeographed.)

Mexican-Americans have pointed out that identity is conditioned by the stereotypes that each group has of the other. Van der Zander (1966) defined sterectype, saying that it "is a category that singles out an individual as sharing certain assumed characteristics on the basis of group membership. 119 Simmons (1959) said that "the Anglo-Americans' principal assumption and expectations emphasize the Mexicans' presumed inferiority." A summary of his findings about common beliefs held in relation to Mexicans is as follows: Mexicans are and lean, they are drunk and criminal people, they are deceigul, low in morality, mysterious, unpredictable and hostile to Anglo-Americans. Mexican-American images of Anglo-Americans are sometimes favorable, particularly when they identify such traits as initiative, ambition, and industriousness. Unfavorable images are those who depict Americans as "stolid, phlegmatic, cold-hearted and insincere."20 Penalosa found that awareness of the Social Structure is positively correlated with acculturation. a consequence the group that suffers the most discriminatory practices is not the lower class people with little education, but the group that has better education and sees his way cut

<sup>200</sup>zzie G. Simmons, "The Mutual Images and Expectations of Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans." in Minorities in a Changing World by Milton L. Barron (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), pp. 292-303.



<sup>19</sup> James W. Van der Zander, American Minority Relations (New York: The Ronald Press, 1966), p. 80.

by the dominant group. 21 Dworkin (1965) studied stereotypes and self-images among native-born and foreign-born Mexican-Americans, and found that foreign-born Mexican-Americans had a more favorable Self-Concept than did the native-born Mexican-Americans.

Attitudes of Mexican-Americans have been researched extrasively. Demos (1962) summarized the previous research saying that educational problems of Mexican-Americans are:

"a) low level of aspiration resulting in failure to achieve commensurate with ability; b) lack of parental aspiration and support of educational effort; c) excessive early school dropouts; d) bilingualism and inadequate facility in the use of the English language; e) biculturalism or dualisms in cultural values between the Spanish-speaking and dominant group; f) excessive peer identification and formation of gangs; g) economic insecurity, the need to contribute to family support; and h) attitudinal differences that are contrary to the Anglo-American feelings toward education. "22 This report, honest as it may be, has been challenged recently by Mexican-American educators that have found that their group is not

<sup>22</sup>George D. Demos, "Attitudes of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Groups toward Education," The Journal of Social Psychology, 1962, 57, 249-256.



<sup>21</sup> Fernando Penalosa and Edward C. McDonagh, "Education Economic Status and Social Class Awareness of Mexican-Americans," Phylon, 1968, vol. 29, pp. 119-126.

the only one responsible for their problems. Rodriguez (1970) said "Tests are only indicators of something more essential: the basic attitude of the schools. The schools are culturally biased. They are designed to produce and serve students patterned after one-culture mold; at the same time, they exclude those who do not fit with the pattern. If our children have problems learning English and making satisfactory scores on tests, it is because the whole system misses us altogether. The schools persist in remaining monocultural, while we are Little wonder, then that most of us have experbicultural. ienced an educational trauma. 1123 Ulibarri (1970) found that the "enrollment gap between the Anglo-American and the Mexican-American progressively widens as the age group gets older. The result is that fewer Mexican-Americans enter college than other population groups." His opinion related to the crucial problem of bilingualism, in that "it is highly preferable to help him develop in a bilingual capacity. Contrary to many educators' opinions, knowledge of two languages mutually enhance and help each other in mastering both."24

<sup>23</sup>Armando Rodriguez, "The Challenge for Educators," The National Elementary Principal, v. L n. 2 Nov. 1970, p. 18. Armando Rodriguez is Chief, Office for Spanish-speaking American Affairs, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

<sup>24</sup>Ulibarri, op. cit. pp. 15 and 17.

#### THE INSTRUMENTS

## The Tennessee Self-Concept Scales

This is an instrument developed by William F. Fitts It has an impressive amount of research in its favor. Over 200 articles and monographies have been written related to this test. Crities (1965) in a review of the test said, "The impression of the instrument gained from the findings which are available, however, is generally a favorable one. Norms are based upon a N = 626, which included Ss from variable parts of the country, in the age range 12 to 58. author frankly points out that the normative group is biased in its overrepresentation of college students, Caucasians and younger people (12 to 30 age range), but there is little or no relationship between such demographic variables as sex, age, race, education, intelligence, and Scale scores. test-retest reliability coefficients for a variety of subscales, admittedly based upon a small sample (N = 60) of the college students over a two-week period, are generally in the .70 and .80s, with only four or five dropping as low as the .60s. Finally validity data on the Scale is promising. tends to meaningfully discriminate psychiatric groups from normals and different psychiatric groups from each other. In addition it correlates as might be expected with other

personality inventories, such as the MMPI and EPPS. "25

This instrument has been developed by Lloyd Warner,
Marcia Meeker and Kenneth Eels in 1960. It has been widely
used in sociological studies as a quantitative measure of
Socio-Economic Status.

<sup>25</sup>John O. Crites, "Fitts, W. H. Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Nashville, Tenn.: Counselor Recording and Tests, 1965,"

Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 330-331.

#### CHAPTER III

#### PROCEDURE

#### General De

and Socio-I nomic Status were considered Independent Variables; Self-Concept and School Achievement were considered

Dependent Variables. In order to test the hypotheses it was decided to distribute the population in four groups according to Intelligence Quotient and Socio-Economic Status. These groups were: High Intelligence Quotient-High Socio-Economic Status, High Intelligence Quotient-Low Socio-Economic Status,

Low Intelligence Quotient-Low Socio-Economic Status, of these categories a Spanish-American and an Anglo group of five students randomly selected from a previously matched population was considered.

## Population

According to the last census 26 Nebraska had 3722 students with a Spanish surname, roughly 1.4% of the total school population. In Omaha, the Omaha Public School District had a total of 30 students with a Spanish surname, roughly 5.6% of the total school population. The Omaha Public School District

<sup>26&</sup>lt;sub>HEW News en. 4, 1970, Table I-C</sub>



had 176 students with Spanish surnames at the Senior High School level, from which 148 attended classes at South High School, (Appendix A, Table VI). The fact that this school concentrates the majority of the High School students was the reason for selecting South High as the site for this research.

#### The Setting

Omeha Public School District. It is located at 4519 S. 24 St., in a neighborhood that knew the rise and fall of the packing industry. The years of the rising packing plants acted as a magnet that drew immigrants from Central Europe to South Omaha. By the thousands came the Poles, Czech, Irish, Croatians, Lithuanians, Greeks, Germans and Mexicans, giving the young city the title of the "Melting Pot." Even when currently many of these families have moved to other places in town, there is a significant proportion of students belonging to non-Anglo Saxon origin in the area.

During the period when this research was done, the school was under the pressure of a Modular Schedule working without an edequate facility and with some racial tensions inside the school mainly between Afro-Americans and Spanish-Americans. Nevertheless, the researcher never saw any kind of agressive behavior at school during the visit he made to collect the data.

29

#### Data and Instrumentation

To measure Self-Concept, the researcher decided to use the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales. This test constructed by William H. Fitts and published in 1964, consists of 100 self-descriptive statements. In taking the scale the examinee responds to each item on a Likert-type five-point endorsement scale, which runs from "Completely false" to "Completely true." The responses are then scored according to a predetermined, two-dimensional classification scheme, one dimension being five aspects of the self (physical, moral-ethnical, personal, family and social) and the other representing the dynamics associated with each of these (what the person is, how he accepts himself, and how he acts). In this testing, the Counseling Form was used.

Data related to Achievement were collected from the School reports. It was decided that the Grade Point Averages during the last two consecutive semesters were a sufficient index.

It was decided to measure Intelligence Quotient using the procedures and records that the Omaha Public School uses.

These data were available at the Counselors Office. The researcher decided to draw a line at 100 I.Q. dividing the population in two parts: over 100 High Intelligence Quotient, under 100 Low Intelligence Quotient.

Socio-Economic Status was to be measured with the Index of Status Characteristics, developed by Lloyd Wraner, Marchia



Meeker and Kenneth Eels in 1960. Information to determine the different groups was provided by the students according to a questionnaire taken from the Index (Apendix B, Scale I). Collection of Data

Steps in collecting the data were as follows: 1) The six Counselors of South High were contacted to get a sample as broad as possible of Spanish-Americans. Each student was asked to complete the questionnaire related to Socio-Economic Status (only two refused). From each one was recorded the Intelligence Quotient. The same operation was done with a random sample of Anglos. 2) The analysis of the Socio-Economic Status showed that the group was very homogeneous. In a continuum from 10 to 70, the total pre-sample showed a dispersion of 32 points, from 30 Highest Socio-Economic Status to 62 Lowest. Even when the normal half should have been at 45 points, it was decided to have it at 44 in order to have a better balanced pre-sample. Above lu points was the High Socio-Economic group, below 144 points was the Low Socio-Economic group, (Apendix A, Table 7). When the total pre-sample was identified in terms of I.Q. and Socio-Economic Status, it was divided into four groups: the four possible combinations of High and Low and the two variables I.Q. and Socio-Economic Status. 4) Using a table of random numbers a sample of five individuals was selected for the four groups in each group. The total definitive sample was 20 students belonging to Spanish-American group and 20



students belonging to the Anglo group. 5) For each of these 40 students the GPA was computed. 6) The Tennessee Self-Concept Scales were given to them, and a hand computation of scores was made. 7) Student selected in the sample had an average age of 17, the oldest being 19 and the youngest 15. There was an even number of 11 and 12 grade students, being the largest part of the sample, with a small number of 10 graders. Processing of Data

Even when the sample was reduced, a vast amount of data was at hand. In order to measure the significance of the difference between the Spanish-American and the Anglo group, a "t" test was used. In order to establish the index of correlation between variables, the Pearson Product-moment correlation was run.



#### IV CHAPTER

#### CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

This research was conducted as a contribution to the Spanish-American community of Omaha and to the City of Omaha in their efforts to give the minority group students a better education. The general assumption was that the Spanish-American group had a lower Self-Concept and a lower level of Achievement than the Anglo group of similar Socio-Economic and Intelligence characteristics. The data presented here were obtained in a study conducted in South High School (April-May, 1971).

#### FINDINGS

- The test of the significance of the difference between the means for the Spanish-American and Anglo group show that the differences in Self-Concept are not significant at the The two groups are extremely similar not only in .05 level. the Total Positive Score but in all the other Sub-Scales. (Table 1).
- Even when the difference is not statistically significant, the Anglo group (all categories) has a higher Self-Concept than the Spanish-American (all categories) (Profile page 35).

# TABLE I

"t" Test for the significance of the difference between the means of the Spanish-American and Angia Students in the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales.\*

| \$0         345.60         0.021         304.20         337.00           \$0         127.20         0.020         118.20         124.80           \$0         111.20         0.092         86.60         103.20           \$0         111.20         0.092         86.60         103.20           \$0         109.20         0.023         99.40         109.00           \$0         70.00         0.004         65.00         71.40           \$0         69.80         0.013         59.60         65.80           \$0         65.50         65.80         65.80           \$0         71.40         67.80         67.80           \$0         71.40         71.40         71.40 | Froup | High I.Q.  Means Spanish-Am  33.20 |        | High Soc-Ec. St. | High I.Q.  Means Spanish-Am  34.20 | Low S Anglos 37.80 | Low Soc-Ec. St.  10s 17.80 0.140 |
|---|-------|------------------------------------|--------|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 40         127.20         0.020         86.60         103.20           20         111.20         0.092         86.60         103.20           20         1109.20         0.023         99.40         109.00           80         70.00         0.004         65.00         71.40           80         67.20         0.013         59.60         65.80           40         66.60         0.113         58.00         67.80           40         71.40         0.00         61.20         71.40  |       | 340.60                             | 345.60 |                  | 304.20                             | 337.00<br>124.80   | 0.077                            |
| 00         109.20         0.023         99.40         109.00           80         70.00         0.004         65.00         71.40           20         69.80         0.008         60.40         62.60           80         67.20         0.013         59.60         65.80           40         66.60         0.113         58.00         67.80           10         71.40         0.00         61.20         71.40  |       | 125.40                             | 127.20 | 0.092            | 86.60                              | 103.20             | 0,240                            |
| 80         70.00         0.004         05.00         1.040           20         69.80         0.008         60.40         62.60           80         67.20         0.013         59.60         65.80           40         66.60         0.113         58.00         67.80           10         71.40         0.00         61.20         71.40   | 1     | 111,00                             | 109.20 | 0.023            | oή•66                              | 109.00             | 0.132                            |
| 20     09.00     0.013     59.60     65.80       80     67.20     0.013     58.00     67.80       40     66.60     0.113     58.00     67.80       10     71.40     0.00     61.20     71.40  |       |                                    | 70.00  |                  | 00.59                              | 62.60              | 0.050                            |
| 40         66.60         0.113         58.00         67.80           40         66.60         0.00         61.20         71.40  |       | 70.20                              | 00.69  |                  | 29.60                              | 65.80              |                                  |
| 1,0 71.40 0.00 61.20 <b>71.40</b>   |       | • 1 (                              | 09,99  |                  | 58.00                              | 67.80              | Ž.                               |
|   |       | •   •                              | 71.40  |                  | 61.20                              | 71.40              |                                  |

\* For the meaning of the different sub-scales, see Appendix B, Glossary.



TABLE I (Continuation)

-3.

"t" rest for the significance of the difference between the means of the Spanish-American and Anglo Students in the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales.

| Low I.&. High Soc-E  Means  Spanish-Am Anglos  31.00 37.60  34c.00 330.00  122.80 125.80 | "t" "t" 0.261                    | Low I.Q. Los Spanish-Am                 | ow Soc-E                   | c. 9t.   | All Categories   | gories   |  |
|--|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|  | "t"<br>0.261                     | Means<br>Spanish-Am                     |                            |  | ı  |  |  |
|  | "t"<br>0.261<br>0.042            | Spanish-Am                              | †                          |  | Means  |  |  |
|  | 0.042                            | 33.20                                   | Ang 103                    | S  | Spanish-Am   | Anglos   | يدي  |
| 37.60<br>330.00<br>125.80  | 0.042                            | 33.20                                   | 0                          | -0.55  | . [  | 25 35  | 0.204  |
| 330.00   | 0.042                            |   | 33.00                      | 0000   | 36.70  | 27.12  |  |
| 125.80   | 0.045                            | ======================================= | 330.10                     | 0.076  | 324.45   | 335.75   | 0.105  |
| 125.80   | 0 03                             | 22.5                                    |                            |  | 1  | 30   | 401.   |
|  | ナイン・ク                            | 0.034 113.80                            | 122.20                     | 0.160  | 120.05   | 125.00   | सं ।   |
|  | 000                              | 60 60                                   | 100.00                     | 0.006  | 100.05   | 104.45   | 0,133  |
| 103.40   | <b>†</b> 00•0                    | 77.00                                   |                            |  | ł  | 26 / 26  | Kiil C   |
| 100 80   | 0.108                            | 09.66                                   | 106.40                     | 0.093  | 104.70   | 7.00.55  | otto o   |
|  |                                  |   | 0.622                      | 600  | 95.29  | 69.00  | 670°0  |
| 68.20  | 190.0                            | 65.60                                   | 04.00                      | 1  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 50                             | 1                                       | 63.60                      | 0.018  |  | 65.30  | 0,021  |
|  | ) O O                            |   |                            |  | 1  | 20 //  | 4 7 0  |
|  | 0.077                            | 59.80                                   | 70.00                      | 0.219  |  | 20.00  | (4,00  |
|  |                                  | - 1                                     | OB 37                      | 0 0 0 1  |  | 67.55  | 0,208  |
|  | 900.0                            |   | 00.00                      |  |  |  | 00 6   |
|  |                                  | 4                                       | 63.60                      | 0.073  |  | 67.40  | 0-1-0  |
|  | 68.20<br>65.20<br>64.40<br>69.00 | 20<br>.40<br>.00<br>.20                 | 20<br>40<br>40<br>20<br>20 | .20 0.061 65.60<br>.20 0.017 62.80<br>.40 0.077 59.80<br>.00 0.008 64.60 | 20       0.061       65.60       66.40         20       0.017       62.80       63.60         40       0.077       59.80       70.00         00       0.008       64.60       66.80         20       0.065       60.40       63.60 | 20         0.061         65.60         66.40         0.017           20         0.017         62.80         63.60         0.018           40         0.077         59.80         70.00         0.219           00         0.008         64.60         66.80         0.051           20         0.065         60.40         63.60         0.073 | 20         0.061         65.60         66.40         0.017         61.90           20         0.017         62.80         63.60         0.018         64.85           40         0.077         59.80         70.00         0.219         63.80           00         0.008         64.60         66.80         0.051         63.10           20         0.065         60.40         63.60         0.073         64.80 |

|  | F CC 08 E             | SPANISH-AM<br>HIGH EQ<br>HIGH SOC E | 60                                      | SPANSH-AM | <b>3</b> | 3 Anglo |     | 1 111 | Anglo   | Low Io | 9       | 1,11,1 | \$       | —————————————————————————————————————— | 111                                     |              | <del></del> |   |                                       | 5            | :<br>:  |         |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|----------|---------|-----|-------|---------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--|---|--------------|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| Courseling Comment   | å                     | ROW<br>TOTAL                        | *************************************** | 2 2 2     | 29       | , . i   |     | 30    | $\perp$ |        | 20 - 02 | •      | - 105    | 2 8                                    | SK.                                     | 2            | 3           |   |                                       | • • •        |         |         |
| THAT STANTED   | VARIABILITY           | COL. TOTAL COL.                     | 06                                      | 101       | 1 801    |         |     | . 05  | 23 53   | l      | 3 8     |        | + + + co | 7 7 7 3                                | 8                                       |              | 20 - 02     | 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - | 2                                     | 33           | 30 - 30 |         |
|  | ESTEEM)               | COL. COL. COL.                      | - 06                                    | - 05      | . 2      |         |     |       | 8       |        |         |        | 9        |  | 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |              | <u></u>     |   | 25                                    | 30           |         |         |
| PROFILE STILL STILL TO THE PARTY OF THE PART | COCITIVE SCORES (SELF | :   -                               | . 00                                    | 3         | 145      |         | 9.  | 35    | 3       | <br>₹  | 120 %   |        |          | -                                      |   |              | 8 2<br>8 2  |   |                                       | <del> </del> | 9 5     |         |
| SCHOOL GRADE   | Field                 | ROW                                 |   | 150       | •        |         | 145 | 130   | 380     | - i.   | 360     |        | - 1      | 3                                      | 7                                       | ा-<br>2<br>1 | 3           | 8 8                                     | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | g 3          | K K     | T ::    |
| Tennessee Self Concept Scale   |                       | ILE SELF. S CISM TOTAL              |   | 50 450    |          | -       |     | •     | 45      |        | 1       |        |          |  |   | 2            | 8           |   | ž                                     |              |         | 2       |
| Tennessee Sell   |                       | T PERCENTILE SCORES                 | 11111                                   | 86.66     | ì        |         | s   | - F   | 8       | 3      | k :     |        | 111      | 2                                      | ╸<br><del>┄</del>                       | 111          | <b>R</b>    | -\<br><del>1\ </del>                    |                                       | 717          | ;<br>   | Π1<br>≥ |

The state of the s

| - |       | <b>3</b> 1           |
|---|-------|----------------------|
| ш | 11111 | RECORDINGS AND TESTS |
| • |       | RECO                 |

| C at by ERIC | nessee Self Concept Scale | sucept S                               | eg<br>CC/je |          |              | ,          |                               |        |                   |        |                    |            |               |                |  | [            | T) ()  | (ALL CAtegories)          |
|--------------|---------------------------|--|-------------|----------|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|--|--------------|--------|---------------------------|
| CAME         |                           |  |             |          | SCHOOL GRADE | NOTE SEEX  | 1, [                          |        |                   |        | TRAE STABTED       |            | The President | e              | TOTAL TRACE                                |              | Spal   | Spanish-                  |
|              |                           |  |             |          | Posit        | IVE SCO    | POSITIVE SCORES (SELF ESTEEM) | LF EST | EEM)              |        |                    | VÂR        |               | <b>\</b>       |  | -            | Ane    | Americans                 |
| SCORE        | PERCENTILE<br>SCORES      | CRITI-                                 | TOTAL       | ROW      | ROW<br>2     | ROW<br>3   | COL.                          | COL.   | - C C C           | - COL  | S =                | TOTAL      | COL.<br>TOTAL | ROW            | $\dashv$                                   | SCORE        | Anglos | los                       |
| 11111        |                           |  |             |          |              |            |                               |        | 8                 | •      | 8                  |            |               |                | ֓֞֟֞֟֓֓֟<br>֓֞֞֞֞֞֞֓֞֞֞֞֞֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓ |              | Nat    | Wational                  |
| 8.           | 99.99                     | 5                                      | 450         | <u>8</u> |              | 82         | \$                            | S.     | •                 |        | <b>3</b>           |            |               |                | • • • • •                                  |              | NON    | Norm group.               |
|              |                           | R                                      | 440         | •        | 145          | 37         |                               |        | 35                | •      | •                  | 92         | P 2           |                | řiři<br>I                                  |              |        |                           |
| 8            | 6.66                      |  |             | •        | 2            |            | •                             | •      | •                 | •      | • •                | 28<br>11 1 | 2             | 4 · · · ·<br>₽ | <u> </u>                                   |              |        | Identity                  |
|              | \$                        |  | 9           | 3        | E            | 3          |                               |        | 98                |        | <del>د</del><br>۱۰ | 8 2 8      | χ S           | * · · · ·      | ة ة<br>المال                               | HOA S        | : Self |                           |
| R            | 1                         |  |             |          | 85           | , 5        | .i                            | 2      | ••••              | •••    |                    | г г<br>г   |               | *              | -<br>                                      |              | ••     | Physical S.<br>Moral Self |
|              | 8 8                       | 8                                      | , i         | 8        |              |            | 3                             | 3      | 1.                | <br>8  | 8                  | 2          | 8             |                | ë ë å                                      | 601 3        |        | : Personal S. Family Self |
| 1            | 2                         | \\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\ | . !         | 135      | <u> </u>     | 4 · · ·    |                               | *      | , , į             | ****   | ĸ<br>I             | 3 %<br>1   | 8             | • •            | 3 E  | 8 5          |        | Social S.                 |
| 39           | <b>8</b> 3                |  |             | ă        | 2 3          | 02         | r.                            | ••••   |                   | k.     | P.                 | 3 0        | Г             | 771<br>8       | ¥ ≅ ₹<br> <br>                             |              |        |                           |
| 8            | 88                        | 45                                     | 35          |          | $\mathbb{N}$ |            |                               |        |                   | 2      |                    | 2.53       | •             | ••             | # #<br># #                                 | <del>-</del> |        |                           |
|              | 8                         | 3 . 1                                  |             |          | 18           |            |                               |        | 3                 | - 1    |                    | ].         |               | . I            | <b>Ž</b> §                                 | Ţ            |        |                           |
| 3            | 2 9                       |  | 98          | =        |              | 6 8        | 2                             | 3      |                   | 3      | 3                  | ж<br>••••• | 8             | •              | <br>                                       |              |        |                           |
|              |                           | 2                                      | 8 % %       | 5        |              | 2          |                               |        |                   | <br>1  | 32                 | ş          | - 22          |                | 8¢   | 9            |        |                           |
| 8            |                           | 50                                     | 1           | 2 8      |              | 8 8        | 2                             |        |                   |        | \$<br>••••         | ສ ສ        |               | 9              | 2 3  | $\neg$       |        | ,                         |
|              |                           |  | <u> </u>    | Se       |              | 8          | 8                             |        |                   |        | \$                 | ž          | 2             |                | 38   | 2            |        |                           |
|              | 0.1                       | -                                      |             | 2 2      | . A T        | 2 2        | \$                            | 9      | . २<br>इ.स<br>इ.स | 8      |                    | 9          |               |                |  |              |        | 36                        |
|              | 50                        | <br>                                   | 981         |          | 5 \$         | <b>3</b> 2 |                               | ****   | g %               | r.     |                    | 0          |               |                | щ  |              |        | 5                         |
|              | •                         | ě                                      | 5 3 3       |          | <b>3</b> 8   |            | <br>E                         | , ,    | 2                 | R<br>R | 8                  |            |               |                | Ш  |              |        |                           |
|              |                           |  |             |          |              |            |                               |        |                   |        |                    |            | PUBLISHED BY: | ) BV:          |  |              |        |                           |

PROFILE SHEET

, i.

Counseling Form

ERIC Concept Scale

- 3. Both, the Spanish-American and the Angli group (all categories) have a lower Self-Concept than the national norms for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales. The Anglo group is only slightly higher in two indexes. (Profile page 35).
- the means for the Spanish-American and Anglo group shows that the differences in School Achievement are not significant at the .05 level. All categories taken together, Anglos were higher than Spanish-Americans. Nevertheless, Spanish-Americans with High I.Q.-High Socio-Economic Status score higher than the Anglos of the same group. (Table 2).
- 5. The relationships between Self-Concept and Intelligence Quotient and Socio-Economic Status are very low, with the highest of 0.48 for the correlation between I.Q. and Grade Point Average among Spanish-Americans. (Table 3).
- 6. The relationship between Self-Concept and School Achievement is low. The highest correlation exists between Grade Point Average and Moral Self among Spanish-Americans. (Table 4).
- 7. School Achievement (Grade Point Average) correlate with Intelligence Quotient at 0.48 among Anglos and at 0.19 among Spanish-Americans. (Table 3).
- 8. Self Criticism score is lower for Spanish-Americans (all categories) than for the Anglos (all categories), and both groups are under the norms for the Tennessee Self-



Ø TABLE

Grade Point Average and "t" Test of the significance of the difference of the means of Spanish-American Students and Anglo Students.

| Group                        | spanish-Am.                             | h-Ara. | Anglos                                 |                | ր <b>է" 8 d.f.</b> |
|------------------------------|---|--------|--|----------------|--------------------|
|                              | GPA                                     | Mean   | GPA                                    | Mean           |                    |
| High Soc 3. St.              | 22 - 22 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - | 280.80 | 20078<br>0008<br>0008                  | 213.40         | 698.0              |
| High I.Q.<br>Low Soc-Ec. St. | 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2   | 215.80 | 3.67<br>3.67<br>3.00<br>82<br>82       | 323.00         | 0.533              |
| Low I.Q.<br>High Soc-Ec. St. |   | 184.80 | 22 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | 208.20         | 0.166              |
| Low I.Q. Low Soc-Ec. St.     | 1.83<br>1.80<br>1.80<br>1.56            | 162.20 | 3.40<br>1.80<br>2.00<br>2.45           | 529 <b>.60</b> | क्तिन• 0           |
| All Categories               |   | 211.65 |  | 243.55         | 0.411 <b>38</b>    |
|                              |   |        |  |                |                    |

j.

TABLE 3

Intercorrelations among the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales Total Positive Score Self-Criticism, Intelligence Quotient, Socio-Economic Status and GPA.

|                   |        |             |            |          | - The state of the |
|-------------------|--------|-------------|------------|----------|--|
|                   | 1.0.   | Soc-Ec. St. | Self-Crit. | Total P. | พสอ  |
| Snanish-Americans | 1.000  |             |            |          |  |
|                   | 0.236  | 1,000       |            |          |  |
|                   | 0.187  | 0.155       | 1,000      |          |  |
|                   | 0.257  | 0.068       | 0.602      | 1 • 000  |  |
|                   | 0.192  | 0.476       | 0.191      | 0.297    | 1,000  |
| .(                |        |             |            |          |  |
| Anglos            | 1,000  |             |            | •        |  |
| ì                 | 00000  | 1 .000      |            |          |  |
|                   | 2,40.0 | 600°0       | 1,000      |          |  |
|                   | 0.063  | 0,169       | ०,486      | 1 .000   |  |
|                   | 0.481  | 0,362       | 0.289      | 0,269    | 1.000  |
| ·                 |        |             |            |          |  |

TABLE IV

Intercorrelations between GPA and the Tennessee Self-Concept Sub Scales

|            | Self-<br>Orit. | Row 1<br>Identity | Row 2<br>Self- | Row 3<br>Behavior | Col 1<br>Phy.<br>Self | Col 1 Col 2 C<br>Phy. Moral P<br>Self Self S | Col 3<br>Pers. | Col 3 Col 4 C<br>Pers. Family S<br>Self. Self. S | Col 5<br>Social<br>Self |
|------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------------|
| Spanish-Am |                |                   |                |                   | 1                     |  |                | •  | (<br>(                  |
|            | 0.191          | 0.388             | 0.025          | 0.025 0.482       | 0.250                 | 0.250 0.486 0.353 0.208                      | 0.353          | 0.208  | 0,287                   |
| Anglos     |                |                   |                |                   |                       |  |                |  | ;                       |
| )          | 0.289          | 1411.0            | 0.371          | 0.371 0.116       | 0.193                 | 0.193 0.287 0.131 0.311 0.021                | 0.131          | 0.311  | 0.021                   |

Concept Scales. Low scores in the Self Criticism items may indicate that the individuals are being defensive and making a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of themselves. (Table I, Profiles pages 35 and 36).

9. Intercorrelations of the Tennessee Self-Concept Sub-Scales yielded some interesting differences between the Spanish-American and the Anglo group. (Table 5).

Identity (What I am) a) correlated with Self-Satisfaction

Spanish-Americans: 0.50

Anglos:

0.71

b) correlated with Physical Seif
Spanish-Americans: 0.46

Anglos:

0.67

c) correlated with <u>Personal Self</u>

Spanish-Americans: 0.76

Anglos: 0.49

Self-Satisfaction

a) correlated with Moral Self
Spanish-Americans: 0.49
Anglos: 0.84

b) correlated with <u>Social Self</u>
Spanish-Americans: 0.53
Anglos: 0.71

Behavior (What I do) a) correlated with Physical Self
Spanish-Americans: 0.38
Anglos: 0.70

44

Physical Self

correlated with Family Self

Spanish-Americans: 0.22

Anglos:

0.63

The fact that the Physical Self correlate lower with Identity and Behavior among Spanish-Americans than in Anglos, may indicate that some ethnic characteristics like color of the skin and others, have no real bearing on the identity of the first group. Generally speaking Anglos are more consistent in their intercorrelations, indicating a more stable identity concept.

Nevertheless, it would be too inaccurate to make too definitive statements from these correlations.

TABLEV

Intercorrelations of the Tennessee Self-Concept Sub-Scales among Spanish-American students and Anglo students.

| 000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.000<br>1.00 |        | Self-<br>Orit.  | Total<br>P.  | Row 1<br>Ident-                                    | Row 2<br>Self-<br>Satis.                           | Row 3<br>Behav.                                    | Col 1<br>Phys.<br>Self                    | Col 2.<br>Moral<br>Self | Col 3<br>Fers.<br>Self  | Col 4<br>Femily<br>Self | Col 5<br>Social<br>Self |
|--|--------|---|--|--|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1.000<br>0.486<br>0.850<br>0.947<br>0.947<br>0.947<br>0.947<br>0.967<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0.968<br>0. |        |   | 000000000000000000000000000000000000000                              |  |  | 0,00,00  | 1.000<br>0.225<br>0.526<br>0.521<br>0.510 | 0,0-3,0,1               |                         | 1.000<br>0.255          | 1,000                   |
|  | Anglos | 000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>00 | 1.000<br>0.850<br>0.947<br>0.907<br>0.800<br>0.820<br>0.722<br>0.722 | 1.000<br>0.719<br>0.677<br>0.678<br>0.711<br>0.490 | 1.000<br>0.807<br>0.742<br>0.848<br>0.687<br>0.686 | 1.000<br>0.704<br>0.686<br>0.728<br>0.630<br>0.738 | 0 4 4 0 0<br>0 1 4 4 0 0                  | • • •                   | 1.000<br>0.401<br>0.505 | 1.000                   | 000                     |

#### DISCUSSION

There is a common characteristic to social and educational research, when it is scientific, and this is the investigator's respect for his findings. Whenever results are not in agreement with hypotheses, there is room for further investigation.

According to the findings, the Hypotheses of this research were not adequately sustained. 1) Spanish-American had not a significantly lower Self-Concept than the Anglo students with the same I.Q. and Socio-Economic background. 2) Spanish-American students had not a significantly lower Grade Point Average than Anglo students with the same I.Q. and Socio-Economic Status. 3) Correlation between Self-Concept with I.Q. and Socio-Economic Status was not statistically significant.

Results related to Self-Concept are in agreement with Barbara Polk Walton (1965) who found that for the same scales there was no apparent difference in Self-Concept between Culturally Deprived and Middle Class adolescents. Nevertheless, in that study the Grade Point Average for culturally deprived students was significantly lower than for the middle class group. She found important differences in the Conflict Scores of the TSCS, that were not investigated in this study. These results are in agreement with Dorothy M. Peters (1968) who found that there was not a significant relationship between Self-Concept scores of the TSCS and over-and under-achievement.



Her findings coincide with the Jervis study (1959) where no significant relationship between Self-Concept and GPA was found.

Results show that both groups are under the national Norms for the TSCS. Nevertheless, as Fitts says in the TSCS Manual, "However, the norm group does not reflect the population as a whole in proportion to its national composition. The norms are over-represented in number of college students, white subjects, and persons in the 12 to 30 year age bracket."27

The overriding conclusion of this study is that the Spanish-American and the Anglo group were extremely similar. Nevertheless, there are some considerations related to the research design that can cast a doubt on the findings. a) Was the "Anglo" group a real control group? The national representation of the Anglo group was: English 7, German 5, Italian 3, Slavic origin 2, Scandinavian 2, Irish 1. Since the researcher did not know how long these families had been living in the United States, there is a possibility that their status (with the exception of the English) was not too different as a minority group than the Spanish-American group. If it is so, the homogeneity of the sample is on firm ground.

<sup>27</sup> William H. Fitts, Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Manual (Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965).



b) Dichotomy High-Low Socio-Economic Status. As have been shown in page 30 there were no big differences in the Social Status of the Sample. The question is: to what extent was the dichotomy between two different groups articial? The researcher must confess that after visiting the school many times, the general impression was that in this area there was only one category, a fundamentally Low Middle Class. In this situation a much more elaborate tool should be used to measure dillerences in Status if they really matter. c) Dichotomy High and Low Intelligence Quotient. The fact that the researcher decided early in the study to split the group in two: ever and under 100 I.Q. made that as far as the population bended to be concentrated in the middle, the dichotomy did not work meaningfully. Nevertheless, since the sample of Spanish-Americans was so small, further classifications in narrower I.Q. categories would have been a problem. d) Sex. Since some researchers have pointed out that girls have in this age (15-19) a higher Self-Concept than boys, it was a concern of the researcher to match both groups in terms of sex (Table 5). Nevertheless, it is assumed that the bearing of sex is minimal in the results.

The results of this study not only did not sustain the hypotheses but did not fit with the strong plea for awareness in discrimination of Spanish-Americans made under the title of Assumptions. Nevertheless, it is important to point that

the findings show that more than dealing with a particular minority group, we have been dealing with several groups very close in social characteristics, and with common problems. Perhaps the evenness of the total sample shows a common mood typical of the South Omaha Area, its deterioation, the lack of good jobs in recent years, the switch of the town moving westward.

#### SUMMARY

A Field Project is always the source of two different kinds of experiences. First it is the exciting experience of being introduced to the science of educational research. When it is done for the first time, as it is the case now, the whole procedure of hypothesizing, building the research design, collecting the data and discussing, becomes an intellectual challenge without parallel. But research is not only methodology, it is search for truth. This not always means that the research can prove his hypotheses. It may happen to be more important for the sake of scientific truth, to realize that oneself hypotheses were wrong. This was the case of this Field Project.

What does it mean when Spanish-Americans were not significantly lower in the main variables, than the Anglo group? For one thing, It may indicate that in this particular school in Omaha, problems of this minority group are not as severe in relation with the total school population. This may serve



but at the same time the fact that both the Spanish-American and the Anglo group are below the norms for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales, may indicate that the total student body is going through a process of lack of esteem. Reasons for this phenomenan may, well be, out of the school in the configuration of the neighborhood and in the general deterioration of the area. It would be pretentious and very unscientific, for a foreigner with so little knowledge of the school to make any assumptions related to causes inside the school, but no doubt at all this needs to be studied.

If this research can help the attention of the educational authorities to be directed to the solution of the problems of the Spanish-American children in Omaha, the goal of this project is more than attained.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### 1. Self-Concept

- Bahle, Esther and J.B. Rotter. "Children's Feeling Personal Control as related to Social Class and Ethnic Group," Journal of Personality, v. 31 (1963), pp. 482-490.
- Bealmer, E., Bussell, G.F., Bussell, H.D., Cunningham, M., and others, "Ego identity and school achievement: a study of their relationship in the latency-age child and his parents." Unpublished masters thesis, Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville, 1965.
- Benjamin, James. "Changes in Performance in Relations to Influence upon Self-Conceptualization," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45: 473-480.
- Berger, E.M. "The relation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others," <u>Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology</u>, v. 47 (1952), pp. 778-
- Brant, Richard M. "The accuracy of Self-Esteem: A measure of Self-Concept Reality," Genetic Psychology Monographs, v. 58 (1958), pp. 55-59.
- Brassard, Elianora I. "Social desirability and Self-Concept description." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nebraska, 1963.
- Brownfain, J.J. "Stability of the Self-Concept as a dimension of personality," <u>Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology</u>, v. 47 (1952), pp. 597-606.
- Calvin, A.D., and Wayne E. Holtzman. "Adjustment and Discrepancy between Self-Concept and inferred Self,"

  Journal of Consulting Psychology, v. 17 (1953), pp.

  39-44.
- Chodorkoff, Bernard. "Self-Perception, Perceptual Defense and Adjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, v. 12 (1954), pp. 508-512.



- Crites, J.O. "Test Reviews: Tennessee Self-Concept Scale,"

  Journal of Counseling Psychology, v. 12 (1965), pp. 330-331.
- Dworkin, Anthony Gary. "Stereotypes and Self-Images held by Native born and foreign born Mexican-Americans," Sociology and Social Research, v. 49 (1965) Jan.
- Fitts, W.H. "Self-Concept and human behavior," Nashville Mental Health Center Research Bulletin No. 1, Nashville ville (2410 White Avenue), 1965.
- Greenberg, G. U. and Frank, G.H. "Response set in the Tennessee Dept. of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale," Journal of Clinical Psychology, v. 21 (1965), pp. 287-288.
- Hauser, F.S. "The relationship of Self-Concept to security, anxiety, and rigidity." Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of Rochester, 1953.
- Holstrom, Twyla. "Self-Concept and Achievement in High School Biology." Unpublished master's thesis, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1966.
- James, W. Psychology: The Briefer Course. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910.
- Jervis, F.M. "Meaning of a Positive Self-Concept,"

  Journal of Clinical Psychology, (1959), 15, 370-3.
- Manis, Mevin. "Social Interaction and Self-Concept,"

  Journal of Adnormal and Social Psychology, v. 50-51

  (1955), pp. 363-369.
- Muro, James J., and Freeman, Stanley L. (ed.). Reading in Group Counseling. Scranton: International Text-book Co., 1969.
- Phillips, E. ... "Attitudes toward Self and others, a brief questionnaire report," <u>Journal of Consultant Psychology</u>, v. 15 (1951), pp. 79-81.
- Peters, Dorothy M. "The Self-Concept as a factor in over and under achievement." (Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1968. No. 68-17, 289.



- Polk, Walton, Barbara. "A Study of differences in School Achievement and Self-Concept of Culturally Deprived and Middle Class Adolescents." Unpublished Master Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1965.
- Raimy, Victor. "Self-Reference in Counseling Interviews," Journal of Consulting Psychology, May-June 1948, 12: 153-163,
- Schwab, J.J., Clemons, R.S., and Marder, L. "The Self-Concept: psychosomatic applications," <u>Psychosomatics</u>, 1966. v. 7, pp. 1-5.
- Scotland, Ezra. and others. "The effects of Group Expectation and Self-Esteem Upon Self-Evaluation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, v. 54 (1957), pp. 55-63.
- "Self-Esteem, Group Interaction and Group Influence on Performance," Journal of Personality, v. 24 (1961), pp. 273-284.
- Sheerer, Elizabeth T. "An Analysis of the relationships between acceptance of respect for self-and acceptance of and respect for others in 10 counseling cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, v. 13 (1949), pp. 109-175.
- Stock, Dorothy. "An investigation into the interrelations between Self-Concept and feelings dir sed toward other persons and groups," Journal of Counseling Psychology, v. 13 (1949) pp. 176-180.
- Vacchiano, R. B. and Strauss, P.S. "The construct validity of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale," Journal of Clinical Psychology, v. 24 (1968), pp. 323-326.
- Walton, Barbara P. "A study of differences in school achievement and Self-Concept of culturally deprived and middle class adolescents." Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1966.
- Williams, R.L. and Cole, Spurgeon. "Self-Concept and school adjustment," <u>Fersonnel and Guidance Journal</u>, Jan. 1968, p. 478.

#### 2. Spanish-Americans

- Altus, William D. "The American Mexican: The Survival of a Culture," <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, v. 29 (1949), pp. 211-220.
- Brown, Sally Ann. "The Teacher-student role relationship in Junior High Schools serving significant numbers of disadvantaged, Spanish surnamed youth." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Denver, 1967.
- Burma, J.H. "Spanish Speaking Groups in the United States." Durham: Duke & iversity Press, 1954.
- Chang, D.K. "A guide of understanding and teaching of Mexican-American Adolescents." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1957.
- Demos, George D. "Attitudes of Mexican-American and Anglo-American groups toward education, "The Journal of Social Psychology, v. 57 (1962), pp. 249-256.
- Fein, Leonard J. "The limits of liberalism," Saturday Review, June 20, 1970, pp. 83-85.
- Gordon, Chad., and Gergen, Kenneth J. (ed.). The Self in Social Interaction. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968.
- Heffernan, H. "The implications of the White House Conference for the education of Spanish-speaking children." Southwest Council on the education of Spanish-speaking People. Los Angeles, Peperdine College, 1951.
- Haftel, S.G. "The needs and anxieties of Spanish-speaking children," California J. of Secondary Education, v. 28 (1951), pp. 168-170.
- Hobart, Charles W. "Underachievement among Minority Groups Students: An Analysis and a Proposal," Phylon v. 24 (1963), pp. 184-196.
- Joyce, William W. "Minority Groups in American Society. Imperatives for Educators," Sociology of Education, v. 33 (1969) pp. 429-433.



- Kluckholm, Florence R. and Fred L. Strodtbeck with the assistance of John ". Roberts and others, "Variations in Value Orientation." Evans on: Row Peterson, 1961.
- Kimball, William Lloyd. "Parent and family influences on academic Achievement among Mexican-American students." Unpublished Doctoral Lissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968.
- Mackey, F. William. "Bilingual Interference: Its analysis and measurement," The Journal of Communication, v. 15 (1965), p. 239.
- Matthiessen, Peter. "Sal si puedes, Cesar Chavez and the New American Revolution." New York: Random House, 1969.
- McDonagh, Edward and Richards S. Eugene. "Ethnic Relations the United States." New York: Appleton, 1953.
- McWilliams, Carey. "The Mexicans in America: A students' Guide to Localized History." Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968.
- Mercer, Jane, R. "Imprints of Culture on the personalities of children," California Mental Health Research Bigest, v. 5 (1967), pp. 161-162.
- "North from Mexico: The Spanish-speaking people of the United States." New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- Ortego, Philip D. "School for Mexican-Americans: Between two Cultures," <u>Saturday Review</u>, April 17, 1971, p. 62.
- Ott, Elizabeth. "The Bilingual Educational Program of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory," Florida F L Reporter, v. 7 (1969) pp. 147-148, 159.
- Fenalosa, Fernanda and McDonagh, Edward. "Education, Economic St and Social Class Awareness of Mexican-Americans," Phylon, v. 29, pp. 119-126.
- Rediguez, Armand, "The Challenge for Educators,"
  The National Elementary principal, Nov. 1970, p. 18.

- Shasteen, Amos Eugene. "Value Orientations of Anglo and Spanish-American high school sophomores. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1967.
- Simmons, Ozzie G. "The mutual image and expectation of Anglo-American and Mexican-Americans," Daedalus, v. 90 (Spring 1961), pp. 286-299.
- Problems and Issues, University of New Mexico, 1970. (Mimeographed.)
- Van der Zander, James. American Minority Relations. New York: The Ronald Press, 1956.
- Vasquez, Richard. Chicano. New York: Doubleday et Co., 1970.
- Vigil, Joaquin Thomas. "A comparison of selected perceptions of Spanish-speaking students and non-Spanish-speaking students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1968.
- Weesner, Carolyn. "Acculturation of Mexican-Americans in a midwestern city." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1968.
- Woods, Sister Frances Jerome. Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups. New York: Harper & Bro., 1956.

55/56

# A P P E N D I X A T A B L E 6

Census of Children with Spanish Surname at the Secondary School level in the Omaha Public School District in 1969.

| Senior High Sch                                  | ool                              | Junior High Schoo   | 1   |
|--|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Benson Bryan Burke Central North South Technical | 5<br>6<br>1<br>4<br>4<br>14<br>8 | Bancroft Beveridge Bryan Hale Indian Hills Lewis & Clark Mann Marrs McMillan Monroe Morton Morris Technical | 51<br>0<br>10<br>29<br>20<br>20<br>30<br>50<br>50 |
|  |                                  |   |   |
| Total  | 176                              | Total   | 154   |

Source: The Omaha Public School District. Office of Dr. Fullerton, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, 1970.

TABLE 7

Ratings of Spanish-American and Anglo students in the W. Lloyd Warner Scale of Status Characteristics.

| Score  | Rating                                 |                     | Score                                     | Ratin                                      | g                     |
|--|--|---------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
|  | Spanish-Am                             | Anglo               |   | Spanish-Am                                 | Anglo                 |
| 10 01 23 456 78 90 1 23 4<br>44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 4 | 1<br>3<br>-<br>1<br>6<br>-<br>17<br>20 | 3 4 2 5 1 3 1 4 1 3 | 444455555555556666<br>4444555555555556666 | 9 6 7 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 7 1 - 5 2 - 1 1 1 - 1 |
| 43 <u>.</u><br>44.   | 1 -                                    | •                   | 61<br>62<br>70                            | 3  | 16                    |

TABLE

|          |  |  |   |   |  |  | <b>5</b> 8  |  |
|----------|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| -        |  | ligh I.a.<br>Low Soc-Ec St.  |   | [.Q. Tr. St.  |  | LOW  |   |  |
| 5        | 73<br>69<br>71<br>76   | tho<br>67  | 522   | 73  | かどらら   | 87.5   | 222   |  |
|          | 61<br>61<br>38<br>70<br>77   | 55   | 37°   | 2   | 65<br>69<br>69<br>69   | 99   | 8634  |  |
| . 1      | 522 23   | 388  | 252   | 182   | 6276   | 09   | 265 K   |  |
|          | 7.1<br>7.0<br>6.5<br>7.0<br>8.5<br>7.0                             | 35.50  | 420元  | 3 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \   | \$ KU3 5   | 0,9  | 6000<br>0000<br>0000  | }  |
|          | 70<br>68<br>75<br>66<br>75   | 69   | , 12 th   | 5 8   | からいか   | 61   | いれない  |  |
| <b>\</b> | 100<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000<br>000 | 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1   |   |   | 2222   | 0  | , <b>5</b> 0, 0, 8  | 2  |
| 1        | 88%88  | 27 CO  |   | 6   | 108  |  | $\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ$   | ·U   |
| · I      |  | R R:   |   |   | 58845X   |  | 123   | 112  |
| 1        | í  | 1  | 301<br>309<br>265   | 312   | 373<br>334<br>294<br>294   | 331  | 305<br>323<br>323<br>323<br>323   | 341  |
| 1 ~ 4    | 39 37 36 56 56   | 28   | 12 <u>8</u>   | \$ <del>1</del>   | 28<br>27<br>33   | 27   | 3878  | 28   |
| Student  | Number<br>33<br>50<br>62<br>62                                     | 78   | <del>+</del> だけなっ   | 72<br>23<br>24<br>25<br>25<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26<br>26  | 2500   | 99   | 7887  | 7 75   |
| Group    | Н  | 1  |   |   | III  |  | ΛI  | •  |
|          | Student Self- Total Row Row Gol. Col. Gol. Gol. 601. 601. 6000.    | Student Self- Total Row Row Col. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol.  Code  Number Crit.  33 39 348 137 96 115 70 71 73 61 73 High I.Q.  50 36 309 114 95 100 75 70 57 38 69  71 75 70 77 71 73 High I.Q.  50 36 344 126 108 110 66 65 72 70 71 76 | Student Self- Total Row Row Col. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol.  Number Crit. Pp 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 5 61 73 High I.Q.  I 33 39 348 137 96 115 70 71 73 61 73 High I.Q.  SocEc St 50 37 349 126 102 102 68 56 61 61 68 High SocEc St 62 36 344 126 106 110 66 65 72 70 71 76 71 | Student Self- Total Row Row Col. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol.  Number Crit. P 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 5  Number Crit. P 1 2 3 1 2 3 4 5  Solution Col. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. G | Student Self- Total Row Row Col. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol.  Number Crit. P 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 | Student Self- Total Row Row Col. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol.  I 33 39 348 137 96 115 70 71 73 61 73 High I.Q. st  62 26 344 137 96 115 70 71 73 61 73 High I.Q. st  62 26 344 138 120 128 70 87 76 71 76  11 4 29 334 133 97 104 69 66 68 67 61 Low Soc-Ec St  52 37 114 64 95 12 54 55 60 05  53 37 132 129 112 82 70 78 70 73 High Soc-Ec St  11 46 28 373 132 129 112 82 70 78 70 73 High Soc-Ec St  53 294 114 108 112 64 65 75 70 High Soc-Ec St  64 55 59 54 70 High Soc-Ec St  65 57 70 High Soc-Ec St  65 57 70 High Soc-Ec St  66 68 67 77 76  67 70 High Soc-Ec St  67 77 76  68 67 77 76  69 67 77 76  69 67 77 76  60 05 | Student Self- Total Row Row Col. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol.  I 33 34 346 137 96 115 70 71 73 61 73 High I.Q.  Self- Total Row Row Col. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol.  II | Student Self- Total Row Row Gol. Col. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. Gol. G |

TABLE 9

Raw Scores of Anglo Students in the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales

|                 | St.  | St.  | SS<br>CT   | <b>3</b>                                 |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
|                 | High Soc-Ec  | High I.Q.<br>Low Soc-Ec.   | Low I.Q.<br>High Soc-Ec                                      | Low I.Q. Low Soc-Ec.                     |
| 503.            | 83<br>67<br>67   | 69<br>960<br>486<br>486<br>89  | 225  | 131725                                   |
| <b>G</b> 01.    | 27,030   | 150<br>120<br>120<br>120<br>120<br>120<br>120<br>120<br>120<br>120<br>12   | 73<br>74<br>65<br>65   | \$25.5%                                  |
| 001.<br>3       | 64<br>67<br>70<br>73<br>62   | 25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25.25<br>25<br>25.25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>25<br>2 | 0250<br>0250<br>0250<br>0250<br>0250<br>0250<br>0250<br>0250 | 28862                                    |
| <b>6</b> 01.    | 64<br>66<br>73<br>73   | 62 68<br>62 68<br>62 68  | 25,727   | 6,98,59                                  |
| 601.            | 83<br>77<br>59<br>59   | 77.72  | 825-28<br>25-28<br>25-28                                     | 23882                                    |
| Row<br>2        | 119<br>103<br>118<br>104   | 104 106 120 105 105 1105   |  |  |
| Row 1           | 133<br>120<br>138<br>131<br>114  | 1322   | 10,100   | 119 1113 1113 123                        |
| Total<br>P      | 371<br>326<br>374<br>351<br>306  | 329<br>335<br>305<br>305<br>305  | 359  | 280<br>298<br>308<br>1,214<br>3,42       |
| Self-<br>Crit.  | $\mathbf{I}$ $\mathbf{C}$ | (  | 4 388  | 4 28 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 |
| Student<br>Code | 118<br>121<br>128<br>129   | 2027   | 21000000   | 112<br>113<br>114<br>146                 |
| Group           | H  | 13   | III  | IV                                       |
| 61              |  |  |  |  |

#### G L O S S A R Y

# Sub-scales of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales

#### The Self Criticism Score

This scale is composed of 10 items. These are all midly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them. High scores generally find the normal, healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism. Total P. Score

This is the most important single score on the Counseling Form. It reflects the overall level of self-esteem.

### Identity (Row I)

These are the what I am items. The individual is describing his basic identity - what he is as he sees himself.

## Self-Satisfaction (Row 2)

This score reflects the level of self-satisfaction or self-acceptance, how he accepts himself.

#### Behavior (Row 3)

This score measures the individual's perception of his own behavior or the way he functions.

# Physical Self (Col 1)

Here the individual is presenting his view of his body, his state of health, his physical appearance, skills, and sexuality.



# Moral-Ethnic Self (Col 2)

This score describes the self from a moral-ethnic frame of reference - moral worth, relationship to God, feelings of being a "good" or "bad" person.

# Personal Self (Col 3)

worth, his feeling of adequacy as a person and his evaluation of his personality apart from his body or his relationship to others.

# Family Self (Col 4)

This score reflects the individual perception of self in reference to his closest and most immediate circle of associates.

# Social Self (Col 5)

It reflects the person's sense of adequacy and worth in his social interaction with other people in general.

#### SCALE I

# Scales for Making Primary Ratings of Four Status Characteristics \*

Status Characteristic Definition and Rating

Status Characteristic Definition and Rating

#### Occupation:

- 1. Professionals and proprietors of large businesses.
- 2. Semi-professionals and smaller officials of large businesses.
- 3. Clerks and kindred work-
- 4. Skilled workers.
- 5. Proprietors of small businesses.
- 6. Semi-skilled workers.
- 7. Unskilled workers.

#### Source of income

- 1. Inherited wealth.
- 2. Earned wealth.
- 3. Profits and fees.
- 4. Salary.
- 5. Wages.6. Private relief.
- 7. Public relief and nonrespectable income.

#### House type

- 1. Excellent houses.
- 2. Very good houses.
- 3. Good houses.
- 4. Average houses.
- 5. Fair houses.
- 6. poor houses.
- Vert poor houses.

#### Dwelling area

- 1. Very high.
- High; the better suburbs 2. and apartment houses, houses with spacious yards.
- Above average. 3∙
- Average; residential neighborhoods, no deterioration in the area.
- Below average.
- Low, considerably deteriorated, rundown and Semi-slum.
- Very low, slum. 7.



<sup>&</sup>quot;Social Class in America" 1960, Harper & \* W. Lloyd Warner. Brothers, New York. page 123.