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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare school self-concepts and academic motivation of learning-disabled children in grades 1-3 with learning-disabled children in grades 4-6.

The investigation was conducted by means of a review of literature that included sources from the Montana State University (MSU) Library and from the personal libraries of faculty at MSU and of the investigator. The review was organized to include the following topics: Development of the Self, The Home Environment, Parenting the Learning-Disabled Child, The School Environment, Self-Concept and Achievement: A Review of Research, Motivation and Achievement: A Review of Research, How the Successful Student Sees Himself and How the Unsuccessful Student Sees Himself.

Further procedures included the administration of the Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory: What Face Would You Wear? (SCAMIN) to all elementary learning-disabled (LD) children in grades 1-6 of the Bozeman Public School System. Means and t-tests were computed to find significant differences between the SCAMIN subfactors and total self-concept and motivation scores on both the primary and intermediate level. Since no significant differences were found the null hypotheses were accepted. Pearson r's were computed to find correlations between the SCAMIN subfactors. The null hypotheses were rejected when significant correlations (.05 level) were found between achievement needs and role expectations and between role expectations and self-adequacy for both the primary and intermediate groups. The correlation between achievement needs and self adequacy was also significant for the intermediate group but not for the primary group. The null hypotheses for the remaining correlations of SCAMIN subfactors were accepted when no significant differences were found. Individual profile analysis revealed more unacceptable profiles in the elementary population.

The spiraling hypothesis of self-concept and motivation development in the normal learning population does not seem to occur in the LD population. Self-concept and motivation do not necessarily decrease with continued failure experiences and increasing age.

Recommendations included further investigations with a larger population, research using a longitudinal design, and research using other affective variables to discover why a spiraling process of self-concept development does not seem to occur.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Researchers have maintained for some time that the self-concept plays a significant role in the educational process. The child who accepts and respects himself will develop his intelligence and achieve academically. Conversely, children having problems in academic achievement may have low self-regard.

Two forces seem to dictate self-concept: the influences of other people and a child's success or failure with a task itself. Of these two forces the former seems to be the greater influence. In other words the child will value himself as he perceives others value him.

People reveal their reactions to a child through their approval or disapproval, acceptance or nonacceptance, love or lack of love, and through other rewards and punishments. Thus if the people important to a child teach him through reactions that he is incompetent in that behavior or skill, a negative self-concept is formed. The self-concept develops as a result of the experiences he has had. When the child's self-evaluation of his competency and the reactions of people whose opinions he values reinforce each other, a positive self-concept is firmly established.

In order to more fully determine the role of self-concept in academic motivation, it would be necessary to trace its development
in the individual.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was to compare school self-concepts and academic motivation of learning disabled children in grades 1-3 with learning-disabled children in grades 4-6.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The relationship between academic motivation, self-concept and achievement for normal learners has been of concern to many investigators. Unfortunately, relatively few studies have been concerned with the effect of personality factors at the elementary school level. Even fewer have been concerned with the learning-disabled population. Whether the relationships found in the normal population can be generalized to learning-disabled children should be questioned.

Estimates of the number of learning-disabled children vary anywhere from 3-10% of the school age population (Goldstein, 1975). The degree of disability ranges from minor to very serious. The child may compensate for his disability if it is minor. More severe cases may manifest secondary emotional and social behavior generally attributed to a continual lack of success. In fact, children with this syndrome come to attention because they represent an individual with behaviors that are deviant and because they are unresponsive to the usual methods of rearing and education.
One of the goals of educating the learning-disabled child is not only to provide for his academic needs but also to improve his self-concept. This in turn provides a greater potential for improved behavior. Considerable effort has been devoted to researching educational procedures and techniques of remediation. Little has been done to research the affective aspects of the learning-disabled child's personality. Special education has not concerned itself with the attitudes of educationally handicapped students toward areas of their school life (Guthery, 1971). As children tend to view their personal worth and adequacy in part by success and achievement in school, an effort should be made to deal with both the learning problems and problems in self-concept. This is especially true in view of the fact that estimates of emotional disturbances in learning-disabled cases range from 100% down to 75% (Hake, 1969).

Recent research shows that there may not be a correlation between achievement and self-concept in the learning-disabled population. In fact, if there is a correlation at all, it may be a negative one (Houck and Houck, 1976, Leviton and Kiraly, 1975, and Edwards, Alley, and Snider, 1971). The commonly held belief that self-concept becomes more negative with more failures may then be questioned in this learning-disabled population. The researcher has addressed herself to the question of this spiraling process. Is
there a difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to self-concept and academic motivation?

GENERAL QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

The investigator has attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What does the group profile for learning-disabled children in grades 1-3 look like with respect to self-concept and academic motivation?

2. What does the group profile for learning-disabled children in grades 4-6 look like with respect to self-concept and academic motivation?

3. Is there a difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to their profiles on self-concept and academic motivation?

4. Is there a relationship between the self-concept subfactors (role expectations and self-adequacy) and achievement motivation subfactors (achievement needs and achievement investment) for both the primary and intermediate groups?

LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

Limitations

1. The inventory was administered to a population which did not know the tester so results may have been limited by the student's willingness to cooperate and reveal himself.
2. Some characteristics inherent in the population may have affected interpretation of the study such as:
   a. The population had been involved in a resource program for various lengths of time.
   b. There was some overlap in the ages of children in the primary and intermediate population.
   c. The population involved had varying degrees of learning disabilities within the categories of mild general and mild specific handicaps.
   d. Some children were receiving special services other than in the resource room.

Delimitations
1. The study was limited to those elementary learning-disabled students in grades 1-6, ages 6-12, presently identified in the Bozeman Public School System, #7.
2. The review of literature was confined to selected books, research bulletins and periodicals from the library at Montana State University (MSU), Bozeman, Montana, and from the personal libraries of faculty at MSU and of the investigator.
3. The inventory was administered by the investigator with the results being read and interpreted by her.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms are defined as they will be used by the investigator throughout the study.

**Learning Disabilities**

"A learning disability is a handicapping condition evidenced by average or potentially average intelligence, observable or objectively validated deficiencies in one or more areas of information processing (how things are learned) and significant discrepancies in academic achievement (what is learned) that cannot be explained because of mental retardation, emotional disturbances and/or vision or hearing deficits." This is the definition of the Bozeman Public School System, #7, Bozeman, Montana, which is used for placement of a child into the educationally handicapped program as a learning-disabled child.

**Academic Self-Concept**

"The academic self-concept is how a child views his role as a learner in school. It is the student's sum of experiences, perceptions, attitudes, and feelings about school and schoolwork" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 1).

**Academic Motivation**

"Academic Motivation is the expressed need of a child to achieve a goal in school, and the moderate avoidance of the child toward
failure in school -- avoidance below the point of anxiety. Motivation has a strong element of cooperative adjustment toward school" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 1).

**Elements of Self-Concept**

Self-concept is made up of Role Expectations and Self-Adequacy.

"Role Expectations is the positive acceptance of the aspirations and demands that the student thinks others -- significant others -- expect of him" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 1).

"Self Adequacy is the positive regard with which a student views his present and future probabilities of success" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 1).

**Elements of Motivation**

Motivation is made up of Achievement Needs and Achievement Investment:

"Achievement Needs is the positive regard with which a student perceives the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards of learning and performing in school" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 1).

"Achievement Investment is the awareness and concern toward shunning the embarrassment and sanctions which are associated with failure in school. When Achievement Investment is extremely high without support from the self-concept, realistic avoidance becomes anxious fear. Anxious fear or Failure Anxiety stifles achievement"
Significant Others

"Significant others refers to parents, siblings, peers, teachers, and sometimes to the counselors, neighbors, adult relatives and friends of the family which have an impact in the child's life. The student views his significant others as models for his behavior. They confer the approval and disapproval that seems to matter. Significant others tell the student in many ways what he is and how he is expected to act. They establish a climate which threatens or supports" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 2).

High Self-Concept and Motivation Profiles

"The uniformly high Self-Concept and Motivation profiles do not insure that the student will achieve in school. The high scores may even be unrealistic for some youngsters. However, high Self-Concept scores indicate that lack of achievement is not due to a defeatist attitude. High academic motivation and self-concept logically infers that the student will continue to strive—although his efforts may not always be well directed—over the long-term. High attitudinal motivation does not guarantee industriousness, but it is a necessary prerequisite for consistent over-achievement" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 3).
Medium Self-Concept and Motivation Profiles

"When all the factors are in the medium range, it does not imply that these "average" scores are necessarily acceptable. There are some critics who think that self-concept among almost all school youth leave much room for improvement" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 3).

Low Self-Concept and Motivation Profiles

"The low Self-Concept and Motivation profile describes a child who is receiving and expecting little satisfaction from school. Possible causes include poor academic and social performance, different cultural values, depression, alienation, and unrealistic demands from parents, teachers, and self. The rewards of school seem too unobtainable to be wished for. The self is resigned to suffer more discomfort in school" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 3).

Anxiety Profile (High Achievement and Low Self-Adequacy)

"The Anxiety Profile is marked by high Motivation and low Self-Concept -- particularly high Achievement Investment and low Self-Adequacy. The anxious youngster wants to achieve, and he is afraid not to achieve. Nevertheless, he views his prospects grimly. Inferring anxiety is particularly valid when the student's actual achievement is average or above" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 3).
Denial Profile (Low Motivation with Inflated Self-Concept)

"The Denial Profile is a highly defensive self-report which is marked by low Motivation and a Self-Concept higher than achievement levels seem to justify. The student rejects the rewards of Goal and Achievement Needs. He also reports indifference or a callous bravado toward avoiding the sanction of failure. His Self-Concept is higher than his achievement level would legitimately suggest because his sense of self-adequacy no longer depends upon what happens in the classroom" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 4).

Protection Profile (High Achievement with Medium Self-Adequacy)

"The Protection Profile has high Achievement Investment Expectations. Achievement must be high or above average. Achievement Needs and Self-Adequacy are a surprising medium or low for such a successful student. The Achievement Needs are being met; therefore, they will not be as intense. Two possibilities are suggested for the depressed self-adequacy: (1) the student's standards are discouragingly high, (2) the student has found self-degradation as a means of gaining sympathy, praise, and lower demands. This is typical of the all "A" student" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 4).

Security Profile (High Profile with Medium or Low Failure Avoidance)

"The most desirable long-range self-concept objective is the Security Profile with high Self-Concept and Achievement Needs but
only moderate or low Achievement Investment. The Security Profile type students have above average academic achievement and high social achievement. They attempt to be creative and work vigorously toward their interests. Due to the low Failure Avoidance of these self-actualizing children, they may be inconsistent on dull "busy work" assignments. When this profile shape appears with low achieving pupils, the term Placid Profile has been applied to these non-striving pupil" (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968, P. 4).

SUMMARY

There is a need for investigation into the emotional and motivational aspects of learning disabilities. This study will compare two groups of elementary learning-disabled students as to their self-concept and academic motivation. The researcher will assess the self-reports of the students and identify factors contributing to their attitudes.

The review of literature will acquaint the reader with information pertinent to the study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For years educators have attempted to predict academic success using intellective variables such as I.Q. The average correlation found between I.Q. scores and achievement range between .50 and .75 (Cole, 1974). Therefore, between \( \frac{1}{4} \) and \( \frac{3}{4} \) of the variability in academic achievement remains unexplained. Research has now shifted toward the measurement of non-intellective variables such as self-concept and achievement motivation for an explanation of the variance.

The relationship between academic achievement, self-concept, and academic motivation for normal learners has been of concern to many investigators. However, literature relating to the affective variables in the learning disabled population is negligible. In this chapter, the researcher has attempted to discuss selected references dealing with the development of motivation and self-concept and its relation to success or failure in school for normals and learning-disabled (LD) children.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SELF

More and more there is a deepening interest in the individual's perception of himself and his situation as a major influence on his behavior. The self-concept is defined as:

"The self-concept, or self structure, may be thought of as an organized configuration or perceptions of the self which are
admissable to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence" (Rogers, 1951, p. 136).

This definition illustrates two important characteristics of the self: it is organized and it is dynamic. The organizational aspect of the self includes one's beliefs about himself, his values, and how success and failure are internalized and generalized. No two people hold identical sets of beliefs about themselves. Each of us is constantly striving to maintain, protect and enhance the self of which he is aware. The self resists change. This dynamic quality of the self also exhibits its role in motivation. Each and every human being experiences personal internal motivation. As Combs has stated, "People are always motivated, in fact, they are never unmotivated. They may not be motivated to do what we would prefer they do, but it can never be truly said that they are unmotivated" (1962, p. 85). The ways we react to people, tasks, and roles, therefore, are those which seem to us to be consistent with our self-image. And we express our self-concept with our behavior.

THE HOME ENVIRONMENT

During the first few months of life the infant is completely
dependent on others responsible for him. The nature of the love and care exhibited by these significant others has an overwhelming influence on the way the infant sees himself and the world. If his experiences tell him that he is wanted, liked, valued and healthy, he can expand as a person. Conversely, the child will have little self-respect or self-confidence if he gets feedback from his significant others that he is inadequate, incapable, unworthy, unable, unwanted, and unloved. The child will become a product of how others see him.

Coopersmith (1967) lists three conditions which lead the child to value himself. These are: (1) parental warmth, whereby the child senses the love and concern of his family and feels that they see him as a person of value, (2) respectful treatment, whereby the child's views are considered, and (3) clearly defined limits, whereby the child comes to know through his parents' relatively high demands and expectations for success that they care what happens to him.

In a study of self-esteem, Coopersmith (1968), using a sample of normal middle class boys, found no consistent relation between self-esteem and physical attractiveness, height, early trauma, the size of family, breast or bottle feeding or the mother's occupation. Boys with high self-esteem had a close relationship with their parents. This relationship took the form of an interest in the
boy's welfare and concern about their companions, problems, and activities. Both the mother and father regarded the boy as a significant person who was worthy of their deep interest. Together, then, the mother and father are critical in maintaining the child's self-image. Miller (1971) reports that the child's perceptions of his parents' attitudes toward school and the parent-child relationship determine his attitude toward education and achievement. Their expectations are internalized into self-perceptions. So it happens that the early years of life are most critical in forming the child's opinion of himself.

PARENTING THE LEARNING-DISABLED CHILD

"No parent is ever prepared to be the parent of a handicapped child. The identification of a mother and father in that role always comes as a painful surprise" (Barsch, 1968, P. 9). Our societal attitudes and the mass media perpetrate the myth that marriage is "eternal bliss" and that the product of this union is children who are physically, mentally, and emotionally perfect. At the same time society also tells these parents that they must be "superparents" (Greer, 1975). They must see that their child is given a superabundance of love, attention, and appropriate schooling. These parents are not to miss any appointments or therapy sessions with helping professionals. If this is not done 24 hours a day, 365 days
a year, society says they are "superbad" (Greer, 1975). This ideal can create unnecessary trauma in the lives of parents of handicapped children. Those parents with learning-disabled children are no exception.

Fotheringham and Creal (1974) have found that parents of learning-disabled children go through a series of distinct adjustments before the child is accurately diagnosed. The first is unawareness. The infant has no obvious physical defects. But as time progresses the child does not behave as the parents expect. Perhaps he is slow to develop physically or perhaps the child is beginning to manifest secondary behavioral symptoms. This then becomes the stage of uneasiness. At this point the parents concern is explored with friends, relatives, and maybe professionals. The parent may also try to rationalize the behavior in terms that are acceptable for that stage of development. For example a parent might say, "Bill doesn't read yet because he'd rather play with trucks and work with his hands." Finally the problem is recognized and accurately diagnosed. Typically, the child is not diagnosed until he has experienced some failure or behavioral difficulty in school.

Parental Reactions to the LD Diagnosis

The parents may react to the diagnosis in several ways. Love (1970) found five reactions more common than others. These are
disbelief, guilt, resentment, hostility, and helplessness.

**Disbelief.** After proper diagnosis parents still seek other exams by different doctors and specialists. They hope the child will be found normal and live up to the picture of society's ideal. This is simply a defense mechanism to the stressful situation. The parents of the learning-disabled child will try to account for the child's poor academic performance with physical disabilities such as poor vision or hearing or illnesses.

**Guilt.** Guilt and feelings of inferiority arise because the parents have not produced the "perfect" child. The parents see the child as an extension of themselves (Brutten, et al. 1973). They see the child's imperfection as a personal affront. The child's failures are interpreted as the parents' failures. Typically the parents are unaware of the guilt feelings and how this message reaches the child. Bryant (1971) explains that the parent then will unconsciously compensate for the guilt feelings with sympathy, possessiveness, overpermissiveness, smothering, suspicion, or overactivity. Any one is the product of ambivalent feelings toward the child and may be expressed overtly or covertly. This in turn creates a family situation in which there is poor communication.

**Resentment.** Parents see other families without handicapped children and become envious. They wish that their child was not exceptional.
This resentment and envy if not kept in the proper perspective can be damaging.

Hostility. The parent may manifest symptoms of hostility. Their desires for the ideal child are not fulfilled. They have set certain goals for him and he is not achieving them. The parent is disappointed. Family members may be subjected to this hostility. Parents show hostility through neglect, denial of advantages and privileges, and by humiliation (Love, 1970). In general Gerber (1976) found parents of learning-disabled children more rejecting than parents of normal children.

Helplessness. Frequently parents are relieved to finally have a label to attach to behavioral symptoms of their learning-disabled child. However, this relief is only temporary. The disability must still be acknowledged. Parents may intellectually understand the problems of the learning-disabled child, but seldom do they accept it emotionally. The parent is now dependent on the advice of professionals which creates a feeling of helplessness. In addition there is a feeling of uncertainty about the child's future.

The diagnosis of a learning disability is a serious threat to the value system of these parents. Gerber (1976) found that parents of children with learning disabilities had their greatest conflicts in the areas most directly related to learning. Similarly, Wetter
(1972) found that parents of learning-disabled children more frequently disagreed in assessing their child's overall level of adjustment than did parents of controls. When conflicts between the parents are not resolved, communications are incongruent and the family becomes dysfunctional (Satir, 1967). The child senses the tension and begins to associate his parents' emotional state with his disability. He begins to feel uncomfortable knowing that his disability is the root of his parents' unhappiness. In a case study by Michael-Smith, Morgenstern, and Karp (1970) it was noted that when a child has a learning disability, one parent tends to ally himself in support of the child. The other parent tends to reject the child. While these conflicts are common, they are not invariable consequences of having a handicapped child. Each family needs to be evaluated separately. Some families handle the situation better than others, but none remain untouched.

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Children come to school with all sorts of ideas about themselves and their abilities. The child's self-image is with him wherever he goes, influencing whatever he does. Along with his self-concept, the child brings a predisposition toward achievement or underachievement. Children who are more realistic in their appraisal of what they can do are likely to be more successful academically (McCoy, 1963).
Traditionally the child is expected to adjust to the school, rather than the school adjusting to the child. The child is expected to adapt to the school environment and compete for the rewards of scholarship. If he does not, he is failed, punished, and rejected. To those with predispositions toward failure, the schools are too often the places where they receive daily reminders of their limitations. Their self-image grows more negative with the passage of time. Once convinced of his academic inadequacy, school becomes a place of threat and anxiety. The child cannot hope to succeed.

**SELF-CONCEPT AND ACHIEVEMENT: REVIEW OF RESEARCH**

Wylie (1961) has noted that studies in the area of self-concept are filled with conflicting and confusing evidence. She ascribes the confusion to the methodological difficulties inherent in the measurement of self-concept, and to the vast array of hypotheses, measuring instruments, and research designs utilized.

Most of the research into the self-concept has been concerned with college students. McCandless (1961, P. 179) states, "Compared with the number of adult studies, there are few studies of the self-concept in children. Self-concept studies of children younger than about fourth grade age are rare, since each child would have to be examined individually (because of reading and writing difficulties)." Young children exhibit a generally limited ability to
clearly verbalize complex self-feelings and perceptions.

Since it is with this age population (grades 1-6) that the researcher is concerned, she will confine her review to studies with this age range. Unless specifically stated otherwise, the following studies deal with the normal learning population.

Studies by Primavera, et al. (1974), Simon and Simon (1975), and Cole (1974) indicate the existence of a relationship between self-concept and academic achievement. This relationship is generally reported as a low-positive correlation or a consistent, moderate correlation. In other words, the findings show that there exists significant difference in the degree of academic achievement between groups of well adjusted and poorly adjusted school children. More specifically, achieving students had a more adequate level of both personal and social adjustment than did underachieving students. For the underachievers, a spiraling cycle is hypothesized which is initiated when the learner recognizes his academic inefficiency and failure to meet societal expectations. Houck and Houck (1976) illustrate the process as shown in Figure 1.

The relationship between self-concept and achievement is quite clear for boys, but less so for girls. Campbell (1967), Primavera, et al. (1974), and Simon and Simon (1975) found a stronger relationship between self-concept and achievement in boys than in girls.
Figure 1. Spiraling self-concept formation.

Male underachievers tend to have more negative self-concepts than female underachievers. Likewise Bledsoe (1964) found significant differences in mean self-concepts of boys and girls at both the fourth grade and sixth grade levels, indicating that at these levels girls have greater self-esteem than boys. He hypothesized that the reason for this may be that the more frequent contacts with women teachers and with mothers (as compared with fathers) enables girls to develop a more self-satisfying self-concept. There is reason to believe that the lower class male in particular is discouraged from academic fulfillment because of the feminine reputation school and education have in the lower class. There is also considerable evidence that in our society women are discouraged from developing beyond a certain point intellectually.

A study by Ozehosky and Clark (1970) seems to confirm Bledsoe's hypothesis. The authors found no significant difference in achievement between boys and girls at the kindergarten level. The constancy of female contact has not yet exhibited a derogatory effect on the male self-concept as it does in the later years.

In 1962, E. Paul Torrance discovered a fourth-grade slump in school motivation and self-concept but no such decline in personal self-concept. Before the fourth grade there were gradual increases in personal and school motivation and self-concept for grades 1, 2,
and 3. At about age 9, near the end of the third grade or at the beginning of the fourth grade, there is a rather severe decline. Then comes a period of recovery especially for girls in the fifth grade. There is another gradual increase in sixth grade before another decline in seventh grade. Torrance noted that each drop occurred at an age of transition from one developmental stage to another. The fourth grade slump occurs with the onset of the pre-adolescent stage when the child has an increased need for consensual validation, peer approval, identification with peers of the same sex, and conformity to peer norms. His hypothesis was that certain periods of stress in children's lives contribute to vexing behaviors that cause discontinuities in creative growth. This occurred in all the cultures tested although the greatest slump occurred in the dominant advantaged culture of the United States.

In 1976 Frank E. Williams confirmed the existence of the fourth grade slump using over 1,000 first to fourth grade children. Williams states that this should not be surprising as one views the typical elementary program. By fourth grade the child is expected to be well-regimented into the academic mold imposed by teacher, parent, and peer group. By fourth grade, fun and games in school end, and skill tasks with texts and workbooks become predominant. The ability to think fluently, flexibly, and originally is not rewarded to the
degree that conformity is rewarded. Thus, the excitement in performing in school declines. Students seem to get discouraged under pressures and expectations over which they have no control. This stress leads to disillusionment with school. (Experiments by Torrance and Williams have shown conclusively that stimulation through opportunities for creative achievement can be powerful enough to prevent the slump.)

Bledsoe (1964) studied the relationship of self-concept of children in grades 4-6 to their intelligence, achievement, interests, and anxiety. As might be expected, self-concept correlated positively with measures of intelligence and academic achievement. Self-concept and manifest anxiety correlated negatively. Significant positive correlations were found for fourth grade girls between self-concept and interests.

Kerensky (1967) investigated the relationships between self-concept, achievement, and five other achievement related variables for 452 elementary school students. A decline in achievement was noted from the third to the sixth grade, and although self-concept remained high, the subjects expressed a high need for achievement and recognition which was not related to their actual performance. Increasing anxiety was noted, and alienation toward schools was seen to begin.
The studies reviewed thus far support the position that a significant, positive relation exists between academic achievement and self-concept. However, Williams (1973) failed to find significant correlations between self-concept and reading achievement in either first or second grade. Three interpretations were offered: (1) that the age level of the subjects may have influenced the relationship, (2) that the self-concept of young children may be subject to wide fluctuation, and (3) that the instrument for measurement may not have been sufficiently sensitive.

Marx and Winne (1975) investigated a predominately black lower socio-economic group of fifth and sixth graders and also found that the relationship between self-concept and achievement for this group was weak.

Four final studies related to the study presented here investigated the relationship of academic achievement and self-concept in children with learning disabilities. Black (1974) studied 25 normal and 25 retarded readers using the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Test and Wide Range Achievement Test. The level of self-concept for learning disabled children was found to be related to the degree of their underachievement. This suggests that increasing underachievement is associated with increasingly poor self-concept. This result tends to support the hypothesis of the circular relationship between
self-concept and achievement. In conjunction with this finding, Black also found that there was a significant decrease in self-concept scores with increasing age and grade.

Another interesting finding in Black's study was a reported lack of correlation between self-concept scores and Weschter Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) I.Q. Piers (1969) has reported that most studies of this relationship have found significant positive correlations. For these learning disabled children, WISC correlations with self-concept scores approximated zero. "For learning-disabled children of normal intelligence, intellectual factors apparently add little to the variance of self-concept scores" (Black, 1974, P. 1139).

Contradictory findings are reported by Leviton and Kiraly (1975), Houck and Houck (1976), and Edwards, Alley, and Snider (1971). These studies report little or no association between academic achievement and self-concept with respect to learning-disabled children. In the Leviton and Kiraly study, the little correlation that did exist was generally negative in sign.

MOTIVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT – REVIEW OF RESEARCH

For one to develop his intellectual potential, one must be motivated. Motivation to achieve is basically and inevitably a personal matter.
Maslow's (1943) classic theory has depicted five basic need areas which motivate man: the physiological needs, the safety needs involving human desire for predictability and organization; the love needs involving the giving and receiving of love and affection; the esteem needs involving human desire for a high evaluation of themselves; and the need for self-actualization involving human desire for self-fulfillment. According to Maslow, the lower level needs must be met in order for the higher level needs to be actualized.

Madsen (1965) has attempted to classify a brief listing of motivational variables which include the following: I. Organic Motives (hunger, thirst, sex, maternal, temperature, pain-avoidance, excretory, rest, and activity); II. Emotional Motives (aggression and fear); III. Social Motives (competition for leadership, dominance, or influence; the achievement motive, the acquisition motive). These motivational variables will not necessarily lead to direct behavior. The behavior will be determined by the individual's evaluation of his needs, goals, capacities, and opportunities.

Recently Rotter (1966) and Wolk and DuCette (1973) found that locus of control mediates the effects of achievement motivation and resultant achievement behavior. There are two distinct groups of need achievement persons: (1) internals who accept responsibility for their acts and for whom achievement tasks are attractive, and
(2) externals who attribute the outcome of their acts to environmental sources and for whom achievement tasks hold no particular attraction. According to Wiener's (1972) view, ability and effort are the variables resulting in success or failure for internals. Externals attribute task difficulty and luck to success or lack of success.

Cole (1974) found that the personality variable which had the highest correlation with the achievement of average third grade children was achievement motivation. The average aptitude student may have achieved less simply because he was not motivated by the materials, organization of the school, or presentation of the teacher.

Hake (1969), in research comparing poor and above-average readers, found significantly more negative covert motivations in the former group. These were as follows: first, the poor readers saw their home and parents as more threatening and less warm and comforting; second, the poor readers tended to identify more with store characters who had punishing teachers; third, poor readers told more stories of children who did not like themselves; fourth, they told stories of children who solved personal problems through defense mechanisms rather than by facing reality; fifth, the poor readers identified with children who solved personal problems aggressively; and sixth, poor readers told more stories of children who were held
in dungeons, beaten, or even killed by the hero.

Other factors influencing motivation include the ability and opportunity to use the inductive reasoning process for fostering creativity, the ability and opportunity for realistic decision making, the ability and opportunity for discriminative listening, immediate feedback providing knowledge of results produced in tasks, the use of praise, varied curriculum tasks, and the ability of the teacher to encourage self-direction in his students. Combined, these seven factors can influence the student in recognizing his own needs and the possible avenues for satisfying them.

**HOW THE SUCCESSFUL STUDENT SEES HIMSELF**

Success is an essential key to progress, but success is only intrinsically meaningful if it signals emotional satisfaction to the individual. Otherwise, the success will be unmotivating.

The successful student can generally be characterized as having a positive self-concept. He seems to have a relatively high opinion of himself and is optimistic about his future performance (Ringness, 1961). He has confidence in his general ability and in his ability as a student (Broookover, et al. 1964). He needs fewer favorable evaluations from others (Dittes, 1959), and he feels that he works hard, is liked by other students and is generally polite and honest (Davidson and Greenberg, 1967). The successful student is generally
polite and honest (Davidson and Greenberg, 1967). The successful student is generally motivated internally rather than externally (Rotter, 1966, and Weiner, 1972). He is interested in doing a task for its own sake rather than for whatever extrinsic rewards may be involved. He is able to ascribe success experiences internally to high ability and effort. Sears and Sherman (1964) say that this is especially true of the academically superior student. These students develop their self-concepts from their ability to achieve or their sense of competence. (The average boys and girls were not found to base their self-concepts on academic achievement.) The self-esteem of these children was related primarily to the opinions of them held by teachers and peers. The extent and quality of these relationships were decisive factors.

HOW THE UNSUCCESSFUL STUDENT SEES HIMSELF

The spiraling effects of continuous failure experiences are a personal tragedy and a social waste. A constant factor involved in failure experiences is the way in which the student perceives himself and his abilities.

Most studies dealing with the unsuccessful student deal with the "underachiever", the student who has the ability to succeed but who because of nonintellectual factors, does not perform up to expectations. Studies which support the notion that the underachievers
tend to have negative self-concepts are numerous (Combs, 1963). These students tend generally to see themselves as less adequate and less accepted by others. Taylor (1964) reported that the under-achiever is self-derogatory, has a depressed attitude toward himself, has feelings of inadequacy, and tends to have strong inferiority feelings. Weiner (1972) found that the locus of control for the unsuccessful student is external. His success outcomes are based in good luck or easy tasks.

The student with a negative self-image rarely performs well in school with these persistent feelings of worthlessness. Guthery (1971) found that educationally handicapped students expressed more negative attitudes than normal children toward teacher, school, and academics. The basic question of whether children see themselves negatively because of their school performance, or whether they perform poorly in school because they see themselves negatively, is unresolved.

SUMMARY

A child acquires attitudes toward himself when he listens to what other people say about him, either when they speak directly to him or when they speak to others about him in his hearing. His self-concept will be either positive or negative depending upon the feedback he receives from these significant others. Miller (1971)
reports that the child's perceptions of his parents' attitudes toward school and the parent-child relationship determine his attitudes toward education and achievement. For healthy, enthusiastic attitudes toward school and academic work, both parents and teachers should frequently and appropriately praise, reinforce, and reward both effort and success in all academic activities.

Several personality and motivational factors that influence the development of intellectual abilities have been discussed. For normal learners, the motivation to achieve and the individual's perception of his ability to achieve are both found to be related to academic success. Likewise, the interaction between self-concept and motivation appears to influence achievement. Therefore research recommends integration of academic and emotional remediation programs for the normal population.

The evidence of a relationship between self-concept, motivation, and achievement for the learning-disabled population is inconclusive. Some say that as secondary behavioral and emotional problems tend to increase in frequency with increasing age, a circular process between personality problems is probable, with both school failure and poor self-concept being mutually non-reinforcing to the learning-disabled child. For these children there is decreasing self-concept with increasing age and grade. This hypothesis parallels what is known to
be true for the normal underachiever. Still others suggest that the relationship between academic achievement, self-concept and motivation for LD children may be different from that of more normal learners. There may be no significant correlation at all between these factors.
CHAPTER III
INTRODUCTION

In order to help understand how the learning-disabled child views his or her role as a learner in school, the researcher has compared academic self-concept and academic motivation in the primary (1-3) and intermediate (4-6) grades.

In this chapter, the instrument and related literature are presented in the following manner:

1. A description of the population is included.
2. The investigative categories are defined.
3. The method of collecting data is discussed.
4. The method of data organization is discussed.
5. An analysis of the data is presented.
6. The precautions taken for accuracy are defined.
7. A summary of Chapter III is presented.

POPULATION

All elementary (1-6) pupils in the Bozeman Public School District identified as learning-disabled by the child study teams were used in this study. This involved 42 pupils. The population was assigned to self-contained classrooms but was also receiving special assistance from a resource teacher.

CATEGORIES OF INVESTIGATION

The areas which were examined in this study are:
1. The comparison between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to self-concept were examined. This includes the self-concept subfactors, role expectations and self-adequacy.

2. The comparison between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to academic motivation were examined. This includes the motivation subfactors, achievement needs and achievement investment.

3. The comparison between the primary and intermediate groups on total scores of both factors, self-concept and academic motivation, were examined.

4. The interrelationships between the subfactors (achievement needs, achievement investment role expectations, and self-adequacy) were examined.

METHODS OF COLLECTING DATA

The investigator administered the Self Concept and Motivation Inventory: What Face Would you Wear? (SCAMIN) to all elementary learning-disabled children in grades 1–6 (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968). This was done by appointment on an individual basis between 8:30 A.M. and 11:30 A.M. during the weeks of March 14–25, 1977. The investigator administered the inventory in the speech therapy rooms of the various schools to avoid distractions. The inventory took approximately 30 minutes per pupil to complete.

SCAMIN is administered with a nonverbal answer sheet showing a
series of five faces. These range from a very sad, frowning face to a very happy, smiling face, with gradations in between. Items were read to the pupils. The student was then asked to mark the appropriate face.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory: What Face Would You Wear? (SCAMIN) reflects the pupil's sum of experiences, perceptions, attitudes, and feelings about school and academic scholarship. Two subfactors contribute toward the way a child feels about his school self-concept, role expectations and self-adequacy. Another subfactor measured by this instrument is school motivation, which includes achievement needs and achievement investment. The authors of the inventory in three samples found that principal components factor analysis yielded three of the four factors for the Early Elementary form (K-3). One of the three samples confirmed four factors (Milchus, Farrah, and Reitz, 1968). Lowell K. Norman (1975) confirmed the four factor structure for the Later Elementary form using a varimax factor analysis followed by orthogonal rotation.

Test-retest reliability for the Early Elementary form was found to be .77 using a population of 65 (Burke, 1968). For the Later Elementary form, test-retest reliability for the motivation portion was found to be .80. Split halves reliability for the self-concept
portion was found to be .84. The total reliability coefficient then for the Later Elementary form was found to be .83. There was a three month interval between the initial test and the retest using a population of 114 (Roth, 1969).

METHODS OF ORGANIZING DATA

The instrument is designed to elicit responses that will be reflective of students' attitudes toward their academic self-concept and academic motivation, how a child views his or her role as a learner in school. The results are shown in tabular form.

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis I: There is no difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to role expectations.

Alternate Hypothesis I: There is a difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to role expectations.

Hypothesis II: There is no difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to self-adequacy.

Alternate Hypothesis II: There is a difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to self-adequacy.

Hypothesis III: There is no difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to achievement needs.

Alternate Hypothesis III: There is a difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to achievement needs.
Hypothesis IV: There is no difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to achievement investment.

Alternate Hypothesis IV: There is a difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to achievement investment.

Hypothesis V: There is no difference in the total self-concept and motivation scores for the primary and intermediate groups.

Alternate Hypothesis V: There is a difference in the total self-concept and motivation scores for the primary and intermediate groups.

Hypothesis VI: There is no correlation between role expectations and self-adequacy in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Alternate Hypothesis VI: There is a correlation between role expectations and self-adequacy in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Hypothesis VII: There is no correlation between role expectations and achievement needs in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Alternate Hypothesis VII: There is a correlation between role expectations and achievement needs in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no correlation between role expectations and achievement investment in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Alternate Hypothesis VIII: There is a difference between correlations of role expectations and achievement investment in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.
Hypothesis IX: There is no correlation between self-adequacy and achievement needs in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Alternate Hypothesis IX: There is a correlation between self-adequacy and achievement needs in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Hypothesis X: There is no correlation between self-adequacy and achievement investment in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Alternate Hypothesis X: There is a correlation between self-adequacy and achievement investment in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Hypothesis XI: There is no correlation between achievement needs and achievement investment in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

Alternate Hypothesis XI: There is a correlation between achievement needs and achievement investment in grades K-3 and grades 4-6.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Means and t-tests have been computed for hypotheses 1-5. Pearson r's have been computed by hypotheses 6-11. Significance has been computed at the .05 level to guard against a Type I error. The results are discussed in Chapter IV.

PRECAUTIONS TAKEN

All tests were hand scored twice for accuracy. The necessary calculations were computer checked.
SUMMARY

Learning-disabled children were used in this study to compare the primary and intermediate grades on measures of self-concept and academic motivation. The Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory: What Face Will You Wear? (SCAMIN) was used. Means, t-tests, and Pearson r's were computed to assist in analysis of the data.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory: What Face Will You Wear? (SCAMIN) is designed to elicit responses that will be reflective of students' attitudes toward their academic self-concept and academic motivation, how a child views his or her role as a learner in school. Two subfactors contribute toward the way a child feels about his performance on school tasks. One is school self-concept derived from: (1) role expectations: the positive acceptance of the demands that a pupil thinks others make of him, (2) self-adequacy: how a pupil views his or her present and future probabilities of success in school. Both role expectations and self-adequacy are summed to yield a school self-concept score.

Another subfactor measured by this instrument is school motivation, defined by the authors as an expressed need of a child to achieve a goal in school. It is derived from: (1) achievement needs: the positive regard a student achieves from intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for learning and school performance, (2) achievement investment: pupils' awareness of the embarrassment and sanctions of failure in school, and desire to shun the humiliation of failure. Both achievement needs and achievement investment are summed to yield a school motivation score.

Thus two scores are derived from the instrument: school
self-concept and academic motivation. Raw scores on the different level tests are converted to stanines for purposes of comparison.

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the SCAMIN subfactors (achievement needs, achievement investment, role expectations, and self-adequacy) and combined self-concept and motivation scores. The results show little difference between the means of primary and intermediate grades.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations of SCAMIN Subfactors and Total SCAMIN Self-Concept and Motivation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subfactors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Group, Grades 1-3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs (AN)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Investment (AI)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectations (RE)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Adequacy (SA)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (AN+AI+RE+SA)</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Group, Grades 4-6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs (AN)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Investment (AI)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectations (RE)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Adequacy (SA)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (AN+AI+RE+SA)</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 confirms that the differences between the means of the SCAMIN subfactors and the means of the total stanine scores are not significant. Therefore, there is no adequate grounds for rejecting the null hypotheses, \( H_0^1-H_0^5 \). There are no significant differences between the primary and intermediate grades.

Table 2

t Values of Primary and Intermediate SCAMIN Subfactors and Total Stanine Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subfactors</th>
<th>df (n-2)</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs (AN)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Investment (AI)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectations (RE)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Adequacy (SA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (AN+AI+RE+SA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the correlations between the SCAMIN subfactors in both the primary and intermediate grades and whether or not the correlations were significant at the .05 level. There was a greater correlation between achievement needs and role expectations at the intermediate level \( (r= .59) \) than at the primary level \( (r= .41) \). Likewise, there was a greater correlation between achievement needs and self-adequacy at the intermediate level \( (r= .70) \) than at the primary level.
The correlation between role expectations and self-adequacy was highly significant for both the primary and intermediate groups (r=.73 and r=.72 respectively). Therefore, the null hypotheses $H_6$, $H_7$, and $H_9$ was rejected and their alternate hypotheses accepted.

The correlations between the remaining subfactors were not significant for either group at the .05 level. In fact, achievement needs and achievement investment may not be related at all for either the primary or intermediate group. Therefore, the null hypotheses, $H_8$, $H_10$, and $H_11$ were accepted.

Despite the fact that there were few statistical differences between the groups, profile analysis of the individual scores showed that there were indeed individual differences between the groups. Figure 2 reveals the primary group demonstrating more unacceptable profiles than the intermediate group. These individual profiles received high teacher confirmation. The definition of the profile types are found in Chapter I beginning on page 8.
Table 3

Correlations Between SCAMIN Subfactors and Their Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subfactors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>Significance Level (N-2 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs and Achievement Investment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs and Role Expectations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs and Self Adequacy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Investment and Role Expectations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Investment and Self Adequacy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectations and Self Adequacy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 3, Correlations Between SCAMIN Subfactors and Their Significance Level, for the Intermediate Group, is located on page 46.
Table 3 (con't)

Correlations Between SCAMIN Subfactors and Their Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subfactors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>Significance Level (N-2 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Group, Grades 4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs and Achievement Investment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs and Role Expectations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Needs and Self Adequacy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Investment and Role Expectations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Investment and Self Adequacy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectations and Self Adequacy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanines</td>
<td>32-36</td>
<td>27-31</td>
<td>24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>x\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>b oo</td>
<td>ooo</td>
<td>ooo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Profile</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placid Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial Profile</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. SCAMIN profile types.

\textsuperscript{a} x indicates profile type of child in grades 1-3.

\textsuperscript{b} o indicates profile type of child in grades 4-6.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

This study investigated the relationship between self-concept and motivation in the elementary (grades 1-6) learning disabled (LD) population. Its purpose was to determine if a difference existed between the primary and intermediate groups in relation to these factors. The method followed was: (1) to review the literature which dealt with the development of self-concept and motivation and their relationship to academic achievement in the normal learning and LD populations, (2) to administer the Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory: What Face Will You Wear (SCAMIN) to the elementary LD population in Bozeman, Montana, (3) to analyze the data obtained from the SCAMIN administrations.

Summary of Literature Review

A child acquires his self-concept from his significant others. He will value himself as others value him. His self-concept will be either positive or negative depending upon the feedback he receives.

For normal learners, the motivation to achieve and the individual's perception of his ability to achieve are both found to be related to academic success. Likewise the interaction between self-concept and motivation appears to influence academic achievement. Achieving normals have a more adequate level of self-concept than underachieving normals. For the underachievers, a spiraling cycle is hypothesized. With more failures comes increasing negative
feedback. With more negative feedback, the self-concept diminishes.

Studies also indicate that sex differences in the relationship between self-concept and achievement are relatively clear cut for boys, but less so for girls. Male underachievers tend to have more negative self-concepts than girls. The underachievers are more externally motivated. Success for this group is attributed to luck and the ease of the task.

A directional flow in the development of self-concept and motivation has been observed in the normal population. A drop in self-concept and motivation occurs during the transition from one developmental stage to another. Kindergarten, fourth grade, and seventh grade show particular slumps in self-concept.

Summary of the Investigation

Learning disabled children in grades 1-6 in the elementary schools of Bozeman, Montana, were selected for the study. The Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory: What Face Would You Wear? (SCAMIN) was administered to the population on an individual basis. Analysis of this study involved computing means of the subfactors included in the instrument (achievement needs, achievement investment, role expectations, and self-adequacy). The significance of the differences between the means were computed by means of t-tests. Since there were no significant differences found in self-concept and motivation between the primary
and intermediate groups, the null hypotheses \( H_0^1-H_0^5 \) were accepted.

Pearson r's were used to determine the existence of relationships between the SCAMIN subfactors. Again the null hypotheses, \( H_0^8, H_0^{10} \) and \( H_0^{11} \), were accepted when no significant relationships were found between achievement investment and role expectations, achievement investment and self-adequacy, and achievement needs and achievement investment. However, the null hypotheses, \( H_0^6, H_0^7, \) and \( H_0^9 \) were rejected when a relationship at the .05 level was found to exist.

These hypotheses included significant relationships between role expectations and self-adequacy, achievement needs and role expectations, and achievement needs and self-adequacy.

Profile analysis of individual scores revealed the primary group as having more unacceptable individual profile types even though statistically there was no difference between the groups (see Figure 2).

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were made by the researcher as a result of this study. Caution should be exercised in generalizing the results to other LD populations.

1. There exists little or no association between achievement needs and achievement investment for either the primary or intermediate LD group. The positive regard a student achieves from the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for learning and school performance
and his desire to shun the humiliation of failure are apparently unrelated or have little relationship in this population.

2. There exists little association between achievement investment and role expectations for either the primary or intermediate LD group. The students' awareness of the embarrassment and sanctions of failure in school and the positive acceptance of the demands that a pupil thinks others make of him appear to have little relationship in this population.

3. There exists little association between achievement investment and self-adequacy for either the primary or intermediate LD group. The students' awareness of the embarrassment and sanctions of failure in school and how the student views his or her present and future probabilities of success in school appear to have little relationship in this population.

4. A significant relationship exists between achievement needs and role expectations for both the primary and intermediate LD groups. The positive regard a student achieves from the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for learning and school performance and the positive acceptance of the demands that a pupil thinks others make of him appear to be interrelated in this population.

5. A significant relationship exists between achievement needs and self-adequacy for the intermediate group. The positive regard a
student achieves from the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for learning and school performance and how a student views his or her present and future probabilities of success in school appear to be interrelated for the intermediate group. This relationship for the primary group is not significant, however. It would appear that these factors associated with self-concept and motivation are more internalized for the intermediate population.

6. A significant relationship exists between role expectations and self-adequacy for both the primary and intermediate LD groups. The positive acceptance of the demands that a pupil thinks others make of him and how that pupil views his present and future probabilities of success in school are highly related in this population.

Statistically there is no significant difference between the primary and intermediate LD groups with respect to self-concept and motivation. Individual profile analysis, however, reveals the primary group disclosing more unacceptable profiles than the intermediate group.

It would appear then that variables other than role expectations, self-adequacy and achievement needs affect the self-concept and motivation of the LD child.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Evidence of the relationships between school self-concept and
academic motivation in the LD population is controversial and inconclusive. The results of this particular investigation disclosed no statistical difference between the primary and intermediate groups with respect to self-concept and motivation. However, individual profile analysis revealed more unacceptable individual profiles in the primary group. Therefore, how the student views his or her role as a learner in school between the primary and intermediate grades is still questionable. The researcher offers the following recommendations for further investigations.

Further investigations should be attempted to compare the primary and intermediate groups with respect to school self-concept and academic motivation. These studies should include the use of larger populations. Discriminating between boys and girls within the population would also be of interest. Likewise, discriminating between those LD students who have repeated grades and those who are non-repeaters would be of interest. A study involving the self-concept and motivation of those in self-contained compared with those LD students receiving only resource room assistance might also be helpful.

In order to determine a directional hypotheses for self-concept and motivation, one might undertake a study by individual grade level. This particular study indicated a directional profile similar to that of normal learners except that the slumps occurred in the third and
sixth grades instead of the fourth and seventh as in the normal learning population. The investigator hypothesizes that this might be due to the fact that 48% (20 of 42 children) of the population had repeated at least one grade.

Comparing self-concept and motivation ratings with some measure of achievement might also be helpful. Other affective variables should also be paired with achievement to discover why the spiraling process (continual failures yielding a poor self-concept) does not seem to occur in this LD population.

Longitudinal designs for all hypotheses would be particularly revealing.
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