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ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL INCARCERATION AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS SCHOOL AND FAMILY

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated differed on several variables as compared to African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents and those who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with only one parent.

John Marshall High School in Richmond, Virginia was the institution studied for this project. John Marshall was chosen for several reasons: the student researcher had access to this population and it was believed that a majority of the students at this institution came from homes where at least one parent was (or had been) incarcerated.

Each student was administered the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), the Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES). In addition, data from students' cumulative folders were analyzed: grade point averages, attendance data, standardized test scores, and disciplinary referrals (if any). Students also answered questions on a 14-item researcher-generated questionnaire. The questions, Likert in nature, assessed students' feelings and perceptions about their family and school environments, as well as their parent relationships.

It was hypothesized that 1) there would be a difference between academic performance, daily absenteeism rate to school, classroom behavior, and attitudes towards school of African-American high school students who have (or have had) at least one
incarcerated parent as measured by students' transcripts, standardized test data, school attendance records, and teacher-generated disciplinary referrals and 2) there would be a difference on the variables of depression, self concept, and family environment among African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent and (a) African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent as measured by the Children’s Depression Inventory, the Multidimensional Self Concept Scale, and the Family Environment Scale.

The results of the study indicate that there were no differences in students who lived with both parents, in students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with only one parent, and those who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated on the measures of depression, self concept, and family environment.

Further study is needed to determine the effects of parent incarceration on African-American school children.

WILLIE LEE STROBLE

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA
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THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL INCARCERATION AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS SCHOOL AND FAMILY
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between parental incarceration on African-American adolescent high school students' academic performance, attendance, classroom behavior, attitudes towards school, depression, self-concept, and family environment.

Need for the Study

When coming from a home where one parent is incarcerated, many adolescents have not been understood by the significant adults in their lives, especially the educators who work with them on a daily basis, year after year. Very little research has been done on the impact that the incarceration of a father has on his sons and daughters (Shaw, 1987; Carlson & Cervera, 1992). The paucity of interest shown in this subject has been in marked contrast to the efforts made on behalf of children of separated or divorcing parents.

Furthermore, there have been few studies on long-term effects of parental incarceration for children. The experience of many children while a parent is in prison has been shown to bear similarity to other kinds of domestic upheaval, and these upheavals have been shown to have very significant effects on children (Shaw, 1992). The feelings that children may have about the absence of a parent needs to be understood and they, the children, should be given opportunities to express them and to speak about what is happening (Shaw, 1992).

A father's absence from a child's life for any reason causes disruptions in psychological and social development (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). Although children of inmates have not been studied extensively or systematically, a father's incarceration has
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been linked to social, emotional, and cognitive delays in children (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). One of the earliest studies on children of inmates, conducted by Fenton, 1959, examined the well-being on these children. Fenton (1959) felt at that time that a study in this area might have lead to more elaborate research in the future on parolees.

Studies of this kind, however, have not lent themselves to a proper investigation of the children. Work carried out by other researchers to establish the proportion of delinquents coming from homes with parents who themselves have delinquent records seemed to have produced different opinions (Morris, 1965). Limited research has suggested that children have behavioral problems at home and at school and suffer from emotional distress, worry, and depression as a result of the loss of their father and other associated difficulties (Carlson & Cervera, 1992).

The most interesting data gathered to date on children of inmates, and in particular, children of African-American inmates, has come from the work done by Swan (1981). Swan asserted that African-American children of inmates were less motivated and less achievement-oriented. This idea was challenged somewhat by Ladner and Conyers (1981), who indicated that those African-American youngsters who have come from lower-and middle-class families, in general, were highly motivated and achievement-oriented. More recently, Shaw (1987) felt that the range of children affected by their father's incarceration, although predominantly from the working classes, was increasing. Both the number of men received into prisons each year and the total prison population on a given date, has continued to rise. It seemed reasonable to suggest that the number of children thus affected has risen also (Shaw, 1987).

To date, the impact of parental incarceration has not been clearly specified. This study, therefore, employed a quantitative approach to look at various indicators of its impact. In an effort to further the knowledge about this growing population in the public
schools, the affective, behavioral, cognitive, and social domains were analyzed. This investigation, therefore, contributes to the research literature by examining adolescent students' home and school lives. This examination increases counselors' awareness of the special needs of this population, a growing population in the public schools in America. In order to help this population, the time has come for extensive research into the long-term effects of parental incarceration on children (Shaw, 1987, 1992).

Specific questions which motivated this study were as follows:

1. What are the effects on African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent?

2. Are there differences between African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent and (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents, and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who do have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent?

3. What are the feelings of African-American adolescents high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent and how do these feelings about their parent's incarceration affect their academic progress, school attendance, classroom behavior, and attitude towards school and learning?

4. What compensations do African-Americans adolescent high school students make when an incarcerated parent is absent?

Theoretical Rationale

When Boyd-Franklin published Black Families in Therapy: A Multisystems Approach in 1989, her approach was considered a roadmap to treating African-American
families effectively. The multisystems approach provided a much-needed expansion of traditional family systems theory by encouraging therapists to take into consideration the ecological context of the African-American family (Aponte, 1994). Aponte (1994) identified the social ecosystem (i.e., social service agencies, community resources, extended family, nonblood kin and friends, economics, race, and skin complexion). All of these parts of the whole system represent components of the black family's ecology that must be considered in the context of the treatment process. The relationship between therapist and client and between training and treatment, however, has received so little attention in much of the clinical literature related to minority families. Boyd-Franklin (1989) admonished the reader to consider seriously the heterogeneity of the African-American family. She also reminded the reader that race is a lens through which most therapy with African-American families was viewed, regardless of one's respective race. Both black and white therapists experience difficulty with African-American families in treatment.

Harry J. Aponte's perspective on working with minority families will also be used in this study. Aponte (1994) insisted that the poorest Americans have too often lost much of their original culture, and consequently, the spiritual sense of meaning that went along with it. Aponte has written that deprivation of poor families is at its core a poverty of despair. This is a poverty that robs people of their souls--of meaning, purpose, and hope (p. 1). However, Aponte views therapy as being either a friend or an enemy to the spirit. Thus, he chooses to bring the search for meaning and hope into the therapy session explicitly, rather than to leave that part of the patient's life outside the door, as he has seen is typically the case.

In working with minority families, Aponte detected more children are living without both parents. One-fourth of all children now live with a single parent. Secondly,
he asserted that children from fragmented families are more likely to suffer emotional or behavioral problems than those who live with their own parents. Thirdly, about one-third of all children today live apart from their fathers. Father absence is an important predictor of problems such as juvenile crime, poor school performance, and adolescent pregnancy (Amato, 1991; Fenton, 1959).

Children learn very early about the instability of relationships (Aponte, 1994). As families continue to break up, reports continue to appear to suggest that suicide, alcoholism, marijuana abuse, and domestic violence are on the rise. As the community becomes undone, so do families and individuals. Social values and structures may break down. The men, in particular, may lose their status and role. The women may not depend upon them and may have to rely on themselves. If the partnership withers, the children lose the closeness, safety, and direction they once had. Thus, a new poverty develops, with its own culture of despair, self-devaluation, and rage.

As this researcher has seen, one of the important causes of disruption in African-American families is the incarceration of the father. As the incarceration rate continues to increase in the general populous, not just locally but nationally, counselors in the public schools in America will be faced with the monumental task of providing services to children of inmates. In order to provide services to these children, counselors must understand the nature of the problem. Therefore, the works of Boyd-Franklin and Aponte indicate that incarceration in African-American families has a disruptive effect on the family and life of adolescents.

**Definition of Terms**

**Boundary:** Boundary is defined as telling who is included and excluded from the activity in question, and what each person's role is in the operation.
**Ecostructural Concept:** Ecostructural concept is defined as not being able to treat poor and minority families without understanding their social and economic contexts.

**Family Reconstruction:** Family reconstruction is defined as using a group experience to simulate a family of origin. Through this technique, family members in therapy can sort out old learning and provide a process for creating new pictures.

**Parental Incarceration:** Parental incarceration is defined as presently having a male and/or a female parent incarcerated or having had a male and/or female parent incarcerated previously.

**Reframing:** Reframing is defined as changing negatives into positives.

**Social Ecosystem:** Social ecosystem is defined as the social network that exists between an individual, his family, and his community that is reflected in one's personal living (Aponte, 1994). This framework for the treatment of the poor expands structural family therapy (Minuchin, 1974) and takes into account the present issue, the ecosystemic context of the issue for the client, and both immediate and long-term goals.

**Underorganized Family:** Underorganized family is defined as a family that is not fully developed. Their structures have not achieved constancy, differentiation, and flexibility.

**Research Hypotheses**

This study focused on the academic performance, school attendance, classroom behaviors, attitudes towards school, family structure and needs of the family of African-American adolescent high school students. Additionally, an analysis of whether there is a difference across these characteristics in adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent and (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents, and (b) African-American adolescent high
school students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent.

The following hypotheses were explored:

1. African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent will exhibit poorer academic performance, a higher daily absenteeism rate to school, negative classroom behaviors, and negative attitudes towards school as measured by students' transcripts, standardized test data, school attendance records, and teacher-generated disciplinary referrals.

2. African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent will differ from (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents, and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent on the variable of depression as measured by the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI).

3. African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent will differ from (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents, and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent on the variable of self-concept as measured by the Bracken's Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (MSCS).

4. Families of incarcerated African-American adolescent high school students will compensate for the absence of the parent by the assumption of parental roles by the children as measured by the Family Environment Scale (FES).
Sample Description & Data Gathering Procedure

The sample for this study was 15 African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents, 15 African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent, and 15 African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent.

Participation was voluntary and subjects were asked to complete three research instruments: the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), the Bracken's Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (MSCS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES).

Limitations of Study

This research was limited by:

1. Use of subjects from a single institution. Therefore, the generalizability of the results to students from other institutions is restricted.

2. Experimental mortality (the loss of subjects during the course of the study). Originally, there were 20 students in each of the three groups. However, as is true in the African-American population today, the dropout rate is high, and since this researcher was working with a population who often comes to school late or not at all, subjects initially chosen to participate in the study were dropped because they, themselves, had stopped coming to school for various reasons or had just not been available to complete the administration of the instruments. This was a concern of the researcher and decreased the strength of the results.
Plan for the Study

Chapter Two of this study reviews the literature related to African-American families, the dynamics which occur in them, the depression, anger, stress, and self-esteem levels of adolescents who come from these families and the impact of incarceration. Chapter Three explains the plan for the study and includes population, design, instrumentation, and methodology. Chapter Four summarizes the results of the data analysis of the Questionnaire, the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), the Bracken's Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (MSCS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES). Chapter Five presents the conclusions, implications and recommendations for further research. An Appendix follows the References.
CHAPTER TWO
A SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapter, it was established that there has not been a significant amount of research generated in recent years on African-American families and the effects of parental incarceration on the families. Virginia Satir's Humanistic Theory and Harry Aponte's conceptual frameworks for looking at and working with poor families, especially African-American families, were presented as models for understanding the dynamics occurring in the African-American family with an incarcerated parent. Counselors and social workers, everyone working with families, need to keep in mind that life is complex and diverse, and therefore solutions have to be complex and diverse. "Ain't no one solution for all problems" (Arnold & Allen, 1995).

Every year in this country, the parents of thousands of children are sent to prison, for terms ranging from a few days to life. It is surprising that with such a large and increasing number of children affected in this way, very little research has been done to study the impact of parental incarceration on children (Shaw, 1987; Carlson & Cervera, 1992). The paucity of interest shown in this subject is in marked contrast to the efforts being made on behalf of children of separated or divorced parents.

Furthermore, there has been a lack of good empirical studies on the long-term effects of parental incarceration for children. This experience, for many children, bears some similarity to other kinds of domestic upheaval which have been shown to have very significant effects for children (Shaw, 1992). The feelings that children have about the absence of a parent need to be understood and the children should be given opportunities to express them and to speak about what is happening (Shaw, 1992).

Shaw (1987) stated that the children of incarcerated parents could be identified at
the bottom of the "pecking order", as one of the most deprived, if not the most deprived, group in our society. A parent's absence from a child's life for any reason has been shown to cause disruptions in psychological and social development (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). Although children of inmates have not been studied extensively or systematically, a parent's incarceration has been linked to social, emotional, and cognitive delays in children (Carlson & Cervera, 1992).

One of the earliest studies on children of inmates examined the well-being of the children of inmates. Fenton (1959) believed that a study in this area might have lead to more elaborate research in the future to evaluate the social and psychological status of the children of prison inmates and parolees. Thus, this chapter will present the current research on African-American families, African-American families with single parents, African-American families with an incarcerated parent, humanistic and restructuring theories as presented by Virginia Satir and Harry J. Aponte, and research on depression, self-esteem, and the family environment.

African-American Families with Incarcerated Parents

The problems that children of African-American prisoners face (along with African-American children of any prisoner) are those of any child with an imprisoned parent. However, it is important to recognize that there are issues of particular relevance to this group of children, and special needs thus occur (Shaw, 1992). All African-American people in the broader society are caught up in the complexity of institutionalized power relationships. These are designed to insulate and protect existing power structures which reinforce inequality at every level. These inequalities extend across race, gender, and class (Shaw, 1992). Thus, given our societal structures and priorities, it would seem that African-American children of prisoners are in a no-win situation. It is extremely important to note that such children are not special cases but are part of a purposely oppressed section of society, within social power networks (Shaw, 1992).
Brodsky (1975) felt that two or three years of a child's life are enormously important in terms of personality development. There is no way in the world that a parent in prison can relate to that growing child's emotional and physical needs. The research on children relationships with their incarcerated parents yields mixed results. The research, however, has clearly shown that children of incarcerated parents do seem to suffer negative consequences (Brodsky, 1975). So great are the numbers of affected children that it would be unlikely that many experienced teachers, health visitors, school and community nurses—especially in inner city areas—have not encountered the problem (Shaw, 1987). This study, therefore, was designed to investigate this phenomenon.

**Virginia Satir and Humanistic and Restructuring Theories**

**Background:** Virginia Satir is often credited with providing so much to the field, much of which is very applicable to working with African-American youths and their families. Humanistic in her approach to working with families, Satir's emphasis is on growth and her assumption is that humans are innately capable of growth. Satir firmly believes that people's perceptions of themselves are absolutely unrelated to the way they really are. Thus, people are guided by what they perceive, not by reality (Satir, 1980).

Satir has coined many terms we use when working with families today. One in particular that appears to have great promise for African-American children and their families is **reframing**; another is **family reconstruction**. **Reframing**, as defined by Satir, involves changing negatives into positives. Satir gives the following example of how reframing works: With an angry, frustrated father whose 13-year-old son will not clean up his room no matter what kind of threats the father makes, she would probably note that the son has much courage and strength of character to stand his ground so firmly. It would also seem significant for the father to realize he has a teenage son who can say "No, I will not do that" even when the pressure to give in is great. Thus, the father might view the whole situation differently, especially if the son seems to get such favorable attributes from
his father. The son's sense of value as a human being rises along with the father's. From this beginning, the possibility of cooperation and change increases.

Satir employs a variety of communication and interaction techniques to orchestrate congruent, sensory-based communication experiences with the families she sees (Woods & Martin, 1984). Between 1964 and 1968, Virginia Satir also developed a group process call family reconstruction. She had noticed that adolescents and adults in therapy did not always have access to the families in which they were born, even though family therapy was often the treatment of choice. When the family of origin was available, there was a wealth of information stored in the extended family that all too often was expressed in cryptic and distorted ways. Satir knew that a therapeutic group could be used to substitute for a person's actual family. Just as peer groups alternatives to family experience are useful, a group experience simulating a family of origin could be a place to sort out old learning and to provide a process for creating new pictures (Satir, Bitter, & Krestensen, 1988).

Satir's premise was that the incarceration of a parent changes the family dynamics. Oftentimes, the children's perceptions of themselves, their needs, and expectations are distorted. Thus, it is imperative for mental health professionals who work with this population to be cognizant of the special needs of this population and to be ready to help with reframing and reconstructing situations that seem impossible for them.

**African-American Families:** Shifting the focus from Satir's family reconstruction concept, one clearly sees how humanistic and restructuring theories apply to African-American families. Savage, Adair, Friedman (1978) have stated that the assumption that single-parent families inherently breed pathological conditions which have negative effects on children has been challenged empirically and conceptually. Much of the controversy regarding single-parent families centers around faulty or questionable conceptualizations and methodological issues in the research. Since the African-American single-parent
family phenomenon is a relevant issue to the African-American community, it is imperative that studies be conducted by African-American researchers who are more likely to be closer to the African-American experience (Savage et al, 1978). Staples (1974a) also states, "the control of African-American family studies is now in the hands of those whose destiny is affected by the nature of what we choose to investigate and the problems that seek solutions." Models of behavior that deal with white families, including theories and models of child development, can be misleading when considering African-American single-parent families. By having similar cultural experiences, African-American researchers may be more aware of some salient factors that affect African-Americans within their everyday environment (Savage et al., 1978).

While Satir's early works did not specifically deal with African-American families and while this study will not deal with therapeutic techniques, implications for mental health workers are apparent, and the data gathered supports future work with this population from a therapeutic standpoint. In the study of Satir's work, several therapeutic goals are discussed. One goal is to assist individual members of the family in clarifying what they want or hope for themselves and their family. It is at this point that Satir wishes to determine how it is, right now, for the members of the family. What is the family style? Who plays which roles? Is there a blamer, a placater, a super-reasonable type, or an irrelevant distractor? In general, individuals move toward a present-time focus. How do you feel in times like these? How do you feel right now? Experiences are occurring. Process is beginning. Humanistic and restructuring approaches, as has been demonstrated through the works of Virginia Satir, work best with African-American adolescents who come from homes where a parent is incarcerated.

**Harry J. Aponte's Conceptual Framework**

**Background:** In many families, the structure of the family must be modified to compensate for the loss of a significant individual. The responsibilities of individual family
members frequently change or increase. Incarcerated parents are far more dependent on their families than they were before they were imprisoned. They are dependent on their families for money, clothing, and other personal articles, such as toiletries. In addition, incarcerated African-American parents are not able to exercise as much influence within their families as they did prior to incarceration. This situation further illuminates their dependent and "fallen" status within their families. This experience is particularly difficult for African-American men because many already have had difficulty fulfilling the roles of breadwinner and head of the household.

Researchers have argued that the inability to cope with this role strain causes many African-American men to withdraw from family responsibilities and committed relationships and to engage in risky behaviors such as criminal activity (King, 1933). Thus, there is a trend by politicians to lengthen the time criminals are incarcerated. Longer incarceration equates to longer separation of parents from their offspring. This separation has been shown to have an adverse effect on the children who come from this family type.

Aponte believed that spirituality is and always has been a source of strength for African-Americans during adversity (Bennett, 1970; Huggins, 1990, Lester, 1968; Mellon, 1988). Mental health professionals need to build family-support groups on this indigenous cultural characteristic in order to enhance the effectiveness of their helping efforts. This can be accomplished, in part, by allowing group participants to express their spirituality and concerns during sessions. Opening and closing group sessions with inspirational music or songs, prayers, and poems can be used to tap into African-Americans' spirituality and concerns during sessions. While this study is not one of therapeutic techniques, the techniques of Aponte and others are very useful in understanding the African-American family and its children.

Aponte's studies of children of incarcerated parents yielded very interesting data on the needs of this growing and diverse population. For example, the data show that
culturally appropriate family-support groups are needed for children of incarcerated parents. The needs of children of incarcerated parents are often neglected, particularly if the father, for instance, did not live with the child before he was imprisoned.

Several studies have viewed the support systems as a major source of strength to the single parent, whereas others have indicated that not all social ties provide support, especially among low-income mothers. Aponte, in his works, talked about the **ecostructural** concept. This concept postulates that one cannot treat poor and minority families without understanding their social and economic contexts. As mental health professionals, one must look at the broad picture and not look at individual situations in isolation of the myriad of systems that come into play and affect the kind of responses one gets from this complicated and often misunderstood population, the children of incarcerated parents. Aponte (1994) admonishes mental health professionals to not make assumptions. For example, one never assumes that with low-income female-headed families, an extended kinship network necessarily operates as a support system (Lindblad-Goldberg & Dukes, 1985).

**African-American Families:** African-American males traditionally maintain contact with their children, even when they are no longer romantically involved with the child's mother. Thus, the child and his relationship with the incarcerated father suffers when the father is imprisoned. Aponte (1994) asserted that more children are living without both parents. They learn early about the instability of relationships. This seems to be an appropriate place to begin a discussion on the subject of the importance of the parental role in the rearing of children.

Families are breaking up, according to Aponte. He believed that reports of suicide, alcoholism, marijuana abuse, and domestic violence are increasing. As the community becomes undone, so do families and individuals. Social values and structures break down. The men, in particular, are losing their status and roles. Adrift, they begin to
get into trouble. The women cannot depend upon them and have to rely on themselves. The partnership withers. The children lose the closeness, safety, and direction they had. They begin to wander off and get into trouble too. A new poverty develops, with its own culture of despair, self-devaluation, and rage (p. 3).

The challenge then, according to Aponte, is before us as mental health professionals. The question Aponte asks is, "Can we make a difference?" Aponte asserted that mental health professionals must, for according to an article in Business Week (1990), some very serious statistics were presented. One-fourth of all children now live with a single parent. One child in four is born out of wedlock. More than half of all children living in single, female-headed households are poor. About one-third of all children today live apart from their fathers. The numbers reflect the trend and are increasing.

Furthermore, children from fragmented families are more likely to suffer emotional or behavioral problems than those who live with their own parents. This was according to a 1993 National Commission on America's Urban Families report. This report went on to say that father absence is an important predictor of problems such as juvenile crime, poor school performance, and adolescent pregnancy. The sad reality is that the outcome of this scenario is grim unless corrective actions are taken.

Aponte called this new population "the new poor." Their emotional and relationship problems require understanding within their socioeconomic and political contexts. African-American parents cannot insulate themselves or their families from society's ills, nor can they buy their children private schooling when their public school fails. They cannot buy into upscale neighborhoods when their housing projects become too dangerous (Aponte, 1994, p. 8).

Finding a cure for America's poor may also lie with the rest of society. Based upon Aponte's work with the poor (and he, too, hesitated to refer to all African-Americans as poor because many of them do not meet his criteria for the label of "poor"), he outlined
several assumptions:

1. The poor needs to feel control over their own lives.

2. The poor needs to work not only to solve problems but also to reach for purpose in life.

3. Solving personal emotional and relationship problems among the new poor calls for mobilizing the full bread and spirit resources of their ecosystems (the individual, his or her family, and the community), a concept that has been described previously. There is a soul in each client that calls for nourishment, support, and yes, even challenge (Aponte, 1994).

Aponte, coined the phrase “underorganized family.” This family type is characterized as being not fully developed. Their structures have not achieved the constancy, differentiation, and flexibility they need to meet the demands of life (p. 17). Thus, where the new poor's "bread and spirit" have been adversely tampered with, as with the underorganized family, serious problems exist.

In working with a family that is underorganized, Aponte introduced concepts of alignment, force, and boundary, all terms Minuchin talks about in his system of family therapy. Of particular importance to this study was the term **boundary**. Boundary tells who is included and excluded from the activity in question, and what each person's role is in the operation (p. 18). Boundary plays an important role in families especially single-parent and single-parent due to incarceration families when roles within the family must be redefined. In a family that is underorganized, alignments, force, and boundaries may be unreliable, poorly defined, limited, or rigid to varying degrees (Aponte, 1994).

The poor and minority client cannot be treated without first understanding his or her social and economic contexts. To accomplish this, an assessment is necessary. An assessment helps the therapist understand the past in the context of today's need. In this way, he is able to address the present needs and ultimately speak to how to help today. It is, therefore, for this reason that this study was designed.
"No man is an island." In one of Aponte's studies, he looked at a child's behavior in school. Aponte postulated that a boy, having trouble in school, is not having trouble alone. A child's behavior is caused by many factors. Some are "inside" the child; some are "outside" of him. The child's parents, his siblings, his family socioeconomic status, his house, his school (teachers, peers, and curriculum), his neighborhood, his neighborhood peer group, and the hue of his skin, television, and others are all factors that must be considered.

When we look at the family, we typically view the family not only as a collection of complex personalities, but also in its own right as a living organization with rules and dynamics (Aponte, 1994). Family members define who is and who is not a member of the family. Outsiders reciprocate with their fences. There are boundaries within the family itself, delineating groupings related to roles within the family. Family members align with and against one another according to the issue or task the family faces at any particular moment. Some family members will exercise more power than others at home. The family, thus, structures relationships among its members. Moreover, the family has its own culture and values, which give meaning to their relationships (Aponte, 1994).

The therapist who works with individuals and families members from the African-American culture has to deal with family and much more beyond the economic deprivation. Clients present themselves with emotional struggles intertwined with a lot of anger, low self-esteem, and suspiciousness. It takes a special kind of temperament to work with these families. Some therapists will never meet success with this population because of, for example, his ethnic or racial backgrounds. But special training is required, a point that Aponte makes in his book, Bread and Spirit: Therapy with the New Poor.

Summary: Work with low-income families by its very nature calls for a more active approach. Therapists put more of themselves into the work to repair the effects of social deprivation and damage to the psyche and the family. Therapists state opinions, give
advice, and become activists with both families and community. And so, value biases are ever present and are all aspects of therapy. The question is not one of whether the therapist's values will come face to face with the family's values in the midst of a therapy session, but how.

Poor, minority groups need successful community ecosystems that include family, friends, schools, social agencies, hospitals, and even the church. They need solidarity of their race and culture to establish and maintain identity and self-esteem. Virginia Satir and others have offered mental health professionals tools that they could share and use in their work with minority youths and their families, but first, these professionals must understand the ecosystem and the dynamics occurring therein.

Counselors do not supply a family's spirit. However, they can participate in it, and perhaps even rekindle new energy and determination if counselors join their own spirit to their clients. Work with African-American children and their families calls for counselors to recognize the family's spirit, draw it out, and fly with it. It is our own spirit that allows us to see and speak to a family's spirit (Aponte, 1994). Our openness to their spirit will allow them to pursue further meaning and purpose in their work with us. Aponte (1994) finally makes a powerful statement. If therapists are to be effective with minority youths and their families, they must work from the perspective of the entire social system, the ecostructural system. By focusing on the present reality with the client, including all aspects of the client's ecostructural system, assessing the needs of the client, agreeing upon achievable goals—only then will change come about. Therapists must constantly remind the client that he always has choices that will make a vital difference in his life (Aponte, 1994). Our work is whole when the practical touches the transcendent, and the bread joins the spirit (p. 247).

The preceding review of the literature attempted to establish the capacity of Humanistic and Restructuring theories, as articulated by Virginia Satir and Harry J. Aponte, for looking at and working with African-American families. Assessing the needs
of children from families with incarcerated parents is the first step in a series of steps to intervene. The process one utilizes is of the utmost importance. Thus, this study was one of "assessment," an indept assessment of components of the adolescent's ecostructural system. The data offers new approaches for therapists who work with African-American families, incarcerated parents, and their children.

Research on African-American Families

Introduction

To understand the strengths of African-American families, one must look at various traits and characteristics of these families that facilitate the needs of their members and the demands made on them by systems outside the family. First, one must be sensitive to the role that religion and spirituality play in the lives of many African-American people. This system of core beliefs is the foundation of the inner strength of the person (Littlejohn-Blake & Darling, 1993).

Secondly, one must be sensitive to the willingness of families to absorb others into the household or kin-structured networks. The close relationships among individual members of a family provide the economic and moral support that assists in day-to-day living as well as in times of crisis. The cultural nature of African-American families seems to account for the willingness of families to call on relatives for help and to maintain a sense of reciprocity. Aponte (1994) extends this concept when he talks about the family's ecostructural system—a system consisting of the individual, family, friends, and the social network (i.e., public institutions and economic infrastructures) with which one must interact.

Children of middle-income African-American families are likely to mature at about the same age as their Euro-American counterparts, but children from low-income African-American families usually mature earlier because of the age at which they are required to assume major family responsibilities (Littlejohn-Blake & Darling, 1993). This is a third
characteristic—strength—of African-American families that one who works with them must understand.

Finally, there is a strong sense of self, an important characteristic in the African-American family. Building positive self-esteem, along with the development of ethnic awareness, is continually emphasized within the cultural context. Strong African-American families have consistently demonstrated that they have what it takes to get what they want. As Littlejohn-Blake & Darling (1993) stated, this basic having what it takes, not the material having, translates into empowerment and a strong sense of self. At the same time, strong African-American families tend to embrace their heritage and show a sense of pride in themselves.

Current Status: Unfortunately, there was minimal research on African-American families and especially African-American family strengths. From 1980 to 1990, only 114 or 17% of the articles appearing in the *Journal of Marriage and the Family* (JMF) included or were about African-American families (Demos, 1990). The research articles revealed several methodological features of African-American family studies that are associated with and indirectly reinforce a distorted image of African-Americans. Demos (1990) further asserted that, for example, only 15% of the empirical articles on African-American families involved the analysis of data collected from African-Americans entirely. Of the articles appearing in JMF from 1939 to 1990, only 2% of the articles used data that was collected solely from African-American respondents.

During the last decade, however, several researchers have become more interested in accentuating the positive aspects of African-American family life and in using the strengths of families or their potential for helping to solve some of the problems that families incur. Much work is still needed in this area, for it is important to recognize that all cultures have strengths (Littlejohn-Blake & Darling, 1993).

The study of African-American family strengths is important for researchers,
theorists, counselors, and educators. Individuals interested in understanding and enhancing the ethnic identity of African-Americans should become more aware of the strengths of African-American families as a crucial element in working with them. By understanding and enhancing the ethnic identity of African-Americans and increasing the awareness of their strengths, African-American families will be more capable of meeting the challenges of a changing society (Littlejohn-Black & Darling, 1993).

Historically, previous studies of African-Americans have been often biased toward traditional Western family norms and values. African-American families have been compared against white Anglo-Saxon norms. Very little attention has been devoted to looking at the African-American family, the father, and his role as a provider. The lack of economic resources—the resources needed to adequately provide for his children—causes fathers to retreat and to appear uninvolved or disinterested in the welfare of his children. Out of shame and guilt over not being able to provide financially for his family, the African-American male parent feels that he has no role in the family (Wade, 1994).

More recently, studies demonstrate that African-American fathers are generally concerned about being a "good" father and taking responsibility for and interest in the lives of their children and that an adequate and secure economic status facilitates the fathering role (McAdoo, 1986; Wade, 1994). When there is a breakdown in the two-parent family structure, one begins to see many interesting phenomena occurring. Primarily, dysfunctional families show evidence of greater stress (Lindblad-Goldberg, Dukes, & Phil, 1985; Lindblad-Goldberg, Dukes, Phil, & Lasley, 1988).

Today, there is a shift. More families are being run by single-parents. Between 1970 and 1980, within the black population, the percentages of female heads of families increased from 31% to 45%. More than half (51%) of these families exists on incomes below 1977 poverty level statistic of $6,191. Thus, African-American, low-income, single-parent families are an increasing phenomenon in American society (Lindblad-Goldberg, Dukes, & Phil, 1985).
Research on African-American Families with Single Parents

Introduction

Savage, Adair & Friedman (1978) stated that the assumption that single-parent families inherently breed pathological conditions which have negative effects on children has been challenged empirically and conceptually. Much of the controversy regarding single-parent families centers around faulty or questionable conceptualizations and methodological issues in the research. Since the African-American, single-parent family phenomenon is a relevant issue to the African-American community, it has previously been suggested that it is imperative that studies be conducted by African-American researchers who are more likely to be closer to the African-American experience (Savage et. al., 1978).

Staples (1974a) states, "the control of African-American family studies is now in the hands of those whose destiny is affected by the nature of what we choose to investigate and the problems that seek solutions." Models of behavior that deal with Caucasian families, including theories and models of child development, are misleading when considering African-American, single-parent families. Having similar cultural experiences, African-American researchers are more aware of some salient factors that affect African-Americans within their everyday environment (Savage et al., 1978).

Several factors have lent support for the need to study the African-American, single-parent families: (a) trends in Census data suggest an increase among African-American, single-parent families; (b) research results are inconsistent and controversial with reference to how African-American children are affected when reared in single-parent families, and (c) most studies have failed to consider the effects of relevant intervening variables such as socioeconomic status, race, community attitudes and support of African-American, single-parent families. Consequently, there is a definite need to help others understand the strengths of African-American families (Littlejohn-Blake & Darling, 1993).
Whatever the cause, there is a school of thought that has promoted the idea that single-parent families inherently breed pathological conditions which have negative effects on children as a result of the parent being absent or uninvolved with his children. This school of thought has been (and continues to be) challenged in the scientific community (Savage, Adair, & Friedman, 1978).

In the past, several studies have attempted to present the view that African-American parents' absence or uninvolvement with their children has pathological consequences on the children's development. The literature further suggested that males in father-absent homes have problems with sex-role and gender identification, school performance, psychosocial development and adjustment, and controlling aggression (Wade, 1994). While the ideas of some researchers have some validity to them, in reality, the portrayals are not representative of African-American families in general.

The Moynihan Report was written to expose two main premises/arguments: (1) a substantial minority of African-American children grow up in fatherless families; and (2) this, in itself, is sufficient to account for the poor school records and high rate of delinquency among young African-Americans (Swan, 1981). These interrelated points can logically be dismissed by suggesting that the mere absence or presence of the father has no real significance since children defined as juvenile delinquents also come from homes—black and white—where the father is present, and other children living in homes where a parent is absent show no sign of juvenile delinquency.

Moynihan, however, did not present any convincing evidence to substantiate his thesis that African-American delinquency was the result of family instability. Even when he presented data to show that African-American children who lived in fatherless homes did poorly in school, Moynihan neglected to show that white children living in such homes did equally poorly. After presenting quantitative data to support the contention that African-American families are more likely than white ones to be headed by women, Moynihan asserted that this situation, however, did create an unstable family situation
Research on African-American Families with Incarcerated Parents

Introduction

While researchers continue to study the strengths of the African-American family, there is a growing concern in the field over the rise in the number of single-parent homes, especially children of incarcerated parents, and how mental health professionals can best work with them. Very little literature exists on the effects of incarceration in this regard (Sack, Seidler, & Thomas, 1976). The literature also shows that children with fathers in jail are often subject to peer teasing. The social stigma associated with having a parent or significant adult male incarcerated exacerbates the emotional difficulties that children experience (King, 1993).

Dependent children also experience intense feelings of sadness and depression as a result of the male parent's incarceration. At least one clinical study found that the psychosocial development of children, particularly boys, is adversely affected when the father or male caregiver is imprisoned (Sack, 1977). The anxieties male children experience has also been found to create conflicts in the mother-son relationship.

The proportion of the population who go to prison at some time in their lives is not known. When it is established, it may well turn out to be surprisingly high. Similarly, the number of children who experience their parent being sent to prison at some stage during their childhood—say birth to sixteen—is also unknown but half a million would appear to be the lowest likely number. It could be considerably greater (Shaw, 1987).

There is great variation in the way in which children cope with the fact that their parent is incarcerated. For some, it is a normal occurrence and for a few a relief; for others, it can be very traumatic (Shaw, 1987). It can be seen that there is no typical case, no common set of circumstances which prevail when a parent goes away. Every family is different and these differences are amplified by personal idiosyncrasies, but the availability...
of otherwise support from friends and family and by social class is very important. At one end of the class continuum is the child from a high crime area where incarceration of a parent is a common occurrence amongst peers, and at the other end, is the middle-class child of a previous happy experience where the parent's incarceration attacks status, career prospects, self-image and loving attention (Shaw, 1987).

**Academic Performance and School Attendance**

The majority of the data gathered to this point on children of inmates, and in particular, children of African-American inmates has come from research conducted by Swan, 1981. Swan (1981) asserted that African-American children are less motivated and less achievement-oriented, an idea that has repeatedly been challenged by Ladner and Conyers, both of whom indicated that African-American children who come from lower- and middle-class families are highly motivated and achievement-oriented. However, Kohn and Ladner suggested that these families have different ways of achieving their goals, that goals are connected to the availability of resources.

Children from homes where one parent is incarcerated have been reported to have some problems in school, usually a temporary drop in grades or instances of aggressiveness (Sack et. al., 1976). The children of incarcerated men are particularly vulnerable to emotional and psychological problems during the parent's absence. Children whose parents are incarcerated frequently feel abandoned, which often leads to problems such as difficulty sleeping, eating, and completing schoolwork. These children are at risk for acting out in school, including picking fights with other children (King, 1993).

Fishman (1990) wrote that, in one of her studies of prisoners' wives, all wives claimed that involuntary separation had adverse effects on their children. Many reported that children went through periods of insomnia, nightmares, and bedwetting. Others reported that children experienced a loss of appetite—or overeating—temporary withdrawal, fretting, clinging, etc. About half of the children who attended school had
problems: temporary falls in grades, truancy, or dropping out of school. One child, whose father had been home for fourteen months out of her seven years, became suicidal (Fishman, 1990).

Friedman and Esselstyn, more than twenty years ago, observed, "There is more than suggestive evidence here that committing a parent to jail is soon accompanied by a depression in the school performance of the children—not only academically, but in all other areas as well. It was now time to explore the link between parental incarceration and the education of young children.

Studies on the relationship between delinquency and parental incarceration revealed an interesting phenomenon. One study suggested that some children had started truanting since their parent went into prison, and a few did so both before and since. However, a few of the children who used to be truant, no longer did so. In this particular study, however, it was not suggested that their stopping was connected with the parent's incarceration (Morris, 1965).

**Classroom Behavior**

Limited research has also suggested that children of incarcerated parents have behavioral problems at home and at school and suffer from emotional distress, worry, and depression as a result of the loss of their parent (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). There are also other associated difficulties. Furthermore, studies relating the impact of incarceration to family relationships are virtually nonexistent, considering the voluminous research on prisons and prisoners (Burstein, 1977; Shaw, 1987).

Research has further suggested that there is a great variation in the way in which children cope with the fact that their parent is incarcerated. For some, it is a normal occurrence and for a few a relief; for others, it can be traumatic (Shaw, 1987; Carlson & Cervera, 1992). Instances have been described where youngsters became hysterical, depressive or delinquent. Shaw (1986) described children running away from home when
their parent was locked up or becoming truant persistently from school. Other children displayed disturbed behavior, began to mix with delinquent groups, and became involved in crime for the first time (Shaw, 1992).

In Burstein's study (1977) on prisoners' children, an interesting comment was made coming from one of the study's inmates with reference to his son: "He heard I was part of a gang, so he started one at school. He says he wants to stay here with me, and be like me. He saw me arrested on the front lawn and cursed officers, saying, "They're keeping you away from me. I hate them!"

Carlson & Cervera (1992) stated that wives of prisoners often report that their children became more of a problem during incarceration than prior to it. There may be an increase in antisocial behavior and aggressiveness during the prison term. Boys and girls may also become truant from school and disobedient at home. Some studies have even suggested that the sudden increase in belligerent behavior occurs within two months of the father's incarceration. Other findings have indicated that disobedient behavior is exacerbated for pubescent or early adolescent boys. Girls may fare even worse than boys by becoming sexually precocious or pregnant (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). It is not uncommon for children to blame their mothers for the incarceration or the problems associated with it.

Further, research has shown that there are factors associated with the extent of children's acting-out behavior: the quality of the relationship with their incarcerated parent, the quality of the mother-child/father-child relationship, overidentification with their father's or mother's criminal behavior, and the guilt feelings of being responsible for their parent's incarceration (Carlson & Cervera, 1992).

Morris (1965) asserted that in one family studied, an eight-year-old boy became very difficult to control, when, after six months, he discovered the whereabouts of his father. On being found by a friendly policeman tampering with car locks, he declared his intention of joining his father in prison. The Morris study, referred to in Swan (1981) and
in Shaw (1987) also looked at the management of children, children's behavior, and the children's relationship with their parent in prison. Interestingly, Swan's research was undertaken because so few studies had been done on the families of African-American prisoners. Over the last quarter of a century, however, a number of studies, conducted in various parts of the world, have increased our knowledge about prisoners and their families (Swan, 1981; Shaw, 1987).

There was evidence that most of the children who showed frequent signs of disturbed behavior missed their incarcerated parent a great deal and talked about him/her a lot (Morris, 1965). A fair number (9 percent) fret inwardly and indicated that they missed the incarcerated parent, but were reluctant to talk about him/her. One study recounted the story of a boy who had become actively delinquent during his father's absence. He showed other signs of disturbed behavior such as enuresis and aggressive attacks on other children as well as on family members and pets (Morris, 1965). Physical neglect or cruelty to children was found to be very rare among families with an incarcerated father, but ignorance or denial of possible emotional difficulties was almost universal (Morris, 1965).

Children from poorer families are more likely to offend because they are less able to achieve their goals legally and because they value some goals (e.g. excitement) highly. Children who are exposed to poor parental child-rearing behavior, disharmony or separation are likely to offend because they do not build up internal controls over socially disapproved behavior, while children from criminal families and those with delinquent friends tend to build up anti-establishment attitudes and the belief that offending is justifiable. The whole process is self-perpetuating.

Glueck's early studies also suggested a strong correlation between parental loss and children's antisocial behavior. Savage et al. (1978) reported in one of their studies on incarcerated parents that the children of these parents were reported as having more difficulty getting along with teachers than did other children. This finding has important implications for teachers and school psychologists who must work with these children.
Early studies on the management of disturbed behavior among children, particularly those of recidivists, has shown that the behavior displayed appear to be a very considerable practical problem, although most children in many of these studies were too young to be officially termed delinquent. Thus, Morris and his colleagues regarded this as one of the most striking findings of the research and one meriting further systematic investigation.

Finally, teachers and other mental health workers reported having seen evidence of bed wetting, lack of concentration, and deep-seated unhappiness (Shaw, 1992). Behavioral problems such as disobedience and aggressiveness, alienation from peers, and somatic complaints, such as sleeping difficulty, are apparent (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). Other children have been described as engaging in systematic "hate campaigns" to all who have come near.

Summary

Teachers have considerable experience with children of incarcerated parents because of the role of the school; others have none. Perhaps the most important thing teachers and other educators can do for an unhappy child is to offer time—time to talk and time which gives permission to talk. Sadly, when this is most needed, it is a scarce commodity because of the clustering effect of problems in the most deprived districts (Shaw, 1987). Many of the educators, however, do not take it upon themselves to spend time with children who need it and there is increasing recognition of the role of the educator in respect of family problems. Quite often, though, the school plays a passive role and does nothing in this respect unless the child actually asks for help. Several teachers justified this on the grounds that a child is entitled to privacy and should not be questioned (Shaw, 1987).

Inasmuch as these families represent a vital segment of American society, their handicaps reflect a trend that would imply an urgent need for relevant and effective social
services to help them achieve and maintain their stability during at least the initial years of adjustment and difficulty. Children need access to family and personal counseling services in order to express their feelings about having a parent incarcerated and to learn how to cope with feelings of anger and sadness (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). Provision for special attention to children at the time of their parent's incarceration should be part of general social service practice everywhere. It should be well-planned, effective and part of standard operating procedures. It should not be left to chance or the unusual incident (Shaw, 1987).

Conducting research on an incarcerated population is difficult. Among other problems, there are few incentives that can be offered for participation (Carlson & Cervera, 1992). However, Carlson & Cervera (1992) offer the following specific hypothesis for future research on inmate family relationships: Children who have closer relationships with their parents prior to incarceration exhibit fewer problems during the parent's incarceration.

Surely, all children have a right of access to education, to physical, intellectual, and social development and to the acquisition of the skills on which life-chance depends. They can be given that right only if first, we adults, especially the educators who meet them daily, recognize who they are, where they are, and try to understand what impinges on their lives and shapes their outlook (Shaw, 1992). The incarceration of one's parent adversely affects children's development in many areas (Shaw, 1992).

**Children's Depression Inventory**

**Overview:** The literature consistently describes depression as a disorder characterized by feelings of worthlessness, guilt, sadness, hopelessness, and hopelessness. It is accompanied by a variety of related symptoms, including disturbances in sleep and eating, loss of initiative, self-punishment, withdrawal and inactivity, and loss of pleasure. Community surveys have shown that as many as 20 in 100 people suffer from significant
depressive symptoms at any one time; some 25 percent of the population may suffer from a depression over the course of a lifetime. The disorder strikes men and women of all ages, in all segments of society, but more recently, studies have indicated that women are more often afflicted. Because very little empirical data exist on the use of the Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI) with African-American and single-parent families and children, much of what this section contains has been taken from Dr. Kovacs' studies and her works with children and adolescents in general.

Reliability: The purpose of testing for reliability is to determine whether a second administration of the instrument, or responses to similar items, would yield substantially the same results. Test-retest reliability refers to the temporal stability of the ratings. Test-retest reliability is a function of both the actual reliability of the child's behavior, and extraneous conditions that may be introduced. Internal consistency reliability refers to the fact that all items on the same scale consistently or reliably measure the same dimension. Internal consistency can be measured with an overall summary coefficient (the alpha coefficient) or with a series of item-total correlations. Internal consistency reliability is a function of both the quality of the construct and the reliability of a rater.

The following table shows alpha coefficients for reliability that have been reported for the CDI in various samples. These reliability coefficients range from .71 to .89, indicating good internal consistency of the instrument.
Table 1
Alpha Coefficients for Reliability for the CDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kovacs, 1983</td>
<td>psychiatric referrals</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovacs, 1983</td>
<td>pediatric-medical outpatients</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovacs, 1983</td>
<td>Toronto public school students</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghareeb &amp; Beshai, 1989</td>
<td>Arabic students (Arabic version of CDI)</td>
<td>.79 to .88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepperlin, Steward, &amp; Rey, 1990</td>
<td>Australian adolescent psychiatric inpatients</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollendick &amp; Yule, 1990</td>
<td>American students</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British students</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smucker, et al., 1986</td>
<td>Pennsylvania students</td>
<td>.83 to .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss &amp; Weisz, 1988</td>
<td>Clinic-referred youths</td>
<td>.81 to .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss et al., 1991</td>
<td>Clinical sample</td>
<td>.86 to .88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 1 clearly shows that with alpha coefficients reported above, the CDI's internal consistency is psychometrically acceptable.

In addition, the CDI appears to have an acceptable level of stability (test-retest). A number of investigators have shown that repeated administrations over time are associated with a significant drop in CDI scores from the first testing to the second (Finch et al., 1987; Kaslow et al., 1984; Meyer et al., 1989). This phenomenon is common among many psychological assessment tools, and is not unique to the CDI (Kovacs, 1992).

Validation: Self-rated depressive symptom inventories have long played a role in the assessment of depression in adults. These tools are economical, easy to administer, and readily analyzable. Because they quantify the severity of the depressive syndrome, they have been used for descriptive purposes, to assess treatment outcome, to test research hypotheses, and to select research subjects. In contrast to the availability of self-rated
symptom scales for adults, until recently, there were no corresponding instruments for youngsters. The CDI was developed in response to that need.

The CDI measures symptoms of depression among children and adolescents. As such, it can be used as part of a routine screening device in a number of settings including schools, outpatient clinics, inpatient clinics, residential treatment centers, child protective services including placement and referral decisions, special education and regular classrooms, juvenile detention centers, and private practice offices. According to Kovacs (1982), potential test users include psychologists, social workers, physicians, counselors, psychiatric workers, pediatric nurses, teachers, school officials, and pastoral counselors. When used for screening, follow-up administration of the CDI can provide important evaluation information about the program of remediation to which the child is assigned. The CDI may be a very important tool for giving the clinician structured and normed information about the child.

If the CDI is used for routine screening, it should be recognized that there is a chance that there will be false positives reported, as well as false negatives. That is, the fact that the CDI, like any psychological screening instrument, is not perfectly valid means that not all problems cases will be identified by the instrument or instruments--false negatives (Kovacs, 1982). Similarly, some children who do not really have clinically significant levels of problem behaviors may be identified as clinical problem cases because of the lack of perfect validity or reliability for the instruments--false positives (Kovacs, 1992). Clinical experience suggests that with the CDI, false negatives are more likely than false positives. Problems of false positive or false negative results can be minimized by considering the test scores as one very useful source of clinical information that must be combined with other sources including direct observation of the child. When the CDI is used for routine screening with children expected to have a very low base rate of behavioral problems--such as unidentified children in a normal classroom--the criterion for selecting children for services may be set as suitably stringent such as a T-score over 65.
The CDI was developed because there was a need for standardized assessment tools in the study of the depressive disorders among juveniles. Limited research on this instrument has revealed very interesting, but not so surprising in most cases, data. Johnson & Greene (1991) investigated the relationship between suppressed anger, somatic symptoms, sleep disturbances, social support, the occurrence of the stressful life events, health risk factors, and the frequent experience of intense feelings of anger among African-American male adolescents. The results indicated that African American males who cope with stress and provocations with chronically high levels of suppressed anger have significantly fewer close friends and family members to talk with about their personal problems. Their personal problems were also more distressing and related to intense angry reactions. Adolescents who frequently suppressed angry feelings reported that their level of comfort and self-esteem was lower while confiding in close friends and family members about their personal problems. Symptoms of cardiovascular arousal, sleep disturbances, and stressful life events were reported more often by adolescents who frequently held in (suppressed) their angry feelings. Similarly, adolescents with high levels of suppressed anger were significantly heavier than African-American males with lower levels of suppressed anger. There was also a tendency for other health risk factors (smoking, drinking, blood pressure) to vary as a function of the level of suppressed anger.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine which coping methods youths use in response to parental divorce.</td>
<td>21 boys and 18 girls and mothers</td>
<td>Avoidant coping as measured by the Coping Responses Measure (Billings &amp; Moos, 1981) correlated r=.69 with CDI scores for girls (p&lt;.01), but not significantly for boys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the effect of stressful life events on self-rated depression in depressed, behavioral problem, and normal children.</td>
<td>60 Ohio school children (29 boys, 31 girls); 20 children were identified as depressed (10 boys, 10 girls), 20 were identified as normal (12 girls, 8 boys).</td>
<td>Depressed children (identified by the CDI) had significantly more stressful life events than either the behavioral-problems group or normal group F(2,4)=16.84, p&lt;.001. This data does not suggest, however, that each life event had a greater impact on the depressed children than life events on the groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the effects of divorce on self-concept, self-esteem, and grade point averages of school children.</td>
<td>61 Kansas school children, 33 fifth graders and 28 graders. 58 were included in the final analysis; 21 had divorced parents (10 girls, 11 boys); 37 had non-divorced parents (21 girls, 16 boys).</td>
<td>Children of divorced parents scored significantly higher (more depressed) on the CDI than did children of non-divorced parents, F(1,50)=10.26, p&lt;.01.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continuation)

Selected Research Using the Children’s Depression Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To predict which children of divorced parents might benefit from an intervention of group therapy sessions.</td>
<td>53 Michigan fourth- and fifth-graders (27 boys, 26 girls).</td>
<td>Subjects' CDI scores were not significantly different from CDI score norms. Of the 9 subjects who were identified by the CDI as depressed (using a cutoff point of 13), only 2 were still depressed after the group intervention. Subjects' CDI scores were not significantly different from CDI score norms. Of the 9 subjects who were identified by the CDI as depressed (using a cutoff point of 13), only 2 were still depressed after the group intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To investigate the association between conduct problem behaviors and self-reported depression in prepubescent males.</td>
<td>56 emotionally disturbed boys, ages 9 to 12, who psychiatric inpatients. 31% were African American.</td>
<td>CDI correlated ( r = 0.34 ) with a measure of conduct problem and ( r = 0.30 ) with a measure of socialized delinquency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one were to look at some of the research studies outlined in Table 2, he/she could extrapolate from the data certain facts: children from divorced homes and children who have experienced stressful life events are affected more deeply by these phenomena than children from other types of settings; and males who come from those environments appear to have been affected more than females as measured by the CDI.

Still, Huntley, Phelps, & Rehm (1987) studied depression in children from single-parent families. These researchers discovered that boys had higher CDI scores than girls, \( F = 5.37, p < .025 \). However, no significant relationship was found between the CDI and the mother's report of the child's depressive symptoms. This is especially significant when one considers the hypotheses of this research study.

Finally, Strauss, Lahey & Jacobsen (1982) examined the nature of the relationship between academic achievement [as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test and the
Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)] and childhood depression (measure by the CDI, the Peer Nomination Inventory of Depression, and by teacher ratings of students). None of the three measures of depression were found to be significantly correlated with the two achievement measures. However, when controlling for the effects of IQ, CDI scores and PIAT scores were significantly and positively correlated ($r=.29$, $p<.05$) for children in second, third, and fourth grades. Again, the results of this study was of particular importance to this researcher since the CDI scores from the sample were compared to the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP), administered in an urban high school in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

**Summary:** As has been shown, the CDI is a mature instrument in the sense that there have been a number of fundamental psychometric studies, and the CDI has been extensively used in clinical situations (Kovacs, 1984). There have been adequate psychometric demonstrations, as has been shown through this review of literature, that the CDI has sufficient temporal reliability, internal consistency, consistent correlations with various syndromes and other scales, and replicated predictive relationships (Kovacs, 1984).

Kovacs (1984) has indicated that longitudinal studies are needed of children identified as having a depressive syndrome by the CDI and other indicators to determine the natural progression of these children through various forms of treatment and other remediation as well as the ultimate outcomes for these children. A study of this type goes beyond the scope of the present study. However, this instrument's developer has asserted that a natural history approach might be the most appropriate for such children because it does not seem ethical to deny a child any reasonable and appropriate treatment for which he or she is eligible. Such natural history studies could identify a cohort of children at a fairly young age and then systematically retest then, as well as interview their parent(s) and teacher(s) on an annual basis. Through tests, interviews, and other methods,
information could be collected on the child's behavior (as assessed by teachers and parents observations, child self-reports, and other indicators), family dynamics and composition, the child's program in school and social settings, various treatments and remediation strategies which have been used throughout the year, and other indicators.

Finally, it has been suggested that further studies may wish to clarify the consensus (or lack thereof) which is achieved when using the Children's Depression Inventory and other methods of classifying the child including behavioral ratings, observations, standardized tests, other standardized rating methods, and clinical observations. It is important to delineate the range of usefulness for these procedures (Kovacs, 1994).

**Multidimensional Self Concept Scale**

**Overview:** Bracken (1992) provided so much insight into the development of the Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS). Bracken (1992) in the preface to his manual on the MSCS defined the construct, self concept. Bracken wrote that self concept has been given considerable attention in the literature, with literally thousands of educational and psychological studies having been conducted on the construct. Despite the large number of self concept studies conducted and the more than a dozen self concept scales published, little success has been achieved in developing a self concept scale that would be optimally useful in both clinical and research settings (Bracken, 1992).

Currently available self concept scales have been developed largely as research tools. Collectively, they have assessed a vaguely defined construct; possessed outdated items; are normed on small samples drawn from single cities or states; have limited technical qualities; are generally theoretically, practically and empirically weak; do not provide guidelines for interpretation, diagnosis. or remediation; provide limited and variable standard scores; and in general, are not intended to assess self concept in both clinical and research settings, as the MSCS was designed to do (Bracken, 1992).

The MSCS was derived theoretically to provide a multidimensional assessment of
self concept. The scale has gone through considerable field evaluations prior to standardization to ensure its technical qualities. The MSCS was normed on a large nationally representative sample, and the nature of self concept development was studied by gender, ethnic heritage, grade level, and region of the country. MSCS norms are reported for each of six subscales and the Total Scale in percentile ranks and the IQ metric (M = 100, SD = 15) to facilitate integration of MSCS scores with scores of other commonly used educational and psychological instruments. Bracken (1992) has indicated that additionally, the MSCS scores can be converted to T-scores to permit comparison with instruments that use that standard score metric. The MSCS was designed specifically to be used as both a clinical tool and a research instrument.

The MSCS interpretation scheme was founded on the importance of its six underlying context-based dimensions: Social, Competence, Affect, Academic, Family, and Physical. Support for the existence and importance of these domains was provided, and a rationale for using these six domains as the common foundation upon which to analyze and synthesize data across other educational and psychological instruments was presented in Bracken's manual. Not only was the MSCS designed to be used as an important instrument in the assessment of social-emotional adjustment for children ages 9-19, but its domains can provide the basis for the interpretation and integration of data from other instruments.

The MSCS has moved forward the study of self concept by better conceptualizing and allowing for more detailed and reliable assessment of the construct (Bracken, 1992). Data from the MSCS standardization sample has helped to answer questions about the developmental nature of self concept. Bracken hoped that this will encourage others to study important educational and psychological conditions in light of a multidimensional self concept paradigm.

Self concept, according to Bracken, is a multidimensional and context-dependent learned behavioral pattern that reflects an individual's evaluation of past behaviors and
experiences, influences an individual's current behaviors, and predicts an individual's future behaviors. Thus, self concept, both domain specific and general, is an interactive environmental-behavioral construct that is organized according to behavioral principles. In this construct, "self" is a pattern of behavior that is sufficiently unique to an individual to be identified with that individual (Bracken, 1992). Although domain-specific self concepts are acquired in each context in which an individual operates (e.g., social, competence, affect, academic, family, physical), these context-dependent self concepts are moderately intercorrelated. Collectively, the overlapping domain-specific self concepts represent global self concept.

The MSCS hierarchical structure is depicted in Figure 1, where global self concept is at the center of the model and the various self concept dimensions overlap the global self concept core and each other.
This model assumes that the various specific self concept dimensions are of approximately equal importance in their contribution to global self concept, although it is recognized that some dimensions are likely to be more important for individual children than for others.

**Reliability:** Self concept is generally considered a stable construct; therefore, one would expect that two administrations of a self concept scale over a brief interval should result in very similar scores on both administrations. Bracken (1987) suggested that tests intended for use in important decision-making situations should evidence reliability (internal consistency and short-term stability) at the .90 level or higher. Additionally, Nunally (1978) suggested that in those applied settings where important decisions are made with respect to specific test scores, a reliability of .90 is the minimum that should be
tolerated, and a reliability of .95 should be considered the desirable standard.

Because each of the six MSCS scales was intended to be used as a diagnostic indicator and can be employed separately, as well as in combination, one would desire that each scale evidence reliability at a .80 criterion level. However, the MSCS Total Scale score should demonstrate reliability at the .90 or higher level because the Total Scale score is more likely to be used to contribute toward important decisions about the student (Bracken, 1987).

The following table demonstrates that the MSCS Total Scale estimates of internal consistency is well above the stringent .90 criterion, and even above Nunally's (1978) ideal standard of .95. At each grade level, the Total Scale coefficient alphas are .97 or higher; the Total Scale score for the entire standardization sample of 2,501 subjects is .98. Grade rather than age levels were used because they combine the smaller samples of the 9- and 19-year-olds into the 5th and 12th grades, respectively. This level of internal consistency suggests that examiners can expect student item responses to be quite consistent within scales. In addition, these findings have suggested that approximately 97-99% of Total Scale score variance to be reliable or true, and only 1-3% due to error. Therefore, researchers have used the MSCS Total Scale score quite confidently when making important decisions about a student's level of self-concept.
Table 3
Scale and Total Scale Alpha Coefficients for the MSCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gender  | | | | | | | |
|---------| | | | | | | |
| Males   | 1179 | .91 | .88 | .91 | .91 | .96 | .92 | .98 |
| Females | 1309 | .90 | .87 | .93 | .91 | .97 | .91 | .98 |
| Total   | 2501 | .90 | .87 | .93 | .91 | .97 | .92 | .98 |

Table 3 also depicts estimates of internal consistency for the six MSCS scales at each grade level and for the entire sample. For five of the six scales, all but Competence total sample internal consistency estimates exceed .90. Internal consistency for the Competence Scales hovers just below the .90 criterion, suggesting that it is sufficiently reliable when used as a scale contributing to the Total Scale score; however, when used as a separate, independent measure of self concept, it should be interpreted cautiously. Across the various grade levels, several of the scales occasionally dip below the .90 criterion, though none dips lower than .85. Even at this lowest level of internal consistency, 85% of the obtained scores has a reliable variance, with 15% associated with error variation. Because the MSCS norms are collective and represent the entire standardization sample, the MSCS total sample reliabilities are the best estimate of overall internal consistency. All of the MSCS scales and the Total Scale score are sufficiently reliable for contributing to important diagnostic decisions.

The MSCS stability was researched by administering the scale in its entirety to eight-grade students in a pretest-posttest design. The interval between the initial and follow-up assessments was 4 weeks. Thirty-seven students were present for both the pretest and posttest administrations. The MSCS Total Scale stability coefficient (.90) is
quite high for a 4-week interval, and supports the instrument's Total Scale stability, the stability of the construct, the intended clinical use, and the continued investigation of the instrument and construct.

Given the strong stability coefficients and the nonsignificant mean score differences across the test-retest interval, the MSCS appear to assess a construct that is stable and resistant to chance score fluctuations. The instrument has shown both internal consistency and stability that are sufficiently high to warrant its use as a clinical assessment device, as well as a robust research tool.

**Validation:** It is typically believed that parents exert a lot of influence over their children when they are young. However, when they enter the adolescent years, it appears that peer pressure takes over. It also appears that peers can get young people to do what their parents cannot get them to do during these often tumultuous years.

DeSaintis, Ketterlinus, & Youniss (1990) measured African-American youths' perception of themselves as good students and as smart. They used a sample of 404 African-American adolescents to estimate how much they cared that their parents and friends perceived them as smart, good students, athletic, and popular. Some of the students were from two-parent homes; some were from single-parent homes. These students were compared to a sample of 280 white students from grade 10 from similar homes.

A series of statistics was conducted on the data collected. Four main effects were looked at: smart, good students, sports, and black-white comparison. It should be noted that in a recent ethnographic study, African-American high school students did not want to be seen as smart or brainy by their peers, even though they were in fact smart and academically successful.

A main effect was obtained for family structure. The data indicated the following: $F(1,396)=3.92$, $p<.05$. Adolescents who lived with both parents ($M = 5.26$) cared more
that they were seen as smart than adolescents living with one parent (M = 5.08). This was significant because research has suggested that children are adversely affected when a parent is absent from the family during the developmental years.

In addition, the data also suggested that youths living with both parents (M = 5.20) cared more than youths living with one parent (M = 5.06) that they were perceived as good students. When we look at Fordham's position previously cited, the results appeared to be the same as she hypothesized. Thus, the analysis clearly supported the notion that children from two-parent family structures cared more about being seen as academically competent than children from single-parent structures (DeSantis, Ketterlinus, & Youniss, 1990). This was significant because an academically competent student generally has high self-esteem.

McAdoo (1979) studied the father-child interaction pattern and its effect on self-esteem in African-American children. He quickly pointed out that the cultural deficit model has often been used to explain children's low school achievement and self-esteem. A socially competent child exhibits positive feelings of self-worth (including a healthy ethnic identity) and a drive for a feeling of achievement. A socially competent child will also do well in the classroom and thus be prepared to achieve in school and later in occupational endeavors (McAdoo, 1990, p. 47). McAdoo's sample consisted of 36 working and middle-class African-American families containing 19 boys and 17 girls living in suburban Columbia, Maryland. On the self-esteem measure, the total mean score for the group was 52. The children in this sample felt good about themselves and felt good that their fathers, mothers, and peers valued them highly.

The implications are clear. African-American fathers may expect the school to utilize the same kind of warm, firm control that fathers present in the home often use with their children. The home and school should work very closely together in order for young African-American children to maintain their self-esteem and to achieve their maximum potential. McAdoo (1979) reminds us that by setting examples of behavior showing
affection, and giving encouragement and consistent guidance, African-American fathers provide their sons (and daughters) with a stable environment and some personal feelings of security which may contribute to high self-esteem.

Johnson & Greene (1991) studied the relationship between suppressed anger and psychosocial distress in African-American male adolescents. Results have shown that adolescents who frequently suppress angry feelings reported that their level of comfort and self-esteem was lower while confiding in close friends and family members about their personal problems. Moderate negative correlations were obtained between the children's general self-esteem and the number of behavior problems reported by their parents (Smets & Hartup, 1988). Correlations for younger boys and girls were as follow: -.59 and -.32 respectively. Correlations for adolescent boys and girls were -.44 and -.45, respectively (all significant beyond the .05 level).

A discussion of Smets & Hartup's study has shown that the children's self-esteem scores were directly related to the family structure and the child's behavior patterns. This study also demonstrated that self-esteem in children was a significant source of variance relating to both structures and behavior patterns. To understand the child is to understand the family, and the treatment of the child implies the treatment of the family structure (Smets & Hartup, 1988).

**Summary:** This section has shown how the construct of self concept plays an important role in the lives of young people. Clearly, the research suggests that adolescents from single-parent homes place less importance on matters that concern them compared to adolescents coming from two-parent homes. In addition, the data implies that educators should convey to schools and to parents the influence that parental structure can have on adolescents' academic performance.

The MSCS can be a useful tool to help educators, especially school counselors, to gauge students' self concept. The instrument represents an extension to the long history of
self concept study. It provides clinicians and researchers with several improvements over existing self concept instruments, including a clearly defined definition of self concept; a behavioral, context-dependent theoretical rationale for the construct; a multidimensional, hierarchical model for the construct; a nationally representative standardization sample; technically sound psychometric characteristics; and considerable empirical and logical support for the instrument as it has been theoretically conceived and modeled (Bracken, 1992).

**Family Environment Scale**

**Overview:** Empirical studies of the family environment of African-American families are scant. Because of the current interest in the African-American family and its youth in public education, the Family Environment Scale (FES) seemed to be an appropriate instrument to use in this study. A number of investigators have used the FES to explore the characteristics of different types of families. Dancy & Handal (1981) conducted a study to determine the effects of gender and age on the subscale scores of male and female African-American adolescents. The secondary purpose of Dancy & Handal's study was to develop norms appropriate for use with African-American adolescents. Some previous studies will be cited in this section; others are listed in the following table.
Table 4
Selected Research Using the Family Environment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Environment (Scale)</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families (FES)</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual-Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral-Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Moos & Moos (1986), the number, ages, and gender of the family affect the emotional quality of the home environment of employed married women. Married women without children reported better family relationships than women with one or two male infants or preschool children, but not better than women with female children and infants. Cohesion has been reported to be lower and conflict higher for mothers with children and mothers with male children when compared to mothers with one child. These findings were consistent with the idea that young boys are more demanding temperamentally and behaviorally than young girls. Moreover, the presence of two children in a household tends to increase family conflict, especially when excessive role demands are placed on mothers who are employed, as were the women in this study (Abbott & Brody, 1985).
The number of parents heading the family was also related to the environment. Families with a divorced mother and one or more adolescents emphasized independence, intellectual and recreational activities, and expressiveness. When comparing two-parent families with one or more adolescents, the families were somewhat less cohesive and structured and less oriented toward achievement and religious pursuits. The \textit{FES} subscale means for a sample of 81 single-parent families as well as other family types are provided in the table below.

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Subscale Means for Three Subsample of Families}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Subscales} & \textbf{Families with one Member over 60} & \textbf{Black and Mexican-American Families} & \textbf{Single-Parent Families} \\
& \textit{(N = 106)} & \textit{(N = 178)} & \textit{(N = 81)} \\
\hline
Cohesion & 7.08 & 6.61 & 6.24 \\
Expressiveness & 5.09 & 4.36 & 4.28 \\
Conflict & 2.11 & 3.30 & 6.58 \\
Independence & 6.89 & 5.96 & 5.47 \\
Achievement Orientation & 5.36 & 6.37 & 5.61 \\
Intellectual-Cultural Orientation & 5.24 & 5.10 & 5.61 \\
Active-Recreational Orientation & 4.07 & 5.03 & 5.61 \\
Moral-Religious Emphasis & 5.61 & 5.99 & 4.06 \\
Organization & 6.31 & 5.95 & 4.99 \\
Control & 4.05 & 4.95 & 4.22 \\
Incongruence & 13.80 & 13.73 & 15.76 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textbf{Reliability}: The internal consistencies of the \textit{FES} are all in an acceptable range, varying from moderate for Independence and Achievement Orientation to substantial for Cohesion, Organization, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, and Moral-Religious Emphasis (see Table 6).
The ten subscale scores were intercorrelated separately on samples of 1,468 husbands and wives and 621 sons and daughters drawn from 534 normal and 266 distressed families. The intercorrelations indicated that the subscales measure distinct, though somewhat related, aspects of family social environments. Cohesion and Organization were positively correlated, as were Intellectual-Cultural and Active-Recreational Orientation. There were negative correlations between Cohesion and Conflict and between Independence and Control. The intercorrelations were quite similar for parents and children and account for an average of less than 10 percent of the subscales variance.

Test-retest reliabilities of individuals' scores for the 10 subscales were calculated for 47 family members in 9 families who took Form R twice with an 8-week interval between testings. The test-retest reliabilities were all in an acceptable range, varying from a low of .68 for Independence to a high of .86 for Cohesion. Test-retest stabilities were also calculated for a 4-month interval on a sample of 35 families and for a 12-month interval on a sample of 241 families. Coefficients were relatively high for these time intervals.
Another important question in characterizing families is the stability of the profile. Profile stability correlations were obtained for 35 families tested 4 months apart and for 85 families tested 12 months apart. A stability coefficient was calculated for each family by correlating the Form R means obtained at Time 1 with those obtained at Time 2 (that is, the N for the correlations was 10—the ten subscales). The mean 4-month profile stability was .78. Of the 35 stabilities, 29 were .70 or above and 20 were .80 or above. The mean 12-month profile stability was .71. Of the 85 stabilities, 56 were .70 or above and 45 were .80 or above. The Form R profiles are therefore quite stable over time intervals of as long as a year, although they reflect changes that occur in the family milieu (Moos & Moos, 1986).

Validation: Because of current interest in ethnic minority families, the FES subscale means for the African-American (N = 85) and Hispanic (N = 93) families in a normative sample were obtained (Moos & Moos, 1986). The results should be interpreted with caution since the samples were small. The families were drawn predominantly from upwardly mobile middle-class populations, and the groups were not matched on family background factors such as size and socioeconomic status. Compared with the overall sample of normal families, these ethnic minority families were more structured. In other words, they placed more emphasis on achievement, moral-religious values, organization, and control, and less on independence. The differences averaged about six-tenths of a raw score point, except for moral-religious emphasis, on which the difference was somewhat larger.

African-American adolescents reported more emphasis on moral-religious values and organization and less on independence and recreational orientation than the adolescents who were mostly white in Moos & Moos (1986) normative group and than a group of 966 white adolescents between the ages of 13 and 18 (Dancy & Handal, 1981; Enos & Handal, 1985). These adolescents also reported less family conflict.
African-American alcoholics saw the social climates of both their families of origin and their conjugal families as less disturbed than white alcoholics saw their families (Patterson et al., 1981). For example, African-American alcoholics reported their conjugal families to be higher on intellectual and religious values, organization, and control.

Families of delinquent or uncontrollable adolescents were characterized by poorer family relationships and less social connectedness. In general, these families scored lower on cohesion and independence and higher on conflict and control (Fox et al., 1983; Kirst-Ashman, 1984; Malin, 1981). The fact that parents of juvenile offenders described their families in similar ways led Kogan (1980) to suggest that these families emphasized strict rules and rigid discipline in order to cope with disruptive adolescent behavior, but that an emphasis on cohesion and expressiveness might be more adaptive.

When adolescents who were referred for outpatient services were compared with matched controls, the families of the adolescent patients were lower in cohesion, expressiveness, independence, and intellectual and recreational orientation and higher in conflict (Tyerman & Humphrey, 1981). Dixon (1982) obtained similar findings in a study of African-American adolescent client and non-client families. The African-American adolescents in treatment also had lower "aspirations" about their ideal family environment than the normal African-American adolescents did. In another study, poor functioning among adolescent girls was associated with strong coalitions between parents and between one of the parents and the child as measured by their level of agreement about the family environment (Bell & Bell, 1982).

Most studies in the area of children's adjustment to divorce link adolescent adjustment more to the quality of family than to parental marital status. Several researchers have noted in the literature that so many children are coming from single-parent homes and from homes where at least one parent is incarcerated, yet, there is not more research conducted in this area. On the other hand, a wealth of research data exists on children coming from divorced homes.
Slater & Haber (1984) found that high family conflict was related to lower self-esteem, greater anxiety, and less internal control among high school students in both intact and divorced families. Similarly, disturbance among adolescent boys in both intact and father-absent families was associated with less supportive and expressive intrafamilial relationships, less family orientation toward personal growth (especially independence as reported by the adolescent), and less participation in intrafamilial activities (Kagel, White, & Coyne, 1978).

In a study of lower middle-class African-American adolescents, Handal (1980; 1984) found that neither parental marital status nor the adolescents' age at the time of the parents' divorce was related to family climate. However, the adolescents' perception of high family conflict (in both intact and divorced families) was associated with their reports of lack of family cohesion, expressiveness, organization, and religious emphasis. The adolescents from high conflict families also reported more psychological impairment and less satisfaction with their social life (Woody et al., 1984). Moos & Moos (1986) suggested that these findings imply that family conflict and lack of social resources are more important predictors of adolescent adjustment than is parental marital status, a point that the present study sought to prove with the selected sample population.

Among adolescents whose parents had separated or divorced, those who rated their families as less cohesive and more conflict-ridden reported higher levels of anxiety. Those who saw their families as more oriented toward independence and control reported higher hostility. In general, stress associated with family reorganization and conflict was the most important situational predictor of poorer divorce adjustment (Farber, Felner, & Primavera, 1985).

Compared to adolescent girls, adolescent boys may react more positively to family disruption. Girls in single-parent families reported more conflict than did girls in two-parent families, while boys in single-parent families reported less conflict and more intellectual-cultural orientation and had better self-concepts when compared with boys in
two-parent families. Increased independence and less conflict with their fathers may promote greater maturity among boys in single-parent families (Slater, Stewart, & Linn, 1983).

One, then, asked the following question: What is the impact of the family environment on children and adolescents? It has affected them in many areas, some of which are children's cognitive and social development, children's temperament, adolescent personality and behavior, and family and school settings. Of the ten aspects of the family environment tapped by the FES, cohesion and intellectual-cultural orientation have the greatest influence on children's cognitive and social development, according to the work of several researchers. In general, supportive and stimulating environments tend to promote cognitive development, while a constrictive achievement orientation may inhibit it (Moos & Moos, 1986).

Specifically, Garfinkle (1982) found that family cohesion was linked to verbal communication, and intellectual orientation to visual memory, perhaps because more stimulating ideas are provided for a child to retain. It has been noted in the literature that cohesion, intellectual orientation, and expressiveness were related more to better stimulation for the child and to the child's mental development (Gottfried & Gofffried, 1984). Also, intellectual orientation was associated with mental development (Wilson & Matheny, 1983) and reading achievement (Harris, 1982). Among sons of alcoholics, family organization was associated with better cognitive test performance (Hegedus, Alterman, & Tarter, 1984). These associations hold for pre-kindergarten children as well. Less cohesion was linked to developmental delay, speech and language deficits, and aggressive and hostile behavior. In addition, less organization and control were associated with shyness and anxiety (Fowler, 1980).

Children's temperament is impacted by the family environment. For example, in a longitudinal study of adopted and non-adopted infants, high family cohesion, expressiveness, independence, and intellectual and recreational orientation, and low
conflict were significantly related to healthy infant temperament (i.e., high activity, sociability, and attention span and an even disposition) (Plomin & DeFries, 1985). Such family climates also were related to less infant shyness. Since these relationships were stronger among non-adoptive families, it has been concluded that connections between family environment and infant development are largely mediated genetically (Daniels & Plomin, 1985; Rowe, 1983).

Hyperactivity and aggression have been associated with the absence of a positive family climate and a family environment low on cohesion and expressiveness and high on conflict (McGee, Silva, & Williams, 1984; McGee, Williams, & Silva, 1984; 1985). Higher self-esteem among adolescents has been related to the three factors associated with healthy temperament: high family cohesion, high expressiveness, and low conflict. In addition, independence and intellectual and recreational orientation are positively linked to self-esteem. In contrast, self-esteem may be hampered by a family that overemphasizes achievement and conformity to restrictive rules (Hirsch, Moos, & Reischl, 1985; Chan, 1985; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Felner et al., 1985).

Low cohesion and recreational orientation, high conflict, and life stress predicted depressed mood among junior high students even after family demographic factors were considered. Less cohesion, independence, and organization and more achievement orientation were related to suicidal ideation (Friedrich, Reams, & Jacobs, 1982). Low family support, especially in combination with high life stress, was strongly related to adolescent symptom complaints (Tyerman & Humphrey, 1983). But high-risk adolescents from families that are low in cohesion have maintained their well-being in the face of stressful family life events by developing extrafamily social ties (Hirsch, 1985; Prasinos & Tittler, 1981). This point was discussed previously in Aponte's work (1994).

Family climates are associated with specific personality traits as measured by the High School Personality Questionnaire. For example, families emphasizing the relationship dimensions tended to have adolescents who were relatively free of anxiety.
Independence and achievement characterized families of assertive, self-sufficient adolescents. Those from religious families tended to be insecure and guilt-prone, whereas adolescents from well-organized families were relaxed and congenial, suggesting that clear rules and defined limits can have positive effects (Forman & Forman, 1981; Fowler, 1982b).

Achievement orientation and control have played a special role in Jewish families. Among Jewish adolescents, high achievement orientation was related to family conflict, but among non-Jewish adolescents, it was related to expressiveness and independence. Also, high control was associated with less independence in Jewish families but with more independence among non-Jewish families. It has been noted that control may reflect the value of family cohesion among Jews, and an adolescent who gains independence may be seen as flaunting that value. Achievement is a less critical issue for non-Jewish families, and family control may be more likely to support adolescent independence (Radetsky, Handelsman & Browne, 1984).

Finally, the family environment affects specific school-related behavior as well as the academic success of children. For example, high intellectual orientation was associated with more time spent studying and less time watching television (McMillan & Hiltonsmith, 1982; Hiltonsmith, 1984) and less likelihood of attrition in the first year of college (Colegrove 1982), but higher recreational orientation was associated with a lower grade point average (Felner et al., 1985).

Family and classroom environments may amplify each other promoting students' personal growth. According to Nelson (1984), students with the highest scholastic self-concepts were located in family and classroom settings (as measured by the Classroom Environment Scale; Moos & Trickett, 1986) both of which were high in support and structure. Cohesive, well-organized families, oriented toward recreational and religious pursuits, tended to promote students' peer and scholastic self-concepts, whereas highly conflicted and controlling families did not (Moos & Moos, 1986).
Summary: This section has looked briefly at three concepts: depression, self concept, and family environment. Also, three instruments were identified that were used to measure these three concepts. Finally, a brief sample of some of the research utilizing the three instruments was identified. This brief sample indicates that there is a great need for more investigation to further the knowledge base of working with African-American adolescent high school students who come from homes where a parent is (or has been) incarcerated.

Conclusion: In summary, the preceding review of literature has attempted to establish the capacity of Humanistic and Restructuring Theories (as theorized by Virginia Satir and Harry J. Aponte) in working with African-American youths and their families, especially adolescents who come from homes where at least one parent is (or has been) incarcerated. The ecostructural system was reviewed from a counseling perspective, with validation for working with this population. Research on the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), the Bracken's Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES) validate the need for more extensive research into the area of working with minority populations.

School counselors come in contact on a day-to-day basis with many students from different types of family home environments (i.e., two-parent, single-parent, and single-parent through incarceration). The research evidence suggests that school counselor effectiveness is related to having an acute awareness of the students they work with and the home environments they come from. It is through this awareness that school counselors can be effective in understanding the impact parental presence or absence has on adolescents' academic performance, school attendance, classroom behavior, attitude towards school and the education process, levels of depression and self concept, and adolescents' perceptions of their family environment. This study assessed the present status of this phenomenon and attempted to document the need for more parental
involvement in the education process of the high school students that school counselors encounter.
CHAPTER THREE
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Chapter III describes the design and methodology of the study. The chapter is divided into the following sections:

1. Population and Sample
2. Data Collection
3. Instrumentation
4. Research Design
5. Specific Null Hypotheses
6. Data Analysis
7. Ethical Consideration

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was African-American adolescent high school students in the United States. The subjects were abstracted from an accessible population of high school students (grades 9-12), from John Marshall High School, a public school, located in Richmond, Virginia. Each subject had come from one of three types of family structures: African-American adolescent high school students who lived with two-parents, African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent, but who lived with one parent, and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent. Initially, a flyer was sent home by students to their parent or guardian announcing the study (see Appendix 1). Afterwards, a participation form was distributed to each student through their homerooms (see Appendix 2). Students who agreed to participate in the study indicated their desire by completing two fundamental questions on the Participation Form: "What type home environment best describes you: Two-parent, Single-parent through
separation/divorce, or Single-parent through incarceration?" and "Are you be willing to participate in a research project studying home environments of students coming from one of the three family situations previously described?" Students were asked to submit their forms directly to the researcher in order to maintain confidentiality of the respondents. Once the forms had been collected, a sorting process was used to form three groups of potential subjects. Not all of the student respondents were used in the study. However, from this list of willing participants, the first twenty students from each group were selected for the study. Permission forms were sent home by students prior to the study's implementation to get each student's signature as well as the signature of each student's parent/guardian. Once all permission forms had been returned bearing both signatures, the study commenced.

Data Collection

The researcher administered the Children's Depression Scale (CDI), the Bracken's Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES) to the students in each group. In addition, each subject completed a researcher-generated questionnaire on which they self-reported demographic data, their own feelings about themselves, school, academic progress, attendance, classroom behavior, and their family composition. Most students were able to complete the three instruments, including the questionnaire, in approximately two hours. This study also used data accessed from individual student records (i.e., standardized test data, grade point averages, class ranks, attendance records, and disciplinary referrals).

Participation in this study was voluntary. Subjects were informed of the purpose and procedures involved in the study (see Appendix 3 and Appendix 4). Subjects were offered the opportunity to receive the results of their assessments and interpretive information, as well as the results of the study, if they desired. Subjects were informed of their right to decline participation or to withdraw from the study at any time.
All responses and data were maintained in a confidential manner by assigning a random number to all data pertaining to each student. All data collected from the student respondents was identified only by these assigned numbers. All data was kept in a locked file cabinet that only the researcher had access to. Confidentiality was guarded within the school, so that the comments that students shared were not be divulged in any way to others within the community.

Instrumentation

The Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), the Bracken's Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES) were used to measure how students felt about themselves and their family environment. All three instruments appeared to provide valid and reliable empirical measures within their respective domains.

Children's Depression Inventory:

The Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) was developed by Maria Kovacs, Ph.D. (1977) to assess commonly accepted symptoms of depression that the child has experienced in the two weeks prior to completing the evaluation. The CDI is a 27-item self-rated symptom-oriented scale which assesses depression in children ages 8 to 17 years. Each of the 27 items that comprise the CDI describes a different symptom of childhood depression, including disturbances in mood and hedonic capacity, vegetative functions, self-evaluation, and interpersonal behaviors. Several items also evaluated the child's functioning in various context such as school. For each item, there were three sentences, and the child was required to choose the one that best described him or her during the previous two weeks. Responses were scored on a 0 to 2 scale, with 2 representing a severe form of the depressive symptom and 0 representing the absence of that symptom. Thus, the CDI yielded a potential score ranging from 0 to 54, depending on the presence and severity of symptomology. Approximately half the items were
arranged so that the first item reflects the greatest level of symptom severity, while the remainder were arranged in such a manner that the first item represented the absence of the symptom. Scoring was accomplished by adding the numerical values assigned to the item choices selected by the child. A scoring template was available, but was not used with this particular study.

Reliability of the CDI has been evaluated through internal consistency and test-retest reliability. Kovacs (1983) reported an acceptable internal consistency (coefficient alpha = .86) in a sample of children and adolescents with diverse psychiatric diagnoses. The scale’s internal consistency in samples of pediatric medical outpatients and public school students was .71 and .87 respectively. Kazdin, French, and Unis (1983) also reported a high internal consistency on the group of children hospitalized in an inpatient psychiatric unit (coefficient alpha = .82). Similar alpha coefficients were reported by Saylor, Finch, Spirito, and Bennett (1984) for grade school children (.94) and children with heterogeneous psychiatric diagnoses (.80). These same investigators also found split-half reliability coefficients of .61 for the even/odd split and .73 for the first half/second half split in the grade school sample. In the psychiatric group, the coefficient for the even/odd was .74 and .57 for the first half/second half split.

Relatively little data has been reported on test-retest reliability with the CDI. Kovacs (1983) reported a moderately high test-retest correlation coefficient of .82 over a one-month interval in a small sample of diabetic children. In a group of 90 public school children, a test-retest over a nine-week interval yielded a coefficient of .84. In a psychiatric population, a one-week test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be .87, but at 6 weeks, the test-retest reliability dropped to .59 (Saylor, Finch, Spirito, & Bennett, 1984). These investigators also reported a one-week test-retest reliability coefficient of only .38 for a sample of grade school children. Kazdin, French, Unis, and Esvedt-Dawson (1983) reported a moderate test-retest reliability coefficient of .50 for children in a psychiatric inpatient unit.
The CDI was originally designed to be administered individually to a child. This researcher administered the instrument individually to each student. Scoring was completed by the researcher following the guidelines of the test manual. It took no more than five minutes per student to score the CDI.

**Bracken's Multidimensional Self Concept Scale:**

The Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS) was developed by Bruce A. Bracken (1992) to provide assessment data related to global self-concept and six content dependent self-concept domains that are critical aspects in the social emotional adjustments of youth and adolescents. The MSCS is appropriate for students between the ages of 9 and 19 years inclusive. This instrument is a 150-item scale that required the respondents to rate items by degree of agreement. Composed of six scales, (i.e., social, competence, affect, academic, family, and physical), the MSCS was normed based on a sample of 2,501 subjects (grades 5 through 12, inclusive) selected from 17 sites throughout the United States. Each scale has 25 items. The scales can be assessed independently or in combination. Raw scores are converted to standard scores and percentile ranks. Rotatori (1994) asserted that score descriptive classifications are available based upon the degree of positive and/or negative self-concept that the student expressed in each of the six content-specific scales and the Total Scale.

The MSCS subscales and total scale produced standard scores with means of 100 and standard deviations of 15, plus percentile ranks, and self-concept classifications. The MSCS has strong subscale internal consistencies, with coefficients alpha exceeding .90 at all age levels, except for the Competence subscale, which ranges from .85 to .90. The total scale coefficients alpha are also quite high, ranging from .97 to .99 for across age levels and .98 for the total sample (Bracken, 1992).

The MSCS is a relatively new instrument. Few studies have been conducted utilizing the MSCS. The MSCS has demonstrated content validity by comparing its
content with the content of five current scales: the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1984), Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (Piers, 1984), Self-Description Questionnaire-I (Marsh, 1988), Self-Description Questionnaire-II (Marsh, 1990), and Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, Revised (Roid & Fitts, 1988). This comparison indicated considerable support for the six areas of the MSCS. Furthermore, Bracken (1992) presented other evidence that demonstrated the extent to which over 70 published personality scales evaluated personal adjustment in at least one subtest area of the MSCS (Rotatori, 1994).

Directions were easy to follow and scoring was easy. Scoring was completed by the researcher following the guidelines of the test manual. Testers, however, were cautioned to be careful when assigning score values to individual items because each scale had both positive and negative items that results in differential scoring procedures. The MSCS can be given by individuals with test administration training backgrounds in groups or individually. Again, this researcher chose to administer this instrument individually.

A test-retest reliability design covering 4 weeks has been used. A MSCS Total Scale stability coefficient of .90 was found. Test-retest correlation coefficients for each of the six subtests were: Social, .79; Competence, .76; Affect, .73; Academic, .81; Family, .78; and Physical, .81.

**Family Environment Scale:**

The Family Environment Scale (FES) was developed by Rudolf H. Moos, Ph.D. and Bernice S. Moos (1974) to measure the social-environmental attributes of various kinds of families. This 90-item true-false instrument contains ten subscales which are designed to appraise these attributes and assess three underlying domains structured after Murray's beta-press concept: the Relationship dimensions, the Personal growth dimensions, and the System Maintenance dimensions.

The Relationship dimensions are appraised by the Cohesion, Expressiveness, and
Conflict subscales. More specifically, the Cohesion subscale assesses the amount of commitment, assistance, and sustenance family members contribute to one another; Expressiveness measures the degree to which family members are encouraged to express their feelings directly and to act overtly; and Conflict appraises the extent to which family members engage in aggression, conflict, and overt anger.

The Personal Growth dimensions are measured by five subscales: Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, and Moral-Religious Emphasis. The Independence subscale appraises the degree to which family members exhibit assertiveness, self-sufficiency, and independent decision-making; Achievement-Orientation measures the impact of activities (e.g., work and school) in casting families into a competitive or achievement-oriented frame of mind; Intellectual-Cultural Orientation assesses the amount of interest in cultural, intellectual, political, and social activities; Active-Recreational Orientation judges the amount of participation in recreational and social enterprises; and Moral-Religious Emphasis rates the amount of emphasis on religious and ethical values and problems.

The System Maintenance dimensions include the Organization and Control subscales. The Organization subscale measures the extent to which lucid organization and structure carry weight in planning family activities and responsibilities, and Control assesses the extent to which established procedures and regulations are followed in running family life.

The FES has three forms: Form R (the Real Form) which was developed to measure each family member's perception of his or her family environment; Form I (the Ideal Form), was developed to assess each family member's conception of what would constitute an ideal family environment; and Form E (the Expectations Form) which was developed to appraise each family member's expectations about the impact of future events on the family, such as the arrival of a new baby. For this study, the Form R was used.
The internal consistencies for the 10 subscales ranged from .61 to .78, and the correct average item-subscale correlations range from .27 to .44. The 8-week test-retest reliabilities range from .68 to .86, and the 12-month stabilities range from .52 to .89. The face validity of the FES is good. The norms were based on 1,125 normal, 500 distressed, 81 single-parent, 85 black, 93 Mexican-American families as well as 106 from families in which one of the spouses is over 60 and 446 different sized families. The internal psychometric properties of the FES has made it one of the best measures available for assessing families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Younger M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Older M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>40.98</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>44.62</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>42.98</td>
<td>13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Cultural Orientation</td>
<td>45.26</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>44.46</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreational Orientation</td>
<td>46.82</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Religious Emphasis</td>
<td>58.15</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>58.41</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>53.45</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>10.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accompanying the reusable FES booklets were separate answer sheets, templates for scoring the answer sheets, and separate profile sheets in standard score units for interpreting performance on each of the ten subscales. Once again, the scoring was done by the researcher following the guidelines outlined in the test manual.
Research Design

The design of this study was descriptive employing analysis of variance comparisons between each of the variables. The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between parental incarceration on African-American adolescent high school students' academic performance, attendance, classroom behavior, attitudes towards school, levels of depression and self-concept, and perceptions of the family environment. The study incorporated a quantitative component only.

As a descriptive study, the data generated from the analyses can be pooled with different samples, thus generating justification and directions for further studies.

Specific Null Hypotheses

1. There is no difference among African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated and (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent on the variables of academic performance, daily absenteeism rate to school, classroom behavior, and attitudes towards school as measured by students' transcripts, standardized test data, school attendance records, and teacher-generated disciplinary referrals.

2. There is no difference on the variable of depression among African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent and (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent as measured by the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI).
3. There is no difference on the variable of self concept among African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent and (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who do not have an incarcerated parent and who live with one parent as measured by the Bracken's Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS).

4. There is no difference in roles assumed within the family among African-American adolescent high school students have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent and (a) African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents and (b) African-American adolescent high school students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent as measured by Family Environment Scale (FES).

Data Analysis

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze data for the four hypotheses. Demographic variables were forced into the equation first in order to factor out the variances for which they account. For the purpose of the quantitative analysis and for determining statistical significance, alpha was set at .05.

Ethical Consideration

The following precautions were established to maintain ethical standards:

1. Subjects were informed in writing and orally of the purpose of this investigation. A consent form included a statement of purpose and ethical safeguards. Only subjects and their parents who signed a consent form were included in the study.

2. Participation was voluntary. Subjects retained the right to decline participation or to discontinue the inventories, in part or in full, at any time.

3. Data collected in the study was kept in confidence. The data from each subject’s
inventories was coded to prevent personal identification. Only group data has been reported in the study. Once the data was recorded from the inventories, the original protocols and identifying information were destroyed.

4. Subjects were given the opportunity to receive their personal results, interpretive material and study results and to discuss these results with the researcher.

5. Subjects were assured that their responses to the inventories would not jeopardize their status or the services they receive at the institution they attend.

Summary

This researcher utilized a descriptive design to investigate the relationship between parental incarceration and academic performance, school attendance, classroom behavior, attitude towards school and learning, levels of depression and self-concept, and perceptions of family environments. The objective of the study was to compare scores among African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents, those who live with one parent but who do not have an incarcerated parent, and those who live with at least one parent but who have (or have had) an incarcerated parent, on instruments assessing several domains. Personal and demographic information was also collected from all subjects. Ethical standards were maintained during the entire data gathering processes.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between parental incarceration and African-American adolescent high school students' academic performance, attendance, classroom behavior, attitude towards school, levels of depression and self-concept, and perceptions of their family environment. The results of the statistical analyses of the data collected for this study are reported in this chapter. It is organized into three sections: descriptive statistics, data analyses of specific research hypotheses, and additional research findings.

Descriptive Statistics

The sample for this study consisted of 45 adolescent African-American high school student volunteers who were assessed by three research instruments and a researcher-generated questionnaire. Additionally, data on students' grade point averages, test data, attendance, and disciplinary referrals were collected.

Since data on family environment were not kept at the school, it was necessary for this researcher to ask this question for the purpose of assigning students to one of three groups: African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents (Group 1); African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent (Group 2); and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated (Group 3). A breakdown of the frequencies and percentages for this data is presented in Table 8. Of this total sample of 45 students, 15 were students who lived with both parents, 15 were students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent, and 15 were students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent.
TABLE 8
Description of the Family Environment (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Environment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American Adolescent High School Students Who Lived With Both Parents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Adolescent High School Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent, But Who Lived With One Parent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Adolescent High School Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each volunteer and their parent/guardian completed a consent form and each volunteer completed a descriptive questionnaire about current personal, school and family information. Frequency distributions for each of the three groups are presented in Tables 9 through 13: age, gender, grade, and male and female parents' education levels as reported by students.

Additionally, each of the three groups of students was asked questions about feelings towards parents, their home environment, school, academic performance, attendance, behavior, and attitude towards school and towards learning. A Likert scale assessed feelings on a continuum of very happy to very sad for questions 2, 5, and 6, very poor to excellent for questions 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, and critical to very unimportant for questions 7 and 8. Additionally, the students were assessed on how often they have gotten referred to an administrator for violation of the school's Code of Conduct on a continuum of everyday to never for question 11. The frequencies and percentages for each question are presented in Tables 14 to 23 (see Appendices).
### TABLE 9

**Description of Age of Subjects (N = 45)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10

**Description of Gender of Subjects (N = 45)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11

**Description of Grade Level of Subjects (N = 45)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADE LEVEL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12
Description of Education Level of Male Parents (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education of Male Parent</th>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or Trade School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate or Two-Year Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or Four-Year Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Grad. or Professional School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
Description of Education Level of Female Parents (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education of Female Parent</th>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or Trade School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate or Two-Year Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or Four-Year Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Grad or Professional School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #2

The mean score for students' feelings about parents' relationship for African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents (Group 1) was 3.73 (SD = .33), for African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent (Group 2) was 3.33 (SD = 1.04), and for African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated (Group 3) was 2.53 (SD = .74). A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance indicated a significant effect for feelings about parent's relationship, F(2,42) = 4.90, MSerror = 1.1429, p<.05.

Post hoc comparison using the multiple F test (CD = 3.43, α=.05) revealed a statistically significant decrease in positive feelings about parents' relationships between group 1 students (3.73) and group 3 students (2.53), but no significant difference between group 1 students (3.73) and group 2 students (3.33) and group 2 students (3.33) and group 3 students (2.53).

Question #7

The mean score for students' feelings about the importance of education for African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents was 4.53 (SD = .63), for African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent was 3.80 (SD = .67), and for African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated was 4.13 (SD = .74). A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance indicated a significant effect for feelings about the importance of education, F(2,42) = 4.27, MSerror = .4730, p<.05.

Post hoc comparison using the multiple F test (CD = 3.43, α=.05) revealed a statistically significant decrease in positive feelings about the importance of education between group 1 students (4.53) and group 2 students (3.80), but no significant difference
between group 1 students (4.53) and group 3 students (4.13) and between group 2 students (3.80) and group 3 students (4.13).

**Question #8**

The mean score for students' feelings about the importance of being successful in school for African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents was 4.46 (SD = .74), for African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent was 3.46 (SD = .91), and for African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated was 4.13 (SD = .63). A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance indicated a significant effect for feelings about being successful in school, $F(2,42) = 6.48, MS_{\text{error}} = .6000, p<.05$.

Post hoc comparison using the multiple F test ($CD = 3.43$, $\alpha=.05$) revealed a statistically significant decrease in positive feelings about the importance being successful in school between group 1 students (4.46) and group 2 students (3.46), but no significant difference between group 1 students (4.46) and group 3 students (4.13) and between group 2 students (3.46) and group 3 students (4.13).

A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance was run on each of the other questions from the questionnaire. The results revealed that no two groups were significantly different at the .05 level. A breakdown of the frequencies and percentages for each question is presented in Tables 14 through 23 (see Appendices).

**DATA ANALYSIS FOR RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

This section will restate each research hypothesis and then present the results for each hypothesis. Analysis of variance was used to explore the relationship between each variable: Children's Depressions Inventory (CDI), Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS), Family Environment Scale (FES), the grade point averages, standardized test...
data, attendance data, and data on disciplinary referrals. For the purpose of this analysis and for determining statistical significance, alpha was set at .05 for all statistical tests.

**Hypothesis 1:**

There will be no significant difference in academic performance, daily absenteeism rate to school, classroom behavior, and attitudes towards school as measured by students' transcripts, standardized test data, school attendance records, and teacher-generated disciplinary referrals among African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents, African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent, and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated.

A one-way between-subjects analysis of variance was run on grade point averages for the sample population. No significant difference was found among the groups of students who lived with two parents, those who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with only one parent, and those who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated. Therefore, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis (Table 24).

**TABLE 24**

Analysis of Variance on Grade Point Average Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Averages</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F(2,42) = 1.4949$, $p = .2360$ (No statistical difference)
A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance was run on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) for the sample population. No statistical difference was found among group 1 students, group 2 students, and group 3 students. Therefore, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis (Table 25).

**TABLE 25**
Analysis of Variance on Standardized Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITBS Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Total</td>
<td>164.73</td>
<td>49.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Total</td>
<td>156.66</td>
<td>46.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Total</td>
<td>154.06</td>
<td>44.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Total</td>
<td>156.93</td>
<td>46.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Language Total $F(2,42) = .7596, \ p = .4742$ (No statistical difference)
Word Total $F(2,42) = .2072, \ p = .8137$ (No statistical difference)
Math Total $F(2,42) = .3736, \ p = .6905$ (No statistical difference)
Complete Total $F(2,42) = .3535, \ p = .7043$ (No statistical difference)

A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance was run on the attendance data for the sample population. No statistical difference was found among group 1 students, group 2 students, and group 3 students. Therefore, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis (Table 26).
TABLE 26
Analysis of Variance on Attendance Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days Present</td>
<td>166.66 (Mean) 12.60 (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>157.40 (Mean) 18.80 (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>158.86 (Mean) 20.21 (Std. Dev.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>9.73 (Mean) 11.17 (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>18.53 (Mean) 16.78 (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>17.93 (Mean) 19.60 (Std. Dev.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Tardy</td>
<td>30.80 (Mean) 30.81 (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>16.06 (Mean) 13.70 (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>12.06 (Mean) 18.46 (Std. Dev.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Present F(2,42) = 1.2120, p = .3078 (No statistical difference)
      Tardy F(2,42) = 1.3748, p = .2640 (No statistical difference)
      Left Early F(2,42) = 2.9635, p = .0625 (No statistical difference)

A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance was run on the disciplinary referrals data for the sample population. No statistical difference was found among group 1 students, group 2 students, and group 3 students. Therefore, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis (Table 27).
TABLE 27
Analysis of Variance on Disciplinary Referrals Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Referrals</th>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Averages</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Referrals $F(2,42) = 1.1173, p = .3367$ (No statistical difference)
Hypothesis 2:

There will be no significant difference on the variable of depression as measured by the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) among African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents, African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated.

A one-way between-subjects analysis of variance was run on the CDI data for the sample population. On the measure of Interpersonal Mood, the mean score for group 1 was 45.46 (SD = 4.22), for group 2 was 55.73 (SD = 12.99), and for group 3 was 48.40 (SD = 5.26). A one-factor between-subjects analysis of variance indicated a significant effect for the interpersonal mood measure, $F(2,42) = 5.87$, $MS_{\text{error}} = 71.43$, $p<.05$.

Post hoc comparison using the multiple F test ($CD = 3.43$, $\alpha=.05$) revealed a statistically significant difference in interpersonal problems between group 1 (45.5) and group 2 (57.7), but no significant difference group 1 (45.5) and group 3 (48.4) and between group 2 (57.5) and group 3 (48.4).

For all other measures on the CDI, no significant difference was found between group 1 students, group 2 students, and group 3 students. Therefore, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis (Table 28).
TABLE 28
Analysis of Variance on Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std. Dev.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CDI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>2.2205</td>
<td>.1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Mood</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>.5683</td>
<td>.5709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Interpersonal Mood</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>5.8720</td>
<td>.0056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffectiveness</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>2.6217</td>
<td>.0845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhedonia</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>2.0828</td>
<td>.1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Self Esteem</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>1.4446</td>
<td>.2473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Statistically significant
**Hypothesis 3:**

There will be no significant difference on the variable of self-concept as measured by the Bracken's Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS) among African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents, African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated.

For all measures on the MSCS, no significant difference was found between group 1 students, group 2 students, and group 3 students. Therefore, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis (Table 29).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std. Dev.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>1.2350</td>
<td>.3012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>.6646</td>
<td>.5198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>1.6328</td>
<td>.2075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>1.0705</td>
<td>.3520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>1.4008</td>
<td>.2577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>.8375</td>
<td>.4399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>1.0260</td>
<td>.3672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No statistical difference
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Hypothesis 4: 

There will be no significant difference on the subscales of cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual-cultural orientation, active-recreational orientation, moral-religious emphasis, organization, and control as measured by the Family Environment Scale (FES) among African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents, African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent, and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated.

For all measures on the FES, no significant difference was found between group 1 students, group 2 students, and group 3 students. Therefore, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis (Table 30).
TABLE 30
Analysis of Variance on Family Environment Scale (FES) Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Students Living With Both Parents (Group 1)</th>
<th>Students Who Did Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Lived With Only One Parent (Group 2)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) One Parent Incarcerated (Group 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>Total Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 30 (Continuation)
Analysis of Variance on Family Environment Scale (FES) Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std. Dev.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Both Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Who Did Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have An Incarcerated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent But Who Lived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Only One Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have (or Have Had)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active-Recreational</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Religious</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>1.3414</td>
<td>.2724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>.9666</td>
<td>.3887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>(2,42)</td>
<td>.1871</td>
<td>.8300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** No statistical difference

### ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between parental incarceration and African-American adolescent high school students' academic performance, attendance, classroom behavior, attitudes towards school, levels of depression and self-concept, and perceptions about their family environment. The
previous section described the results of the research hypotheses concerning the variables of depression, self concept, and the family environment. There appears to be no difference in the level of depression, self concept and the family environments among the groups of African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents, African-American adolescent high school students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent, and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent.

Additional information was generated in this study when some students in the sample population indicated that they either lived with a relative other than the biological parent or lived with friends or friends of the family. The variables chosen for this analysis were based upon the simple frequencies. Through individual counseling sessions with these students, this researcher discovered that students from these two groups, in fact, did have a parent or both parents incarcerated, and for some reason, chose not to disclose this information. For statistical gathering purposes, these students' data were analyzed with the group of African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated. The results of this analysis are contained in Table 31.

**TABLE 31**

Frequency of Students Indicating that They Lived With Relatives Other Than Biological Parent or that They Lived with Friends or Friends of the Family (N = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Environment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live with relative (i.e., aunt, uncle, grandparent)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with friends or friends of the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

The preceding chapter reported the results of this study examining the relationship between parental incarceration and African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents, those who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with one parent, and those who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated. Descriptive statistics, data analysis of specific research hypotheses, and additional findings were reported. It was noted that no significant results were found for the four research hypotheses in this study. The next chapter will discuss the research findings and their implications.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This research was designed and implemented in an attempt to examine the affective, cognitive, and behavioral processes of African-American adolescent high school students who come from a home in which a parent is incarcerated. Specifically, this study sought to discover whether there was any relationship between parental incarceration and African-American adolescent high school students' academic performance, attendance, classroom behavior, attitude towards school as measured by a researcher-generated questionnaire, levels of depression and self-concept, and perceptions of the family environment.

This chapter will review the results presented in the previous chapter and then discuss the findings and their implications. Previous research will be highlighted in order to convey the meaning this research project has in the broader picture for counselors who work with similar students to the ones described in this research study. Besides the four original study hypotheses, additional information and findings will be extrapolated. Research limitations will be noted, as well as recommendations for further inquiry.

DISCUSSION OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The data for this study were collected over a four month period of time in hopes of documenting empirically the effects of parental incarceration on African-American adolescent high school students. Specifically, this research assessed three groups of students coming from three different home environments. Because the sample of students coming from a home where at least one parent was incarcerated was smaller than desired (N=20 for large effect), students from the other two groups of families were eliminated.
from the study. Thus, a total N of 45 students became subjects for this study.

The results of this study indicated that there was no significant difference among the three groups of subjects on any of the data collected. The observed relationship between parental incarceration and depression, self concept, and family environment as each relates to academic performance, school attendance, classroom behavior, and attitudes towards learning was not consistent with Satir's (1980) premise that the incarceration of a parent changes the family dynamics and often, children's perceptions of themselves, their needs, and expectations are distorted.

**Academic Performance**

As noted in Chapter 4, the findings with regard to academic performance, daily attendance, classroom behavior, and attitude towards school did not support hypothesis 1. Grade point averages for the three groups revealed that while there was no statistically significant difference between the students from African-American adolescent high school students who lived with both parents (Group 1) and African-American adolescent high school students who lived with one parent, but who did not have an incarcerated parent (Group 2), there was a small difference worth mentioning between the three groups. The mean grade point average for group 1 was 2.85; for group 2 (2.40); and for African-American adolescent high school students who have or have had at least one parent incarcerated and who live with only one parent (Group 3), the mean was 2.26. This was surprising to this researcher because one would expect the mean for group 1 to have been considerably higher than the means for groups 2 and 3.

Parents' active involvement in their children education often yields positive results. So often when parents are not a stranger to the school environment, visit teachers on Parent-Teachers Conference Days, attend PTA meetings, and insist that their children study each day, the payoff is worthwhile. The fruits of the parents' effort is revealed in the students grades and ultimately, in the students' grade point averages. One could
extrapolate from the results on grade point averages that parent involvement with this population of students in terms of attending conferences and meetings at school and being actively involved in the education process of the child is minimal.

In addition, the difference in academic performance level, as measured by standardized test data was even greater, though not statistically significant, in language among students from group 1 and group 3, but not for group 2 and group 3. The difference between the means of group 2 and group 3 was 14.06. It appears that there is no difference between the students from group 1 and group 2, but there is a difference between the groups 1 and 2 and group 3. One explanation for this outcome is that the students from group 3 may not have strong support networks at home. It is possible that the single-parent is caught up in compensating for the absent parent by way of working long hours to make a living, and consequently, he or she does not have the time to ensure that the student is studying properly. Poor study habits often lead to poor academic performance. This is reflected in the test scores, and this is a plausible explanation for the findings.

In Chapter 2, it was noted out that the support systems are major sources of strength for the single-parent family. Aponte (1994) proposed that a failure to consider the broad picture and the myriad of systems that come into play in the lives of African-American families, may result in a distorted perspective. Aponte further added that family dynamics are complicated and further misunderstood for the children of incarcerated parents.

**Attendance**

The inferential data presented in the preceding chapter revealed that anticipated differences between the students from groups 1, 2 and 3 on the measure of attendance data was not statistically significant. However, a difference was detected in the descriptive data, and this difference occurred in a direction unpredicted. Mean gain scores were
nearly doubled for the students' tardies in groups 1 and 3. It was further hypothesized that this non-significant difference was caused by outliers in the data. After removing the top three scores for each group, another analysis of variance was run. Again, the data revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference among the three groups.

In Chapter 2, Shaw (1986) talked about children becoming truant persistently from school when a parent became incarcerated. The data are inconclusive, for while it appears that students who live with both parents generally attend school more regularly than students from single-parent homes, students from groups 2 and 3 miss about the same number of days. This suggests that there really is no difference between single-parent families regardless of the parent's status (incarcerated or non-incarcerated). Without a strong support system, one where significant others assist the family with ensuring that students attend school on a regular basis, one can expect that single, working parents will not be as effective in changing poor school attendance patterns as is apparent oftentimes in two-parent homes. If counselors are to be effective with African-American students and their families, they must work from the perspective of the entire social system.

Behavior

It was established in Chapter 2 that children from fragmented families are more likely to suffer behavioral problems than those who live with both parents. According to the 1993 National Commission on America's Urban Families Report, previously cited in Chapter 2, children from fragmented families are more likely to suffer emotional or behavioral problems than those who live with their own parents, and father absence is an important predictor of problems such as poor school performance. Since the data from this study did not fully support the idea that African-American adolescent high school students who have or have had at least one parent incarcerated and who live with one parent demonstrate a significant difference in the number of disciplinary referrals they receive, it is possible that some other variable would better assess this phenomenon.
In addition, it was suggested that father absence was an important predictor of problems such as poor school records and a high rate of delinquency. As suggested through the literature in Chapter 2, behavioral problems such as disobedience, aggressiveness and alienation from peers are apparent quite often. With this population, however, the findings revealed that the number of referrals students with an incarcerated parent received were not the highest of the three groups. In fact, a frequency count of disciplinary referrals revealed that students who did not have an incarcerated parent but who lived with only one parent received the highest number of referrals from teachers for violating the school’s Code of Conduct.

Students received the greatest number of referrals for the following violation: defiance of school personnel’s authority. Savage et al. (1978) reported that children of incarcerated parents have more difficulty getting along with teachers than other children. The findings suggest that incarceration is not a good indicator of whether or not a student will display negative behaviors in the classroom. The findings, however, may suggest that if children are exposed to poor parental child-rearing, one can expect their behavior to be less than desirable. Children who are not accustomed to following rules at home and are not accustomed to structure may have a hard time adapting to structure in other settings. These same students also oftentimes lack direction and support. Thus, effective support networks for families, as appear to be apparent in two-parent homes in the present study, may provide necessary structure and resources to diminish the impact of an absent or incarcerated parent.

Questionnaire and Hypotheses

In the present study, all subjects from single-parent homes with an incarcerated parent were confronted for the first time with a significant adult in their lives interested in studying a topic that often is not discussed openly. The students have learned to approach any questioning about their home environment, and in particular, their parent’s
incarceration with caution. Some students even displayed evidence of resistance to certain types of questions, especially those questions that address relationships between their parents and themselves.

For question #2 on the questionnaire, the data suggests that students in group 3 generally felt somewhat sad about their relationship with their parents. This is in contrast to students who live with both parents and who tend to feel somewhat happy. For students who live with one parent but who do not have an incarcerated parent, the feeling is one of neutrality (neither sad nor happy). This corroborated the earlier findings of Sack (1977), cited in Chapter 2.

Sack's work (1977) support the idea that dependent children experience intense feelings of sadness and depression as a result of parent incarceration. When a parent becomes incarcerated, the family dynamics change. Depending on how close the incarcerated parent was to the child prior to the incarceration, this phenomenon can have a negative effect on the child. This is one plausible explanation for this difference.

For question #7 on the questionnaire, the data suggest that students in groups 1 and 3 generally place more value on the importance of education in comparison to students from group 2. For students who live with both parents and students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated, the importance of education is valued slightly higher. The group of students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent see the value of education as being just important.

This finding did not support the hypothesis either. If the findings had supported the hypothesis, students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated would have placed very little importance on the value of education. One plausible explanation for this difference is for this researcher to consider the demographic data collected from the questionnaire on parents’ education levels. The data in Chapter 4 indicated that the highest average education level attained for the male parent of students who lived with both parents was “a high school diploma” (53%), followed by “some college” (13%). For
students who did not have a parent incarcerated but who lived with only one parent, the highest average education level attained for male parents was "a high school diploma" (40%). Ironically, this was followed by "no response" (33%). Then, for students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated, the highest average level of education attained for male parents was "some high school" (60%). This suggests that the majority of the male parents have not earned a high school diploma. It appears that parents who, themselves, have not finished high school would have a difficult time convincing their child to place a great value on education.

The data on the attained education level of the female parent was slightly different. For two-parent families, the highest average education level attained for the female parent was "some college" (40%), followed by "some high school" (20%). In the single-parent home without incarceration, the highest average education level attained for the female parent was "a high school diploma" (33%), followed by "some college" (26%). Then, in the single-parent home with incarceration, the highest average education level attained for the female parent was "a high school diploma" (40%). There were more male parents in the families with incarceration that had not finished high school. It appears that the education level of a parent plays an critical part in instilling the value of education in African-American adolescent high school students.

Responses to question #8 on the questionnaire suggest that students in groups 1 and 3 generally see being successful in school as critical to very important in comparison to students from group 2. Group 2 students saw school success as just being important. This finding did not support the hypothesis either.

If the findings had supported the hypothesis, students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated would have seen school success as unimportant for themselves. This was not evident from the data collected in this study. In fact, the students from group 3 looked very similar to students from group 1. This is encouraging, for while it seems that more parents from incarcerated families have not finished high
school, the students from these families, nonetheless, believe that being successful in school is critical, lesson that has universal application to other endeavors in life. Because the data in this study suggests that students from group 3 generally feel that school success is important, the attitude of mediocrity and the feelings of low self-worth can be changed in a positive way. Again, this is a plausible explanation for the difference.

In Chapter 2, the literature suggested that children from single-parent homes and children who have experienced stressful life events are affected more deeply by these phenomena than children from other types of settings. Furthermore, the incarceration of an adolescent’s parent adversely affects development in many areas: cognitive, behaviorally, and socially. This was not supported totally by the data collected in this study.

Post-hoc analyses of African-American adolescent high school students’ scores on the CDI were conducted in an effort to determine the level of depression of specified within-group variables: Negative Mood, Interpersonal Problems, Ineffectiveness, Anhedonia, and Negative Self-Esteem. In the first analysis, the mean score for subjects on the variable of negative mood was found to be lower for students in group 1 and just about equal for students in groups 2 and 3. Judging from this analysis, depression appears to have had its greatest impact on subjects who come from single-parent homes regardless. It does not matter whether a parent is incarcerated or not. This offers a plausible explanation for this finding.

On the variable of ineffectiveness, anhedonia, and negative self-esteem, again, students from group 1 scored differently from students in groups 2 and 3. Parental incarceration is not a factor in determining whether a student will experience depression. The students in this study have all come from the same geographical location. It is quite possible that many students have similar socioeconomic status. In collecting the data, no allowances were made for the income levels of the three groups. The consideration of parents’ income levels could possibly diminish the difference that might exist among the
three family types.

The post-hoc analysis sought to determine the significance of interpersonal problems among African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated and who live with one parent in relationship to students who live with both parents and students who live with only one parent but who do not have an incarcerated parent. A finding indicated that there is a significant difference on the variable of interpersonal problems among students from group 1 and students from groups 2 and 3. These results support the earlier findings of Wade (1994) cited in Chapter 2.

Wade (1994) asserted that children from father-absent families have problems with psychosocial development, adjustment, and controlling aggression. The phenomenon of false-negatives (problem cases not being identified by the instrument when they, in fact, exist) and false-positives (problem cases being identified as clinical problems when they, in fact, are not) is of concern to this researcher. Kovacs (1992) asserted that clinical experience suggests that with the CDI, false negatives are more likely than false positives. Thus, while it appears that children who come from a home where a parent is (or has been) incarcerated have more interpersonal problems, this researcher suspects that there could be more students who experience feelings of depression that this instrument did not detect.

Post-hoc analyses of African-American adolescent high school students' scores on the MSCS were conducted in an effort to determine the level of self concept of specified within-group variables: Social, Competence, Affect, Academic, Family, and Physical. In each of the six analyses, the average mean score of subjects in group 1 was higher than for the students who were in groups 2 and 3. Judging from this analysis, the level of self-concept appeared to have had its greatest impact on all subjects from single-parent homes, with or without incarcerated parents.

Coming from a single-parent home has been viewed in the literature as being
dysfunctional, and social and education expectations may be shaped by stereotype perspectives. Thus, students’ self-concepts are low. Students from two-parent family structures cared more about being seen as academically competent than children from single-parent structures (DeSantis, Ketterlinus, & Youniss, 1990). An academically competent student may be more likely to have high self esteem, and often, these students come from the two-parent families, according to research cited in Chapter 2. This offers a plausible explanation for this finding.

Finally, a post-hoc analysis on the specified within-groups variables on the FES was conducted to determine the perceptions of the family environment among African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated and who live with one parent in relation to students who live with both parents and students who live with only one parent but who do not have a parent incarcerated. The variables looked at were the following: Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement, Intellectual-Cultural, Active-Recreational, Moral-Religious, Organization, and Control. A finding indicated that for all of the variables with the exception of independence, achievement, organization, and control, the mean scores for students from groups 2 and 3 were similar. The results partially supported the earlier findings cited in Chapter 2 that independence and achievement were highlighted in families similar to the ones in this study.

The findings in Chapter 2 revealed that single-parent families emphasized independence, intellectual and recreational activities, and expressiveness. When compared to two-parent families, single-parent families were somewhat less cohesive and structured and less oriented toward achievement and religious pursuits. Rearing children in a single-parent family is challenging for the parent. There is a movement at the federal, local, and state governments today to move able-bodied persons from the welfare rolls. This movement is forcing many single parents to go out of the homes to work. As more children are left to rear themselves, one sees that the family structure would be less
cohesive and less structured. Again, without strong parental support, there is evidence to suggest that single-parent families will be less-achievement oriented.

If the findings had fully supported the hypothesis, students who have (or have had) an incarcerated parent would have demonstrated less cohesiveness and an orientation away from achievement. The students from group 3 in this study were very similar to the students in groups 1 and 2. This suggests that the students in this study have come from the same neighborhood and were of the same racial background. Thus, the differences, if any, were negligible.

In addition, Handal (1980) found that parental marital status was related to family climate. This might explain why students from groups 2 and 3 look so similar when one considers the data analyses. Supportive and stimulating environments tend to promote cognitive development. Strong support networks and social resources might be more important predictors of adolescent adjustment than parental marital status. High-risk adolescents from families that are low in cohesion have maintained their well-being in the face of stressful family life events by developing extrafamily social ties. Adolescents from well-organized families adjust more readily, suggesting that clear rules and defined limits can have positive effects in spite of who makes the rules and who sets the boundaries.

The ecostructural concept states that one cannot treat poor and minority families without understanding their social and economic contexts (Aponte, 1994). A child’s behavior is influenced by many factors. One significant influence is the peer group. It is possible that the African-American adolescent high school students in this study experience significant peer influence.

Models in the literature for assessing traditional two-parent families are often not appropriate for looking at and comparing minority families. Further, the two-parent family is not necessarily functional. It would appear that the family structure must be modified to compensate for the loss of a significant individual (Aponte, 1994). The data from this study indicate that brief parent incarceration may not affect the sample student.
population. With longer incarceration sentences on the rise, however, it is possible, that parent incarceration will begin to make a difference in many domains that affect adolescent students’ lives.

Shaw (1992) has suggested that the experience of long-term incarceration of parents for children bears some similarity to other kinds of domestic upheavals, which may have negative effects for children. However, for the students evaluated in this study, no statistically significant differences were found among groups which included the absence or incarceration of a parent. Possibly the students and their families have developed strengths and a resilience which compensate for the challenges they face daily.

Finally, effective support networks for families may provide the necessary structure and resources to diminish the impact of an absent or incarcerated parent. Several studies have viewed the support systems as a major source of strength for the single-parent family. When support is missing, problems may emerge. The data suggest that if a backup system exists and this system works, the negative behaviors counselors and educators expect to face are minimized. The same standards appear to apply to all family types as they relate to this research study, and therefore, African-American adolescent high school students in this study who live with both parents show little difference from the students from the other two groups. The differences between the means were slight on each measure. African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents perform and behave much like students who live with one parent or who live with one parent and who have (or have had) an incarcerated parent.

The students in this study did not perform as expected based upon this researcher’s experience. It appears that having an incarcerated parent living in the home with the student prior to incarceration did not have any effect as measured by the assessment instruments. Students appear to adapt easily to their “new” family structure.

Finally, the questionnaire and instruments administered to this sample populations did not reveal any significant statistical difference in the perceptions and feelings of the
students regardless of the family environment. Possibly, an instrument that assesses affect and other aspects of the family experiences (i.e., FACES) may provide more useful data. More research in this area is needed.

In conclusion, data from this study clearly indicate that a need for further research into the relationship between parental incarceration and African-American adolescent high school students’ academic performance, school attendance, classroom behavior, attitudes towards school and learning, levels of depression and self-concept, and perceptions of the family environment is warranted.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The preceding section has reviewed and discussed the findings of this study. A variety of possible explanations exist for the failure of the data in this study to produce the hypothesized outcomes. No significant difference was found between the students who live with both parents, the students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with only one parent, and the students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent. Several limitations in this research design and methodology may have also influenced this study and the research findings. These include the following: (a) the research design; (b) the nature of the sample; and (c) the measurement instruments.

**Research Design**

This was a descriptive study instead of a longitudinal study. Baseline data were not available on students who have (or have had) at least one incarcerated parent, and thus, no data were available for comparisons. Similar studies, as well as longitudinal and qualitative studies, should be conducted in other educational settings to increase the generalizability of this study’s results.
Nature of the Sample

The composition of the sample used in this study must be considered when interpreting the study's results. Racial and cultural factors may have influenced the findings for the all-African American sample considered in this study. Since a comparison group of subjects from other races and cultures was not available, the influence of those factors could not be determined and is, therefore, these students are not representative of the population. As was noted in Chapter 3, all of the students used for this study were African-American. While this is representative of the population at the site where the study was conducted, this will limit the generalizability of the study. All of the students in this study also lived in a specific geographical location, which further limits generalizability of the study. Studying the influence of racial/cultural bias was beyond the scope of this study. An examination of racial and cultural bias among students who have (or have had) an incarcerated parent is a recommended topic for future research.

In addition, a true-experimental design was not employed. Students were not selected for this study on a random basis, and therefore, there is the possibility of sampling bias. Due to the sensitive nature of the research question, this researcher was unable to generate an adequate sample size of students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated. Students were referred by other counselors and teachers. The rest of the students volunteered. Volunteers have been found to be different from non-volunteers. Borg and Gall (1989) stated that although most educational research involves voluntary subjects, these samples have greater potential for bias than random, non-voluntary samples.

Future research should attempt to assess a larger number of subjects at the same point in time. By replicating the assessment on larger groups of random subjects, insight will be gained into the reliability of the non-significant results generated by this study.
Measurement Instruments

All measurement instruments contain possibility for measurement error. The three measurement instruments used in this research have impressive records for their use in scholarly investigations. The instruments were not used in isolation but as a reliability check for each other. With the additional verification of instrument reliability, the chance of the findings being influenced by measurement error appears less likely because several pieces of data were analyzed. Despite their credible reliability and validity scores, a qualitative component to a study of this nature might have given insight into the cognitive processes of students who have an incarcerated parent.

Post-hoc analyses of the experimental group subjects' scores on the CDI, MSCS, and FES were conducted in an effort to determine the impact of parental incarceration on specified within-group variables. In nearly every analysis, the mean scores among students from groups 2 and 3 were similar and different from students from group 1. Judging from this analysis, parental incarceration does not appear to have that great of an impact on students' academic performance, school attendance, and classroom behavior, nor does parental incarceration greatly impact students' levels of depression and self concept and their perceptions of their family environments.

In summary, this study has a number of limitations which may serve to restrict its generalizability. While these limitations are significant, they do not necessarily undermine the importance of the findings of this study. They do, however, demand consideration from other researchers and educators attempting to generalize the conclusions drawn from this study.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

A review of literature revealed that there is an obvious absence of research and data examining the impact of parental incarceration on African-American adolescent high
school students. This research was an attempt to address that need. The results from this study appear to indicate that there is no significant difference in depression, self concept, and the family environment among African-American adolescent high school students who live with both parents, African-American adolescent high school students who do not have an incarcerated parent incarcerated but who live with only one parent, and African-American adolescent high school students who have (or have had) an incarcerated parent and who live with one parent. More exploration of this topic is necessary to validate these findings.

CONCLUSION

This previous section has reviewed the findings of this study and discussed the implications of these study results. This single study did not produce strong evidence that parental incarceration was a predictor of poor academic performance, poor school attendance, classroom behavior problems, lower levels of depression and self concept, and distorted perceptions of the family environment. It did, however, succeed in promoting the concept that fundamental to working with and understanding African-American families is an awareness of the students’ ecostructural system. This information may be useful in future efforts to answer the research question.

Although the research hypotheses were not supported, this study has also established a research base on parental incarceration and its effect. It also has provided data about a group of students who have (or have had) at least one parent incarcerated. Additional research is now possible with subsequent groups of students coming from similar family environments. Generalizations based upon these conclusions, however, need to be approached with caution as suggested in the discussion of the limitations of this study.

In addition, future research is needed to determine whether there is a difference between adolescent high school students from various cultures and locations. It would
also be beneficial for counselor educators to recognize that this population of students exists and may have special needs. Workshops should be designed and made available for school guidance counselors to make them aware of and sensitive to the unique needs of students who have an incarcerated parent. In addition, more research is needed to examine and clarify the long-term effects of incarceration on male students as opposed to female students.

As has been emphatically stated several times throughout this study, very little research has been conducted in this area. This study adds to the body of knowledge that currently exists, but more research is needed. In spite of the results of this research study, the long-term effects of incarceration have not been fully realized and extensive research in this area must be undertaken.
Greetings from Mr. Stroble's Office:

DISSERTATION RESEARCH STUDY

As many of you know, I am in the process of completing my doctoral studies at The College of William and Mary in Virginia. To complete my degree program, I need to conduct a research study and to defend orally my results at a later date. I desperately need you, the students of John Marshall High School, to assist me with my study. You will be chosen to participate only if you indicate your desire to do so by completing the "Dissertation Participation Form." At this time, I need to get a list of the names of the students who are willing to participate and those who are not willing to participate. If you are willing to participate, you will be contacted later with more details.

WHAT WILL I HAVE TO DO?

• Fill out a 14-item questionnaire relating to your academic performance, your attendance, and your classroom behavior in school.
• Fill out three paper and pencil surveys relating to your feelings of depression, your self-concept, and your family environment.

IF I DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE AND LATER CHANGE MY MIND, CAN I?

• Absolutely! You have the right to drop out of the study at any time without the threat of any negative consequences.

WILL I BE IDENTIFIED AS BEING A PART OF YOUR STUDY?

• No! Your data will be assigned a code number that only I will know. When the final report is prepared, I will give you a copy of the report if you want one. Within the report itself, nobody's name will ever be mentioned. You will be described only as a group.

HOW LONG WILL THIS STUDY LAST?

• I anticipate beginning to meet with those students who are selected to participate on an individual basis around the beginning of October, 1996. I further anticipate that it will take you about 2 hours to complete the pen and pencil surveys and the questionnaire.

HOW, THEN, DO I BECOME A PART OF YOUR STUDY?

• Ask your homeroom teacher for a sign up slip and return the slip directly to me in the Guidance Office, OR place the slip in the box on Ms. Hicks' desk (the box with the padlock on it).

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH SOME OF YOU OVER THE NEXT FEW WEEKS AS I ATTEMPT TO COMPLETE MY STUDY.
DISSERTATION RESEARCH PARTICIPATION FORM

1.  ____ **YES!** Mr. Stroble, I am willing to participate in your study. You have my permission to contact me at a later date to discuss further with me what I am expected to do. (Answer question number two.)

2.  ____ **NO!** Mr. Stroble, I am not willing to participate in your study. (Do not answer the next question.)

2. What living arrangement best describes your home? **(Circle only one.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live with both parents</th>
<th>Live with one parent</th>
<th>Live with one parent; my other parent is incarcerated</th>
<th>Live with relative (i.e., aunt, uncle, grandparent)</th>
<th>Live with friends or friends of the family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

__________________________________________________________  _______________________
(Print your full name)                                      (Homeroom No.)
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Dear Parent/Guardian:

I am interested in interviewing your son/daughter about his/her feelings as they relate to academic performance, school attendance, classroom behavior, and attitude towards school. Students will be identified and placed in one of three groups: students who live with both parents; students who do not have an incarcerated parent but who live with one parent; and students who come from a home where a parent is (or has been) incarcerated to compare each group's unique home environments. I hope that other students with similar family backgrounds as those that will be studied can benefit from what this research project will discover.

Specifically, I want to make an appointment to talk to your son/daughter and to ask him/her to fill out some paper and pencil questionnaires (surveys). The time required to complete these items will be about two hours. Everything your son/daughter writes down by way of the instruments will be confidential. In addition, this research study will require access to individual student records (i.e., standardized test data, grade point averages, class ranks, attendance records, and disciplinary records). I will report summaries only on all data collected, so all data will be reported as part of a group or as an anonymous quotation. I shall be happy to provide you and your child with a copy of the results of the study at its conclusion if you wish.

If you decide to allow your son/daughter to participate in this study, please read the consent form. You and your child must sign one copy of the form and return it to me, keeping the other copy for your information. I look forward to the possibility of working with your child on this important study.

Sincerely,

Willie L. Stroble, Jr., Ed.S.
Guidance Counselor
John Marshall High School
Richmond, Virginia
Phone: (804) 780-6052 (O) or 553-4063 (H)
Consent Form

This consent form is to request your child's voluntary participation in a study to be conducted in 1996 by Willie L. Stroble, Jr. in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree in Counseling at The College of William and Mary in Virginia. Please read the following information carefully and sign the section marked "Informed and Voluntary Consent to Participate" if you are willing to allow your child to participate in the study and your child agrees to participate.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the experiences of children who have an incarcerated parent and the effects this incarceration has on the child's academic performance, school attendance, classroom conduct, and attitude towards school. Children this type home environment will be then compared to children who come from a two-parent home and to children who come from single-parent homes. The participants will be asked to comment on their feelings towards their parents and towards school, before, during and after the incarceration. Because very little research has been done on children from African-American families, this study will describe the children's feelings using objective measures to which they self-report. The goal of the study is to provide mental health professionals (i.e., counselors) with useful tools for diagnosing and assessing the needs of this student population.

AMOUNT OF TIME INVOLVED FOR PARTICIPANTS

Participants will be asked to fill out three standardized instruments: the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), the Bracken's Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES) and a questionnaire developed by the researcher. It is expected that the tests and the questionnaire will take about two hours to complete. A summary of the combined results of the study will be sent to you and the student participants who wish to receive copies.

RISKS AND BENEFITS

We, my child and I, understand that the risks involved in participating in this study are minimal. They are no greater than those encountered in standard assessment processes. We understand that no benefit can be guaranteed from participating in this study, except for the satisfaction of knowing that my child is potentially helping other students with similar backgrounds as my child and myself.
COSTS AND PAYMENTS

We understand that we will not be compensated for my child's participation in this study.

ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

All data collected in this study will be kept confidential. Participant data will be assigned a number and only the researcher will have access to that number. For purposes of reporting results, only group data or anonymous quotations will be used. No data will be used for any purpose except that expressly specified in this study.

ASSURANCE OF VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. We understand that we are free to refuse to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time. We understand that our decision to refuse to participate or to withdraw will not adversely affect the services I or my child receive at John Marshall High School, Richmond, Virginia or result in any penalty whatsoever.

AVAILABILITY OF RESULTS

Please check here if you wish to receive a written summary of the results of this study

INFORMED AND VOLUNTARY CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

We have been fully informed and consent to participate in the study outlined above. Our right to decline to participate or to withdraw at any time has been guaranteed.

Student's Signature Date

Parent/Guardian's Signature Date

Address

Phone Number
Research with Human Subjects Protocol

1. **Description of the Research**
   (a) research question
   (b) scientific or educational benefits of the work
   (c) potential risks to the participants
   (d) faculty person responsible
   (e) research methodology

2. **Copies of**
   (a) standardized tests
   (b) researcher-designed questionnaire

3. **Consent Form**

4. **Description of Participants**

5. **Will the subjects be:** (check one)
   ___yes ___no (a) fully informed
   ___yes ___no (b) partially informed
   ___yes ___no (c) deceived

6. **Will subjects be told that they may terminate participation at any time?**
   ___yes ___no

   Will subjects be informed that they may refuse to respond to particular questions or refuse to participate in particular aspects of the research?
   ___yes ___no

7. **Does the research involve any physically intrusive procedures or pose a threat to the subjects' physical health in any way? If so, please explain.**

8. **Will the research involve:**
   ___yes ___no (a) physical stress or tissue damage?
   ___yes ___no (b) likelihood of psychological stress (anxiety, electric shock, failure, etc.)?
   ___yes ___no (c) deception about purposes of research (but not about risks involved)?
   ___yes ___no (d) invasion of privacy from potentially sensitive or personal questions?

   If any of the above is involved, explain the precaution to be taken. Also, if any of the above is involved and the research is conducted by a student, explain how the faculty advisor will supervise the project.

9. **If any deception is involved, explain the debriefing procedure to be followed.**
Sex: Male____  Female____  Race: ________________
Grade Level: _____
Today's Date: ________________

Indicate the highest level of education completed by your father (or male guardian) and by your mother (or female guardian).

Father (Circle only one choice.)
1. Grade School  f. Associate or two-year degree
2. Some high school  g. Bachelor's or four-year degree
3. High school diploma or GED  h. Some graduate or professional school
4. Business or trade school  i. Graduate or professional degree
5. Some college  j. Unknown

Mother (Circle only one choice.)
1. Grade School  f. Associate or two-year degree
2. Some high school  g. Bachelor's or four-year degree
3. High school diploma or GED  h. Some graduate or professional school
4. Business or trade school  i. Graduate or professional degree
5. Some college  j. Unknown

Directions: After reading each question, circle the response that best describes your opinion, feelings, or perception about the particular subject and of your family situation.

1. What living arrangement best describes your home?
   - Live with both parents (biological parents)
   - Live with one parent (one biological parent)
   - Live with one parent; my other parent is incarcerated (one biological parent)
   - Live with relatives (i.e., aunt, uncle, grandparent)
   - Live with friends or friends of the family

2. How do you feel about your parents' relationship?
   - Very happy
   - Somewhat happy
   - Neither sad nor happy
   - Somewhat sad
   - Very sad

3. How would you rate your relationship with your father?
   - Very poor
   - Poor
   - Fair
   - Good
   - Excellent

4. How would you rate your relationship with your mother?
   - Very poor
   - Poor
   - Fair
   - Good
   - Excellent
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5. How do you feel about your home environment?

- Very happy
- Somewhat happy
- Neither sad nor happy
- Somewhat sad
- Very sad

6. How do you feel about school?

- Very happy
- Somewhat happy
- Neither sad nor happy
- Somewhat sad
- Very sad

7. How important is your education for you?

- Critical
- Very important
- Important
- Somewhat unimportant
- Very unimportant

8. How important is being successful in school for you?

- Critical
- Very important
- Important
- Somewhat unimportant
- Very unimportant

9. How would you rate your performance in school?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

10. How would you rate your attendance to school?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

11. How often do you get referred to a principal for violating the school's Code of Conduct?

- Everyday
- Most of the times (1-3 times a week)
- Sometimes (1-3 times a week)
- Rarely (1-3 times a month)
- Never

12. How would you rate your behavior in school?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

13. What is your attitude towards school?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

14. What is your attitude towards learning?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent
TABLE 14
Classification of Relationship with Father (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Relationship</th>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 2.45, p = .0997 (No significant difference)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Relationship</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = .6829, p = .5107 (No significant difference)
# TABLE 16
Classification of Feelings About Home Environment (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Feelings</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Somewhat Sad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Neither Sad nor Happy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Somewhat Happy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very Happy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 1.1580, p = .3239 (No significant difference)
TABLE 17  
Classification of Feelings About School (N = 44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent *(N=14)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Feelings</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Sad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Somewhat Sad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Neither Sad nor Happy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Somewhat Happy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very Happy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One subject did not respond to this question.

Note: F(2,42) = .3012, p = .7415 (No significant difference)
TABLE 18
Classification of Feelings About Performance in School (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Feelings</th>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 1.4000, p = .2579 (No significant difference)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Feelings</th>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 1.9342, p = .1572 (No significant difference)
TABLE 20
Self-Report on Referrals to Principals for Violating School's Code of Conduct (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Relationship</th>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -(1-3 times a month)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Most of the times (1-3 times a week)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Everyday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 1.2923, p = .2853 (No significant difference)
### TABLE 21
Classification of Feelings About Behavior in School (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Feelings</th>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 2.0254, p = .1446 (No significant difference)
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### TABLE 22
Classification of Attitude Towards School (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Attitude</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 2.4595, p = .0977 (No significant difference)
TABLE 23
Classification of Attitude Towards Learning (N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Attitude</th>
<th>Students Who Live With Both Parents (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Do Not Have An Incarcerated Parent But Who Live With Only One Parent (N=15)</th>
<th>Students Who Have (or Have Had) At Least One Incarcerated Parent (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F(2,42) = 1.3706, p = .2651 (No significant difference)
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