To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Paul L. Beasley entitled "The relationship between students' views about the purpose of school and their race, socioeconomic status, educational aspiration, and academic self-concept." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

William H. Coffield

William H. Coffield, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Jan R. Jacobs

M. Alumadi

J. P. Pendelli

H. W. Harris, Jr.

Accepted for the Council

Leo Minkel

Vice Provost
and Dean of the Graduate School

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS' VIEWS ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF SCHOOL AND THEIR RACE, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION, AND ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Paul L. Beasley

December 1988

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to:

-the memory of my grandfather, Paul Holsey, and the inspiration he has given to us;

-my mother, Mrs Pauline Beasley, for keeping her father's dream alive;

-my father, Millard Beasley, for his love and admiration;

-my daughters, DeAnna and Erin, they are my heart; and

-my wife, Pamela, she is my life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am fortunate to have had to help of a number of friends and colleagues. I am indebted to my committee members, Dr. William Coffield (Chairman), Dr. Fred Venditti, Dr. George Harris, Dr. Mohammad Adhami, and Dr. Dan Quarles. Each gave careful attention to my work, encouragement during times of frustration, and excellent advice on putting together a credible research study. I especially appreciate Dr. Coffield's help during a very difficult time in his life, and Dr. Quarles' very strong and consistent guidance.

I am also grateful to the Upward Bound directors who helped collect data for me. These persons include Mr. William Jackson of the Girls Club of Memphis, Ms. Beth Sullivan of Eastern Kentucky University, Dr. GW Mingo of the University of Florida, Ms. Charlestine Hickson and Mr. Michael Gile of the University of South Carolina, Dr. Harold Dickerson of Huntsville, Alabama, Mr. Marvin King of Morris Brown College, and Ms. Adrienne Long of Tusculum College. I also want to thank Dr. Donald Loftus, Superintendent of Hamilton County, Tennessee Schools, for allowing me to collect data from seniors in the Hamilton County school system.

I am also indebted to two persons who helped me in specific ways. Dr. Michael Biderman was extremely helpful to my understanding of factor analysis and I am grateful for his willingness to give time and patience to me. Dr. Jan Mickler gave invaluable feedback on the various drafts I asked her to read. I appreciate her generosity.

The completion of this study would have been almost impossible

without the support and encouragement of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga administration. Provost Sandra Packard was very generous in arranging a leave of absence for me, and Dr. Jane Harbaugh accepted responsibility for most of my duties while I enjoyed the benefits of the leave. I am thankful for both expressions of support. Also, I want to thank the UTC Upward Bound and Special Services staff members for their understanding, support, and patience.

ABSTRACT

Recent trends indicate declines in the enrollment rate of black students in higher education. These trends may reflect the high rate of poverty among black students and the tendency for students with low socioeconomic status to value goals extrinsic to the educational process. Consequently, these students may be motivated by factors that are not addressed directly by academic activity and, therefore, do not encourage academic achievement or educational aspiration.

The purpose of this study was to develop measures of two views about the purpose of school and determine if differences in these measures existed between students of different races and socioeconomic levels. One view focused on the extrinsic value of school, or the belief that schooling should lead to social and economic advancements. The other view focused on the intrinsic value of schooling and preparation for responsible adulthood. Data were collected in the Southeast from 1000 high school seniors.

Factor analysis and split half reliability results supported the validity and reliability of the variables used to measure views about the purpose of school. Among the various socioeconomic categories, there were no significant differences in mean scores on the intrinsic view of school measure. However, white students in the highest socioeconomic category had significantly lower mean scores on the extrinsic view of school measure. While there was no significant difference between black and white student mean scores for the

intrinsic view of school measure, black students had significantly higher mean scores on the extrinsic view of school measure.

From the results of the study it was concluded that blacks and students from the lower socioeconomic categories tended to view schools primarily as preparation for jobs. The implication of this conclusion is that these students may not be motivated by academic activity that is only indirectly related to job preparation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY....1

Introduction....1

Statement of the Problem....4

Statement of the Purpose....5

Definition of Terms....5

Limitations of the Study....7

Assumptions of the Study....7

The Research Hypotheses of the Study....8

Organization of the Study....8

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE....10

A Historical Perspective on the Purpose of Schools....10

The Purpose of Education: The Significance of Views....15

Views About the Purpose of Education: Consequences for Black Students....17

I. METHODOLOGY....20

Introduction....20

The Initial Population....20

The Survey Instrument....21

The Final Sample....22

Data Integrity....23

Coding of Data....25

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Statistical Procedures....28

Reliability Tests used in the Study....29

Validity Tests used in the Study....30

IV. **FINDINGS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY**....33

Introduction....33

The Reliability of the Study....33

The Validity of the Study....35

Analysis of Descriptive Data....43

Analysis of Interval Level Data....55

The Overall Findings of the Study....65

V. **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY**....68

INTRODUCTION....68

THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY....70

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH....71

REFERENCES....77

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A LETTER TO RESPONDENTS' PARENTS....83

APPENDIX B SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS AND INSTRUMENT....84

APPENDIX C DIAGRAM OF STATISTICAL PROCEDURES....89

APPENDIX D SPSS-X PROGRAM....90

VITA....92

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Summary Profile of Participating Students....24
2. Summary Profile of Participants by Race and Socioeconomic Status....24
3. Reliability Coefficients of Measurements for the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Views of School and Academic Self-concept 34
4. Factor Analysis Initial Statistics on Academic Self-concept 36
5. Academic Self-concept Factor Matrix....36
6. Academic Self-concept Oblimin Factor Rotation 38
7. Academic Self-concept Factor Correlation Matrix....38
8. View of School Initial Factor Statistics....40
9. Factor Matrix Initial Solution....41
10. View of School Factor Loading After Varimax Rotation 42
11. Crosstabulation: Race by Socioeconomic Status 44
12. Crosstabulation: Race by Plans to Attend College....45
13. Crosstabulation: Race by Plans to Attend College Controlling for Socioeconomic Status....47
14. Crosstabulation: Socioeconomic Status by Plans to Attend College 48
15. Crosstabulation: Socioeconomic Status by Plans to Attend College Controlling for Race....49
16. Crosstabulation: Race by Reason for Attending College....50
17. Crosstabulation: Socioeconomic Status by Reason for Attending College....52

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

18. Crosstabulation: Race by Reasons for Attending College Controlling for Socioeconomic Status 53

19. Crosstabulation: Socioeconomic Status by Reasons for Attending College Controlling for Race 54

20. Crosstabulation: Race by Educational Aspiration.....56

21. Crosstabulation: Socioeconomic Status by Educational Aspiration.....57

22. Crosstabulation: Race by Educational Aspiration Controlling for Socioeconomic Status.....58

23. Crosstabulation: Socioeconomic Status by Educational Aspiration Controlling for Race.....59

24. One-way Analysis of Variance on the View of School As Preparation for Responsible Adulthood by Socioeconomic Status 60

25. One-way Analysis of Variance on The View of School As Preparation for Jobs by Socioeconomic Status 60

26. T-test of Significance on The View of School as Preparation for Responsible Adulthood by Race 61

27. T-test of Significance on The View of School as Preparation for Jobs by Race 61

28. T-test of Significance on The View of School as Preparation for Responsible Adulthood by Students Plans to Attend College.....62

29. T-test of Significance on The View of School as Preparation for Jobs by Students Plans to Attend College.....62

30. T-test of Significance on The View of School as Preparation for Responsible Adulthood by Reasons for Attending College.....63

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

31. T-test of Significance on The View of School as Preparation for Jobs by Reasons for Attending College.....63

32. Analysis of Variance on The View of School as Preparation for Responsible Adulthood by Educational Aspiration.....64

33. Analysis of Variance on The View of School as Preparation for Jobs by Educational Aspiration.....64

34. Correlation of View of School Scores With Socioeconomic Status.....65

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent trends indicate a decline in the level of black student participation in higher education. The Southern Regional Educational Board (1985) reported that significant gains in the number of black college students peaked in the 1970's and since that time the trend has been in decline. The American Council on Education (1985) also reported a decline in the participation rate of black students in all but vocational post-secondary education programs.

This trend toward declining participation persists in spite of demographic data which show an increased percentage of blacks in the pool of potential college students (Glenny, 1980; Marks, 1984). However, fewer black high school graduates enter higher education (Marks, 1984) and on both the high school level (Glenny, 1980) and college level (Suen, 1983, Astin, 1982, The American Council on Education, 1985) black students have an extremely high dropout rate. Consequently, blacks have not achieved a level of participation in higher education that reflects their proportion in the general population.

Students' views about the purpose of school may be an important factor in the disparity of educational attainment among blacks. In a study by Nicholls, Patashnick, and Nolen (1985), two belief systems

about the purpose of school were found to affect how secondary school students set classroom goals and how they planned to achieve success.

One belief system is an extrinsic view of education, specifically, the view that school should lead to greater socioeconomic status. It was found to be related to negative student behavior and attitudes, i.e. the avoidance of work, the desire for easily achieved success, the lack of satisfaction from learning, and the feeling that success is caused by luck.

The alternative belief system is an intrinsic view of school. It defines schooling as preparation for responsible adulthood and involves acquiring a greater understanding of the world and social responsibilities. Nichols et al. (1985) found a dependent relationship between this view and positive student behaviors and attitudes, i.e., the willingness to work hard, satisfaction from learning, and the feeling that success is caused by hard work.

Historical and current emphases in education support categorizing views about the purpose of schools as either extrinsic or intrinsic. The extrinsic view toward greater social and economic status, typically expressed as job preparation, reflects a young industrial nation's concern about the development of a qualified work force (Rudolph, 1984). Proponents (Hoyt, Evans, Mackin & Mangum, 1974) of career education also support this view by emphasizing the need to insure the economic strength of our country through the integration of students into the work force.

Conversely, the intrinsic view of school reflects European traditions that stress an elitist idea of education as the preservation

and making of culture. The strength of its influence is evidenced by the pervasive support for the liberal arts and general education which reflect its thesis.

Whether students give primary emphasis to either view may be a factor of economic and social status. According to Maslow's (1962) hierarchical need theory, intangible goals become important only after basic needs have been satisfied. In this context, the tangible and concrete goals represented by the extrinsic view of school would have greater appeal to poor people and the abstract and intangible goals of the intrinsic view would appeal more to person without poverty. Because of a high rate of poverty among black families (The College Board, 1985) the extrinsic view may be more appealing to black students. Therefore, the findings by Nicholls et al. (1985) may explain the disparity in educational achievement among these students as a consequence of the negative behaviors and attitudes that have been tied to the extrinsic view.

The relationship between views about the purpose of school and poverty may be similar to the relationship between self-concept and poverty. Jordan's (1981) discussion of low academic self-concept included characteristics that are similar to those Nicholls et al. (1985) used to describe students with the extrinsic view of school. Specifically, low self-concept and the extrinsic view of school were associated with an external locus of control or an individual's feeling that there is something outside of his or her control (e.g., luck) which determines fate.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The decline of black student enrollment in higher education is problematic for colleges and universities. Over the past 25 years, costly programs (Bowen, 1980) and extensive remedial and developmental services directed at improving the success rate of minority students have failed to achieve a desired level of success while placing considerable strain on limited educational budgets. In addition, there was a general decline in academic performance among college students (Astin, 1980) that led to considerable criticism of higher education's accountability. Consequently, many colleges and universities initiated efforts to improve academic performance (The American Council on Education, 1986). Although these efforts enjoyed considerable popular and governmental support, they were criticized for lack of concern for educational equality (The College Board, 1985, Southern Regional Educational Board, 1985) and the likelihood that blacks and other minorities would fail to meet higher academic standards. The problem was complicated further by reports (SREB 1985, & Keller, 1983) of a precipitous drop in the pool of traditional age college applicants and the need for a larger percentage of women and minorities to meet enrollment needs. Consequently, colleges are faced with either continuing expensive programs that do not work and weaken academic standards or re-examining the problem for new insight and strategies.

How students view the purpose of school may be important to improvement in the educational success of black students. However, in an extensive review of social cognition research, Weinstein (1983),

discussed studies of students' perceptions of teachers, teacher behavior, peers, other school personnel, self, causes of behavior, classroom climates, and social climates of schools. Within this review there were no studies that addressed students' perceptions about the overall purpose of school as an institution with specific goals.

III. STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to develop measures of the intrinsic and extrinsic views of school and to determine if differences in these measures existed between students of different races and socioeconomic levels.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Socioeconomic status, for the purpose of this study is a relative measure of a family's social and economic status as determined by parents' category of employment. It is measured by responses to survey questions about parents' occupations and job duties which are then coded according to the revised socioeconomic index of occupational status developed by Stevens and Featherman (1981).

Academic self-concept is limited to the self assessment of academic ability. It is measured by eight survey questions that require students to respond on a four-part semantic scale which progresses from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This scale is subsequently converted to a numerical scale ranging from one to four. Factor analysis is used to

verify the eight responses as a construct that reflects academic self-concept. The sum of the responses forms the measurement of academic self-concept.

Intrinsic view of school refers to the acceptance of the purpose of school as primarily providing preparation for responsible adulthood, including active citizen involvement, the appreciation of aesthetics, and the value of learning. It is measured by ten survey questions that require students to respond on a seven-point numerical scale. Factor analysis is used to verify the responses as a construct that reflects the intrinsic view of school.

Extrinsic view of school refers to the acceptance of the purpose of school as primarily providing preparation for jobs. It is also measured by ten survey questions and its final score determined in the same manner as the score for the intrinsic view of school.

Educational plans refer to students' responses to a survey question that asks about post high school plans. The response options consist of seven items that reflect either plans to attend college or plans to not attend college.

Reasons for attending college reflect students' responses to a survey question which asks for the most important reason for attending college. The response options include items that reflect the extrinsic and intrinsic views of school, reasons that are unrelated to either view of school, and the statement "do not plan to attend college."

Educational aspiration refers to the highest level of education students plan to complete. The response options include all degree possibilities from high school through doctorate degree.

V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The sample for this study was limited to seniors at twenty-three high schools in Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The selection of schools was based on the development of a data base that contained a balance of black and white students from various socioeconomic levels. Participation in the study was on a voluntary basis and allowed only if parental approval was given. Therefore, the sample does not represent a random sample.

VI. ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was based on the following assumptions.

1. The survey items which measured the intrinsic and extrinsic views of school reflected these dimensions as they are defined above.

2. Students' descriptions of their parents job titles and duties could be used to obtain a reliable occupational code on the revised socioeconomic index of occupational status developed by Stevens and Featherman (1981).

3. Students' responses to survey questions about post high school plans did not vary significantly from what students actually did.

VII. THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

This study examined the relationships between students' views about the purpose of schools and their socioeconomic status, race, educational aspirations, and academic self-concept. For each test the alpha level was set at .05. The related research hypotheses were:

1. H_{01}: There is no statistically significant differences in scores on views about the purpose of school (intrinsic and extrinsic) among students of various socioeconomic levels.

2. H_{02}: There is no statistically significant differences in scores on views about the purpose of school (intrinsic and extrinsic) for black and white students.

3. H_{03}: There is no statistically significant differences in scores on views about the purpose of school (intrinsic and extrinsic) among students with different educational aspirations.

4. H_{04}: There is no correlation between measures of views about the purpose of school and scores for academic self-concept.

VIII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I introduced the problem and the basis for the study. It also stated the purpose, defined terms that have special meaning, and listed the limitations. It also included the assumptions and the hypotheses of the study.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature that gives a historical basis for the research hypotheses and the importance of the

study.

Chapter III describes the procedures for data collection and analysis.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the study.

Chapter V contains a summary, conclusions, and discussion of the study and its findings. The chapter also contains statements about implications for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

This study examined whether student perceptions about the purpose of school related to the variables of race, socioeconomic status, and self-concept. It focused on whether students view the value of school as extrinsic, a means to greater social status, or intrinsic, the experience of becoming a responsible adult. This review of literature presents an analysis of how these two views have significantly influenced American education and why they may be related to differences in academic success among minority and non-minority students.

II. A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE PURPOSE OF SCHOOLS

In American education there are two emphases which have had considerable influence on the development and definition of goals for public schooling. The first is a view of education as culture and the process of becoming cultured. It consists of liberal learning and reflects the European tradition of colleges as communities for the preservation and cultivation of culture among elites (Coleman, 1973). Within this view, the value of education is intrinsic.

The second view emphasizes the extrinsic value of schooling as a means to an end, specifically, a means to greater social and economic status. This view reflects the historical efforts of a young industrial nation to produce trained professionals.

Both emphases reflect social development in America. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton (1985) describe how American higher education began with European traditions and then evolved to serve the needs of an emerging industrial society.

> We have repeatedly had to notice that during the nineteenth century, the social world changed from being a community, a cosmos of callings, into an industrial-corporate society organized around competing professional careers. Education institutions were transformed in ways comparable to the transformation of other institutions. The American college through much of the nineteenth century was organized on the assumption that "higher education constituted a single unified culture." The purpose of college education was to produce a "man of learning" who would have "an uplifting and unifying influence on society..." It was only late in the nineteenth century that the research university replaced the college as the model for higher education - contemporaneously with the rise of the business corporation (p. 298).

As Frederick Rudolph (1984) explained, the educational interests of American colonies were not served by the emphasis on European traditions. The colonies had no hereditary elites and there was considerable need for professional skills. Therefore, colleges were encouraged to focus more on the training of professionals. The interest in developing a professional work force resulted in The Morrill Act of 1862 which gave to colleges the primary responsibilities for certifying mechanical and agricultural professions. According to Rudolph, this mandate provided the impetus for the growth of American universities.

According to Barlow (1973), the impetus for vocational education in secondary schools came from Senator Carroll S. Page of Vermont. The purpose of his 1912 Vocational Education Bill was to "broaden out our school system by the addition of education for the basic vocations on the farm, in the shop, and in the home" (p.30). The intent of Page's actions was to bridge the gap that existed between the rich and poor by providing systematic means for young people to enter the work force. Barlow considered the extensive research that accompanied Page's legislation to be the cornerstone that defined and functionally described the concept of vocational education.

In spite of the tremendous support and need for vocational education, the interest in European educational aims did not disappear altogether. The idea of education as the preservation and cultivation of culture remained a vital part of American democratic society. As stated by Bellah et al. (1985), Thomas Jefferson "believed that the best defense of freedom was an educated people actively participating in government" (p.31). In this regard, education extends beyond job training to include an understanding of what culture is and ought to be. More importantly, it stresses the responsibility of participating actively in the making of culture through the democratic process.

Devotion to the nation-state is extrinsic to the liberal education Jefferson considered necessary for a democracy. In this sense it mirrors the means-to-an-end emphasis of vocational education. However, John Dewey, who greatly influenced modern education, emphasized strictly the intrinsic value of educational goals. As quoted by Goodlad (1979), Dewey stated:

> Since growth is the characteristic of life, education is all one with growing; it has no end beyond itself. The criterion of the value of school education is the extent to which it creates a desire for continued growth and supplies means for making the desire effective in fact (p.53).

Dewey (1958) expressed the view that education should be a liberating process that helps individuals become responsible persons who are able to live life to the fullest. Belief in the value of human experience was considered to be the basis for educational process. He defined education as "that re-construction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (p.58). As an extension of this reasoning, Goodlad (1979), concluded that the aim of education is then to maintain a system that stimulates individual learning and appreciation for self-realization.

Both the intrinsic and extrinsic views underlie the role of schools in contemporary society. The commitment to general education requirements by most colleges reflects the continued desire to unify the various fields of learning to achieve an overall understanding of people and culture. Conversely, the focus on career education in secondary schools and the strength of professional programs in higher education reflect the commitment to practical needs and the meaningful integration of students into the work force. Each emphasis has merit and utility in an industrialized democracy and need not be incompatible with the other. However, concerns about justifying the cost of education have elevated career preparation to the point of overshadowing the intrinsic value of schools.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, the cost of education was increased greatly by the need to educate the large "baby boom" generation and to provide expanded opportunities to women and minorities. As stated by Hoyt (1974), this increased expense made it clear that education could not continue to be its own justification. A business oriented society demanded more concrete outcomes than those proposed by the educated man concept. To this end, career preparation seemed to provide the concreteness taxpayers desired. It had tangible outcomes for students and, during a time of economic stress, addressed the need for national economic development.

As explained by Weatherby (1980), to address the public's interest in limiting educational expenses, governmental officials enacted accountability requirements that often focused on concrete outcomes. Consequently, colleges now have to demonstrate the "value added" by the collegiate experience. As indicated in a report by The American Council on Education (1986), job placement is an accepted measure of effectiveness in over 70 percent of the colleges and universities in this country. Whether graduates get jobs depends upon many factors far beyond the control of colleges. However, when it comes to the proof of higher education's value, job placements speak directly to public sentiment for concrete and measurable outcomes.

As discussed in the book Habits of the Heart, (Bellah et al., 1985), there are historical and cultural bases for the preference for career education. The national preoccupation with individualism and the idea of the "self-made man" make education important to the accomplishment of the "American Dream," often defined as economic security. To

this end, the value of education is often related to economic success.

The preference for career preparation may have an historical basis and may clarify accountability interests. However, critics object to its narrow focus. Goodlad (1979), quoted Dewey's objection to vocational education's danger in maintaining the status quo.

> Wherever social control means subordination of individual activities to class authority, there is danger that industrial education will be dominated by acceptance of the status quo. Differences of economic opportunity then dictate what the future callings of individuals are to be. We have an unconscious revival of the defects of the Platonic scheme without its enlightened method of selection (p. 37).

McPherson's (1983) discussion of the "screening hypothesis," echoed Dewey's concern. This hypothesis asserts that education functions to maintain class divisions by "adapt[ing] people to specific roles in a class-divided society: in particular, it socializes people into roles as 'bosses' and as 'workers'" (p.256).

III. THE PURPOSE OF EDUCATION: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF VIEWS

The historical emphasis on both the extrinsic and intrinsic view of school makes it possible for students to perceive the purpose of education as preparation for jobs, preparation for responsible adulthood, or both. However, recent evidence suggests that the interest in job preparation has assumed dominance among students. The National Center for Educational Statistics (1982) reported that "there has been a substantial increase in the number and percentage of students who major in occupationally oriented fields that are perceived by the

students as qualifying them for jobs when they graduate," (p.45).

This turn of events could have detrimental effects. As indicated in the study by Nicholls, Patashnick, and Nolen (1985), the extrinsic view of education and its emphasis on job preparation were associated with negative behaviors and attitudes that interfere with achievement. Penick and Morning (1983) supported this conclusion by reporting findings that suggest an attraction for the intrinsic nature of engineering is more indicative of success than the attraction for external benefits. In their study, students who entered engineering majors to qualify for high paying jobs had a dropout rate significantly higher than students who entered the major because they were interested in learning about engineering techniques or investigating particular engineering problems (p. 50).

Tinto's study (1975) provided insight into why it is difficult to succeed in higher education with a primary concern for job preparation. He used Durkheim's theoretical postulates about suicides to explain the dropout process in the context of how well students fit into the campus environment. Tinto explained that persons who leave the academic environment are most often those who are not committed to prevailing moral codes (academic goals and related behaviors) or who do not establish identification with the institution. He concluded that, in higher education, persistence is influenced by the complex relationship between academic and social integration.

Academic integration is acceptance of prevailing values for academic goals and learning. These values are generally expressed by faculty through the curriculum and standards for admission,

continuation, and graduation. Social integration relates to how well a student fits into the social environment of the campus. It is typified by membership in organizations, identification with athletic teams, and participation in extra-curricular activities. A strong commitment to academic goals may counteract social maladjustments, and strong commitment to the institution could outweigh the lack of academic integration.

In spite of the heavy emphasis on professional education, most college curricula require an appreciation for liberal learning, or the intrinsic value of education. Students whose primary goal is to qualify for specific jobs may find many of their courses meaningless and have difficulty establishing genuine relationships with faculty. These students may not experience Tinto's academic integration and, therefore, become prone to dropping out.

IV. VIEWS ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF EDUCATION: CONSEQUENCES FOR BLACK STUDENTS

Since 1980, a number of researchers have reported excessively high attrition rates for black college students. Suen (1983) reported evidence of black student attrition as high as 73.4 percent, compared to a rate of 47.7 percent for the overall student population (p.117). Similarly, Dunston, Richmond, and House (1983), Astin (1982), and The American Council on Education (1985), reported evidence of disproportionately high attrition among black college students. The high dropout rate of black college students may be explained by the

incompatibility of students' primary goals and the primary emphases and processes of post secondary educational institutions. Jones (1979) and Astin (1982) reported that a majority of black college students major in fields oriented to particular occupations. This finding may reflect the general trend reported by the National Center for Educational Statistics (1982) for students to pursue majors associated with specific occupations. On the other hand, it may reflect that many black students view education primarily as a way to improve their socioeconomic status.

In addition to the insight provided by Nicholls et al. (1985), it is important to understand why the extrinsic view of education is associated with low academic achievement, especially for black students. According to motivation theorists (Beck, 1978; Lawler, 1973; Shea, 1976), achievement motivation is related to the availability of opportunities for success. Because, the unemployment rate among blacks has increased steadily between 1965 and 1980 (The College Board, 1985), black high school students may not accept that they will achieve greater socioeconomic status from educational achievement. Therefore, many of these students may either leave high school before graduation or choose not to pursue a post secondary education.

Because of evidence that academic achievement will not result in desired outcomes, black students may not develop the necessary skills and motivation to become confident with their academic abilities. According to Jordan (1981), motivation theorists often attribute the lack of confidence about academic and other abilities to poor self-concept. Marion (1985) was able to show a consistent relationship

between positive self-image in high school and higher college-going rates.

A positive self-concept seems to be especially important to the success of black students. Tracey and Sedlacek (1984) identified seven non-cognitive variables associated with black student retention in college that included a positive self-concept. In addition, The National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering (1983) recommended that college recruiters take into consideration minority students' academic self-concept when making admissions decisions because of its positive relationship to students' persistence in engineering programs.

The description of students with low self-concept that both Jordan (1981) and Marion (1985) used was similar to the description Nicholls et al. (1985) gave to students with an extrinsic view of school. Specifically, low self-concept and the extrinsic view of schools are associated with an external locus of control or the feeling that something outside an individual's control (e.g. luck) determines fate. Given this similarity, a positive correlation may exist between low self-concept and the extrinsic view of school.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

The following section describes the methods that were used to conduct the study. The first section describes the identification of the sample and the administration of the questionnaire. It also contains a description of the questionnaire and the methods for coding it. The second section presents the statistical techniques used to analyze the data.

II. THE INITIAL POPULATION

The sample for this study consisted of seniors in 23 high schools located in Florida, Kentucky, Georgia, Tennessee, and South Carolina. The schools were selected with the help of Upward Bound directors. Upward Bound is a federal grant program that provides college preparatory assistance to students from families with low income. Colleges and universities sponsor Upward Bound projects which must work closely with local school systems to achieve their goals. Because of this close relationship, the Upward Bound directors were able to select schools that provided a balanced representation of black and white students, and students from various socioeconomic levels.

Eight directors each received 250 surveys and worked with local school authorities to gain permission for students in at least two schools to participate in the study. The principals of the schools determined the homerooms or classes that would be asked to participate in the study. Because the respondents were minors, the Upward Bound directors asked for their parents' permission before allowing students to participate in the study (see appendix A). The surveys were completed on the day after permission was given by parents.

All of the surveys used in the study were completed in the spring of 1988. The Upward Bound director read the instructions for completing the survey and monitored the completion of each part. Appendix B contains a complete text of the instructions. A total of 1,123 completed surveys were returned by mail for data analysis.

III. THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey instrument (see Appendix C) consisted of 45 items in three parts. The first part, items 2 through 8, consisted of rating scale items that measured academic self-concept. The second part, items 9 through 38, consisted of rating scale items that measured views about the purpose of school. The third part collected demographic data and information on post high school plans. It included items 39 through 45.

Items that were postulated to measure academic self-concept were based on studies by Nowicki and Strickland (1973), Marion (1985), and Jordon (1981). Items that surveyed views about the purpose of school (9 through 38) were based on the study by Nicholls et al. (1985) with

modifications that focused only on schools as preparation for jobs and schools as preparation for responsible adulthood. Ten additional items were included to mask the intent of the study.

Items 39 and 40 collected data on sex and race, and item 41 solicited information about post high school plans. The response options consisted of seven items that reflected either plans to attend college or plans to not attend college.

Item 42, reason for attending college, asked for the most important reason for attending college. The response options included items that reflect the extrinsic and intrinsic views of school, reasons that are unrelated to either view of school, and the statement "do not plan to attend college."

Educational aspiration was measured by item 43. The response options included all degree possibilities from high school through the doctorate.

Items 44 and 45 (what parents do at work) determined the coding of students'socioeconomic levels.

IV. THE FINAL SAMPLE

A total of 1,123 surveys were returned for analysis. This number represented 56 percent of the total number of surveys mailed to directors. If there were missing data for items 2 through 41 the survey was not included in the study. These responses comprised the measure of academic self-concept and views about the purpose of school. Relatively few responses determined these measures and each had significant

influence on the final score. Therefore, any missing data would have distorted scores for individual cases.

The surveys returned by Asian (10) and Hispanic (17) students were too few for meaningful analysis. Therefore, these surveys were excluded from the study. Surveys were also excluded from the study if the information on parents' occupations could not be coded. However, because of the importance of persons with low socioeconomic status to the analysis of data, a score of 09.99 was assigned to those cases in which the students stated their parents were either unemployed, on public assistance, or disabled. This score was lower than any occupation code.

A total of 1000 surveys were used in the data analysis. Table 1 provides a breakdown of individual schools according to students' race and socioeconomic levels. Table 2 shows a breakdown of students by race, and socioeconomic levels. Of the 1000 cases in the sample, 319 were black students and 681 were white. There were 544 females, of whom 187 were black, and 357 were white. There were 456 males of whom 132 were black and 324 were white. Among the black students, 58.6 percent were females and 41.4 percent were males. For whites, 52.4 percent were females and 47.6 percent were males.

V. DATA INTEGRITY

The researcher screened the surveys to make sure they were completed according to instructions. Those that had missing data for items 2 through 40 and items 44 and 45 were omitted from the analysis.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY PROFILE OF PARTICIPATING STUDENTS

SCHOOL	BLACK	WHITE	LOW INCOME	SKILLED LABOR	WHITE COLLAR	PROFES-SIONAL	TOTAL
#1		28		6	9	13	28
#2	1	24	2	3	10	10	25
#3		20		2	8	10	20
#4	1	10	1	2	3	5	11
#5	19		1	5	7	6	19
#6	1	12		6	5	2	13
#7	79		8	24	31	16	79
#8	8	9	6	8	3		17
#9	2	102	8	38	37	21	104
#10	6	63	5	14	23	27	69
#11	29		4	15	7	3	29
#12	34	1	6	11	13	5	35
#13	1	10	11				11
#14	2	10	12				12
#15	2	3	5				5
#16	19	1	20				20
#17	21		21				21
#18	8	30	5	7	16	10	38
#19	29	138	24	6	40	97	167
#20	9	29	5	6	17	10	38
#21	12	84	10	2	20	64	96
#22	6	40	3	7	7	29	46
#23	30	67	18	9	27	43	97

TABLE 2

SUMMARY PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS
BY RACE AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	RACE	
	BLACK	WHITE
LOW INCOME	99	76
SKILLED LABOR	78	93
WHITE COLLAR	88	195
PROFESSIONAL	54	317

The surveys were placed in groups by individual schools and counted. Within each group, individual surveys were assigned the group number of the school and the corresponding count value. The surveys for each group were then entered into separate ASCII computer files and given line numbers based on their their count values.

As a measure of data integrity, a random sample of at least thirty percent of the records was compared to the completed surveys. The data in the computer files matched exactly the data on the surveys.

The twenty-three files were then merged into one large file and up-loaded to the main frame computer. A random sample of line numbers from the separate computer files was compared to the corresponding line numbers in the large file to make sure the transfer had not distorted the data. There were no errors.

The final test of data integrity involved using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) computer program to conduct a frequency count on all variables. This procedure indicated the proper alignment of data. As a result of these tests, the data files were considered identical and an accurate representation of student responses.

VI. CODING OF DATA

The survey instrument (Appendix C) provided measures of students' academic self-concept, view of school as preparation for jobs (extrinsic) and preparation for responsible adulthood (intrinsic). It

also collected information on gender, race, post high school plans, and parents' occupations.

Questions on academic self-concept (2 through 8) were measured on a four-point rating scale that ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". These items were coded with numerical values that ranged from one (strongly agree) to four (strongly disagree). Items six and eight were reverse scored because they are the only items for this measurement that had negative connotations for agreement. The sum of the scores represented the measure of academic self-concept and ranged from 7 (high) to 28 (low).

Views about the purpose of school were measured by twenty survey questions that included ten for preparation for jobs and ten for preparation for responsible adulthood. Ten additions items were included to mask the intent of the study and were not coded. The views were measured on a seven point numerical scale with seven as the high score. The sum of the responses for each set of ten items represented the score for either the intrinsic or extrinsic view of school. The scores ranged from a low of 10 to a high of 70.

The response options for item 41 (plans after high school) were recoded to represent whether students planned to attend (1,2,3) or not attend college (4,5,6,7). Responses to item 42 (reason for attending college) were recoded as either extrinsic (1), intrinsic (2,3,4), unrelated (5,6,7) or not attending (8).

Items 44 and 45 (what parents do at work) were used to determine students' socioeconomic levels. Parents' occupations were coded using item analysis and the revised socioeconomic index of

occupational status developed by Stevens and Featherman (1981). For each case, the highest occupation code for mother or father was used as the indicator of socioeconomic status.

The index developed by Stevens and Featherman (1981) is a revision of The Duncan Socioeconomic Index (SEI) for occupations which provides prestige ratings for Census occupations. As described by Mueller and Parcel (1981) the SEI used 1950 Census data to assign a score to each occupation by using the following regression equation: SEI score = $0.59X_1 + 0.55X_2 - 6.0$, where X_1 is the percent of the males in the occupation with incomes of at least $3,500 and X_2 is the percent of males in the occupation who are at least high school graduates. The regression weights were obtained by regressing the percent excellent and good ratings from the North-Hatt study for each occupation on X_1 and X_2. As discussed by Mueller and Parcel, the North-Hatt study was a 1947 national survey that collected ratings on 90 occupations. These data were then used to form a scale which ranged from a high of 96 for Supreme Court Justice to a low of 33 for shoe shiner. The revision by Stevens and Featherman updated the SEI with 1970 Census data and the inclusion of women.

Occupation scales are generally accepted by sociologists as the most reliable measure of socioeconomic status (Muller & Parcel, 1981; and Stevens and Featherman, 1981). There is high correlation even among different measures of social strata (i.e. economic, power, and prestige). In a study to determine the best measure of socioeconomic status in child development research, Gottfried (1985) concluded that

Stevens and Featherman's modified SEI was most suitable for determining SES for individuals and heads of households.

VII. STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. The program and a schematic diagram of the data analysis are presented in Appendices D & E. The first procedure was part of the process to insure proper data entry and involved production of a frequency distribution of responses for each variable. Also, the distribution of responses was examined to determine if there were balanced representations of blacks and whites and students from different socioeconomic levels.

Crosstabulations were used to partition responses by particular groups. This procedure also produced chi-square statistics that were used to evaluate nominal and ordinal level measure relationships.

T-tests and one-way analysis of variance tests were used to determine differences between various groups on mean scores for academic self-concept, the intrinsic view of school, and the extrinsic view of school. These scores were measured at the interval level. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test the hypothesized linear relationship between socioeconomic status and views about the purpose of school, and academic self-concept and views about the purpose of school.

The index of forecasting efficiency (Mouly, 1970), was used to determine the strength of correlation coefficients. This index

represents the predictability of a coefficient over and above chance and is defined as:

$$e = 1 - \sqrt{1 - r^2}$$

VIII. RELIABILITY TESTS USED IN THE STUDY

The SPSS-X reliability procedure was used to test the stability of responses that determined the scores for academic self-concept, the intrinsic view of school, and the extrinsic view of school. This procedure uses the split-half method of reliability estimation. Its basic premise, according to Stone (1978), is that an observed score (X_o) has two components: a true score (X_t) and an error score (X_e).

$$X_o = X_t + X_e$$

The true score is an error free measurement estimated by the mean of all observed values. The error component is the difference between the observed score and the true score. Because the true and error scores are statistically independent, the sum of their variances equal the variance of observed scores. The reliability (r_{xx}) of a measure is a correlation coefficient that represents true score variance divided by observed score variance.

$$r_{xx} = 1 - \frac{s_t^2}{s_o^2}$$

IX. VALIDITY TESTS USED IN THE STUDY

The primary concern in assessing the validity of the survey instrument is with determining the extent to which it measures what it purports to measure. In this study, the use of factor analysis allowed for the examination of the instrument's construct validity for measures of academic self-concept and views about the purpose of school. Factor analysis provided a test of construct validity by condensing many variables into a few underlying constructs. According to Biderman (1987), if the variables that measure academic self-concept were valid, they should correlate with a single factor at .5 or higher. This logic was used to also conclude that, if more than one factor was defined, the correlation between or among these factors should be at .5 or higher. If the variables that measure views about the purpose of school were valid, they should define appropriately two separate factors and have individual correlations at .5 or higher.

In all cases, factors were extracted using the maximum likelihood (Rao Canonical factoring) method which, according to Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1970), is appropriate for analyzing observed data that comprise a sample from a population where a specific number of common factors exactly applies (one for academic self-concept and two for view of school) and where the distribution of variables is multi-variate normal.

Eigenvalues indicate the amount of variance underlying the variables associated with a factor. According to accepted conventions (Kim & Mueller, 1978; Nie et al., 1970), there is significant

difference between factors with eigenvalues greater than one.

The factor solution produces a table of initial statistics that include a communality statistic for each variable. As described by Nie et al., (1970) and Kim and Muller (1978), this statistic is the proportion of variance in the variable explained by all the factors. The square of the correlation of variables with factors is the percent of variance in the variable accounted for by the factor. A high correlation indicates a strong association with the factor. In this study, a correlation of .5 (25 percent of the variance in the variable) or higher was considered significant.

As explained by Nie et al. (1970), in the initial factor solution the first factor accounts for as much variance as possible. Therefore, the actual correlation of variables with factors may be distorted by the accommodation of variance in variables that is not part of the factor. To avoid this distortion, factors were rotated so that each variable tended to load highly on only one factor.

An oblique (oblimin) rotation allows factors to correlate with one another and was used with the variables that measure academic self-concept. These variables should form a composite measure that may or may not be reflected along one dimension. If there is a solution with more than one factor, the factor correlation matrix (produced by the rotation method) would show the correlation of the factors with each other. High correlation would indicate that the factors are not distinct. The oblique rotation also produces a table of the regression coefficients of each variable for each factor. Therefore, the loading of variables onto more than one factor should further explain the

inter-correlation among factors.

The factor solution on views about the purpose of school included only those variables which measure the purpose of school as either preparation for jobs or preparation for responsible adulthood. Therefore, the observed data were expected to reflect a sample from a population where two factors exactly apply. An orthogonal (varimax) rotation was used to maximize the tendency of each variable to load highly on only one factor.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

The strength of this study is determined by whether the data represent valid and reliable measures of intrinsic and extrinsic views about the purpose of school. Therefore, this section begins with a discussion of results from reliability and validity tests. Descriptive statistics and the chi-square test were then used to describe how various groups were represented in the sample. The data for this part of the analysis were at both the nominal and ordinal levels. This section concludes with results from bivariate and multivariate tests which explained differences among the groups in the sample. In this part of the analysis, the data were at the interval level and the sample, because of its size, was treated as a normal distribution.

II. THE RELIABILITY OF THE STUDY

The reliability of the survey instrument as a measure of academic self-concept, the intrinsic view of school and the extrinsic view of school was tested using the split-half method of reliability estimation. The results of these tests are in Table 3. For each test, the coefficients for measurements of views about the purpose of school

TABLE 3. RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF MEASUREMENTS FOR THE INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC VIEWS OF SCHOOL AND ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT

	INTRINSIC VIEW	EXTRINSIC VIEW	ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT
NUMBER OF ITEMS	10	10	7
GUTTMAN SPLIT-HALF	0.8525	0.8961	0.2707
EQUAL LENGTH SPEARMAN-BROWN	0.8559	0.8965	0.2716
UNEQUAL-LENGTH SPEARMAN-BROWN	0.8559	0.8965	0.2740
ALPHA FOR PART 1	0.7395	0.7981	0.4861
ALPHA FOR PART 2	0.8194	0.8661	0.5222

were high, indicating a reliable assessment of student responses. The coefficients for academic self-concept indicated a lack of reliability in the sum across variables as an estimate of a case's true score. The coefficients may be low because they were based on ordinal level data which was converted to the interval level. As indicated by Mouly (1970), it is accepted practice in educational research to measure attributes (e.g. academic self-concept) with rating scales and to convert responses to numerical values. However, Quarles (1976) noted difficulty with using certain types of statistical (parametric) tests with measurements from a rating scale. Although Quarles cited evidence that ordinal variables can be treated as interval-level data, the scale construction for the measure of academic self-concept may not have allowed this kind of conversion.

As explained by Mouly (1970), scale construction involves a series

of items which "elicit responses that are psychologically related to the attitude-object being appraised..." (p.298). However, as explained below, the results of the validity test indicated that the variables did not form a measure of academic self-concept and, therefore, may not be psychologically related. Mouly also stated that scale divisions must not restrict the respondent's freedom of expression within the psychological dimension under study. In this regard, the four divisions of the academic self-concept scale was probably not adequate.

Stone's (1978) suggestion of increasing the length of a test to improve its reliability points to another weakness in the measurement of academic self-concept. Seven survey questions may not have been an adequate number to obtain a reliable measure of academic self-concept.

III. THE VALIDITY OF THE STUDY

Factor analysis was used to evaluate whether variables 2 through 8 could be condensed into a single construct that provide a general measure of academic self-concept. As shown in Table 4, the data did not support the treatment of these variables as measures of a single construct. The initial factor solution showed two dimensions with eigenvalues greater than one. Also, the two dimensions accounted for only 47.8 percent of the total variance, which indicated the variables have only moderate association with the factors.

The factor matrix in Table 5 shows the correlation of variables with factors (loadings). The square of the correlation is the percent of variance in the variable accounted for by the factor. Variables

TABLE 4. FACTOR ANALYSIS INITIAL STATISTICS ON ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PCT
VAR02	0.08421	1	1.83398	26.2	26.2
VAR03	0.09899	2	1.51440	21.6	47.8
VAR04	0.09027	3	0.92996	13.3	61.1
VAR05	0.14637	4	0.86604	12.4	73.5
VAR06	0.32830	5	0.75164	10.7	84.2
VAR07	0.12165	6	0.67988	9.7	93.9
VAR08	0.33113	7	0.42409	6.1	100.0

TABLE 5. ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT FACTOR MATRIX

VARIABLES	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
8. Planning only makes a person unhappy since plans hardly ever work out anyway.	.96837	
6. Good luck is more important than hard work.	.58989	
5. I take a positive attitude toward myself		.55426
7. I am as capable as most other students.		.45616
3. If someone studies hard enough he or she can pass any subject.		.41714

six and eight comprised a dimension which reflected whether respondents feel it is hard work or chance (luck) which controls their fate. The loadings for these variables indicated a very strong association with the factor. It accounted for 94 percent of the variance in variable 8 and 35 percent of the variance in variable 6.

The second factor consisted of variables 3, 5, and 7, and reflected a positive view of self. The association of these variables with the factor was relatively weak as only variable 5 correlated above 0.50. Variables 2 and 4 did not have significant correlation with either dimension.

An oblique (oblimin) rotation allowed factors to correlate with one another and was used because the variables were supposed to measure one construct. This rotation method provided further evidence that the variables did not constitute a single measure of academic self-concept. The pattern matrix in Table 6 shows the regression coefficients of each variable for each factor when the variable was regressed on factors. These regression coefficients were different from the correlation in the factor matrix because they were affected by intercorrelations among factors. Nevertheless, the factor loadings were similar to the coefficients in the structure matrix which did not adjust for correlations among the factors. The factor correlation matrix (see Table 7), which contained the correlation of the factors with each other, showed low correlation between the factors, indicating that they were distinct.

Factor analysis was also used to evaluate the validity of variables which measured views about the purpose of school. Only those variables

TABLE 6. ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT OBLIMIN FACTOR ROTATION

	PATTERN MATRIX:		STRUCTURE MATRIX:	
VARIABLE	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
VAR08	.96974		.96834	
VAR06	.58899		.58991	
VAR05		.55807		.55516
VAR07		.45919		.46264
VAR03		.42001		.41799
VAR02				
VAR04				

TABLE 7. ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT FACTOR CORRELATION MATRIX

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
FACTOR 1	1.00000	
FACTOR 2	.11820	1.00000

which measured the purpose of school as either preparation for jobs or preparation for responsible adulthood were included in the analysis. Therefore, the observed data were expected to reflect a sample from a population where two factors exactly apply.

Table 8 shows that the factors explained moderate to low amounts of variance in each variable. The eigenvalues indicated there were three distinct factors which explained a total of 58.2 percent of the variance in all variables.

The unrotated alignment of variables with factors is in Table 9. The correlations with factor 3 were below 0.40 and were not included in the table. This factor explained less than 16 percent of the variance in each variable. Because all of the variables measure the purpose of school, the first factor was distorted by extreme loadings. However, the initial solution was not expected to provide a meaningful explanation of the data.

An orthogonal (varimax) rotation was used to determine if the variables identified two distinct factors that measure (1) school as preparation for jobs and (2) school as the process of becoming a responsible adult. Table 10 presents the results of the rotated solution. Factor one consisted of the ten variables that measured the purpose of school as preparation for jobs. Each of these variables had significant correlations with the factor (25 percent of the variance). Five of the variables loaded onto factor 3; however, only one of these correlations (variable 28) was above 0.50 and in each case factor one explained a greater amount of variance.

Factor 2 included the variables that reflected the purpose of

TABLE 8. VIEW OF SCHOOL INITIAL FACTOR STATISTICS

VARIABLE	COMMUNALITY	FACTOR	EIGENVALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM
VAR09	.27184	1	8.48818	42.4	42.4
VAR11	.26528	2	2.12677	10.6	53.1
VAR12	.22884	3	1.01824	5.1	58.2
VAR13	.45372	4	.83006	4.2	62.3
VAR14	.53932	5	.79035	4.0	66.3
VAR17	.43200	6	.69116	3.5	69.7
VAR19	.44691	7	.67243	3.4	73.1
VAR20	.68797	8	.63017	3.2	76.2
VAR22	.57450	9	.60182	3.0	79.2
VAR24	.56042	10	.53526	2.7	81.9
VAR25	.54542	11	.49417	2.5	84.4
VAR26	.50011	12	.47485	2.4	86.8
VAR28	.69105	13	.44309	2.2	89.0
VAR29	.57019	14	.38074	1.9	90.9
VAR30	.63390	15	.37600	1.9	92.8
VAR31	.47260	16	.35890	1.8	94.6
VAR33	.48112	17	.32659	1.6	96.2
VAR34	.52658	18	.28282	1.4	97.6
VAR37	.51842	19	.25623	1.3	98.9
VAR38	.38008	20	.22217	1.1	100.0

ML EXTRACTED 3 FACTORS. 5 ITERATIONS REQUIRED.

CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC: 666.3379, D.F.: 133, SIGNIFICANCE: 00

TABLE 9. FACTOR MATRIX INITIAL SOLUTION

VARIABLES	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
28. HELP US TO PREPARE FOR THE JOBS OF THE FUTURE.	.82064	
20. TEACH US THE SKILLS THAT WILL GET US TOP JOBS.	.79455	
30. PREPARE US FOR JOBS THAT WILL GIVE US A COMFORTABLE LIVING.	.74644	
25. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF EARNING A LIVING.	.73117	
24. HELP US TO IDENTIFY THE KIND OF JOBS WE ARE BEST SUITED FOR.	.73043	
14. HELP US QUALIFY FOR GOOD JOBS.	.70669	
37. TEACH US ABOUT INTERVIEWING FOR JOBS.	.68785	
34. TEACH US TO HELP SOCIETY.	.67417	
22. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES FACING OUR STATE AND COUNTRY.	.65940	.43369
29. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT THE WORLD.	.65464	.41009
33. TEACH US HOW TO COMPETE FOR JOBS.	.64118	
19. PREPARE US TO MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO OUR COMMUNITY.	.61984	
13. HELP US UNDERSTAND PROBLEMS THE WORLD WILL FACE IN THE FUTURE.	.58792	
31. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF VOTING IN ELECTIONS.	.57875	
38. TEACH US TO LEARN THINGS ON OUR OWN.	.55862	
26. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND HOW OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM WORKS.	.55399	.45446
17. PREPARE US FOR JOBS THAT WILL GIVE US ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY THE BEST OF EVERYTHING.	.51934	
11. IDENTIFY STUDENTS WHO HAVE THE ABILITY TO GET TOP JOBS.	.44830	
9. HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW SCIENCE CAN HELP SOCIETY.	*	
12. HELP US APPRECIATE THE ARTS.	*	

*Denotes a factor loading below 0.4.

TABLE 10. VIEW OF SCHOOL FACTOR LOADING
AFTER VARIMAX ROTATION

VARIABLES	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
30. PREPARE US FOR JOBS THAT WILL GIVE US A COMFORTABLE LIVING.	.75230		
20. TEACH US THE SKILLS THAT WILL GET US TOP JOBS.	.70859		.42297
17. PREPARE US FOR JOBS THAT WILL GIVE US ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY THE BEST OF EVERYTHING.	.68527		
33. TEACH US HOW TO COMPETE FOR JOBS.	.67810		
28. HELP US TO PREPARE FOR THE JOBS OF THE FUTURE.	.61494		.56335
37. TEACH US ABOUT INTERVIEWING FOR JOBS.	.58182		
14. HELP US QUALIFY FOR GOOD JOBS.	.54571		.42335
25. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF EARNING A LIVING.	.53553		.41597
24. HELP US TO IDENTIFY THE KIND OF JOBS WE ARE BEST SUITED FOR.	.53358		.47524
11. IDENTIFY STUDENTS WHO HAVE THE ABILITY TO GET TOP JOBS.	.48537		
22. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES FACING OUR STATE AND COUNTRY.		.69557	
26. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND HOW OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM WORKS.		.69351	
29. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT THE WORLD.		.67975	
31. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF VOTING IN ELECTIONS.		.66668	
34. TEACH US TO HELP SOCIETY.		.60694	
13. HELP US UNDERSTAND PROBLEMS THE WORLD WILL FACE IN THE FUTURE.		.53835	
19. PREPARE US TO MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO OUR COMMUNITY.		.51239	
9. HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW SCIENCE CAN HELP SOCIETY.		.49746	
12. HELP US APPRECIATE THE ARTS.		.45958	
38. TEACH US TO LEARN THINGS ON OUR OWN.		.44858	

school as becoming a responsible adult. This factor accounted for at least 20 percent of the variance in each variable, indicating a strong association between the variables and the factor.

The correlation of variables with the first two factors indicated the variables measured two distinct dimensions on the purpose of school. Factor 1 reflected concern for the extrinsic value of school (preparation for jobs), and factor two reflected concern for a more intrinsic value of school (becoming a responsible adult). The association of variables with the third factor was weak and a reflection of an element in factor one.

The results of these tests indicated that the measurement of academic self-concept was not valid. Instead, the variables were poor measures of two dimensions. However, the measurements for the intrinsic and extrinsic views of school had high correlations with factors that were defined appropriately.

IV. ANALYSIS OF DESCRIPTIVE DATA

Table 11 contains crosstabulation results for blacks and whites by socioeconomic levels. Analysis of chi-square statistics revealed that race and socioeconomic level were not independent. Analysis of expected values and chi-square residuals indicated that blacks were over-represented in the low-income and skilled labor cells and under-represented in the white collar and professional cells.

According to the data in Table 12, 75.1 percent of the students in

TABLE 11. CROSSTABULATION: RACE BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Residual	LOW INCOME 1	SKILLED LABOR 2	WHITE COLLAR 3	PROFES-SIONAL 4	Row Total
BLACKS	99 55.8 31.0% 56.6% 43.2	78 54.5 24.5% 45.6% 23.5	88 90.3 27.6% 31.1% -2.3	54 118.3 16.9% 14.6% -64.3	319 31.9%
WHITES	76 119.2 11.2% 43.4% -43.2	93 116.5 13.7% 54.4% -23.5	195 192.7 28.6% 68.9% 2.3	317 252.7 46.5% 85.4% 64.3	681 68.1%
Column Total	175 17.5%	171 17.1%	283 28.3%	371 37.1%	1000 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
115.29908	3	.0000

Number of Missing Observations = 0

TABLE 12. CROSSTABULATION: RACE BY PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE

Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Residual	ATTEND COLLEGE 1	NOT ATTEND 2	Row Total
BLACKS	216 228.9 70.8% 29.8% -12.9	89 76.1 29.2% 36.9% 12.9	305 31.6%
WHITES	509 496.1 77.0% 70.2% 12.9	152 164.9 23.0% 63.1% -12.9	661 68.4%
Column Total	725 75.1%	241 24.9%	966 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
3.93976	1	.0472
4.26367	1	.0389

(Before Yates Correction)

Number of Missing Observations = 34

the sample planned to participate in some form of post secondary education. For both black and white students the percentages for college attendance were high compared to data on actual attendance rates. However, with a significance level of 0.0472, the chi-square results indicated that race and college attendance were dependent and the chi-square residuals showed that blacks were less likely than whites to participate in post-secondary education.

Controlling for socioeconomic status (Table 13) weakened the relationship between race and plans to attend college. Although low income blacks planned to attend college at a rate significantly higher than that for low income whites, the chi-square results on the other categories of socioeconomic status showed no dependence between race and plans to attend college.

The data in Table 14 showed the influence of socioeconomic status on plans to attend college. Although in each socioeconomic category a majority of students planned to attend some form of post secondary education, the chi-square residuals increased significantly at each succcessive level of socioeconomic status. Controlling for race (Table 15) did not negate this dependence in that within group results for both blacks and whites were similar to results for the total group. Specifically, students in the low income and skilled labor categories planned to attend college at a rate lower than that for students in the white collar and professional categories.

According to the chi-square results in Table 16, race and reasons for attending college were also dependent. The data showed that black students were primarily interested in attending college to qualify for

TABLE 13. CROSSTABULATION: RACE BY PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE CONTROLLING FOR SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

	LOW INCOME			SKILLED LABOR			WHITE COLLAR			PROFESSIONAL		
Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Residual	PLAN TO ATTEND COLLEGE	PLAN NOT TO ATTEND	ROW TOTAL	PLAN TO ATTEND COLLEGE	PLAN NOT TO ATTEND	ROW TOTAL	PLAN TO ATTEND COLLEGE	PLAN NOT TO ATTEND	ROW TOTAL	PLAN TO ATTEND COLLEGE	PLAN NOT TO ATTEND	ROW TOTAL
BLACKS	67 57.8 69.1% 65.0% 9.2	30 39.2 30.9% 42.9% -9.2	97 56.1%	45 48.5 60.0% 42.5% -3.5	30 26.5 40.0% 51.7% 3.5	75 45.7%	60 60.1 73.2% 30.3% -.1	22 21.9 26.8% 30.6% .1	82 30.4%	44 45.2 86.3% 13.8% -1.2	7 5.8 13.7% 17.1% 1.2	51 14.2%
WHITES	36 45.2 47.4% 35.0% -9.2	40 30.8 52.6% 57.1% 9.2	76 43.9%	61 57.5 68.5% 57.5% 3.5	28 31.5 31.5% 48.3% -3.5	89 54.3%	138 137.9 73.4% 69.7% .1	50 50.1 26.6% 69.4% -.1	188 69.6%	274 272.8 89.0% 86.2% 1.2	34 35.2 11.0% 82.9% -1.2	308 85.8%
Column Total	103 59.5%	70 40.5%	173 100.0%	106 64.6%	58 35.4%	164 100.0%	198 73.3%	72 26.7%	270 100.0%	318 88.6%	41 11.4%	359 100.0%
	Chi-Square D.F. Sign 7.45573 1 .0063 8.33231 1 .0039 Before Yates Correct			Chi-Square D.F. Sign .95170 1 .3293 1.29840 1 .2545 Before Yates Correct			Chi-Square D.F. Sign .00000 1 1.0000 .00159 1 .9682 Before Yates Correction			Chi-Square D.F. Sign .10308 1 .7482 .31217 1 .5764 Before Yates Correction		

Number of Missing Observations = 34

TABLE 14. CROSSTABULATION: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE

Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Residual	ATTEND COLLEGE 1	NOT ATTEND 2	ROW TOTAL
LOW INCOME	103 129.8 59.5% 14.2% -26.8	70 43.2 40.5% 29.0% 26.8	173 17.9%
SKILLED LABOR	106 123.1 64.6% 14.6% -17.1	58 40.9 35.4% 24.1% 17.1	164 17.0%
WHITE COLLAR	198 202.6 73.3% 27.3% -4.6	72 67.4 26.7% 29.9% 4.6	270 28.0%
PROFESSIONAL	318 269.4 88.6% 43.9% 48.6	41 89.6 11.4% 17.0% -48.6	359 37.2%
Column Total	725 75.1%	241 24.9%	966 100.0%

Chi-square	D.F.	Significance
67.25605	3	.0000

Number of Missing Observations = 34

TABLE 15. CROSSTABULATION: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE CONTROLLING FOR RACE

	BLACK			WHITE		
Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Residual	PLAN TO ATTEND COLLEGE	PLAN NOT TO ATTEND	Row Total	PLAN TO ATTEND COLLEGE	PLAN NOT TO ATTEND	Row Total
LOW INCOME	67 68.7 69.1% 31.0% -1.7	30 28.3 30.9% 33.7% 1.7	97 31.8%	36 58.5 47.4% 7.1% -22.5	40 17.5 52.6% 26.3% 22.5	76 11.5%
SKILLED LABOR	45 53.1 60.0% 20.8% -8.1	30 21.9 40.0% 33.7% 8.1	75 24.6%	61 68.5 68.5% 12.0% -7.5	28 20.5 31.5% 18.4% 7.5	89 13.5%
WHITE COLLAR	60 58.1 73.2% 27.8% 1.9	22 23.9 26.8% 24.7% -1.9	82 26.9%	138 144.8 73.4% 27.1% -6.8	50 43.2 26.6% 32.9% 6.8	188 28.4%
PROFES-SIONAL	44 36.1 86.3% 20.4% 7.9	7 14.9 13.7% 7.9% -7.9	51 16.7%	274 237.2 89.0% 53.8% 36.8	34 70.8 11.0% 22.4% -36.8	308 46.6%
Column Total	216 70.8%	89 29.2%	305 100.0%	509 77.0%	152 23.0%	661 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
10.50587	3	.0147	67.53977	3	.0000

Number of Missing Observations = 34

TABLE 16. CROSSTABULATION: RACE BY REASON FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE

	Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct Residual	EXTRINSIC 1	INTRINSIC 2	Row Total
BLACK	2	194 166.6 74.3% 36.3% 23.2% 27.4	67 94.4 25.7% 22.1% 8.0% -27.4	261 31.1%
WHITE	4	341 368.4 59.1% 63.7% 40.7% -27.4	236 208.6 40.9% 77.9% 28.2% 27.4	577 68.9%
	Column Total	535 63.8%	303 36.2%	838 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
17.40568	1	.0000
18.05945	1	.0000

(Before Yates Correction)

Number of Missing Observations = 162

high paying jobs (extrinsic reasons) while whites had a higher than expected value for intrinsic reasons and a lower than expected value for extrinsic reasons.

There also appeared to be a relationship between socioeconomic status and reasons for attending college (Table 17). Within the professional category a significantly higher percentage of students had intrinsic reasons for attending college than students in the other socioeconomic categories. This response pattern added significantly to the chi-square results. The number of white collar students with extrinsic reasons for attending college also made a contribution to the chi-square results.

The dependence between race and reasons for attending college did not remain true when socioeconomic status was controlled (Table 18). In all but the professional socioeconomic category there were no statistically significant differences between blacks and whites regarding reasons for attending college. However, the responses of professional blacks suggested that they were more like students in the other socioeconomic categories than professional whites.

When race was controlled (Table 19) the relationship between socioeconomic status and reasons for attending college was different for blacks and whites. Among black students, the majority (194, or 74 percent) had extrinsic reasons and socioeconomic status was not related to reasons for attending college (chi-square significance of 0.80). However, among white students there was very strong dependence between socioeconomic status and reasons for attending college. A significant number of professional students (47.4 percent) had

TABLE 17. CROSSTABULATION: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY REASON FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE

Count / Exp Val / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct / Residual	EXTRINSIC	INTRINSIC	Row Total
LOW INCOME	89 81.1 70.1% 16.6% 10.6% 7.9	38 45.9 29.9% 12.5% 4.5% -7.9	127 15.2%
SKILLED LABOR	89 87.5 65.0% 16.6% 10.6% 1.5	48 49.5 35.0% 15.8% 5.7% -1.5	137 16.3%
WHITE COLLAR	169 155.8 69.3% 31.6% 20.2% 13.2	75 88.2 30.7% 24.8% 8.9% -13.2	244 29.1%
PROFESSIONAL	188 210.7 57.0% 35.1% 22.4% -22.7	142 119.3 43.0% 46.9% 16.9% 22.7	330 39.4%
Column Total	535 63.8%	303 36.2%	838 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
12.07176	3	.0071

Number of Missing Observations = 162

TABLE 18. CROSSTABULATION: RACE BY REASONS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE
CONTROLLING FOR SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Count / Exp Val / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct / Residual	EXTRINSIC 1	INTRINSIC 2	Row Total
LOW INCOME			
BLACK 2	59 55.4 74.7% 66.3% 46.5% 3.6	20 23.6 25.3% 52.6% 15.7% -3.6	79 62.2%
WHITE 4	30 33.6 62.5% 33.7% 23.6% -3.6	18 14.4 37.5% 47.4% 14.2% 3.6	48 37.8%
Column Total	89 70.1%	38 29.9%	127 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
1.57260	1	.2098
2.11371	1	.1460

(Before Yates Correction)

Count / Exp Val / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct / Residual	EXTRINSIC 1	INTRINSIC 2	Row Total
SKILLED LABOR			
BLACK 2	42 42.9 63.6% 47.2% 30.7% -.9	24 23.1 36.4% 50.0% 17.5% .9	66 48.2%
WHITE 4	47 46.1 66.2% 52.8% 34.3% .9	24 24.9 33.8% 50.0% 17.5% -.9	71 51.8%
Column Total	89 65.0%	48 35.0%	137 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
.01815	1	.8928
.09855	1	.7536

(Before Yates Correction)

Count / Exp Val / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct / Residual	EXTRINSIC 1	INTRINSIC 2	Row Total
WHITE COLLAR			
BLACK 2	55 49.2 77.5% 32.5% 22.5% 5.8	16 21.8 22.5% 21.3% 6.6% -5.8	71 28.1%
WHITE 4	114 119.8 65.9% 67.5% 46.7% -5.8	59 53.2 34.1% 78.7% 24.2% 5.8	173 70.9%
Column Total	169 69.3%	75 30.7%	244 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
2.64457	1	.1039
3.16465	1	.0752

(Before Yates Correction)

Count / Exp Val / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct / Residual	EXTRINSIC 1	INTRINSIC 2	Row Total
PROFESSIONAL			
BLACK 2	38 25.6 84.4% 20.2% 11.5% 12.4	7 19.4 15.6% 4.9% 2.1% -12.4	45 13.6%
WHITE 4	150 162.4 52.6% 79.8% 45.5% -12.4	135 122.6 47.4% 95.1% 40.9% 12.4	285 86.4%
Column Total	188 57.0%	142 43.0%	330 100.0%

Chi-square	D.F.	Significance
14.77318	1	.0001
16.04467	1	.0001

(Before Yates Correction)

TABLE 19. CROSSTABULATION: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY REASONS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE CONTROLLING FOR RACE

	BLACK			WHITE		
Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct Residual	EXTRINSIC 1	INTRINSIC 2	Row Total	EXTRINSIC 1	INTRINSIC 2	Row Total
1 LOW INCOME	59 58.7 74.7% 30.4% 22.6% .3	20 20.3 25.3% 29.9% 7.7% -.3	79 30.3%	30 28.4 62.5% 8.8% 5.2% 1.6	18 19.6 37.5% 7.6% 3.1% -1.6	48 8.3%
2 SKILLED LABOR	42 49.1 63.6% 21.6% 16.1% -7.1	24 16.9 36.4% 35.8% 9.2% 7.1	66 25.3%	47 42.0 66.2% 13.8% 8.1% 5.0	24 29.0 33.8% 10.2% 4.2% -5.0	71 12.3%
3 WHITE COLLAR	55 52.8 77.5% 28.4% 21.1% 2.2	16 18.2 22.5% 23.9% 6.1% -2.2	71 27.2%	114 102.2 65.9% 33.4% 19.8% 11.8	59 70.8 34.1% 25.0% 10.2% -11.8	173 30.0%
4 PROFESSIONAL	38 33.4 84.4% 19.6% 14.6% 4.6	7 11.6 15.6% 10.4% 2.7% -4.6	45 17.2%	150 168.4 52.6% 44.0% 26.0% -18.4	135 116.6 47.4% 57.2% 23.4% 18.4	285 49.4%
Column Total	194 74.3%	67 25.7%	261 100.0%	341 59.1%	236 40.9%	577 100.0%
	Chi-Square 6.73900	D.F. 3	Significance .0807	Chi-Square 9.94770	D.F. 3	Significance .0190

Number of Missing Observations = 162

intrinsic reasons compared to 35 percent of the students in the other three socioeconomic categories. Although not shown in the table, a significant number of low income (32.4 percent) and skilled labor 21.7 whites did not plan to attend college.

There appeared to be no dependence between race and degree aspirations (Table 20). However, there was a strong relationship between socioeconomic status and degree aspirations (Table 21). Students in the white collar and professional categories tended to aspire for higher level of education than students in the low income and skilled labor categories. This relationship remained true when socioeconomic status (Table 22) and race (Table 23) were controlled.

V. ANALYSIS OF INTERVAL LEVEL DATA

One-way analysis of variance with scheffe, a posteriori contrast test, was also used to test for mean differences among student in the various socioeconomic categories on view of school scores (H_{01}). Alpha was set at 0.05. The results on socioeconomic status are presented in Tables 24 and 25. On the view of school as preparation for responsible adulthood (Table 24), analysis of the F ratio revealed that there were no significant differences in mean scores for the four groups. However, there were significant differences in the scores for the view of school as preparation for jobs (Table 25). Students whose parents had professional jobs scored significantly lower (50.4717) on this measure than low income students (54.9943), skilled

TABLE 20. CROSSTABULATION: RACE BY EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION

Count / Exp Val / Row Pct / Col Pct / Residual	HIGH SCHOOL	BACHELOR DEGREE 2	MASTER DEGREE 3	PROFES-SIONAL	DOCTORATE 5	Row Total
BLACKS	41 40.0 13.4% 32.3% 1.0	85 81.2 27.8% 32.9% 3.8	100 99.8 32.7% 31.5% .2	45 44.7 14.7% 31.7% .3	35 40.3 11.4% 27.3% -5.3	306 31.5%
WHITES	86 87.0 12.9% 67.7% -1.0	173 176.8 26.0% 67.1% -3.8	217 217.2 32.6% 68.5% -.2	97 97.3 14.6% 68.3% -.3	93 87.7 14.0% 72.7% 5.3	666 68.5%
Column Total	127 13.1%	258 26.5%	317 32.6%	142 14.6%	128 3.2%	972 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
1.31373	4	.8590

Number of Missing Observations = 28

TABLE 21. CROSSTABULATION: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS
BY EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Residual	HIGH SCHOOL 1	BACHELOR DEGREE 2	MASTER DEGREE	PROFES-SIONAL	DOCTORATE 5	ROW TOTAL
LOW INCOME	42 22.3 24.6% 33.1% 19.7	39 45.4 22.8% 15.1% -6.4	44 55.8 25.7% 13.9% -11.8	34 25.0 19.9% 23.9% 9.0	12 22.5 7.0% 9.4% -10.5	171 17.6%
SKILLED LABOR	41 21.6 24.8% 32.3% 19.4	51 43.8 30.9% 19.8% 7.2	43 53.8 26.1% 13.6% -10.8	20 24.1 12.1% 14.1% -4.1	10 21.7 6.1% 7.8% -11.7	165 17.0%
WHITE COLLAR	31 35.7 11.4% 24.4% -4.7	90 72.5 33.0% 34.9% 17.5	95 89.0 34.8% 30.0% 6.0	33 39.9 12.1% 23.2% -6.9	24 36.0 8.8% 18.8% -12.0	273 28.1%
PROFES-SIONAL	13 47.4 3.6% 10.2% -34.4	78 96.4 21.5% 30.2% -18.4	135 118.4 37.2% 42.6% 16.6	55 53.0 15.2% 38.7% 2.0	82 47.8 22.6% 64.1% 34.2	363 37.3%
Column Total	127 13.1%	258 26.5%	317 32.6%	142 14.6%	128 13.2%	972 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
122.53833	12	.0000

Number of Missing Observations = 28

TABLE 22. CROSSTABULATION: RACE BY EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION CONTROLLING FOR SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Count / Exp Val / Row Pct / Col Pct / Residual	HIGH SCHOOL	BACHELOR DEGREE 2	MASTER DEGREE 3	PROFESSIONAL 4	DOCTORATE 5	ROW TOTAL
LOW INCOME						
BLACKS	14	23	28	24	8	97
	23.8	22.1	25.0	19.3	6.8	56.7%
	14.4%	23.7%	28.9%	24.7%	8.2%	
	33.3%	59.0%	63.6%	70.6%	66.7%	
	-9.8	.9	3.0	4.7	1.2	
WHITES	28	16	16	10	4	74
	18.2	16.9	19.0	14.7	5.2	43.3%
	37.8%	21.6%	21.6%	13.5%	5.4%	
	66.7%	41.0%	36.4%	29.4%	33.3%	
	9.8	-.9	-3.0	-4.7	-1.2	
Column Total	42	39	44	34	12	171
	24.6%	22.8%	25.7%	19.9%	7.0%	00.0%
	Chi-Square 13.44348	D.F. 4	Significance .0093			
SKILLED LABOR						
BLACKS	14	24	22	8	6	74
	18.4	22.9	19.3	9.0	4.5	44.8%
	18.9%	32.4%	29.7%	10.8%	8.1%	
	34.1%	47.1%	51.2%	40.0%	60.0%	
	-4.4	1.1	2.7	-1.0	1.5	
WHITES	27	27	21	12	4	91
	22.6	28.1	23.7	11.0	5.5	55.2%
	29.7%	29.7%	23.1%	13.2%	4.4%	
	65.9%	52.9%	48.8%	60.0%	40.0%	
	4.4	-1.1	-2.7	1.0	-1.5	
Column Total	41	51	43	20	10	165
	24.8%	30.9%	26.1%	12.1%	6.1%	100%
	Chi-Square 3.81061	D.F. 4	Significance .4322			
WHITE COLLAR						
BLACKS	10	27	32	9	6	84
	9.5	27.7	29.2	10.2	7.4	30.8%
	11.9%	32.1%	38.1%	10.7%	7.1%	
	32.3%	30.0%	33.7%	27.3%	25.0%	
	.5	-.7	2.8	-1.2	-1.4	
WHITES	21	63	63	24	18	189
	21.5	62.3	65.8	22.8	16.6	69.2%
	11.1%	33.3%	33.3%	12.7%	9.5%	
	67.7%	70.0%	66.3%	72.7%	75.0%	
	-.5	.7	-2.8	1.2	1.4	
Column Total	31	90	95	33	24	273
	11.4%	33.0%	34.8%	12.1%	8.8%	100.0%
	Chi-Square 1.00060	D.F. 4	Significance .9097			
PROFESSIONAL						
BLACKS	3	11	18	4	15	51
	1.8	11.0	19.0	7.7	11.5	14%
	5.9%	21.6%	35.3%	7.8%	29.4%	
	23.1%	14.1%	13.3%	7.3%	18.3%	
	1.2	.0	-1.0	-3.7	3.5	
WHITES	10	67	117	51	67	312
	11.2	67.0	116.0	47.3	70.5	86.0%
	3.2%	21.5%	37.5%	16.3%	21.5%	
	76.9%	85.9%	86.7%	92.7%	81.7%	
	-1.2	-.0	1.0	3.7	-3.5	
Column Total	13	78	135	55	82	363
	3.6%	21.5%	37.2%	15.2%	22.6%	100%
	Chi-Square 4.24914	D.F. 4	Significance .3733			

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 28

TABLE 23. CROSTABULATION: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS CONTROLLING FOR RACE

	BLACK						WHITE					
Count Exp Val Row Pct Col Pct Residual	HIGH SCHOOL	BACHELOR DEGREE 2	MASTER DEGREE 3	PROFES-SIONAL 4	DOCTOR-ATE 5	ROW TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL	BACHELOR DEGREE 2	MASTER DEGREE	PROFES-SIONAL 4	DOCTOR ATE	ROW TOTAL
LOW INCOME	14 13.0 14.4% 34.1% 1.0	23 26.9 23.7% 27.1% -3.9	28 31.7 28.9% 28.0% -3.7	24 14.3 24.7% 53.3% 9.7	8 11.1 8.2% 22.9% -3.1	97 31.7%	28 9.6 37.8% 32.6% 18.4	16 19.2 21.6% 9.2% -3.2	16 24.1 21.6% 7.4% -8.1	10 10.8 13.5% 10.3% -.8	4 10.3 5.4% 4.3% -6.3	74 11.1%
SKILLED LABOR	14 9.9 18.9% 34.1% 4.1	24 20.6 32.4% 28.2% 3.4	22 24.2 29.7% 22.0% -2.2	8 10.9 10.8% 17.8% -2.9	6 8.5 8.1% 17.1% -2.5	74 24.2%	27 11.8 29.7% 31.4% 15.2	27 23.6 29.7% 15.6% 3.4	21 29.7 23.1% 9.7% -8.7	12 13.3 13.2% 12.4% -1.3	4 12.7 4.4% 4.3% -8.7	91 13.7%
WHITE COLLAR	10 11.3 11.9% 24.4% -1.3	27 23.3 32.1% 31.8% 3.7	32 27.5 38.1% 32.0% 4.5	9 12.4 10.7% 20.0% -3.4	6 9.6 7.1% 17.1% -3.6	84 27.5%	21 24.4 11.1% 24.4% -3.4	63 49.1 33.3% 36.4% 13.9	63 61.6 33.3% 29.0% 1.4	24 27.5 12.7% 24.7% -3.5	18 26.4 9.5% 19.4% -8.4	189 28.4%
PROFES-SIONAL	3 6.8 5.9% 7.3% -3.8	11 14.2 21.6% 12.9% -3.2	18 16.7 35.3% 18.0% 1.3	4 7.5 7.8% 8.9% -3.5	15 5.8 29.4% 42.9% 9.2	51 16.7%	10 40.3 3.2% 11.6% -30.3	67 81.0 21.5% 38.7% -14.0	117 101.7 37.5% 53.9% 15.3	51 45.4 16.3% 52.6% 5.6	67 43.6 21.5% 72.0% 23.4	312 46.8%
Column Total	41 13.4%	85 27.8%	100 32.7%	45 14.7%	35 11.4%	306 100.0%	86 12.9%	173 26.0%	217 32.6%	97 14.6%	93 14.0%	666 100%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance
35.26976	12	.0004	120.05414	12	.0000

Number of Missing Observations = 28

TABLE 24. ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR RESPONSIBLE ADULTHOOD BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	163.1416	54.3805	.5051	.6788
Within Groups	996	107221.8334	107.6524		
Total	999	107384.9750			

TABLE 25. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR JOBS BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	5272.9510	1757.6503	13.2501	.0000
Within Groups	996	132120.8240	132.6514		
Total	999	137393.7750			

labor students (56.2047) and white collar students (54.4346). The evaluation of these findings lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no difference in how students view the purpose of school and indicated that students in the highest socioeconomic category tended to view school less as a means to jobs than other students.

The t-test of statistically significant difference was used to test the hypothesis on the two views of school scores by race (H_{02}). The results of these tests are presented in Tables 26 and 27. With a significant level of 0.05, the F test of sample variance indicated that, in both tables, each pair of groups had the same variance and the pooled-variance estimate should be used to evaluate whether significant differences existed in the means scores. The results on the view of

TABLE 26. T-TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR RESPONSIBLE ADULTHOOD BY RACE

GROUPS	N OF CASES	MEAN	SD	SE	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB	POOLED VARIANCE t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB	SEPARATE VARIANCE t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB
BLACKS	319	53.2696	10.917	.611								
WHITES	681	51.9853	10.082	.386	1.17	.093	1.83	998	.068	1.78	579.60	.076

TABLE 27. T-TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR JOBS BY RACE

GROUPS	N OF CASES	MEAN	SD	SE	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB	POOLED VARIANCE T VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB	SEPARATE VARIANCE t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB
BLACKS	319	56.9749	11.555	.647								
WHITES	681	51.6740	11.430	.438	1.02	.811	6.81	998	.000	6.79	615.80	.000

school as preparation for responsible adulthood indicated the two groups had approximately the same variance and there was no significant difference in how black and white students viewed this aspect of the purpose of school. However, as with socioeconomic level, there was a significant difference in how black and white students viewed the purpose of school as preparation for jobs. The results in Table 27 did not support the null hypothesis, because black students had a significantly higher mean score than white students.

The tests of the hypothesis that no statistically significant differences existed in how students with different educational aspirations viewed the purpose of school (H_{03}) involved an analysis of data on whether students planned to attend college (variable 41), their primary reason for wanting to attend college (variable 42), and the

TABLE 28. T-TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR RESPONSIBLE ADULTHOOD BY STUDENTS PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE

						POOLED VARIANCE			SEPARATE VARIANCE		
GROUPS	N OF CASES	MEAN	SD	SE	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB
ATTEND COLLEGE	725	52.9683	10.002	.371								
NOT ATTEND	241	50.7635	11.404	.735	1.30	.010	2.86	964	.004	2.68	370.40	.008

TABLE 29. T-TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR JOBS BY STUDENTS PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE

						POOLED VARIANCE			SEPARATE VARIANCE		
GROUPS	N OF CASES	MEAN	SD	SE	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB
ATTEND COLLEGE	725	53.0703	11.712	.435								
NOT ATTEND	241	54.5643	11.376	.733	1.06	.596	-1.73	964	.084	-1.75	421.54	.080

highest level of education they wished to complete (variable 43). Tables 28 and 29 contain the results of t-tests on the two views about the purpose of school for students either planning to attend or not attend college. These results indicated that students who planned to attend college had a significantly higher mean score on the view of school as preparation for responsible adulthood, but not on the view of school as preparation for jobs. Therefore, the primary difference between the two groups may be a more balanced understanding of the purpose of school among students planning to attend college.

Tables 30 and 31 contain the results for variable 42, reasons for attending college. These results showed significant differences in the mean scores of both views of school for students with extrinsic reasons (primarily to qualify for high paying jobs), and those with intrinsic reasons (to study a particular subject, or to investigate particular

TABLE 30. T-TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR RESPONSIBLE ADULTHOOD BY REASONS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE

						POOLED VARIANCE			SEPARATE VARIANCE		
GROUPS	N OF CASES	MEAN	SD	SE	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB
EXTRINSIC	535	51.7813	10.652	.461								
INTRINSIC	303	54.3993	9.317	.535	1.31	.010	-3.57	836	.000	-3.71	698.26	.000

TABLE 31. T-TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR JOBS BY REASONS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE

						POOLED VARIANCE			SEPARATE VARIANCE		
GROUPS	N OF CASES	MEAN	SD	SE	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB	t VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB
EXTRINSIC	535	54.5776	11.656	.504								
INTRINSIC	303	50.8944	11.722	.673	1.01	.904	4.39	836	.000	4.38	624.23	.000

problems). This finding is not surprising and indicated consistency between the responses for variable 42 and the survey items which measured the views of school.

One-way analysis of variance was used to obtain the results on scores for students with different levels of educational aspiration (Tables 32 and 33). Students with aspiration only to complete high school scored significantly lower (49.0551) on the view of school as preparation for responsible adulthood than students with aspiration to complete bachelor degrees (51.5659), master degrees (53.4164), doctoral degrees (53.5078) and professional degrees (53.7113). However, the scores on the view of school as preparation for jobs were not significantly different.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to examine the degree to which view of school scores correlated with

TABLE 32. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR RESPONSIBLE ADULTHOOD BY EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	2329.0301	582.2575	5.5004	.0002
Within Groups	967	102364.1829	105.8575		
Total	971	104693.2130			

TABLE 33. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE VIEW OF SCHOOL AS PREPARATION FOR JOBS BY EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	1410.9949	352.7487	2.5778	.0362
Within Groups	967	132323.6553	136.8394		
Total	971	133734.6502			

socioeconomic status. The raw scores for socioeconomic status (which were measured at the ratio level) were used in these tests. As indicated by the results in Table 34, socioeconomic status was a poor predictor of view of school scores. The index of forecasting efficiency was 0.02 on scores for the view of school as preparation for jobs and 0.00002 on scores for the view of school as preparation for responsible adulthood. These results indicated that knowledge of socioeconomic status was of minimal value in predicting scores on the view of school.

Results from the reliability and validity tests indicated that the variables which measured academic self-concept were inconsistent and invalid. Therefore, results from statistical tests would be misleading.

TABLE 34. CORRELATION OF VIEW OF SCHOOL SCORES WITH SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Measures	Mean	Std Dev	Correlation
View as Responsible	52.3950	10.3679	-.0069
View as Jobs	53.3650	11.7274	-.2018

VI. THE OVERALL FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to develop valid and reliable measures of the extrinsic and intrinsic views of school and to determine if differences in these measures exist between black and whites students, and among students in various socioeconomic categories. Data collected for the study included responses to ten survey questions that measured the extrinsic view of school, and responses to ten questions that measured the extrinsic view of school. Responses to survey questions on race, post high school plans, and parents' occupation were also used in the data analysis. In addition, seven variables were formulated to measure academic self-concept to determine the association of this trait to views about the purpose of school. The split-half reliability procedure, factor analysis, chi-square statistics, and measures of statistically significant difference, and measures of association were used to obtain the following results:

1. The variables that measured views about the purpose of school were found to be reliable with split-half coefficients of 0.8525

(intrinsic) and 0.8961 (extrinsic).

2. The variables that measured academic self-concept had a reliability coefficient of 0.2707 and were not considered reliable measurements.
3. Factor analysis results indicated the variables that measured the two views about the school were valid.
4. The variables that measured academic self-concept, according to factor analysis results, were not valid.
5. Among the various socioeconomic categories, there were no significant differences in mean scores on the intrinsic view of school. However, students in the professional socioeconomic category had significantly lower scores on the extrinsic view of school.
6. There was no significant difference between black and white students on mean scores for the intrinsic view of school. Black students had significantly higher mean scores on the extrinsic view of school.
7. Correlation coefficients revealed that the association between views about the purpose of school and socioeconomic status was weak or nonexistent.
8. Crosstabulation tables and chi-square statistics revealed that black students had significantly lower socioeconomic status than white students.
9. Race and plans to attend college appeared dependent. However, there was a high number of low income blacks in the sample which masked the influence of socioeconomic status. When socioeconomic

status was controlled, race and plans to attend college were independent in the skilled labor, white collar and professional categories. In the low income category, blacks planned to attend college at a rate higher than whites.

10. Among blacks, there was not a dependent relationship between socioeconomic status and reasons for attending college. However, among whites, a significantly higher number of professional socioeconomic status whites had intrinsic reasons for attending college while whites in the other socioeconomic categories had preference for extrinsic reasons.
11. Race and educational aspiration were independent; however, there was a dependent relationship between socioeconomic status and educational aspiration.

CHAPTER V.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the 1970s and much of the 1980s higher education made continuous efforts directed at improving educational opportunity for blacks and other minorities. Although these efforts were criticized for diluting academic standards and budgets, current demographic trends indicate that colleges may now find such efforts are necessary to offset an expected drop in the number of traditional age college applicants. However, past efforts to expand educational opportunity were not effective as evidenced by a high dropout rate and a trend toward declining participation in higher education by black students. Because colleges and universities can not financially support programs that are ineffective, it is necessary to examine the problem for new insights and solutions.

Students' perceptions about the purpose of education may be a factor in whether or not they achieve academic success. Research in the field of social cognition (Weinstein, 1983) recognized the mediating influence of students' perceptions on learning, yet little is known about how students' views about the purpose of school affect academic achievement. This study was an attempt to examine this question by investigating how views about the purpose of school might relate to

race, socioeconomic status and educational aspiration.

From a historical perspective, two views were identified that have significant influence on American education. An intrinsic view emphasized responsible adulthood and the making of culture. Conversely, an extrinsic view emphasized social and economic advancement, primarily through jobs. The measures used to detect these views were found to be valid and reliable, and they indicated differences between black and white students that were influenced by socioeconomic status.

The variables which measured the two views about the purpose of school had very high reliability and validity. The reliability coefficients were stable in responses from a large sample that included students from 23 different high schools and five different states. Evaluation of factor analysis results indicated that the variables were appropriate measures of the views they were intended to represent.

Factor analysis was used to determine the construct validity of the variables. This statistical technique required consideration of a number of options for evaluating data. However, the basic tenet of the procedure, condensing a group of variables to a minimal number of constructs, justified its use.

The construction of the questionnaire was faulty in two ways. First, the instrument did not include "unemployed" as a category of parent occupation. Therefore, a number of questionnaires were returned without information on family socioeconomic status. The oversight in not providing for this response was a critical error given the importance of low income status to the central question in the study. Fortunately, a substantial number of students whose parents were either

unemployed or on public assistance responded with this information.

The scale construction of the questionnaire also affected the measurement of academic self-concept. In this instance, the variables may have been valid, however, the restricted range of the scale (from 1 to 4) may have led to a general lack of discriminating power. Therefore, the results of reliability and validity tests did not support the use of the scale as a measure of academic self-concept.

II. THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The first null hypothesis was that no statistically significant difference would exist in scores on views about the purpose of school among students of various socioeconomic levels. The findings did not support this hypothesis. Although there was no significant difference in mean scores on the intrinsic view of school, results from one-way analysis of variance indicated that students in the highest socioeconomic category (professional) had significantly lower means scores for the extrinsic view of school than students in the other socioeconomic categories. Relatedly, students in the professional socioeconomic category, (1) regardless of race, planned to attend college at a significantly higher rate than students in the other socioeconomic categories (Tables 14 and 15); (2) had a higher than expected value for intrinsic reasons for attending college; and (3) had higher levels of educational aspiration.

The second null hypothesis was that no significant difference would exist in view of school scores for black and white students. This

hypothesis was rejected because of a significant difference in the two groups on mean scores for the extrinsic view of school. Even when controlling for socioeconomic status (Tables 18 and 19), black students had higher than expected values for extrinsic reasons for planning to attend college. This was not true of white students, especially those in the highest socioeconomic category. Therefore, there were unexplained reasons why black students tended to prefer the extrinsic value of school.

The results of one-way analysis of variance called for the rejection of the third hypothesis that no statistically significant difference existed in scores on views about the purpose of school among students with different levels of educational aspiration. Students with aspiration to complete only high school had significantly lower mean scores on the intrinsic view of school. It should be noted, however, that, regardless of race, students in the lower socioeconomic categories (Table 23) had the lowest educational aspiration.

The fourth hypothesis was not tested because of the lack of reliability and validity for the measure of academic self-concept.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The findings of this study supported the proposition that socioeconomic status influences how students view the purpose of school. Students in low socioeconomic categories tended to view the purpose of school as preparation for social advancement through employment. Among students in the high socioeconomic categories, there

was a greater appreciation for the intrinsic value of school. Because of a high rate of poverty and reasons not explained by the study, black students in all socioeconomic categories tended to place greater value on the extrinsic view of school. In this regard, they were different from their white counterparts who maintained the distinctions determined by socioeconomic status.

The results indicated the imposing strength of socioeconomic circumstances on schooling. The possibility that students in the lower socioeconomic categories are somehow distracted from an appreciation of the aesthetic value of school not only diminishes what can be gained from the school experience, it also validates the argument that schools do little more than serve as agents of social selection. As explained by Shapiro (1983), this argument was the basis for the education reform movement of the 1960s.

> The cultural (and related educational) revolt that resulted from the egalitarianism had, as its heart, a number of common pressures: these included the attempt to reduce the separation between (or merge) what constitutes "culture" and real life; the attempt to assimilate politics and culture; the concern to erase the separateness of personal and cultural experience; and the attempt to reduce or eliminate the traditional hierarchies that restrict who may participate in the "making" of culture, what counts as comprising culture, and who is able to appreciate it. (p.16)

A number of studies justified this reformist's argument by establishing the importance of social factors to students' academic success. One of the most prominent is Tinto's (1975) application of Durkheim's theory of suicide to dropouts. His major findings emphasized both academic and social integration as significant determinants of students' persistence toward degrees.

Although black students may recognize the intrinsic value of school, this perspective may have less utility for a large percentage of them because of the need to address the immediate concerns of poverty. However, schools only indirectly address these concerns and a major part of traditional curricula does not relate to this aim at all. Consequently, the tendency for black students to choose alternatives to higher education must be viewed in relation to the incongruence of students' needs and the activity of academic institutions.

An important question to consider is what should schools do to address directly the needs of economically disadvantaged students, many of whom are black? It is unreasonable to expect that students from social and economic poverty will find adequate motivation in curricula with a primarily white middle-class orientation. If all students are expected to achieve, then schools must reflect more the experience that students bring with them. Educational reform that expands the curriculum to include not only study about minorities but also study from the perspective of minorities may provide opportunities for self-affirmation, a positive view of self, and appreciation for the intrinsic value of school.

In addition, it must be recognized that poverty and racial prejudice have inhibiting effects on learning that justify continued efforts to bring about educational opportunity. In the past these efforts were often saturated with inadequate standards that demeaned the value of education for everyone and led to criticism of equal access programs. However, as expressed by K. Patricia Cross (1983), there is no need to sacrifice quality for access.

> The problem (of poor quality) came when we lost sight of the purpose of access - which was not merely to permit students to enter colleges but to enable them to learn... We need not make the choice between equality and quality. We can have both. Indeed, it might be said that there is no true equality until each student is offered the right to do his or her best. Sad to say we have not been offering that right to either high-achieving or low-achieving students. Denial of the opportunity to take pride in one's accomplishments is a serious infringement on educational rights. And where standards have been compromised, students are denied the very basic human right to feel good about themselves and their accomplishments (p.3).

Schools must be willing to accept the challenge of truly educating disadvantaged students with quality instruction that takes into consideration special needs, but which does not placate or reward the undeserving. In addition, schools must be prepared to address the social and psychological consequences of poverty. As stated by Wharton (1986), important variables in the educational attainment of blacks are self-image, aspiration, and the pervasive stereotype that black students are academically deficient. He proposed broad-based efforts involving schools and communities to establish stronger, more competitive, achievement-oriented self-images among black students.

Unless schools are to become training grounds for employers, efforts to accommodate the needs of the economically poor should not be limited to preparation for jobs but include an emphasis on the intrinsic value of education as well. As Thomas Jefferson emphasized, it is a primary responsibility of citizenship in a democracy to be involved actively in the political and cultural processes that determine the nature of our society. To focus solely on job preparation diminishes the importance of this responsibility.

In addition, there is no efficacy in directing students to vocational programs or emphasizing career preparation. According to Mandt (1982), the current emphasis among college students for career preparation resulted in workers without the wide variety of skills needed to function successfully in a dynamic business community. Industrial psychologists such as Hersey and Blanchard (1977) warned that work environments which deny the satisfaction of esteem and self-actualization needs have the danger of producing increased levels of tension, anxiety, and frustration in workers. Clearly, the extent of these problems may be reduced by educational programs that allow students to approach work with creativity, motivation beyond material gain, and the knowledge to control their environment. These benefits are more likely to be derived from an intrinsic appreciation of education and learning. In this regard, perhaps educators should place greater emphasis on the intrinsic value of school and less emphasis the dubious notion that schooling leads to well-paying and satisfying jobs.

There are still a number of unanswered questions relative to the importance of knowledge about how students view the purpose of school. This study was limited to the examination of post-high school plans alone and, therefore, does not provide a valid basis for discussion of the effects of these views on actual students' participation in higher education. Additional insight is needed from a follow-up study to evaluate differences in views about the purpose of school and their effect on college attendance and performance.

Also, an understanding of the relationship between views about the purpose of school and self-concept may explain whether or not

differences in views are problematic.

The study did not explain why black students in all socioeconomic categories preferred the extrinsic view of school. Therefore, a follow-up study is needed to examine views about the purpose of school in relation to other variables that might explain this preference.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

American Council on Education (1985). Minorities in higher education. ERIC Document ED 275 215.

American Council on Education. (1985) Campus trends, 1984. (Research Report 65) El-Khawas, Elaine.

American Council on Education. (1986) Campus trends, 1984. (Research Report 73) El-Khawas, Elaine.

Astin, Alexander (1982). Minorities in American higher education. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, Alexander (1980). The American freshman: National norms for the fall 1980. Los Angeles: University of California.

Barlow, Melvin L. (1973). Historical antecedents to career education. In Joel H. Magisos (Ed.) Career education (pp.30-39). Washington, DC: The American Vocational Association, Inc.

Beck, Robert Clarence,. (1978) Motivation: theories and principles. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall.

Bellah, Robert N., Madsen, Richard, Sullivan, William M., Swidler, Ann, and Tipton, Steven M. (1985) Habits of the heart individualism and commitment in American life. New York: Harper & Row.

Biderman, Michael D. (1987) Principal components analysis. Unpublished manuscript.

Bowen, Howard Rothmann (1980). The costs of higher education : how much do colleges and universities spend per student and how much should they spend?. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Coleman, James S., (1973) The university and society's new demands upon it. In Carl Kaysen (Ed.) Content and context (pp. 359-400) New York: McGraw Hill.

Cross, K. Patricia (1983). Underprepared Learners. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Dewey, John (1958). Democracy and education. In Joe Park (Ed.) The philosophy of education (pp.73-105). New York: Macmillan.

Dunston, F. M., Richmond, Peggy A., and House, Lee A. (1983). Review of the literature: black student retention in higher education institutions. Chapel Hill: Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc.

Glenny, Lyman A. Demographic and related issues for higher education in the 1980s (1980) Journal of higher education 51, 363-380.

Goodlad, John I. (1979). What schools are for. (Monograph). Los Angeles: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Gottfried, Allen W. (1985). Measures of socioeconomic status in child development research: Data and recommendations. Merrill-Palmer quarterly 31, 85-92.

Hersey, Paul & Blanchard, Kenneth H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior : utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall

Hoyt, Kenneth B., Evans, Rupert N., Mackin, Edward F., and Mangum, Garth L., (Eds.) (1974). Career education: What it is and how to do it (2nd ed.). Salt Lake City: Olympus.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. (1973) Toward a definition of career education. In Joel H. Magisos (Ed.) Career education (pp. 15-29). Washington, DC: The American Vocational Association, Inc.

Jones, Larry G. Black students enrolled in white colleges and universities: Their attitudes and perceptions (1979). Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Jordan, Theresa J. Self-Concept, motivation, and academic achievement of black adolescents (1981). Journal of educational psychology 81, 509-517.

Keller, George, (1983). Academic strategy : the management revolution in American higher education. Baltimore, Md. : Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kim, Jae-on, Mueller, Charles W. (1978). Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Kim, Jae-on, Mueller, Charles W. (1978). Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lawler, Edward E. (1973). Motivation in work organizations. Monterey, Calif., Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.

Marion, Paul B. (1985). Relationships of self-image in high school with attendance and grade point average at postsecondary educational institutions. College and university, 60, 328-35.

Marks, Joseph L. (1984). Higher education enrollment, 1982: Trends in the nation and the south. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Maslow, Abraham H. (1962). Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand.

McPherson, Michael S., (1983). Value conflicts in american higher education: A survey. Journal of higher education, 54, 243-273.

Mandt, Edward (1982). The failure of business education and what to do about it. Management Review, 71 47-52.

Mouly, George (1970). The science of educational research. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Muller, Charles W., and Parcel, Toby L. (1981). Measures of socioeconomic status: Alternatives and recommendations. Child development, 52 13-30.

National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering, Inc. (1983) The retention of minority engineering students. (Research Rep.) Penick, B.E. and Morning, Carole.

National Center for Educational Statistics (1982). Changing patterns in undergraduate majors. American education 18, inside back cover.

Nicholls, J.G., Patashnick, Michael, and Nolen. Susan B. (1985). Adolescents' theories of education. Journal of educational psychology 77, 683-692.

Nie, Norman, Hull, C. Hadlai, Jenkins, Jean G., Steinbrenner, Karin, & Bent, Dale (1970). Statistical package for the social sciences. NewYork: McGraw Hill.

Nowicki, S. and Strickland, B. R. (1973). A locus of control scale for children. Journal of Consulting and clinical psychology 40, 148-154.

Penick, B.E. & Morning, C. (1983). The retention of minority engineering students. (Research Rep.) National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering, Inc.

Quarles, Daniel R. (1976). Faculty classroom instructional performance as a function of the actual, ideal and importance responses of undergraduate college and university students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee.

Rudolph, Frederick (1984) The power of professions, Change, 16 13-17+

Shapiro, H. Svi. (1983). Class, ideology, and the basic skills movement: A study in the sociology of educational reform. Interchange 14, 15-23.

Shea, Brent Mark, (1976) Schooling and its antecedents. Review of educational research 46, 463-526.

Stevens, Gillian and Featherman, David L. (1981) A revised socioeconomic index of occupational status. Social science research, 10, 364-395.

Stone, Eugene (1978). Research methods in organizational behavior. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Suen, Hoi K. (1983). Alienation and attrition of black college students on a predominantly white campus. Journal of college student personnel, 24, 117-121.

The College Board (1985) Equality and excellence: The Educational status of black Americans. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

The Southern Regional Education Board (1985). A new Covenant: Access to Quality Undergraduate Education. Atlanta, Ga.: SREB.

Tinto, Vincent. (1975) Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of educational research, 45, 89-125.

Tracey, Terence J. and Sedlacek, William E. (1984). Noncognitive variables in predicting academic success by race. Measurement and evaluation in guidance, 16, 171-178.

Weatherby, George, (1980). Countervailing forces affecting coordination. Change, 12 18-24.

Weinstein, Rhona (1983). Student perceptions of schooling. The elementary school journal, 83, 287-312.

Wharton, Clifton R. Jr. (1986). Public education and black American: Today's crisis, tomorrow's disaster? ERIC Document ED276388.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A. LETTER TO RESPONDENTS PARENTS

Dear Parents,

What students think about the value of school is very important. However, it is very hard for teachers to know how students view the purpose of school. I think I have come up with some ideas that may explain the importance of school to students. The Superintendent's office has agreed to help me test these ideas, but I need your help as well. I would like for your son or daughter to complete a survey that asks them about what they think the purpose of school is.

Students will not be allowed to put their names on the survey. I don't want anyone to know how your son or daughter answered questions, and I will not let them complete complete the survey unless you approve.

I will also ask students about the kind of work their parents do. I need this information to see if students from different backgrounds view the purpose in the same way. Because students will not put their names on the survey, no one will know how they answered these questions.

It takes about ten minutes to complete the survey. I will work with the principal at the school to have the survey completed at a time that will not interfere with other activities. I hope you will allow your son or daughter to participate in this project.

If you are willing to let your son or daughter complete the survey, please sign this letter at the bottom so your son or daughter may return it to school. I appreciate very much your help.

Sincerely

Paul L. Beasley
The University of Tennessee

I have been informed about the intent of the survey to be conducted by Mr. Beasley and I agree that _____
(son or daughter

may participate in the study.

_____ (parent's signature)
(date)

APPENDIX B SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS AND INSTRUMENT

People often talk about what schools should be doing. You have probably heard their arguments on TV and read about them in the paper. But people don't often ask students what they think schools should be doing. The survey you are about to complete gives you the opportunity to let others know what students feel are the purposes of school.

The survey questions are about your thoughts and opinions. There are no right or wrong answers, only how you feel. We all have our points of view on issues and no one can say that they are right or wrong. So answer according to your own feelings and not according to what you think others want you to say.

Do not put your name on the survey. We do not want anyone to know how individual students answer the questions. That is not important. We want to be able to say that so many females or males feel this way or that students of a particular race feel a certain way, but we don't want to give names.

We want to say how students view the purpose of school but we don't want to force you to answer the survey questions. If you feel uncomfortable about a question, leave it blank. If you leave questions blank we won't be able to use any of your answers. So we hope you answer all of the questions. Sometimes it is hard to decide how you feel about a question. This should not happen very often. Please try to answer each question as best you can.

Any questions about what I have said or what you are about to do.

Thank you for your help. Let's get started.

The first part of the survey is items 2 to 8. Think about these statements and how they might describe your feelings as a student. Please look at item 2. Most of the time getting good grades means a great deal to me. If you strongly agree with this statement check SA. if you strongly disagree the statement check SD. You can circle the various choices in between. When you have answered item eight, please turn your survey over so I will know when to start the last section.

In the next section I want you to circle the number that best describes how important you think the statement is to the purpose of school. Look at item 9, help us to understand how science can help society. If you think it is very important for schools to help you in this way circle the number 7. If you think it is not very important for school to help you in this way circle number 1. You can circle any of the numbers in between according to how important you feel the statement is.

The last session asks questions about the kind of student you are, your educational plans and goals, and the kind of work your parents do. When you have finished this part, fold you questionnaire like this (demonstrate) and I will come around to collect it. You may begin now.

Thank you for your help.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS DESIGNED TO GIVE STUDENTS AN OPPORTUNITY TO SAY WHAT THEY THINK THE PURPOSES OF SCHOOL ARE. PLEASE ANSWER EACH QUESTION AS BEST YOU CAN. DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.
SA = STRONGLY AGREE; A = AGREE; D = DISAGREE; SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. MOST OF THE TIME GETTING GOOD GRADES MEANS A GREAT DEAL TO ME. [SA] [A] [D] [SD]

3. IF SOMEONE STUDIES HARD ENOUGH HE OR SHE CAN PASS ANY SUBJECT. [SA] [A] [D] [SD]

4. IT IS BETTER TO BE SMART THAN LUCKY. [SA] [A] [D] [SD]

5. I TAKE A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD MYSELF. [SA] [A] [D] [SD]

6. GOOD LUCK IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN HARD WORK. [SA] [A] [D] [SD]

7. I AM AS CAPABLE AS MOST OTHER STUDENTS. [SA] [A] [D] [SD]

8. PLANNING ONLY MAKES A PERSON UNHAPPY SINCE PLANS HARDLY EVER WORK OUT ANYWAY. [SA] [A] [D] [SD]

RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS FROM 1 TO 7 (7 AS THE HIGHEST) BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER THAT COMES CLOSEST TO WHAT YOU FEEL SCHOOLS SHOULD TRY TO DO.

9. HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW SCIENCE CAN HELP SOCIETY.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. HELP US GET INTO THE BEST COLLEGES.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. IDENTIFY STUDENTS WHO HAVE THE ABILITY TO GET TOP JOBS.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. HELP US APPRECIATE THE ARTS.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. HELP US UNDERSTAND PROBLEMS THE WORLD WILL FACE IN THE FUTURE.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. HELP US QUALIFY FOR GOOD JOBS.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. HELP US LEARN RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. HELP US THINK CLEARLY (CRITICALLY) ABOUT WHAT IS RIGHT AND WRONG IN SOCIETY.
+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. PREPARE US FOR JOBS THAT WILL GIVE US ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY THE BEST OF EVERYTHING.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. HELP US DEVELOP SELF-DISCIPLINE.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. PREPARE US TO MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO OUR COMMUNITY.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. TEACH US THE SKILLS THAT WILL GET US TOP JOBS.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. HELP US TO MAKE FRIENDS WITH OTHER STUDENTS.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES FACING OUR STATE AND COUNTRY.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. TEACH US HOW TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. HELP US TO IDENTIFY THE KIND OF JOBS WE ARE BEST SUITED FOR.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF EARNING A LIVING.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND HOW OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM WORKS.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. TEACH US TO RESPECT AUTHORITY.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. HELP US TO PREPARE FOR THE JOBS OF THE FUTURE.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT THE WORLD.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. PREPARE US FOR JOBS THAT WILL GIVE US A COMFORTABLE LIVING.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF VOTING IN ELECTIONS.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. TRAIN US TO LIVE AN ORDERLY, REGULATED LIFE.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. TEACH US HOW TO COMPETE FOR JOBS.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. TEACH US TO HELP SOCIETY.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. HELP US USE OUR FREE TIME WISELY.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. PROVIDE US OPPORTUNITIES TO PLAY SPORTS.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. TEACH US ABOUT INTERVIEWING FOR JOBS.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. TEACH US TO LEARN THINGS ON OUR OWN.

+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY AND CHECK THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER.

39. SEX: FEMALE [1] MALE [2]:

40. RACE: ASIAN [1] BLACK [2] HISPANIC [3] WHITE [4]

41. WHAT DO YOU PLAN TO DO AFTER HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

[1] ATTEND A 4 YEAR COLLEGE
[2] ATTEND A 2 YEAR COLLEGE
[3] ATTEND A VOCATIONAL COLLEGE
[4] JOIN THE MILITARY
[5] GO TO WORK
[6] TRAVEL
[7] I HAVE NO DEFINITE PLANS

42. WHICH IS THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR YOU TO ATTEND COLLEGE (CHECK ONLY ONE)

[1] TO QUALIFY FOR HIGH PAYING JOBS
[2] TO LEARN MORE ABOUT OUR WORLD
[3] TO LEARN NEW TECHNOLOGY
[4] TO STUDY A PARTICULAR SUBJECT
[5] TO MEET NEW FRIENDS
[6] TO PLEASE PARENTS
[7] TO PLAY A VARSITY SPORT
[8] DO NOT PLAN TO ATTEND COLLEGE.

43. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION YOU PLAN TO EARN? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE [1]
BACHELOR'S DEGREE [2]
MASTER'S DEGREE [3]
PROFESSIONAL (e.g. Doctor, Lawyer) [4]
DOCTORATE (Ph.D) [5]

WHAT JOB TITLES DO YOUR PARENTS HAVE? (WHAT ARE THEIR JOBS)?

44. MOTHER_____

45. FATHER_____

WHAT DO YOUR PARENTS DO AT WORK?

46. MOTHER_____

47. FATHER_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.

APPENDIX C. DIAGRAM OF STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

1. FREQUENCIES

1. Integrity of data.
2. Distribution of responses.
3. Representation by special groups.
   a. black students
   b. white students
   c. high income students
   d. low income students

2. RELIABILITY

1. Variables that measure academic self-concept.
2. Variables that measure the intrinsic view of school.
3. Variables that measure the extrinsic view of school.

3. FACTOR ANALYSIS

1. Test the validity of the research questionnaire.
   a. academic self-concept
   b. intrinsic view of school
   c. extrinsic view of school

4. CROSSTABULATIONS

1. Race by socioeconomic status.
2. Race by plans to attend college.
3. Socioeconomic status by plans to attend college.
4. Race by plans to attend college controlling for socioeconomic status.
5. Socioeconomic status by plans to attend college controlling for race.
6. Race by reasons for attending college.
7. Socioeconomic status by reasons for attending college.
8. Race by reasons for attending college controlling for socioeconomic status.
9. Socioeconomic status by reasons for attending college controlling for race.
10. Race by educational aspiration.
11. Socioeconomic status by educational aspiration.
12. Race by educational aspiration controlling for socioeconomic status.
13. Socioeconomic status by educational aspiration controlling for race.

5. T-TEST

1. View of school scores by race.
2. View of school scores by plans to attend or not attend college.
3. View of school scores by reasons for attending college (intrinsic or extrinsic).

6. ONE-WAY ANOVA

1. View of school scores and socioeconomic status.
2. View of school scores and educational aspiration.

7. CORRELATION

1. Academic self-concept scores and view of school scores.
2. View of school scores and socio-economic status.

APPENDIX C. SPSS-X PROGRAM

```
FILE HANDLE    VIEW3
DATA LIST FILE=VIEW3 RECORDS=1  /VAR01 1-2 VAR02 TO VAR43 3-44
 VAR44 45-46 VAR45 47-48 VAR46 49-53
VARIABLE LABELS VAR01 'SCHOOL'
 VAR02 'GRADES MEAN GREAT DEAL'
 VAR03 'PASS ANY SUBJECT' VAR04 'BETTER SMART THAN LUCKY'
 VAR05 'POSITIVE ATTITUDE'
 VAR06 'LUCK MORE IMPORTANT THAN WORK'
 VAR07 'CAPABLE STUDENT' VAR08 'PLANNING MAKES UNHAPPY'
 VAR09 'UNSD SCIENCE' VAR10 'GET INTO COLLEGE'
 VAR11 'GET TOP JOBS' VAR12 'APPRECIATE ARTS'
 VAR13 'UNSD WORLD PROBLEMS' VAR14 'QUALIFY FOR JOBS'
 VAR15 'LEARN REGELION' VAR16 'THINK CLEARLY'
 VAR17 'MONEY FOR THE BEST' VAR18 'SELF DISCIPLINE'
 VAR19 'CONTRIBUTE TO COMMUNITY' VAR20 'SKILLS FOR JOBS'
 VAR21 'MAKE FRIENDS' VAR22 'UNSD NATIONAL ISSUES'
 VAR23 'PHYSICALLY STRONG' VAR24 'ID FOR JOBS'
 VAR25 'IMPORT OF EARN LIVING' VAR26 'UNSD POLITICAL SYS'
 VAR27 'RESPECT AUTHORITY' VAR28 'PREPARE FOR FUTURE JOBS'
 VAR29 'UNSD DIFFERENT VIEWS' VAR30 'COMFORTABLE JOBS'
 VAR31 'VOTING IN ELECTIONS' VAR32 'ORDERLY LIVES'
 VAR33 'COMPETE FOR JOBS' VAR34 'HELP SOCIETY'
 VAR35 'USE FREE TIME' VAR36 'PLAY SPORTS'
 VAR37 'INTERVIEW FOR JOBS' VAR38 'LEARN ON OWN' VAR39 'SEX'
 VAR40 'RACE' VAR41 'PLANS' VAR42 'REASON FOR COLLEGE'
 VAR43 'EDUC ASPIRATIONS' VAR46 'SES'
VALUE LABELS  VAR02 TO VAR08 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE'
 3 'DISGREE' 4 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/
 VAR39 1 'FEMALE' 2 'MALE'/
 VAR40 1 'ASIAN' 2 'BLACK' 3 'HISPANIC' 4 'WHITE'/
 VAR41 1 '4-YEAR COLLEGE' 2 '2-YEAR COLLEGE' 3 'VOCATIONAL COLLEGE'
 4 'MILITARY' 5 'WORK '6'TRAVEL '7'NO PLANS'/
 VAR42 1 'QUALIFY FOR HIGH PAY JOBS' 2 'LEARN ABOUT WORLD'
 3 'LEARN NEW TECHNOLOGY '4'PARTICULAR SUBJECT ' 5'FRIENDS'
 6 'PARENTS' 7 'VARSITY SPORT '8'NO PLANS TO ATTEND'/
 VAR43  1 'HIGH SCHOOL' 2 'BACHELOR DEGREE '3'MASTER DEGREE'
 4 'PROFESSIONAL' 5 'DOCTORATE'/
COMPUTE VAR47=VAR09+VAR12+VAR13+VAR19+VAR22+VAR26+VAR29+
 VAR31+VAR34+VAR38
COMPUTE VAR48=VAR11+VAR14+VAR17+VAR20+VAR24+VAR25+VAR28+
 VAR30+VAR33+VAR37
VARIABLE LABELS VAR47'RESPONSIBLE SCORE'VAR48'JOBS SCORE'/
MISSING VALUE  VAR01 TO VAR43 (0)
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES = VAR01 TO VAR48/
 FORMAT = ONEPAGE DVALUE/
 STATISTICS = ALL/ MISSING = INCLUDE
RELIABILITY VARIABLES = VAR09 VAR12 VAR13 VAR19 VAR22 VAR26
 VAR29 VAR31 VAR34 VAR38/
```

```
  SCALE=VAR09 VAR12 VAR13 VAR19 VAR22 VAR26 VAR29 VAR31
  VAR34 VAR38/  MODEL=SPLIT(.05)
RELIABILITY VARIABLES = VAR11 VAR14 VAR17 VAR20 VAR24 VAR25
 VAR28 VAR30 VAR33 VAR37/
  SCALE=VAR11 VAR14 VAR17 VAR20 VAR24 VAR25 VAR28 VAR30
  VAR33 VAR37/ MODEL=SPLIT(.05)
FACTOR VARIABLES=VAR11 VAR14 VAR17 VAR20 VAR24 VAR25 VAR28
  VAR30 VAR33 VAR37 VAR09 VAR12 VAR13 VAR19 VAR22 VAR26
  VAR29 VAR31 VAR34 VAR38/ ROTATION=VARIMAX/
FACTOR VARIABLES=VAR02 TO VAR08/ ROTATION=OBLIMIN/
T-TEST GROUPS=VAR40(1,2) /VARIABLES VAR47 VAR48/
T-TEST GROUPS=VAR41(1,2) /VARIABLES VAR47 VAR48/
T-TEST GROUPS=VAR42(1,2) /VARIABLES VAR47 VAR48/
ONEWAY VAR47 BY VAR46(1,4)/ RANGE-SCHEFFE(.05)/
ONEWAY VAR48 BY VAR46(1,4)/  RANGE-SCHEFFE(.05)/
ONEWAY VAR47 BY VAR43(1,4)/ RANGE-SCHEFFE(.05)/
ONEWAY VAR48 BY VAR43(1,4) /RANGE-SCHEFFE(.05)/
PEARSON CORR VAR47 VAR48 BY VAR46/ OPTIONS 2 3/
```

VITA

Paul Lee Beasley was born in East Point, Georgia on January 10, 1950. He attended public schools in that city and graduated from South Fulton High School in 1968. In 1972, he earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Human Relations (psychology and sociology) from Earlham College, and, in 1973, he earned a Master of Education degree from Trenton State College. He completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education Degree at the University of Tennessee in December, 1988.

While in high school he participated in the Upward Bound Program at Emory University. Upward Bound is a college preparatory program for students from families with low income. The Program had a profound impact on his view of education and educational processes for various social and ethnic groups. While at Earlham he continued his association with the Program by working as a tutor, counselor, and teacher for Upward Bound students in the Richmond, Indiana area. After graduate school, he served as the Upward Bound Coordinator at Emory University, and, in 1975, he worked for the U.S. Office of Education as a Program Officer for Upward Bound and other Title IV Programs.

In 1978, Mr. Beasley was employed by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga as the Director of Special Services and Upward Bound. Since that time he has increased his involvement with educational opportunity programs. He currently serves as President of the Tennessee Association of Special Programs and board member for the Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel and the National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations.