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CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Introduction

Life styles of individuals who live in poverty contain few opportunities for optimal physical, emotional, or psychological human development. Low-income individuals are often described as inactive or isolated from the mainstream of social movement relative to self and community. By providing activities and education through which those living in deprived environments might learn of alternative styles of life, it is hoped the cycle of poverty can be changed.

The important question being asked by many professionals in education, psychology, social work, and other disciplines is how do low-income persons really feel about themselves, and can they see their family and community role as being "action for change" in both self and environment?1

It is through the study or understanding of human ecology that individuals can interact with people, become a part of the community social movement, and be an active thinking participant in one's environment. One can, as a result, control one's own destiny and think better of self because of such involvement.

Self-concept of Head Start parents and the manner in which participation in project activities might influence such feelings about self is of prevailing importance in this investigation. Active participation or involvement in life-experience Head Start activities should improve parents' feelings about themselves.

Understandably for any member of society the variables of involvement or participation and how the individual regards himself can be multidimensional. Recent professional interpretations by Brim\(^2\), Rogers\(^3\), Cooley\(^4\), Schultz\(^5\), and Mead\(^6\), present a pragmatic


viewpoint by suggesting that the real world is an active place, and those with a stable "concept of self" can most appreciate this activity. In this sense, not only do new forms of orientation appear, but new qualities or content of experience make their appearances. Reciprocally, these create new meaning for conduct. The appearance of new activities in the life of any individual basically refers to the socialization process.

According to Rogers and Tough, the "action for self" theory implies that action is therapy and that such action produces a more positive self-concept.

From a functional approach, it is the opinion of both Reissman and Nolan that universities must initiate and have a special obligation for conducting research to validate methods for improving "life-styles" of low-income subjects.

From principles basic to human development and mental health, there is the mandate that professionals continue to seek answers about how well the individual can function, maintain himself, become...
involved, and participate as a productive member of society. From a layman's viewpoint, the involved person concept may even be of more significance because the current federal tax dollar is providing basic financial support for many projects designed to assist low-income persons.

One of the federally funded efforts to assist families in poverty was the Economic Opportunity Act, introduced and passed in 1964, by the United State Congress. This allowed for the establishment of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This was the administrative agency for federal funds allocated primarily to provide various economic, educational, vocational, and human development opportunities for individuals from poverty environments. Specific projects within the Office of Opportunity were Legal Aid, Family Planning, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Credit Unions, Job Corps, Head Start, and others.

Each project was developed and funds requested according to surveyed needs at the community level. Funds were allocated from the National Office of Economic Opportunity and then channeled to the regional, and with state approval, finally to local Community Action Agencies.

This investigation of how low-income parents felt about themselves emerged from the Head Start component. Specifically, Head Start was designed as an intervention program to improve the life chances of the disadvantaged preschool child and his family. This meant not only opportunities for improvement in school, but greater
assistance in medical, social service, dental, parent participation, and nutritional areas. Further, this meant new approaches to family life education, home management, and consumer economics, as well as opportunities for up-grading the knowledge and experiences concerning parent-child interaction.

Head Start gained enough stability to warrant a move, in the summer of 1969, from the Office of Economic Opportunity to a newly formed Federal Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This change, however, in no way affected the policy and guidelines which established the basic philosophy of Head Start.

Policy and guidelines for Head Start were designed to improve the life chances for the total child and his family. Goldbery explains,

The Head Start center is known to be both a concept and a community facility—representing the drawing together of all these resources—family, community, and professional—which can contribute to the child's total development.11

A review of the success of the various Office of Economic Opportunity projects indicates that Head Start has become a very popular program. Even though some current research has not shown significant educational gains, the active process of developing the potential in children during their formative years seems to

underlie much of the cultural expectations for the maintenance of positive mental health, and therefore, for the goals and objectives of Head Start.

The components that are included in Head Start are numerous, but the main emphasis for this study is placed on the parent component. This philosophical concept of parent involvement as useful for this investigation is very clearly defined in the following statement,

...the value of a Head Start Child Development Center can have for a child will depend, in large, on how well his parents are involved in the program.\(^\text{12}\)

During 1969-1971, the Head Start parent involvement component received new emphases. Opportunities for involvement range from official guidelines that set policy in hiring low-income parents for participation in the child's classroom to the recruitment of parents for the various social and educational functions assigned to the program. Additional participation might come through policy or advisory activities, or in other community activities which come as a result of opportunities afforded through Head Start.\(^\text{13}\)


Goldbery states,

...the overall philosophy of the project is to involve the parents to improve their own social functioning in order to support their children's educational and social development through successful family living experiences. It is felt that unless there is parent participation, the program would be ineffective for there would be no reinforcement at home of what is done at the center, nor would there be hope for parents and schools to find mutually beneficial ways of working together...14

Brim15 and Goldbery16 suggest that parent participation is encouraged in a variety of ways, including: assisting in the classroom, accompanying the children on field trips, and participating in adult education activities. The main goal for parents is to enable them to equip themselves for successful family living in partnership with the school, community agencies, and appropriate professional persons.

Clarizio17 states that higher priority must be given to activities designed to change parental beliefs, feelings, and behaviors, because maximum use of one's school learning ability necessitates the dual efforts of home and school. Further, he

14 Goldbery, op. cit., p. 344.


16 Goldbery, op. cit., pp. 344-345.

suggests more imaginative means of strengthening the relation between home and school must be devised and greater emphasis must be placed on the importance of the home's reinforcement of the school's efforts.

From Clarizio's viewpoint, it is particularly disastrous that parents have been reluctant to take a lead in fostering closer relationships with the school. He also believes that the school has been unable to create a climate in which these mothers and fathers could be assisted to realize the value and necessity of education in a modern society.

Heffernan and Todd believe that mutual confidence between the school and the parents must be established, and state that the school should,

Make each parent's contact with the school a pleasant and constructive one...

and further, that school personnel and parents work together for two purposes:

To further the best interest of the children. To assist an individual child in solving his problems of development.

18Ibid.


20Ibid., p. 21.

21Ibid.
The way a child grows depends on the help and understanding of his family. Many parents who participate in Head Start have not had previous opportunities to learn how to increase their ability to provide this help and understanding. To change or help a child, the parents must also be helped to change. Concepts of family and child development have mostly been taught through the traditional educational system, but these systems have, in the past, failed to reach many segments of the population, especially the low-income. The increasing complexity of modern life separates all strata of the parent population from the school, with the problem being most serious for the low-income parents. The Head Start philosophy suggests that at the preschool level, this trend is most easily reversed.22

Auerbach23, Brim24, and others25 interpret that the concept of parent participation implies a sound mental health approach with a primary preventive purpose through understanding viewpoints and attitudes. Parents gain more satisfaction from being parents when

---


they can help their children enjoy childhood, when they can help their children learn, and when they realize that they are important teachers and models for their children. Taylor implies that many of society's problems can be solved through such parent education efforts.

Within the overall family and child development and early childhood education orientations of Head Start, much time and effort are given to the study of the emotional, physical, and psychological health of the individual. These generalized areas of human development encountered by each individual, in turn, supports respective self-concept feelings. Such self-concept feelings are an extremely important element in motivation and achievement for change.

The basic philosophy of community action and Head Start implies that through activities and involvement, the individual will experience self-improvement and that attitudes about himself will change for the better.

Grambs and Rogers support the theory that social adjustment in the community over a period of time is correlated with described changes in self-attitudes and self-perceptions.

---


If the theory that stabilization and adjustment in a social situation within one's community over a period of time coincide with changes in one's self-concept can be accepted, then it is important to investigate or consider the kinds of conditions which maximize change. Concomitantly, the self-concept determines a number of behaviors, and a positive change in self-concept would be desirable. Rogers\textsuperscript{29}, Jouard\textsuperscript{30}, and Coopersmith\textsuperscript{31}, reinforced the suggestion that one's self-concept or attitudes about himself serves as a schematizer for experiences and as a determinant of other attitudes.

The prior discussions are functional only through a theoretical assumption that low-income parents who move from a "non-participation" to a "participation" role bring about change in self-concept or attitude about self. The improvement of self-concept, which is the basic and relevant variable, can then be projected as one of the philosophical bases for the Head Start support of parent participation.

To measure the variable of self-concept, an abstract instrument, the semantic differential, has been used. The use of

\textsuperscript{29}\textsuperscript{Ibid.}, pp. 436-439.


this device is relatively new in the field of experimental research. The review of literature produced no instances of use with low-income subjects. Heise\textsuperscript{32} feels that it is important that more studies incorporate the use of the abstract instrument in the field of experimental research. Summers states,

Attitude measurement needs to devote more attention to the collection and treatment of specimens other than self reports.\textsuperscript{33}

The measurement of attitude with the semantic differential is also discussed by Heise\textsuperscript{34}. He identifies the advantages and disadvantages of such use and suggests that the terminology which describes "the self" as the "despised construct" might be reincarnated by the scattered nature of methods used to analyze "self-concept".

Kuhn\textsuperscript{35} implies that "self" has long been the central concept in the symbolic approach to social psychology, while little if anything has been done to employ it directly in empirical research. Scientific study of low-income families is generally even more deficient.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34}Heise, op. cit., pp. 250-251.
\end{itemize}
It is hoped that this experiment will also assist in fulfilling Kuhn's prediction that,

If I may be permitted a brief look at the crystal ball, I would see in it for the next twenty-five years of symbolic interaction theory an accelerated development of a research technique on the one hand and a coalescing of most of the separate subtheories on the other.36

Evaluation of Head Start components (i.e., curriculum, nutrition, medical and dental, volunteer services, staff development, social services, career development, and parent participation) has been of continuous concern since the inception of the project.37

Endres and Evans38 believe that evaluation has come late to the field of parent education and that much of what has been done has been criticized as unsound, since the evaluation attempts have relied heavily on participant assessment rather than on observations and reports of unbiased and uninvolved observers. More empirical data relative to low-income families is urgently needed.

It is agreed that evaluation is needed. There is, however, less certainty about the exact manner in which to combine variables and approaches for such evaluation.

Is the measurement of self-concept a valid way to study low-income subjects? Is the involvement theory an important enough

36 Ibid., pp. 60-62.


variable for such in-depth investigation? Is the semantic differ­
ential a sensitive enough instrument to correctly assess the feelings
of low-income subjects? What aspects of the combined variables are
or are not difficult combinations? Are there any significant
differences in involvement between the Head Start and non-Head
Start populations? Within Head Start, do the various types of
project activities encourage different commitments on the part of
the parent?

Concerns relative to parent involvement originate from a pro­
fessional experience with the development of programs for low-income
families and children as well as a personal and professional desire
to assist in the improvement of life styles for children and parents
in general. Human development principles, as well as the need for
more scientific knowledge, pervade all aspects of the problem. The
purposes of this investigation range from those that are academically
and theoretically based to those that are functional and personal.

Statement of the Problem

The study was designed to measure the self-concept of low­
income Head Start parents as compared with non-Head Start parents.
Further, it was designed to investigate the nature of change in
feelings about self that might be brought about by involvement or
participation in various kinds of Head Start project activities.

These activities, which can be classified as "normal life
experiences", can be categorized as those that relate to the child, to education, and to the social life of the adult.

Objectives

General objectives refer to the broad sociological research concepts identified as:

1. To provide insight into a peculiar stratified group of individuals who live in poverty.
2. To review the literature in order to identify functional and theoretical approaches to both self-concept and parent participation.
3. To discover new or additional information about self-concept of the low-income parent and about how these feelings influence function.
4. To provide background support for both the academic discipline of parent education as well as for the entire social-educational phenomena within the parent-child-school situation.

Specific objectives refer to the more intimate details of the nature of the study, the methodology, and the choice of the instrument. These objectives can be listed as follows:

1. To experiment with the use of the abstract semantic differential instrument with a low-income strata of the population.
2. To measure self-concept feelings of low-income persons and try to discover if there is a difference in feeling of those who are more involved in Head Start activities as compared with those who are not.
3. To experiment with the variables of time and type of activity as they relate to Head Start programs.
4. To formulate some definite implications relative to the above specific objectives.
As a result of the rationale and objectives as listed, the hypotheses can thus be stated as follows:

Hypothesis One

A positive attitude change concerning self is concomitant with parental participation in Head Start activities.

Hypothesis Two

A positive attitude change concerning self will be significantly different in regard to the amount of time spent in participation.

Hypothesis Three

A positive attitude change concerning self will be significantly different with participation in various types of program activities.

Definitions

Some terms incorporated in the context of this paper having definite connotative meanings according to the way in which they are used might still be misinterpreted because they are so widely used. Since the problem is one of semantics, it is, therefore, important to describe the following words or phrases as used in this study.

Self-concept

Refers roughly to the person's subjective and cognitive evaluations of himself.

Adult-educational activities

Those adult-interaction situations that definitely have elements of training or career progression for the individual taking part. Some examples of this might be adult education classes, policy-decision making meetings, leadership development training sessions, college credit courses, etc.
Adult-social activities

Those adult interaction situations that are for personal enjoyment. Some examples might be holiday parties, open-house visitations, informal discussion groups.

Child-oriented activities

Those situations where the parent involves himself as the activity directly relates to the child's school program. It might be visiting in the classroom, helping with some activity in the classroom, helping the child at home with some definite school learning activities.

Low-Income

The guidelines which categorize low-income families for Head Start were those adopted for this investigation. The guidelines are as follows:

O.E.O. Poverty Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Non-Farm Family</th>
<th>Farm Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Participation or involvement

In this particular research, these terms have synonymous meaning and are often used interchangeably. Basically, they mean the sheer active role of doing, performing, or physically taking part in any designated activity.

Parent coordinator

The parent coordinator is the local Head Start project staff person assigned to contact parents and coordinate, recruit, or encourage their participation in various activities.

Assumptions

There are several basic assumptions which appear to be a natural part of the organization for designing and implementing this investigation of low-income parents and the manner of how they function as unique individuals in the community at large. For example, it can be assumed that the semantic differential instrument used in the modified Q-sort methodology will be an appropriate and sensitive device for testing such population strata. Further, it is assumed that self-concept as a variable measured in this study is a precept that lends itself to abstract measurement.

It can be taken for granted that low-income parents have a realistic view of their approach to participation in activities related to their children, their social and educational activities, and moreover, that they do not exaggerate or use internal defenses to disguise their real life styles.

It can also be assumed that Head Start programs have had some generalized influence on parents and families of enrolled
parents and children, or else this component of Head Start would not be so highly reinforced.

Lastly, it is assumed that if these parents who participate in this study do place a higher value on what they think of themselves because of their general involvement in activities concerned with self and children, they can learn more about the environment, do more for others, and be a decision-maker about controlling their environment. Further, that if any person is a contributing member of society, it is assumed that this will help provide more positive feeling about himself.

**Limitations**

This study is limited to the low-income, social-cultural strata of the general population as defined by the Office of Economic Opportunity poverty guidelines. More specifically, it applies to the organization of Head Start parents.

The review of literature attempts to provide a theoretical foundation for self-concept but does not include a thorough in-depth review of the historical development. The review of self-concept should be thought of as a functional organization which should prove useful for this experiment.

The process is limited to the use of the abstract semantic differential presented in a modified Q-sort methodology.

The sample selection is limited to an urban midwestern community of approximately 370,000, with mixed ethnic backgrounds. The control group, made up of comparative low-income, non-Head Start
parents, was asked the same questions and given the same self-concept test. The questions asked were limited to the nature of activities and the amount of time spent in these activities.

While many approaches to the study of the parent could be identified, the limitations as outlined present the concepts that emerged as most important. Professional experience with Head Start families was an important factor in limiting the study to low-income parents. Prior use of the semantic differential and the novel implementation with low-income families were motivating factors in the choice of this particular instrument.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Within the realm of education, the traditional focus on the parents has been defined as an activity using educational techniques in order to effect change in parent role performance.

The dimensions of this self-contained viewpoint are rapidly changing. The usual approaches are receiving renewed emphases and additional techniques for working with the parent are being initiated. The Head Start parent participation component has greatly reinforced the academic concept of parent education.

While there have been a number of theoretical assumptions dealing with the disadvantaged parent, few research projects have been directly concerned with the parent of the family in poverty. Fewer yet have dealt with the measurement of how low-income parents feel about themselves and how these feelings might be influenced by their active participation in life experience activities.

The first part of this present chapter consists of the review of the major studies and current theories which show a relationship between Head Start and the variable of parent participation.
In the second part, there is a discussion of various theoretical explanations of "self-concept" which seem to reinforce the concept of self as used in this investigation.

Because of the unique use of the semantic differential with low-income subjects and the relative fact the abstract instrument is substantially a recent approach used in empirical research, it appeared to be important to include this review in the third section.

Parent Participation

Brim's well-known reference and work in the field of parent education presents a historical review of the parent education movement. His review directly relates to this specific study because it suggests that when parents participate, parents are, in turn, better able to discuss, to think, and therefore, more capable of consciously deliberating the ends and means useful for controlling their own environment. Parent participation will further increase the conscious and rational aspects of the role performances as perceived by the parent.

Psychiatry, psychology, education, sociology, social work, anthropology, and more lately the fields of group dynamics and mass communication have all contributed to the rationale for having parents involved or becoming better educated toward such control.

Brim, whose work is possibly the most academically respected in the parent education movement, appropriately sets the stage for explaining the Head Start philosophy of parent involvement.

Through a program of parent participation, a Head Start Child Development Center can provide parents with opportunities to gain the following:

- Recognition of the qualities they already possess.
- Understanding and appreciation of how children grow and learn, and how learning can be extended into the home.
- Confidence and enjoyment in the role of parents, leading to rising hopes for their children.
- Greater belief in themselves and their worth as individuals, leading to ever-widening participation in community action.
- Experiences in working with other racial, ethnic, and social groups.
- New and improved skills opening avenues to job opportunities.
- Increased knowledge of community resources and facilities, and how they can be used to improve family living.
- A chance to discuss family, community, and personal problems and possibly, a chance to solve them.
- Family togetherness through being involved in projects and activities.
- Understanding of the value of parent-school relationships.

The Federal Office of Child Development maintains a research program which assesses the various specific project components.

---

In relation to the parent participation component, research has shown that

Parents approve of Head Start and see its value for their children. Their involvement in Head Start ranges from a high degree of enthusiastic participation to a passive indifference with some element of suspicion. However, when parents who wish to participate in the Head Start programs are controlled, for research purposes, in the amount of participation time, significant differences result. The children of parents who have a high level of participation perform better on tests of achievement and development. In addition, parents who duplicate in the home the specific learning activities in the classrooms and who are trained in the teaching techniques, enhance the learning of their children more than parents teaching only in the home or with the learning activities confined in the classroom.³

Recent research by Hervey⁴, Gotberg⁵, and Willmon⁶, has definitely established that children of those Head Start parents who have exhibited greater amounts of time involvement in the project perform better on tests of achievement and development. These forms of involvement can be considered normal kinds of life experience activities.


Aside from the above cited research, there is little published empirical data concerning Head Start parents, particularly that dealing with attitudes and self-concept.

One of the few direct studies that did, however, deal with attitudes, expectations, and behavior of Head Start parents was conducted by Hervey. She found that Head Start's direct influence on the child had been evaluated, but the influence of the program upon parents has been the subject of only peripheral interest. Further, that since Head Start seeks to influence the child not only directly through the classroom program, but indirectly through the parents as well, it would seem appropriate to investigate the effects of Head Start participation upon parents by comparing them with similar parents of similar children.

From Hervey's research, few behavior and attitude differences were found between Head Start and non-Head Start low-income parents. She concluded that apparently the parents, as well as the children, are missing out on much of the real benefits that Head Start might have to offer.

Clarizio, in his experiment with differences in maternal attitudes following involvement in Project Head Start activities, suggested that research relative to the pre-school programs for

---

7 Hervey, op. cit., pp. 1-3.

8 Ibid.

disadvantaged children has been centered on the child and neglected the disadvantaged parent.

From Clarizio's research, it was hypothesized that group meetings oriented to the interests and needs of lower-class mothers and conducted by educators and/or guest speakers would result in the development of more favorable attitudes toward education and the schools. This, however, was not supported. The suggested reasons for failure to find differences ranged from insufficient parent involvement, the formal style of the meetings as compared with the usual informal style of life, the fact that the communicator was seen as an outsider, and too much emphasis was placed on verbal interaction.

From the results of this study, it seemed apparent that the school-home aspect of Head Start programs had not modified the educational attitudes of lower-class mothers. Further Clarizio implied that attempts to work with mothers from depressed areas in a meaningful program have not received warranted attention.10

Endres and Evans11 provide foundational support for increased factual knowledge of parents who have participated in parent education programs. They specifically identify the need for research pertaining to the way in which feelings improve and attitudes change

10Ibid., p. 11.

as a consequence of participation in parent education programs. Further, they suggest that from a parent education program, a parent should also effect change in his overt behavior.

Taylor\textsuperscript{12}, in her philosophy of parent education, agrees with this to the degree that she thinks parent participation may be termed as "practice teaching" for parenthood, and that this may contribute to the solution of some of the basic problems of our times.

Willmon\textsuperscript{13}, who also conducted a study relative to parent involvement, concluded the following:

(a) Parental involvement in an educational program for young children appears to be a factor in future academic motivation.

(b) Anti-poverty programs concerned with up-grading the achievements of students should involve and educate the parents.

(c) Many parents of culturally disadvantaged children will attend and participate in the Head Start program if invited and encouraged.

(d) Those involved in formulating policy and executing the Head Start program, as well as local administrators and teachers, should encourage parent participation and involvement in the program.

McCarthy\textsuperscript{14} found significant differences in the amount of gain in the language abilities of Head Start children where their


\textsuperscript{13}Willmon, op. cit., p. 406.

parents participated in an individual home visit program, and a significant change in attitudes between parents who participated in the general group meeting involvement program and those who participated in no parent involvement program. She concluded that disadvantaged parents are concerned about their children and willing to cooperate with school personnel when a plan is devised that is within their realm of capabilities. McCarthy found that culturally disadvantaged parents tend to feel inadequate in their role as parents and tend to show little trust in their child.

According to a recent research project conducted at Florida State University, it was established that highly active parental involvement in Head Start influenced academic motivation. Brim suggests developmental norms as the most common areas of content for parent education and further that the traditional interpretation excludes the intellectual development of the child. Recent research, however, contradicts Brim's analysis. Much recent work has specifically been cited in relation to the parent being involved in the cognitive learning process of children from low-income families.

15Ibid.
17Brim, op. cit., pp. 155-156.
As Karnes states,

The particular cognitive style of the low-income, low-educational level family is perpetuated from generation to generation....to break this vicious cycle, intervention in early childhood is essential.18

Intervention experiences incorporated in many specific research projects range from those that improve social and physical development to those that imply improved cognitive structures. Basically, all of the methods are designed to involve the parents in combating the perpetual deprivation in learning abilities of young disadvantaged children.19

Brim makes a very appropriate summarizing statement when he states,

....the effects of parent education probably depends on the interaction of a certain method with certain content, clientele, and type of result being considered.20

Self-Concept

Poverty, while it has always been in existence, has been acutely examined for the last decade from both an academic and a


20Brim, op. cit., p. 280.
layman's viewpoint. The over-abundance and greater degree of affluence have made middle and upper America more aware of the segment of the population that must live with the paradox called, "America, the land of opportunity".

While the milieu of professional politics and social organizations have implemented programs to assist low-income individuals to remove themselves from the syndrome of their poverty stricken environment, the unique humanism and the complexity of the task belies the fact that "we" are still at it.

From this research it would be hoped that some additional attention and information for an isolated problem area, that of analyzing the self-concept feelings of low-income parents, would be provided.

While participating in the 1965 American Home Economics Association workshop concerned with professionals working with low-income families, Chilman suggested that the "ego-strength" or "high level of self-confidence", did not exist with low-income families... that they lack a goal-oriented life style and have generally negative attitudes about people and their environment.21

From those opinions projected by Chilman, it could be assumed that the same population would exhibit relatively negative self-concept feelings. In the same presentation, she stated,

...the very poor generally subscribe to the basic values and goals of our society, but they adapt these values and goals to the circumstances of their own lives that are infiltrated and circumscribed by the many disadvantages that go along with being poor.22

Since this specific study deals with the measurement of change in self-concept as influenced by participation in Head Start activities, could it be expected that the process of adaptation might cause a less enhancing concept of self?

Mohendra, in a 1969 research paper, relates that the patterns of personal achievement are significantly related to the perceived self and that the importance of the self-concept in the educational process seems to need more emphasis than is presently being given.23

Participation for change in self-concept may also be reinforced by a recent study by Caplin24, where he found that there was a significant positive relationship between self-concept and academic achievement.

Mulford and Salisbury25 imply that status roles are salient

22Ibid., p. 47.


during the early years of marriage, while Gesi\textsuperscript{26} recently deducted from his experimental programs that self-concepts of low-income persons revealed greater discrepancy between actual self-concept and that which they would prefer. Insofar as it is the parents whose role of fulfilling socially important activities which might be important to change in self-concept, these findings could imply that low-income individuals do not logically assess themselves.

Pietrofesa states that a positive self-concept and a healthy personality are considered assets to the individual. When the individual maintains such adequate feelings, which is basic to all learning, he can, in turn, make adequate involvement or vocational choices.\textsuperscript{27}

If the characteristics of low-income persons can be classified as abstract, less concrete, or less "with the real world", then Hewitt's\textsuperscript{28} research is a valid presentation. In his study, which compared change in "self-concept" after sensory deprivation in concrete persons as compared with abstract persons, he found that concrete persons had higher self-concept feelings and that they also rely more on their external environment for stimulation.


The number of self-concept studies of the low-income population have been relatively few in number, and the majority of these have been with children rather than with adults. Within this sphere of relationships, in a study by McDaniel, it was found that there was no difference in self-concept between middle-class and low-income children.

Relative to verbal reinforcement of self-concept, there was a comparative theoretical assessment by behaviorists and humanists which supported evidence of a relationship between self-concept and performance. Verbalizations and participation in activities involving self, according to this study, do have importance. Soffen investigated the variable of involvement with relevant activities designed to increase knowledge and acceptance, and found that these involvement activities did not significantly change the self-concept of those who participated.

If similar and related work can be equated, Geisler found that low-income students who were active and involved in life


experiences and school activities such as staff interaction, field trips, special interest groups, academic classes, had a higher positive self-concept score than did those low-income students not involved.

The importance of the study of "attitudes about self" are emphasized by several theorists; Coopersmith states,

...these attitudes are self-fulfilling by their very effects upon motivation and action. The person who believes, realistically or not, that he is likely to succeed and that he deserves respect and attention, will present a posture of confidence and thereby increase the likelihood of his success and of the respectful attention of others. Such a person's expectations become a reality to others as well as to himself, both by virtue of his overt actions and statements and by the energizing effects that positive expectation for the future are likely to have upon the present.33

Rogers34 suggests that concept of self is important and when correlated with certain feelings and self-perception, has bearing upon the attitudes, psychological reactions, and behavior of the individual.

Further, Jouard states that attitudes concerning self are,

....related to healthy personalities and people who play their roles satisfactorily and at the same time derive personal satisfaction from role enactment; more, they keep growing and they maintain high-level physical fitness....if our clients are to be helped, they must change, and change in valued directions. A change in valued direction may arbitrarily be called growth.35

---


The self has long been the central concept in the symbolic approach to social psychology, while little if anything has been done to employ it directly in empirical research. Scientific studies of self-concept of low-income persons are generally even more deficient.

Although the consequences of self-concept are multi-faceted in their expression, there is a suggestion that concept of self is generally integrated with behavior and only rarely represents an independent defense.

The avoidance of subjective experience as a topic of study may stem from varied and uncertain definitions that have been employed in research on the self and failure to confront basic and confounding issues. Coopersmith indicates that research on the self would be categorized in the province of attitude studies. The abstraction can be functionally symbolized as "a person's idea of himself to himself". In this investigation, the terms self-concept and attitudes of self will be used interchangeably.

A theoretical explanation by Brown suggests that "the self is not the same as the human organism, which is, in certain ways, identified with the organism". He also interprets other theorists such as Freud, who often used the "ego" in the same sense as "self"; James, who interprets the self as a mental construction of the human organism; and Mead, who has very persuasively argued that the

---


37Ibid., pp. 20-22.
self is a derivation of social life. After reviewing several theoretical stances to the approaches of the study of self, Brown concludes with two points, which are,

....that the self-conception is created by a process in impression formation much like the process by which conception of others are created...

and,...that the organism's conception of the self and of other persons are highly interdependent entities.

Consequently, Brown continues, "It seems to me that on the subject of self, as on the subject of others, the organism never has more than an opinion. Brown, Grambs, and Girona believe that the measurement of self-concept can indicate one's feelings and attitudes about oneself.

The concept of self is inevitably a complex concept. It is multi-dimensional in that it represents not only internal and external manifestation and diverse experiences, but it is often based on different levels of competence dealing with the environment. Further, the attitudes that a person has about himself can be evaluative.

---


39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid., p. 437.


Research findings on attitudes developed over the last century lead us to believe that these attitudes are intertwined with positive and negative affective stages and are likely to have marked motivational consequences. 44

James, Mead, and Cosley provided major psychological insights and guidelines for the study of "self". It must, however, be granted that theoretical formulations concerning the study of the "self" do differ and that no single theoretical context can be considered without accepting a number of vague and often unrelated assumptions. For the purpose of integrating these and other concepts into a coherent and testable theory 45, it can be inferred that all persons develop a self-image of themselves which serves to guide and maintain their adjustment to the external world. Since this image develops out of interaction with the environment, it reflects the judgments, preferences, and shortcomings of the particular familial and social settings...and further, that an image of self stems from self-perceptions, which are correlated with attitudes, physiological reactions, and behavior of the individual.

Taking the above basic assumptions into consideration, another equally important factor, as defined by Girona, indicates that these perceptions are measureable. He states,

...how one perceives himself is a function of the perceptual organization. Central to the perceptual organization of an

44Coopersmith, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

individual are the perceptions of himself that because of their central nature, become strong determinants of the whole perceptual field...and that these perceptions of self include affective elements of a positive or negative character. If a measure of the degree of positive or negative affect can be attached to the perceptions of himself, such would be the determination of a basis for making some inferences about the nature of his self-concept.46

From these and other definitions, a final statement can be made that the ideas of self-concept are related basically to the kind of beliefs and attitudes a person has about himself.47 And further, that the words the individual connects in his private awareness to the description of himself are, in fact, semantic symbols which have denotative as well as connotative meaning of an affective nature. Because these connotative affective meanings are fairly stable across individual members of the same population, they may provide data from which the level of affect that the individual attaches to the perception of himself can be inferred.

According to Parsons, the "I" or "me" is the object or identity system within the socialization process. It gives meaning to the individual and is the reference system for interpreting the meaning of the individual's actions.48

If validly measured, then, this partial indicator of the

---

46Girona, op. cit., pp. 3-4.
47Grambs, op. cit., pp. 11-18.
nature of self should provide useful information on some aspects of the individual's perceptual and self-attitudinal organization.

As Rogers states,

...there is scattered and inconclusive evidence that increased functional intelligence and functional learning are correlated with the described changes in self-attitudes and self-perception.

If an aspect of involvement can be interpreted to mean adjustment, there is evidence that social adjustment in the community over a period of time is correlated significantly with the perception of self and self-in-relationship-to environment.

There is also some empirical evidence which indicates that improved self attitudes maintain elements of therapy and can be correlated with,

...A decrease in psychological tension as verbally expressed.
...Heightened frustration tolerance.
...A decrease in defensive behavior.
...A decrease in negatively toned attitude toward others.
...An increase in mature behavior.
...Improved adjustment on the job.
...Lessened anxiety, greater personal integration, etc.

Generally, it would appear that the individual changes when he perceives himself as a more adequate person, that he is more aware of his immediate relationships and environment, and is better able to evaluate experiences in ways that are non-inherent to specific

---

49 Rogers, op. cit., p. 437.
50 Ibid.
51 Ibid.
objects. Rogers continues to state that these changes are not random, but appear to have commonality of trend.52

One of the few references found which would be most closely aligned to the design of the current research were papers taken from the November, 1969, conference report on self-concept in adult participation.53

Tough, in his presentation, said,

...one reason for some adults becoming involved in education and similar learning efforts was they feel satisfied or happy whenever they spend time at learning rather than some other activity. Some of their responses indicated that the learner's perception of himself and his regard for himself are important.54

In a general way, the relationship between self-concept theory and participation or involvement by the adult is something like this: if there is some (not extreme) lack of congruence between the ideal self and the perceived self, a need or drive for balance between the two selves will probably arise. One way to achieve balance is to change the perceived self (really, the actual self) through a deliberate sustained effort to learn—that is, a learning project such as a series of private lessons, etc.

In the same conference, Zahn suggested that attitudes about

52 Ibid.


self may favorably or unfavorably design rationalizations to defend certain behaviors, and therefore, these attitudes and inner motivations can provide or impede change or control over one's own environment.

In a research paper by Silver, a number of definitions of self-concept were projected. In spite of the slightly different perspectives of self-concept, there are also essential similarities; for example

...since the purpose of an individual's behavior is the satisfaction of his own need, the perceptual field is usually organized with reference to the behavior's own phenomenal self.

The meaning of an object or event is, thus, the definition of the relationship between the object or event and himself.

A second interpretation used by Silver to describe self-concept is,

...as an organized configuration of perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities, the precepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and the environment; the value qualities which we perceive as associated with experiences and objectives as having positive or negative valence.

Silver further suggests that there is a distinguishing dif-


57Ibid.
ference between "self", "concept of self", and "self-concept", and defines the latter as the organization of the system of generalizations a person has about himself; the cluster of the most personal meanings a person attributes to himself.58

In another of Silver’s definitions, a hypothetical self was inferred, which is portrayed as a social product and which has full meaning only when expressed in social interaction.

...that every evaluative statement a person makes concerning himself can be considered a sample of his self-concept.59

Another suggestion is that concepts of self are those more or less discrete perceptions of self which the individual regards as part or characteristic of his being...that self-concept is an approximation of a larger organization, not synonymous with it.

The last of Silver’s interpretations is stated as follows,

...the self-concept be defined as the organization of all that the individual refers to as "I" or "me"...a patterned relationship or 'gestalt'...a degree of stability and consistency which gives predictability to the individual and his behavior.60

Silver summarizes her statements by projecting the view that the self is differentiated throughout life, that we continuously discover, with greater and greater clarity who and what we are.

Instruments that measure self-concept range from checklists and open-ended questions to abstract devices. Instruments available

58 Ibid.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid., pp. 8-10.
to identify and measure attitudes of self are few in number and even these are not often of reliable caliber. The problem inherent in any of these deals with two issues. First, the question of validity or whether the instrument actually measures what is intended. The second problem centers around the reliability of the instrument. When the above problems are taken into consideration, along with symbolic and perceptual theories, the choice of a semantic differential instrument has advantages over other design considerations.

Dildine defines self-concept as somewhat more complex when he states,

...a person's inner pattern of thinking and feeling about himself which are the most central, conscious, and persisting aspects of his self-image. A motivation continuum from defensive self-maintenance to creative self-enhancement is also set forth, together with a behavior cycle (including perception, interpretation, memory, decision, and action) operating in the nervous system to govern behavior through one's inner frame of reference...those parts of the phenomenal self which the individual has differentiated as definite and fairly stable characteristics of himself.

Self-concept has been viewed within various theoretical frameworks and has alternately been conceived as the "knowing self", the "organizer", the "motivator", the "pacifier", and the "subjective voice of culture". Regardless of which function is emphasized, it is seen as a perceptual system toward which regard is directed, and

---


which schematizes experience. This phenomenological view of the self is defined as an attitude, one which can be tapped by assigning traits, feelings, and characteristics of behavior.63

In summary, the broad scope of definitions and ways of interpreting self-concept have, for use in this investigation, been condensed and generalized to refer roughly to the person's subjective, cognitive, and evaluative feelings about himself.

**Semantic Differential**

The use of the semantic differential is a fairly recent development as an instrument for the measurement of attitudinal change. Consequently, those references that are available are very recent in nature. There were none that dealt specifically with attitudes of low-income adults. As an introduction, it is necessary to explain that the measurement of attitude concerning self is a psychological concept. A persistent dilemma exists in regard to the measurement of change along psychological dimensions. Within differential psychology, there is no choice except to give preference to the stigma of subjectivity and assume that interpretable dimensions for individuals with different initial standing can be made.64

Various theoretical approaches which are relative to the measurement of meaning are critical of the use of the semantic

---

differential for this purpose. According to Snider and Osgood, the linguistic theories attempt to define meaning by laws from which human behavior can be analyzed. The mediation process relates meaning to the representational- mediation learning theory, and the physical-perceptual concepts casts yet another approach to the use of meaning as an experimental variable.

Further, as the applications of the semantic differential become more numerous and diverse, it becomes increasingly necessary to evaluate some of the methodological assumptions upon which the semantic differential is based.

Part of the problem in regard to the measurement of the psychological variable of attitude of self-concept is not with the subjective variable, but with the design of the instrument which will be used in the experiment. When techniques of reporting subjective phenomena are developed, subjective phenomena are as proper as objects of scientific study as any other data.

According to Lunberg,

...the behavior which we define as attitudinal or as an attitude is a certain observable 'set' of the organism or a reaction tendency preparatory to, and indicative of, more complete adjustment...


In this experiment, then, the term "attitude" will be used to denote the general set of the organism as a whole toward an object or situation which calls for adjustment. As such, it includes all the neural and other physiological sets and postures toward a situation, and their psychological correlates.

The principal aspect of attitudes which is to be measured is that which takes the form of opinions or feelings expressed in language.

A further interpretation by Jahoda is,

A person's beliefs will often give very clear indications of his feelings and his desires. The converse is also true, and emotional reaction will sometimes reveal beliefs which a subject is unable to verbalize. Conscious beliefs, the psychoanalysts have demonstrated, are frequently more superficial than feelings and motives; thus, in the attempt to understand a person's behavior, knowledge of this feeling may be more fruitful than knowledge of his beliefs.68

Osgood, in his creative theoretical model for the measurement of attitude, feels that since the internal mediation activity is part of the semantic structure of the individual, it can be correspondingly indexed. Further, the factor analysis of meaning may then provide a basis for extracting this attitudinal component of meaning.69

The semantic meaning is the "relation of things to their signifies" and through the semantic differential conditions of a


stimulus which is not the significate, but which becomes a sign of the
significate, will be discovered.\textsuperscript{70}

Osgood rationalizes the process of the development of the seman-
tic differential as

If unrestricted linguistic output...has high presumption
validity, it is apparent that if we are to use linguistic
encoding as an index of meaning, we need (a) a carefully
devised sample of alternative verbal responses which can
be standardized across subject, (b) these alternatives to
be elicited from subjects rather than emitted so that
encoding fluency is eliminated as a variable, and (c) these
alternates to be representative of the major ways in which
meanings vary....to increase the sensitivity of our instru-
ment, we may insert a scale between each pair of terms, so
that the subject can indicate both the direction and the
intensity of each judgment.\textsuperscript{71}

When the individual decodes a particular sign, it can be
assumed that a complex mediating reaction occurs, and that it is made
up of a pattern of the polarized reaction represented in varying
degrees of intensity. When the individual encodes this semantic state
against the differential, it should be assumed that the selection of
directions in the semantic space is coordinated with what reactions
are elicited by the sign. In turn, the degree of polarization (ex-
tremeness in the space or how far out along the scales he checks) is
coordinated with how intensely these reactions are made.

Gerow, in specific research designed to investigate the

\textsuperscript{70}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{71}\textit{Ibid.}
encoding paradigm of Osgood's representational mediation model of
meaning, indicated that there can be validity to this mechanism.72

Jahoda suggests that questions which simply obtain a like-
dislike reaction might be useful when studying clearly defined issues
which relate to everyday activities.73

Osgood indicates that "there are no standard concepts and no
standard scales; rather, the concepts and scales used in a particular
study depend upon the purpose of the research."74

One example of such use as directly related to Osgood's
semantic differential design was a specific study to measure atti-
tudinal change. The significance was the likeness to this study,
and Seim found the semantic differential instrument a useful tech­
nique.75

Long and others also conducted a self-concept study using
the semantic differential instrument. In essence, their study, which
dealt with school children, was apparently functional and revealed
familiar cultural expectations. These pointed out that stereotyped

72Joshua Ralph Gerow III, "The Semantic Differential and Concept
Discrimination," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of

73Jahoda, et. al., op. cit., p. 166.

74Osgood, et. al., op. cit., p. 76.

75Robert Martin Seim, "A Measurement of Attitudinal Change
Following a Ten-Week Guidance Class: A Semantic Differential
Study," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern
roles of "bad boy", "big boy", "little girl", "good girl", were internalized by middle childhood.76

Noble's study, while not using the semantic differential technique, did employ a polarized style to measure differences in attitudes held by low-income Appalachia mothers as compared with middle-class mothers. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in attitudes of the factors of contentment-discontentment; authoritarian-control; confidence-lack of confidence; democratic attitudes and instrumental role of parents.77

As Sizemore suggests,

the use of the semantic differential technique has obvious advantages: it is easy to construct, requires a minimum of administrative time, and is clearly amenable to machine sorting.78

In conclusion, language does develop representational processes in association with signs and these processes are intimately concerned with behavior. This cycle of processes result in meaning, and meaning is one of the most significant pivotal variables in human behavior.


Osgood\textsuperscript{79} implies that even though the semantic differential is at this time a crude and very provisional measure of meaning, uses are readily identified. Many of the applications are in the social area.

\textsuperscript{79}Osgood, et. al., op. cit., p. 329.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed outline of the methods used to investigate whether or not the self-concept of low-income Head Start parents is influenced by their involvement or participation in life experience activities. The activities are those programmed by and scheduled through the Head Start project and those that are designed especially for parents. A description of the selection of the sample, as well as the specific characteristics of the subjects, will be presented.

Variables which provide the basis for the direction of the investigation will be described and put into proper perspective with the method of analysis. These variables include the kind and amount of time spent in the project activities and the measurement of self-concept. A modified Q-sort was used to administer the semantic differential instrument for the measurement of the self-concept variable. This has been explained and illustrated, and a concisely organized overview of the framework of methodology is provided.

The pilot study provided a valuable assessment of the total process and as a result, changes in procedure as well as changes in expectation for use of the semantic differential were made. For
example, it was learned that there were no great differences in self-concept scores made by the Head Start and non-Head Start subjects. Also, the pilot project had been designed as a pre and post measurement.

The Sample

The subjects for the experimental groups were drawn randomly from an enrollment pool of approximately 1,000 full-year, half-day Head Start parents, enrolled during the 1969-70 and 1970-71 school year.

All parents, in both the experimental and control groups, were from the low-income strata of the population of an urban midwestern community of approximately 470,000. Federal guidelines dictate that those families who participate in Head Start verify their poverty income levels; and as a matter of regulation, the same income restrictions as judged through welfare or housing records were imposed on the choice of control group subjects. A second criterion of selection for the control group was the existence of preschool children in the family. Naturally, the control group had not participated in Head Start activities.

There were 100 parents in the control group, and the same number in the experimental group. Only one parent in each family was asked to respond to the interview schedule. While the majority of subjects were female, there were five male participants in the control group and two in the experimental group. Data on age was not collected, but it was obvious that age of participants ranged from the early twenties to the late forties.
Interviews were conducted concurrently for both the experimental and control subjects during the fall and winter of the 1970-71 school year. No specific day of the week was set aside for such interviews. However, more Saturdays and Sundays were used simply because of convenience for the interviewers.

**Experimental Design**

A post-test, control group plan was utilized for the study. The design resolves into three separate one-way analyses of variance paradigm as illustrated on page 55.

Each of the experimental groups had a corresponding control group. One experimental variable was the amount of time spent in activity participation. Participation in the various program activities can be operationally dichotomized in the following manner:

A. Type of program activity.

B. Amount of time involved or in participation.

Types of program activities were classified into three levels, as follows:

1. Child-oriented (C)
2. Adult-educational (AE)
3. Adult-social (AS)

Amounts of time involved or participation in the various program activities as listed above were divided as follows:

1. High involvement or participation.
2. Low involvement or participation.

The control group completed the framework which illustrates the
factorial design. Since the objective was to measure each factor and variable against the control group, the k treatment method of analysis was also used. This procedure could be classified as a design of the experimental post-test only with one control group, and is illustrated in Table One.

The parent self-rating scale is illustrated in Appendix D and the parent coordinator's rating scale in Appendix E. The scores from these scales relative to the amount of time spent in each activity were correlated by the Pearson Product-Moment correlation. This is most commonly computed with the following formula:

\[ y_{xy} = \frac{\Sigma xy}{N \sigma_x \sigma_y} \]


TABLE 1
One-Way Analysis of Variance and k Treatment Design of the Experimental Post-Test Only With One Control Group

Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High (1)</th>
<th>Low (2)</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AE (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

Subject Selection

After the assessment of the pilot study and the total proposal objectives were identified and approved in the spring of 1970, the next step was to formulate a plan for reaching the population to be sampled. After some time of initial planning, the procedure can best be described through the series of steps taken in obtaining the sample. These can be listed as follows:
1. The local Head Start director was contacted and the inquiry was made as to whether a current list of participating Head Start families could be obtained. In addition, an explanation of the experiment was given. The director approved, but referred the investigation to the supervisor of parent coordinators.

2. The parent coordinator of the local project, after a second explanation of the nature of the study, stated that a list of names and addresses of those families enrolled could be obtained for the study. Within a few days, this list was made available.

3. The county welfare director was contacted by phone and the process and purpose of the experiment was explained. A personal visit and explanation followed.

4. During the personal visit, a sample of the instrument and modified Q-sort cards were exhibited and explained. It was explained that the welfare department would be willing but was not allowed to openly expose the welfare files to persons outside the department.

5. An alternate process for obtaining suitable control subjects was to visit a casework supervisor's staff meeting, at which time the experiment could be explained, and the supervisors asked individually if they could refer some suitable families.

6. Another source for locating control subjects was through the Metropolitan Housing Authority. This organization basically serves low-income people. A phone call was made first to the director in charge of all the city's housing developments. After explaining the experiment, the director was agreeable, but suggested the quickest way to obtain the family references would be to contact the manager of each respective low-income housing project. Consequently, the names and phone numbers of each project manager were obtained.

7. Each project manager was contacted by phone and follow-up letters of explanation were forwarded. The purpose of the call, and the reference to the director were made. Each said they would be willing to assist in the study. One subsequently mailed a suitable list of names. One suggested the investigator come to the main office to copy suitable references. The third managed only low-income housing for elderly persons.
8. After names and addresses were collected, interviews were conducted by a young male from within the black community, a young Caucasian graduate student, and the investigator. All three members of the team used the same set of directions and operated by the same process. This process is outlined in Appendix A.

9. In each case, where a phone call was made to obtain observations for the sample, the same detailed explanation was incorporated into a letter which was sent to the person contacted. This served as both a follow-up and a confirmation, as well as an opportunity to thank the director, manager, or coordinator for cooperating.

Instructions To The Subjects:

Subjects were located either in their own homes or where they might have been attending a group meeting; for example, in Y.W.C.A. meeting rooms or hospital clinic waiting rooms. In the homes, the room most often used was the living room, but a number of interviews were conducted in the kitchens. At any location, an attempt was made to arrange the situation so that subjects could more readily accept the explanation concerning the research.

It was explained that an attempt was being made to compare Head Start parents with non-Head Start parents, to survey the kinds of activities the parents were involved in, and to try to determine whether or not this made any difference in the way the parents felt about themselves.

The uniqueness of the semantic differential was identified and comparisons of a direct question process were made with an indirect question approach. The rationale used was that the semantic
differential was basically an "indirect" test or an "indirect" way of getting an answer.

Statements were made at intervals relative to the interviewee making a decision as to whether or not to continue. This was especially true if the subject at any time showed hesitation or resentment in any form. If the subject showed any interest in the results of the study, the investigator stated the results would be made available when completed.

General Instructions for Interviewing

General instructions were given to those who conducted the interviews with the understanding that each interviewer has his own unique approach to people and that each situation presents a unique "interaction". Both of these conditions preclude the need for minor adjustments in the general instructions. A specific outline of procedure is presented in Appendix A. From a comprehensive viewpoint, these instructions deal with the approach for introducing oneself and explaining the nature of the study; showing and explaining the instrument and other questionnaires; administering the semantic differential and finalizing the interview. Specific questions relative to the categorization of activities is included.

Independent Variables

Amount of Participation

In order to determine the amount of participation in the experimental group, the data collection sheets for the Head Start parents as shown in Appendix F were used at the time of the interview. The
number of hours or participation per week spent in each of the categories or kinds of activities was recorded. As each data sheet was later analyzed by the investigator, the activities were grouped and hours per week totaled and assigned to the respective categories.

To identify those experimental subjects who would be classified as high or low participants in each activity, the total sample (100) was rank-ordered first for the average weekly hours of participation in child-oriented activities. The top one-third \((N=33)\) was defined as the high participants, the middle third was discarded, and the lower third \((N=33)\) was designated as the low participants. The same process was again applied to the experimental subjects' recorded hours of participation in social activities and a third time relative to educational activities. In order to select the control group \((N=33)\), every third subject was chosen at random from the total sample of 100 subjects.

**Type of Participation Activities**

Most Head Start activities in which parents of enrolled children can participate are easily categorized as being either those that are child-oriented, adult-educational, or adult-social.

1. **Child-oriented (C).** Those activities that can directly be assigned to interactions where the parent is actually working with or in close proximity with the child. Examples of such activities could be helping in the classroom, going on field trips with children, helping the child with school activities at home.

2. **Adult-educational (AE).** Those experiences that are more organized toward training or career advancement. Adult basic education classes, leadership training courses, participation on parent-policy committees, taking part in general parent education activities, would be included.
(3) Adult-social (AS). Activities assigned to this category would be those that supposedly provide the adult with some personally enjoyable experiences. Some examples would be family picnics, open-house, or parent visitation activities and holiday get-togethers.

The point could be argued that all of the above defined activities would in some form be educational for any adult who participates. While this is true, the categories as identified are based on the investigator's consideration that Head Start emphasizes the three approaches to parent participation as being important and distinct within themselves.

**Dependent Variable**

**Measurement of Self-Concept**

According to Bonjean\(^5\), a variety of sociological measurement devices could have been used for this type of investigation, but prior knowledge and academic use of the semantic differential, as well as novel use with low-income subjects, were motivating factors in the choice of this particular instrument. The semantic differential (affect scale) chosen for this investigation is one designed by Girona.\(^6\) An additional factor having importance for this specific selection was that the reliability for the scale had been established with the population of approximately 80 college seniors and was calculated by three methods as illustrated in Table Two.

---


TABLE 2
Reliability of Girona's Semantic Differential Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest reliability</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split-half reliability</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel for reliability</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated by the Pearson-Product-Moment Formula.

While no additional reliability tests were conducted on the low-income population sampled, Girona cited a number of validation experiments with a variety of population segments other than the group he sampled. His conclusion was that when subjects use the semantic differential on themselves, it may be expected that they will reveal the degree of affect elicited by or attached to their own self descriptions.

For use with low-income subjects, the original seven point scale was changed as follows:

1. A reduction from a seven point to a five point scale.
2. Alternate words for each set of polarized adjectives were developed for use where the subject did not understand the meaning of the original words (note Appendix C).
3. A modified Q-sort method of administering the instrument was adopted for use.7
4. The level of sophistication of some subjects did not necessitate the use of the modified Q-sort. In these cases, simply a one-to-one explanation, using the printed form of the instrument was made. In a few instances, the subject

checked the scales. In the others, the interviewer not only did the checking, but also explained each set of adjectives and discussed the choices within the set, before proceeding to the next set.

Relative to the five point scale (Appendix B), the lowest numerical score of one was assigned to the negative adjective with the range increasing by one step, with the most positive receiving the highest weight of five points.

Of the total set of polarized adjectives, each column of the five point scale was, in turn, totaled for sub-scores; the subscores, in turn, totaled for a final self-concept score for each subject.

According to this schedule, a subject total self-concept score could range from a minimum of 29 to a maximum of 145.

In the pilot experiment, more concepts than "self" were measured, but the final decision was to measure only the concept of "self", and to adapt the process by using a modified Q-sort. The format which resulted from adapting the original instrument to use with the Q-sort is illustrated below:

A set of such cards as illustrated above was made for each set of polarized adjectives and were arranged in rank order of one through five for each set of adjectives as well as in the order
listed on the instrument. The purpose was to provide some semblance of order for the interviewer who recorded the choices made while, at the same time, giving the test.

It was hoped that the one-to-one contact of the interviewer and the use of the modified Q-sort with individual parents would be non-threatening and more motivating to those invited to participate in the experiment.

The adaptation for use of the alternate set of words was also incorporated because the pilot project provided enough evidence to show that low-income subjects might have some difficulty in understanding all the sets of polarized adjectives that make up the semantic differential.

An alternate set of words was prepared for the interviewer to use in cases where difficulty was encountered. The interviewer was given instructions to use only the listed alternate definitions or synonyms as substitute descriptive terms for the respective polarized adjective. ⁸

The alternate list of words which was the author's attempt to adapt the instrument to the level of the population served is illustrated in Appendix C.

The nature of the semantic differential involves the congruency

factor relative to the honesty of the responses. Osgood, Heise, and Moss label this the "principle of congruity". This can more clearly be defined as the moment of symbol selection when a situation exists in which the latent impulse "scans" a pool of potential symbols which share one or more physiognomic qualities with the content to be represented. According to Moss, these observations are completely predictable as judged by the principle of congruity. Accordingly, ...

...the more polarized one sign is, relative to the other, the less change is undergone. Where one member of an assertion is neutral, all the shift in meaning is concentrated on this concept.

Basically, the congruity principle deals with the interaction of cognitive events that occur more or less simultaneously. Osgood admits that the range of prediction situations covered testifies to the potential range of such principles of human thinking, and further, that congruity does not operate in a vacuum. Last, but not less

---


12 Osgood, et. al., op. cit., p. 329.

13 Ibid.
significant, he admits that these and other parameters affecting the operation of congruity in human thinking need to be further studied.

### Experimental Details

Subjects selected for the experimental group were identified from the total enrollment of the full-year, half-day Head Start project, and random selection characterized the majority of the 100 subjects selected. The process included taking the total enrollment and attempting to locate every sixth observation. It was assumed that in the final count, enough subjects will have been contacted to fulfill the needed sample size. In cases where the family had moved or sections of housing had been relocated and the actual sixth person could not be located or if located, would not participate, judgment was made by the investigator as to what methods would be used to retain the randomness of the selection. In most cases, the nearest to the sixth family was chosen. In a few, the subject was selected from wherever the parent could be located. Thomlinson\(^{14}\) uses the term judgment sampling to define this process. Comparing content with process, Kerlinger uses the same basic judgmental theory when he states,

> Ordinarily and unfortunately, it is not possible to draw random samples of items from a universe of content. Such universes of content exist only theoretically.\(^{15}\)

---


\(^{15}\)Kerlinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 446-447.
The control group also consisted of 100 subjects, and judgment sampling was used to select specific low-income subjects with pre-school children from the Welfare Aid to Dependent Children clients or from the Metropolitan Housing applications.

After specific subjects were chosen, the instructions, as described in Appendix A, were given to the interviewer. The process for collecting data from the experimental group posed the problem of transportation. The random sample choice meant that the subjects would be scattered. Model cities, urban renewal relocations of housing, and the transient nature of low-income families created subject selection difficulties.

A number of sample contacts in both the experimental and control groups, after listening to the explanation of the purpose and process, declined to participate and a few initially agreed but chose not to continue after the test began. Those who refused impressed the interviewers as being those most hostile.

Many of the control, as well as the experimental group, were located in concentrated, low-income housing units of single, two-family, or multiple-family dwellings.

For both groups, home calls were made, and the interviews usually took place in the first room entered. Some, because of lack of seating area in the living room, or because of the need for a table, were done in the kitchen. Often, the room with the fewest people was chosen for the test. Also, in most cases, there were a
number of children around, and the choice of whether they remained
was left up to the subject.

Some subjects exhibited introspect by verbalizing and
thinking about each set of polarized adjectives. Occasionally, a
subject would find the test threatening, and in these cases, the
interviewer made every attempt to assist the subject in feeling
comfortable in making a decision to or not to continue with the test.
In many cases, the subjects thought the test was "funny" or would
question the interviewer about the way in which to interpret some
of the sets of adjectives. Remarks were kept as objective as
possible.

The tests took approximately 15 minutes, but often, the total
interview was more time consuming. This depended on the interest of
the subject. Often children in the family were interested in the
procedure at hand, and in some instances, would express opinions as to
"where" the parent would be categorized along the five step scale
between adjectives. The matriarchal family seemed to be more the rule
than the exception, and in a number of cases, the grandchildren in the
home belonged to the unmarried teenage daughter, who was also still
living at home. There was an average of two preschool children present
in those families samples. The total sample (N = 200) had completed an
average of ten and one-half years of formal education.

In summary, while the research dealt with low-income subjects,
the limitations of their life-styles did not appear to inhibit
participation.
Statistical Analysis

The treatment of the data incorporated the use of three separate one-way analysis of variance procedures to test the self-concept hypotheses. Where necessary, the ANOVA was followed by a t-test.

Edwards\(^{16}\) identified the formula for the standard error of the difference between two means as:

\[
\frac{S_{X_1} - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{2s^2}{n}}}
\]

The t-test would be:

\[
t = \left(\frac{\bar{X}_k - \bar{X}_c}{\left(\frac{(U_k - U_c)^2}{2.46}\right)}\right) \geq 2.24
\]

The significance level was set at the .05 level. Edwards rationalizes this procedure by stating,

In some experiments, the major objective is to compare each of a number of different treatments with a standard or control.\(^{17}\)

It can be further interpreted to mean that in an experiment on the influences of involvement on self-concept, one group of subjects was tested under a standard of instructions and in the absence of any added incentives. This group was designated as the control group.

\(^{16}\)Edwards, op. cit., pp. 149-150.

\(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 148.
The relative treatments, as in this case, the types of activities, would then consist of varying situations. The objective here was to use this design to find out which, if any, of the activities in either high or low participation would result in significant differences in self-concept as measured by the scores obtained with this instrument.

Values of degrees of freedom, standard error of deviation, level of significance of differences are reported.

The estimate of time given by the Head Start parents was correlated with the estimate of time given by the parent coordinator. The formula used for this process was the Pearson Product-Moment correlation.\[^{18}\]

\[
Y_{xy} = \frac{xy}{N \sigma_x \sigma_y}
\]

As a final point of emphasis, Edwards\[^{19}\] states,

...our concern with the mean of the scores for the treatment groups involves only the question of whether or not they are significantly greater than the control group.

To recapitulate, the variables and the subjects being investigated have been defined. The intricate details of the method of analysis has been presented so that a comprehensive explanation of the experiment is available.

\[^{18}\] Guilford, op. cit., pp. 95-98.

\[^{19}\] Edwards, op. cit., pp. 148-149.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study was conducted to investigate the influence of participation in project activities on the self-concept of Head Start parents. The self-concept of 100 Head Start parents and 100 non-Head Start parents was measured by the semantic differential technique. In addition, the variable of time for participation in child-oriented, social, or educational activities was determined for the parents of Head Start children.

Information gained as a result of the statistical analysis will be presented in this chapter. Three one-way analyses of variance to assess differences in self-concept means between the control and the experimental groups was applied. In the design, high and low participants in the three different types of activities were included. Experimentation was with post-test only measurements.

As explained in Edwards¹, a second step was the application of the t-test as used by Dunnett.² This served as an additional


²Ibid., Dunnett indicates that the optimum allocation of subjects to the control and to each of the k treatment groups is approximately n₀/n₁ = k, where n₀ is the number of observations for the control and n₁ is the number for each of the k treatment groups. For example, with k = 4 treatments, we should have approximately twice as many subjects in the control group as in each of the treatment groups.
assessment of in-group differences. A correlation coefficient was derived from the rated amounts of participation as estimated by the parent and the respective parent coordinator. The analysis (and, therefore, the results) was designed to gain information relative to each of the hypothesis.

**Analysis of Hypothesis One**

In Hypothesis One, it was stated that a positive change concerning self is concomitant with parental participation in Head Start activities. The analysis of the data supported the fact that in this particular investigation and with the use of this particular instrument, this Hypothesis could not be accepted.

The possible range of self-concept scores was from a minimum of 29 to a maximum of 145. The median score would have been 87. The self-concept scores of the experimental group ranged from 73 to 134. There were only six subjects who scored below the median of 87. The scores from 87 up to the highest score of 134 were evenly scattered. Mean scores are illustrated in Table Nine (Page 80).

Girona's original semantic differential scale contained a range of seven points. This meant a minimum of 29 points and a maximum of 203 points. While Girona did not provide data supporting the actual self-concept scores of subjects in his experiment, the mean scores on three normative samples were 157.6, 156.59, and 149.91, respectively. Computations with mean scores in round percentage figures reveal no differences in self-concept as measured by this instrument. Girona's middle-class college student sample and the low-income sample used in this investigation respond to this measurement in much the same manner.
The control group self-concept scores ranged from 50 to 148. There were 13 below the score of 87. The remaining scores were also evenly scattered. According to this information, the control group exhibited a wider range of scores than did the experimental group. Mean scores for the control group are also shown in Table Nine (Page 80).

Both experimental and control observations produced scores that were above the median and, therefore, of a very positive orientation. There are apparently no great differences between the Head Start and control parents. While Hypothesis One cannot be accepted, there are specific and internal evaluations that produce some interesting findings.

**Analysis of Hypothesis Two**

Hypothesis Two was designed to question one of the more specific elements of parent involvement that might have influenced change in self-concept. In Hypothesis Two, it was stated that a positive attitude change concerning self would be significantly different in regard to the amount of time spent in participation. The subjects were delegated into high and low participants.

**Analysis of Hypothesis Three**

In Hypothesis Three, it was stated that positive attitude change concerning self would be significantly different with participation in the various types of activities. The activities were those categorized as child-oriented, adult-social, or adult-educational.
Child-Oriented Activities

For analysis of change in self-concept relative to child-oriented activities, a one-way analysis of variance was used to compare the mean self-concept scores of the control group and the experimental groups. These mean scores can be seen in Table Nine (Page 80). The results of these comparisons for child-oriented activities can be found in Table Three.

TABLE 3
Analysis of Variance of Mean Self-Concept Scores Between and Within Child-Oriented Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>678.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>339.00</td>
<td>1.49 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>21795.000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>227.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22473.000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup><sub>F .05 (2, 96) = 3.09</sub>

According to the results, child-oriented activities had no influence on self-concept scores of the experimental and control groups relative to the parents' participation in Head Start.
To compare each group to the control group for an assessment of the differences in high and low participants, a test procedure suggested by Dunnett\(^3\) and described in Edwards\(^4\) was used.

In this instance, the ANOV F ratio had been reported at 1.49, which warranted the use of the k treatment. The magnitude of the difference itself describes the nature of the k treatment process. Assuming that the variances of the groups are all estimates of a common population variance, the estimate based upon the combined variances of the control and k treatment groups will be the mean square within groups with \((n-1) + k(n-1) = 2, 96\) d.f. The mean square within groups obtained in the usual way is 227.03. Then the standard error of the difference between two means will be shown as

\[
S_{X_1 - X_2} = \frac{\sqrt{(2)(227.03)}}{33} = 3.71 \times 1.94 = 7.19
\]

**Participation Time**

The results of the k treatment of the high and low participants of the child-oriented activities is shown in Table Four. These were judged significantly greater than 0 since \(X_1 - X_0 = 7.19\).

\(^3\)Ibid.  
\(^4\)Edwards, op. cit., p. 150.
TABLE 4
T-Test With k Treatment For Difference In Means For High and Low Participation In Child-Oriented Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Activity Mean</th>
<th>Control Mean</th>
<th>Diff. a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>103.30</td>
<td>108.54</td>
<td>-5.24 ≤7.19 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>109.13</td>
<td>108.54</td>
<td>0.54 ≤7.19 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a2, 26 d.f.

From the results, it can be assumed that neither high nor low participation in child-oriented activities of the experimental group had an influence on the self-concept of Head Start parents.

Adult-Social Activities

The results for the analysis of variance for the comparison of self-concept mean scores (as illustrated in Table Nine) of the control and experimental groups in the adult-social activities is shown in Table Five.
TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance of Mean Self-Concept Scores Between and Within Groups in Adult-Social Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>F &lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22655.000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>236.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22774.000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^aF .05 (2, 96) = 3.09$

The low ANOV F ratio of ≤ 1. did not warrant the k treatment. The results indicate that adult-social activities had no significant relationship with the self-concept of Head Start parents as measured by this specific semantic differential.

Participation Time

The ANOV F ratio's in the adult-social activities did not warrant the more in-depth assessment of the k treatment. Due to this result, it could be assumed that the amount of time spent in participation in the adult-social activities had no significant influence on the difference of self-concept as defined and measured in this experiment.
Adult-Educational Activities

The mean self-concept scores as illustrated in Table Nine of the parents involved in adult-educational activities were computed in the one-way analysis of variance test, and the results of these comparisons can be seen in Table Six.

| TABLE 6 |

Analysis of Variance of Mean Self-Concept Scores Between and Within Groups With Adult-Educational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>855.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>427.500</td>
<td>2.37 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>17363.000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>180.865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18218.000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>F .05 (2, 96) = 3.09

According to this evidence, adult-educational activities had no significant influence on the change of self-concept as measured in this experiment.

Participation Time

Results as shown in Table Six indicate that while the ANOV F ratio of ≤ 2.36365 of the adult-educational activities did not reach
the .05 level of significance ($\geq 3.09$), the means did warrant a t-test of differences. Again, the k treatment was applied and the results of this are shown in Table Seven. Any observed differences between a treatment mean and the control mean is judged significantly greater than zero if $X_1 - X_0 \geq 6.42$. The formula used for this computation was:

$$S_{X_1 - X_2} = \sqrt{\frac{2(180.86)}{33}} = 3.3107 \times 1.94 - 6.42$$

**TABLE 7**

T-Test With k Treatment for Difference in Means For High and Low Participation Time in Adult-Educational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Participation</th>
<th>Activity Mean</th>
<th>Control Mean</th>
<th>Difference$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 - X_0 = 110.73$</td>
<td>$108.54$</td>
<td>$108.54$</td>
<td>$2.19 \leq 6.42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 - X_0 = 115.57$</td>
<td>$108.54$</td>
<td>$108.54$</td>
<td>$7.03 \geq 6.42^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a(2, 26)$

*Significance $\geq 6.42$.

The results of the t-test with the k treatment indicated that in the adult-educational activities there is a significant change in self-concept of those Head Start parents who were classified as low participants. The level of significance was $\geq 6.43$ and the difference
between the experimental and control groups was 7.03.

A Pearson Product-Moment correlation of the parents' estimate of participation time and the parent coordinator's estimate of the parents' time revealed a high degree of correlation as illustrated in Table Eight.

The low or zero scores of time spent in social and educational activities prohibited correlations in the low participation categories.

TABLE 8

Correlation Coefficients of the Parents' And Parent Coordinator's Estimates Of Time Involved in the Various Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Participation</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Participation</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Participation</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Participation</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means, standard deviation, variance, and F ratio at the .05 level of significance of the high and low participants within the three activity areas are shown in Table Nine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Amount Of Participation</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child-Oriented</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>103.30302</td>
<td>16.34300</td>
<td>267.09375</td>
<td>1.49319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>109.12120</td>
<td>13.28248</td>
<td>176.4243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>108.54544</td>
<td>15.41344</td>
<td>237.5742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-Social</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>107.15150</td>
<td>15.63092</td>
<td>244.32568</td>
<td>0.18832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>109.45454</td>
<td>15.06665</td>
<td>227.00391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>108.54544</td>
<td>15.41344</td>
<td>237.57422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-Educational</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>110.72726</td>
<td>14.44238</td>
<td>208.58240</td>
<td>2.36365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>115.57574</td>
<td>9.82049</td>
<td>96.44202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>108.54544</td>
<td>15.41344</td>
<td>237.57422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F .05 = 3.09
Summary of Analysis

The methods of analyses as reported in this section were the ANOV tests for the three separate types of activities and the t-test with k treatment for the F ratios that, while not significant, were closest to the .05 level of significance of ≥ 3.09. The child-oriented activities resulted in non-significant ratio; the adult-social activities resulted in non-significant F ratio; and the highest was the adult-educational activities with an F ratio that was ≤ 2.36365. Only the child-oriented and the adult-educational activities were computed by the t-test with the k treatment. Of these two t-tests with treatment analyses, those Head Start parents who only slightly participated in the educational activities or who were classified as the low participants revealed any significant change in self-concept scores.

The correlation coefficient, which was computed to compare the parents' participation scores with those given by the parent coordinator, was very high. From the analyses as projected by the tests, it was apparent that Hypothesis One, which stated that a positive attitude change concerning self is concomitant with parental participation in Head Start activities could not be accepted. There are, however, trends to indicate that there are differences between the control and experimental groups.

In participation, only educational activities, as compared with social and child-oriented activities, had any significant
influence. Trends indicated that the child-oriented activities had some influence, and the social activities had minimal influence. Causes for this might be explained by the fact that non-Head Start parents are as socially active as Head Start parents. While these activities might not be planned by a formal organization, it is the activity and not the source that is important.

In Hypothesis Two, it was stated that a positive attitude change concerning self would be significantly different with participation in various types of activities. While not significant with ANOV, the t-test showed a significant difference in low participation in the adult-educational activities. However, with no more support than can be established from the data, Hypothesis Two cannot be accepted. As explained, the trends indicated the same change relative to the child-oriented activities. The social activities had the least influence of the change of self-concept of Head Start parents.

In Hypothesis Three, it was stated that a positive attitude change concerning self would be significantly different in regard to the amount of time spent in participation. Within the adult-educational activities only, it was the low participants who experienced significant change in attitudes about self as defined in this experiment.

While not significant in either the child-oriented or the adult-social activities, again the low participants in child oriented activities revealed the most trend for change. Trends in the adult-social activities indicated no difference.

Taking all variables and analyses into consideration, the influence of education seemed to have the greatest bearing on the
change of self-concept. The significance that was obtained did sustain the hypotheses and, therefore, Hypothesis Three cannot be accepted.

In studies dealing with the low-income population, descriptive research and subjective data are of relative importance. Findings of this nature suggest that the interviewers and investigators of social science must have courage to meet the family member(s) at the level of reality which existed in each environment. The investigator was conscious of looking for ways to extend a feeling of empathy and acceptance. Many subjects were not hesitant to otherwise talk about themselves and their personal situations. While all the homes entered were limited in material wealth, there was evidence of a broad range of management competencies--some very orderly and organized, while others were so littered and unclean there was hardly space to sit down. Human relationships and signs of family stability that could be observed would also be scattered over a broad negative to positive spectrum.

The principal investigator, as well as the other two interviewers, came away from the home visits with feelings and comments which centered around, "Now I can see why..." The experience has served to remind the investigator to be thankful for the skills and competencies and other resources available for the management of her own life-style. Increased humbleness and sincerity in personal and professional relationships with low-income persons has resulted from this experience.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Social change in contemporary society mandates that more research be conducted relative to the life styles of low-income families. Providing outlets for positive change for the strata of population that exists in poverty can only have reciprocal positive benefits for community life in general. Questions center around what programs are most useful and how do low-income subjects feel about themselves and the way in which they are involved in various activities.

The program in question was the parent component of Project Head Start. This is an intervention program that seeks to improve the educational, social-emotional environment, and physical-nutritional condition of the young deprived child. Also within Head Start, a great deal of time, money, and energy is spent in planning activities with and assisting low-income parents whose children attend the preschool child development centers. This study was designed to determine if there would be a relationship or change in attitudes about self or self-concept of low-income parents who participated in project activities.

Participation was categorized into three different types
for the purpose of ascertaining if participation in one kind of activity would be more influential on change in self-concept than would involvement in another activity. The categories were child-oriented, adult-social, and adult-educational activities.

The study was also designed to assess whether amount of time spent in various activities had any influence on the change in attitude about self. For this investigation, the time spent in various activities was divided into high and low participation.

Self-concept is a construct that is not easily defined. The variable as it is defined for this investigation basically means the attitudes one has about himself. Theoretically, self-concept has many interpretations, but most would agree that it could be measured. The review of literature did not reveal any research studies dealing with self-concept of low-income parents.

Two groups of subjects ($N = 200$) were used. The experimental group ($N = 100$) were those who participated in the Head Start parent activities and were given the self-concept semantic differential rating scale. The subjects were divided into high ($N = 33$) and low ($N = 33$) participants. The control group was given the same semantic differential self-concept rating scale. Since the group was composed of non-Head Start persons, they were not exposed to the activities. The experimental group was chosen at random from the 1969-70, 1970-71 enrollment of a full-year Head Start program. The final composition of the control group
(N = 33) was chosen at random from the total 100 sample size. This was accomplished simply by using every third subject. All participants were low-income parents from a midwest, urban community. The ethnic make-up consisted of Black, Caucasian, and some Mexican-Americans. Only one parent from each family was interviewed and, therefore, the sample includes both male and female participants.

Each participant was given a semantic differential, self-concept rating scale as developed by Girona. This particular instrument was chosen because the reliability had previously been established (Appendix B). Each parent also estimated the amount of time spent each week in participation relative to the child, social, or educational areas (Appendix D and F). The measurement of meaning, which is the theoretical basis for the design of the semantic differential is relatively new in the field of sociological and educational research. No instances could be found where it was used with low-income subjects.

The data collected on the participation and self-concept variables were analyzed by means of three one-way analyses of variance tests.

No significant difference was found in any of the child-oriented, adult-social, or adult-educational activities when the high participants were compared with the low participants. While the differences between high and low participants were not significant according to the ANOV, Edward's k treatment was applied to determine if there was a difference in any of the three types of
activities between either the high or low participants and the control groups.

Of the high and low participants in the child-oriented, adult-social, and adult-educational activities, Edward's k treatment indicated significant differences with the low participants in the adult-educational activities only. The parents' estimate of participation time was checked by the parent coordinator for each respective parent. The parent coordinator's estimate of time in the various activities was highly correlated with estimates given by the parents.

Working with low-income subjects presented a number of unexpected subjective variables. These centered around empathetic feelings and the degree of sophistication of the subject relative to the ability to read and write. This was important in the application of the semantic differential by the Q-sort method.

**Implications**

Findings range from those that encompass the Head Start parent involvement component to those that are more specifically concerned with the theoretical aspects of the measurement of self-concept. Perhaps even more serious are those implications related to the families who live in poverty for they are the recipients of a number of Federally funded programs. Since their needs are very real and practical, any findings that could be of a helpful nature in the improvement of such programs would certainly be important.

While this particular study does not reveal significant influence on self-concept from the amount and kind of participation
in program activities, there are several important implications that can be projected.

It is quite clear from the findings as discussed that the hypotheses cannot be accepted. According to this semantic differential, as used, and the independent variables, as outlined, there are no differences in the way low-income Head Start parents feel about themselves as compared with low-income parents who do not participate in Head Start activities.

Policies which served as guidelines for the development of Head Start parents would be expected to be manifested to a greater degree in the parent's feelings about himself. The reason for the limited results might be searched and sorted through, but may be attributed to one of two causes; the methodology or the theoretical. Either the variables in question did not provide an adequate methodological basis on which to judge the effects of participation on Head Start parents, or secondly, the measurement of these variables may have been insufficient.

While there is evidence that these measurements have served several research studies as useful tools for investigation, they have not been used with low-income samples. This same argument can be held for use of the semantic differential as a suitable instrument for measuring self-concept. Neither had this, however, been used with low-income subjects. This particular self-concept rating scale was chosen because the reliability has already been established with another group. Perhaps it was not particularly
suited for this segment of the population. The general population of low-income persons are regarded as having low or inadequate concepts of self. The self-concept scores, however, revealed definite positive scores. In this study, it was also assumed that parents of Head Start children would have a higher self-concept score than parents who did not have this advantage. However, a mean score random sample from these two groups did not differ.

Theoretically, the results must be interpreted as refutation of the original hypotheses: that parents of Head Start children will have a significant change in self-concept with involvement in life experience activities; that amount of time spent in these activities will have an influence on self-concept; and, that the type of activity will also have a significant influence on change in self-concept.

A very appropriate and specific question is the meaning of the results to Head Start personnel regarding policies and guidelines as administered through the Office of Child Development.

First, it appears that the parent involvement component is not making enough of an impact on the attitudes of parents and how they feel about themselves. An increase in the efforts or emphases might make a more significant change. An increase of efforts in one type of activity as compared with another might bring about more significant change about self (i.e., emphases on the educational activities as compared with social activities).
Findings indicated the educational activities had the most significant relationship on the change of self-concept. This certainly has bearing for all educators and trainers of low-income persons.

Other psychological phenomena might also have influenced results. For example, perhaps the larger amounts of time spent in child-oriented activities and social involvement as compared with educational involvement simply indicated a general social resistance to education or school-related activities.

While many parents verbalized the fact that they enjoyed the social activities, and obviously many were very busy and involved, perhaps the social and child-oriented activities are much less influential to the total personality of that parent.

From this study it could be implied that the non-Head Start parents, while less involved socially, had higher self-concept scores. Perhaps their feelings about themselves were so internally secure, that they did not psychologically need the involvement.

One implication that would seem to be related is the fact that within the Head Start component of each local project a great deal of money and energy is spent to reach and work with the parent. Some of the attempts to have the parent become more involved with his children, to assist his efforts in becoming more active in the decision-making role, and to participate in social or educational activities, may need to be further reinforced.
An important aspect of this study has been the novel use of the abstract semantic differential with persons from the poverty strata of the population. This study suggests the need for more theoretical as well as empirical research dealing with this approach. Questions can be asked relative to the suitability of this type of instrument with such a population sample. If, however, even a meager view can be gained of how positively or negatively low-income subjects evaluate themselves, then the use of the semantic differential is justified.

From this study, it can be stated that Head Start projects obviously program a wide variety of activities for parents, the greatest of these being those activities dealing with children. The least in amount were those activities dealing with formal educational training. While the differences in self-concept as measured within and between all activities had limited significance, the range was, however, greatest for those involved in educational activities. This could be interpreted to have implications for the direction of adult-education components in general and for the Head Start parent involvement component specifically.

Recommendations

Findings reported in this study have resulted in the following suggestions or recommendations for further study:

1. That similar socio-economic population strata be studied relative to other variables. For example, personal, family, and community needs as related to education, and training or effects of training on child rearing and family management, etc.
2. That self-concept, being the evasive construct that it is often thought to be, continue to be investigated through the use of a variety of instruments and with a variety of segments of the population.

3. That new studies be designed to incorporate similar variables. For example, if the educational component does have significance, it is suggested that this receive more in-depth investigation.

4. That similar experiments on a pre and post longitudinal basis be conducted. Self-concept is a construct that might require long exposure to experiences before change could occur.

5. That experiments with low-income subjects be conducted relative to specific competencies. For example, that of home manager, consumer, community member, etc.

6. That comparisons be made between differing groups relative to self-concept as well as other variables. For example, low-income - middle-income; male - female; middle-age - younger.

7. That the same semantic differential be used with the low-income strata of the population relative to the measurement of variables other than self-concept. For example, children, other family members, home, community, etc.

8. That studies of low-income families be designed to meet specific needs of various Head Start components. For example, carry over of parent participation into elementary school systems, how well parents really integrate themselves into legal aspects of Head Start, etc.
APPENDIX A

DIRECTIONS FOR INTERVIEWER
1. Interviewer should introduce himself, ask for the mother or father, and state that he is conducting a research project for an Ohio State University graduate student dealing with parents, the way in which they feel about themselves, and the way in which they participate in various activities.

2. State that we would appreciate having them take part, and that all they have to do is look at a set of words, which will take about 10 to 15 minutes.

3. Continue to explain, (while showing a sample of some of the sets of word cards) that all they need to do is pick out of each set of words the one they think best describes their feelings.

4. If you are not in the house by this time, ask if you might step in so that you can show them the rest of the words. If the interviewee appears willing, (or at least not openly saying no) proceed positively and ask if you can sit down, preferably at a table. If it is apparent that there is no suitable table space, or yet, no seating space suitable in those family conditions, make the best of the situation and proceed with adaptations. (Some interviewees may not need to see every card, but can use the one-page listed semantic differential test; and some may seem to want to check their own tests.) You may need to take a few minutes for general conversations in order to ease the feeling of strangeness between the two of you.

5. Show the instrument check sheet (Appendix B) and the cards and the general information sheet (Appendix D or F), stating that these forms will be used to record the answers.

6. State that their task (while exhibiting the first set of Q cards) would be to look at each set of cards and pick out one answer that they feel most indicates their feelings.

7. Explain that these types of questions are what is called an abstract test, rather than a direct question test. In fact, that in some ways it might appear so different that it is even "funny". Give the interviewee time to look at the papers or cards and draw from them any questions or comments they might have relative to the instrument.
8. As you feel the situation becoming more at ease, or you sense the interviewee is about ready to accept the abstract test, state that there are some other general questions that need to be asked. At this point, record information on forms as illustrated in Appendix D and F.*

9. Present the first in the series of sets of words, explaining very clearly and slowly (if necessary, repeat) that as they look at the words, they must pick out the one they think tells their feelings about themselves. For example, tell them to think about themselves, look at the set of cards, and if they feel very positive, pick that card; if they feel somewhat positive, pick the next card; if they feel in-between, pick the middle card; if they feel somewhat negative, pick the next to the last card on the left; or if they feel very negative, pick the far left card. In summary, whichever one they feel best describes themselves, choose that card or space.**

10. With the total set of cards arranged in the same order as those sets of adjectives listed on the answer sheet, or using the answer sheet for the more sophisticated interviewee, proceed with the same process for the total test.

11. As the test is given, and the interviewee comes to word sets that he appears or says he does not understand, the interviewer should use only the alternate set of descriptive words for each polarized adjective as appears in the sample list in Appendix C.

12. As the test is completed, thank the participant for taking part, and reassure him that no identification of individuals will be made, but rather that they will be classified according to code numbers.

*In order to ascertain the amount and kind of involvement, some probing questions might need to be asked. The interviewer may need to give examples, help estimate time, etc.

**As the interviewer begins the test, close observation of the subject, along with a display of a set of cards and the test sheet, should indicate a choice between the two methods. If on any set of words the subject hesitates an unreasonable length of time, the interviewer should follow through by actually verbalizing the alternate set of words. If the subject chooses the check sheet, you can assume that a different level of competency exists. Then volunteer to check the sheet but ask the subject if he would rather check it himself. If he chooses to check the instrument himself, you can assume an even higher level of sophistication.
APPENDIX B

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL USED FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF SELF-CONCEPT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td>Beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td>Clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless</td>
<td>Careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td>Generous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homely</td>
<td>Pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumb</td>
<td>Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sour</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowardly</td>
<td>Brave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5
| boring   |   |   |   |   |   | interesting |
| dull     |   |   |   |   |   | bright      |
| stale    |   |   |   |   |   | fresh       |
| sloppy   |   |   |   |   |   | neat        |
| fat      |   |   |   |   |   | slim        |
| black    |   |   |   |   |   | white       |
| foul     |   |   |   |   |   | fragrant    |
| profane  |   |   |   |   |   | sacred      |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
APPENDIX C

ALTERNATE WORD LIST
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unattractive</th>
<th>attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ugly</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plain, homely)</td>
<td>(pretty, lovely, good-looking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(soiled, tarnished, unclean)</td>
<td>(pure, spotless, unmixed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careless</td>
<td>careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(untidy, negligent, unmindful)</td>
<td>(watchful, cautious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dishonorable, double-dealing)</td>
<td>(frank, honest, honorable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unkind, grouchy, nagging, warlike, hurtful)</td>
<td>(kind, helpful, sociable, agreeable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stingy</td>
<td>generous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(greedy, petty, closefisted, beggarly)</td>
<td>(open-hearted, free-hearted, unselfish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad</td>
<td>happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupid</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no brains, dull,</td>
<td>(brains, smart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brainless, loony)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homely</td>
<td>pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumb</td>
<td>smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sour</td>
<td>sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(shaky, jumpy, shaking)</td>
<td>(fearless, heroic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongwilled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hurting)</td>
<td>(gentle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowardly</td>
<td>brave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(run, give-up, get-out,</td>
<td>(dare, command, demand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cringe)</td>
<td>warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(tire, bother, annoy)</td>
<td>(pleasing, entertaining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Synonyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dull (shady, cloudy,</td>
<td>(bright (flashing, shiny,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dim, dreary)</td>
<td>sunny)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sloppy (unkempt, untidy, careless, dirty)</td>
<td>(neat (tidy, clean, trim, prim, well-dressed, spotless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>(white)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foul (stinking)</td>
<td>(fragrant (sweet-smelling, perfumed))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profane (impure, sinful, unsanctified)</td>
<td>(sacred (holy, pure, consecrated, heavenly))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

DATA SHEET FOR HEAD
START PARENTS

103
Code #

M    F

Name ______________________

Address ____________________

No. of Pre-School Children ________________

Years of School Completed ________________

Activities in which I have participated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate No. of Hrs. Per Week</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ Volunteer with School Related Activities

____ Paid Aide

____ Volunteer in the Classroom

____ Social Activities

____ Parent Meeting

____ Parent Education Groups

____ Work at Home with Children with Schoolwork

____ Parent Advisory Committee

____ Other
APPENDIX E

PARENT COORDINATOR'S EVALUATION
An important element of the statistical design is the validation of the quality (time and kind) of parent involvement. Each participant has been asked to check the type (kind) of activity in which they participated and the approximate length of time or numbers of opportunities for participation.

As a method of cross-checking, I would appreciate having you, as the parent coordinator, use one of these evaluation instruments for each participant. Please return them along with the other completed post-test score sheets.

Thank you very much.

According to my estimation, parent code # _____ in community _____ participated or became involved in our Head Start project in the following manner and according to the time stated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate No. of Hours per Week</th>
<th>Symbol for Type of Involvement</th>
<th>Type of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(children)</td>
<td>Volunteer with school-related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(children)</td>
<td>Paid aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(children)</td>
<td>Volunteer in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(social)</td>
<td>Social Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(social-adult)</td>
<td>Parent meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(adult education)</td>
<td>Parent education groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(children)</td>
<td>Work at home with children's school work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(adult education)</td>
<td>Parent advisory committee work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Code # Name___________________
M  F  Name___________________
Address___________________
No. of Pre-School Children___________________
Years of School Completed__________________

Activities that I have taken part in during this past year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours per Week during Past Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>A-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (child)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>A-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>A-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (adult)</td>
<td>A-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

TABLE 10

SELF-CONCEPT SCORES AND AVERAGE WEEKLY HOURS OF PARTICIPATION IN CHILD-ORIENTED, ADULT-SOCIAL, ADULT-EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR HEAD START AND NON-HEAD START SUBJECTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Subject SCS</th>
<th>Social Subject SCS</th>
<th>Educational Subject SCS</th>
<th>Child Subject SCS</th>
<th>Social Subject SCS</th>
<th>Educational Subject SCS</th>
<th>Control Subject SCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96 94</td>
<td>96 94</td>
<td>95 122</td>
<td>85 134</td>
<td>93 110</td>
<td>93 110</td>
<td>1 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 122</td>
<td>95 122</td>
<td>90 130</td>
<td>79 118</td>
<td>74 73</td>
<td>76 111</td>
<td>2 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 125</td>
<td>94 109</td>
<td>89 96</td>
<td>78 128</td>
<td>72 98</td>
<td>70 130</td>
<td>3 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 85</td>
<td>92 85</td>
<td>87 84</td>
<td>72 98</td>
<td>69 130</td>
<td>69 130</td>
<td>4 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 130</td>
<td>90 130</td>
<td>86 86</td>
<td>71 98</td>
<td>68 108</td>
<td>68 108</td>
<td>5 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 90</td>
<td>89 96</td>
<td>85 134</td>
<td>69 130</td>
<td>67 133</td>
<td>67 133</td>
<td>6 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 84</td>
<td>88 90</td>
<td>86 92</td>
<td>68 108</td>
<td>65 81</td>
<td>66 102</td>
<td>7 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 86</td>
<td>86 86</td>
<td>80 164</td>
<td>67 133</td>
<td>56 114</td>
<td>56 114</td>
<td>8 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 93</td>
<td>85 134</td>
<td>79 118</td>
<td>58 94</td>
<td>48 98</td>
<td>52 118</td>
<td>9 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 94</td>
<td>84 93</td>
<td>78 128</td>
<td>57 105</td>
<td>39 102</td>
<td>47 114</td>
<td>10 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 144</td>
<td>83 103</td>
<td>75 125</td>
<td>55 93</td>
<td>37 74</td>
<td>43 107</td>
<td>11 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 111</td>
<td>81 94</td>
<td>73 92</td>
<td>52 118</td>
<td>35 110</td>
<td>42 110</td>
<td>12 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 73</td>
<td>80 144</td>
<td>64 103</td>
<td>50 118</td>
<td>33 111</td>
<td>39 102</td>
<td>13 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 81</td>
<td>79 118</td>
<td>63 108</td>
<td>48 98</td>
<td>30 112</td>
<td>38 125</td>
<td>14 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 103</td>
<td>78 128</td>
<td>62 91</td>
<td>46 78</td>
<td>28 102</td>
<td>32 115</td>
<td>15 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 108</td>
<td>75 125</td>
<td>61 97</td>
<td>45 116</td>
<td>27 110</td>
<td>30 102</td>
<td>16 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 91</td>
<td>73 92</td>
<td>57 105</td>
<td>44 108</td>
<td>25 95</td>
<td>27 110</td>
<td>17 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 97</td>
<td>64 103</td>
<td>55 93</td>
<td>43 107</td>
<td>23 114</td>
<td>26 109</td>
<td>18 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 96</td>
<td>62 91</td>
<td>54 116</td>
<td>42 110</td>
<td>22 110</td>
<td>21 111</td>
<td>19 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 98</td>
<td>61 97</td>
<td>50 118</td>
<td>36 103</td>
<td>19 102</td>
<td>19 102</td>
<td>20 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 98</td>
<td>60 96</td>
<td>45 116</td>
<td>31 89</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>18 130</td>
<td>21 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 74</td>
<td>57 105</td>
<td>40 129</td>
<td>30 112</td>
<td>15 123</td>
<td>17 109</td>
<td>22 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 110</td>
<td>55 93</td>
<td>35 110</td>
<td>27 110</td>
<td>14 121</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>23 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 114</td>
<td>54 116</td>
<td>34 114</td>
<td>25 95</td>
<td>13 125</td>
<td>14 121</td>
<td>24 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 111</td>
<td>53 95</td>
<td>33 111</td>
<td>22 110</td>
<td>12 113</td>
<td>13 125</td>
<td>25 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 115</td>
<td>50 118</td>
<td>28 102</td>
<td>20 103</td>
<td>11 104</td>
<td>12 113</td>
<td>26 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 101</td>
<td>49 95</td>
<td>24 111</td>
<td>19 102</td>
<td>10 115</td>
<td>11 104</td>
<td>27 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 102</td>
<td>45 116</td>
<td>23 114</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>8 117</td>
<td>10 115</td>
<td>28 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 111</td>
<td>41 98</td>
<td>22 110</td>
<td>14 121</td>
<td>6 133</td>
<td>8 118</td>
<td>29 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 123</td>
<td>40 129</td>
<td>20 103</td>
<td>11 122</td>
<td>5 118</td>
<td>6 133</td>
<td>30 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 115</td>
<td>34 114</td>
<td>15 123</td>
<td>8 117</td>
<td>4 131</td>
<td>5 118</td>
<td>31 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 112</td>
<td>24 112</td>
<td>9 112</td>
<td>3 125</td>
<td>3 125</td>
<td>4 131</td>
<td>32 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 118</td>
<td>7 115</td>
<td>7 115</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>3 125</td>
<td>33 136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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