

70-23,010

VINCENT, Robert David, 1942-
SUMMER EMPLOYMENT AND POOR YOUTH: AN EVALUATIVE
DESCRIPTION.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1970
Social Psychology

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT AND POOR YOUTH:

AN EVALUATIVE DESCRIPTION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ROBERT D. VINCENT

Norman, Oklahoma

1970

**SUMMER EMPLOYMENT AND POOR YOUTH:
AN EVALUATIVE DESCRIPTION**

APPROVED BY

William R. Hood
John W. Moore
Raymond L. Laver
Anthony O. Foster
Robert W. Kettner

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Appreciation must go for the dissertation research to Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio, for its support of the project.

For their kind, patient, non-bureaucratic participation in this project the assistance of Drs. Ketner, Feaver, Morris and Foster has been gratefully received and is much appreciated.

For the sometimes miraculous transition from vague sheets of yellow legal paper to impeccable final copy, the experience and hard work of Betty Frensley is acknowledged anew as with so many other efforts of this sort.

In five years of graduate study, most are kind, many are friends, but few give as much as Bob Hood, and that giving can be celebrated with one word--freedom--the opportunity to learn, to become, to love life and the doing of it all in one's own time. Few in academia have the courage to offer something so simple. This precious gift was mine and it can only be acknowledged by giving it to others whose needs are the same.

To Linda there are no words, except the many that have passed between us, marvelously this paper changes nothing for us and yet we did it together--it is ours "for what it is worth" and more.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM	1
II. METHOD.	30
III. RESULTS	40
IV. DISCUSSION	96
V. SUMMARY	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY	112
APPENDIXES	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Income Groups by Race	6
2 Distribution of Job Types and Income by White and Nonwhite Population.	7
3 Labor Force Distributed by Employment Status, Race, and Sex, Adjusted for Census Bureau Undercount of Nonwhites, Columbus, Ohio, 1960.	9
4 Unemployment Rate and Participation in Total Labor Force, 25 to 54-Year-Old Nonwhite Men, by Marital Status, March, 1967	11
5 Classifying Disadvantaged Persons Annual Net Income Criteria	13
6 N. A. B. Job Goals, Pledge, and Actual Employment for Summer Jobs, 1968	17
7 Bipolar Adjectival Scales with Factor Loadings for Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Dimensions.	33
8 Personal Characteristics	42
9 Birthplace and Length of Residence.	43
10 Family Structure	44
11 Income Source	45
12 Time in Transit and Method of Transportation.	46
13 Education	48
14 Priority of School Attended by Race	49

15	Place of Birth as a Function of Race	50
16	Time in Transit as a Function of Transportation Mode	50
17	Time Spent in Transit as a Function of Race	51
18	Source of Income Alternative as a Function of Race . .	51
19	Mean Number of Siblings Distributed by Race	52
20	Mean Number of Siblings Distributed by Family Structure	52
21	Regression Statistics Utilizing Race as an Independent Variable to Predict Certain Dependent Variables . . .	54
22	Regression Statistics Utilizing Mean Siblings as an Independent Variable to Predict Family Structure . . .	55
23	Intercorrelation of Scales in the Potency I Dimension.	59
24	Intercorrelation of Scales in the Evaluative Dimension	60
25	Intercorrelation of Scales in the Activity Dimension. .	60
26	Intercorrelation of Scales in the Adolescent Value Dimension.	61
27	P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Work"	63
28	Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Work"	66
29	P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Paycheck".	67
30	Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Paycheck".	70
31	P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Boss"	71

32	Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Boss"	74
33	P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Cop".	75
34	Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Cop".	78
35	P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "My Life"	79
36	Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "My Life"	82
37	P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Fight".	83
38	Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Fight".	86
39	P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Soul"	87
40	Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Soul"	90
41	Task Analysis Scores for All Companies by Factor Clusters for the Concept "Work".	91

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT AND POOR YOUTH:
AN EVALUATIVE DESCRIPTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

This dissertation examines the relationship between a number of demographic variables and attitudinal variables obtained from a sample of summer employed youth. In addition, descriptive measures of job conditions are presented in terms of expressed satisfaction with employment. In examining the original data of this study, particular attention is given to the racial dimensions of current employment strategies and possible misconceptions such as the perception of the "black community" as monolithic in terms of aspiration and need. In addition, particular strategies for youth summer employment are discussed as indicated by the combined analysis of attitudinal and demographic variables.

A basic problem in the formulation of employment programs is the development of an accurate social-psychological perception of the target population attended by a development of the relationship between this perception and employment strategies. The problem for this research is to describe appropriate methodology for deriving such perceptions.

Background

For almost a century, this country has struggled to achieve some possible, even if imperfect, fruition to the concept of the right of every man to equality and inherent dignity. In the past decade, this struggle has led to a most painful experience involving the recognition of elements of social repression. These considerations have created a growing concern for certain institutional elements of our society. One of these institutions, public assistance, may be doing great harm by substituting human maintenance for human dignity. This failure may in part be based on the anomaly of a welfare system existing within a society based, in large part, on the protestant "work ethic" or redemption. The Advisory Council on Public Welfare recently concluded that, "Public assistance payments are so low and so uneven that the Government is by its own standards and definition a major source of the poverty on which it has declared unconditional war" (1966, p. 12). The imposition of the "work ethic" prescribes that employment yield greater benefits than any system involving unemployment as a requirement. The outcome is a compromise between professional social welfare advocates and the business community (as chief advocates of the "work ethic") which seems to keep both groups employed but does little to solve the problems of poor people.

One expression of this compromise, the current Social Security and Public Assistance Act was written during the middle thirties as a simplistic response to massive depression. At that time in equally simplistic fashion, poverty was often defined roughly by head count of those

people who were out of work perhaps for no other reason than that the economy in its present condition could not provide them with jobs. The implicit condition of such a definition was that all those out of work were in fact employable. The issues of class discrimination and equal opportunity were yet to become major public concerns. Welfare grants at that point in time were intended as a tool to provisionally guarantee certain human necessities of people who were unemployed. Public works programs followed essentially the same philosophy: If it is not possible for the private sector to employ a given individual, then it is incumbent upon all the people in the form of their government to provide support from public income.

This decision set an unfortunate precedent. It became acceptable to think in terms of the government's responsibility for the poor and business' responsibility for maintaining the economic system. The private sector abdication of social responsibility accompanied by bureaucratic ambition to increase influence has been the uneasy state for thirty years between private sector and government.

The state of affairs has allowed business to avoid solving racial discrimination, low wage, and job injury problems, among others, by utilizing public sector programming as the backstop to their failure. In general, the cost of not solving inherent problems of the dominant free-enterprise economic system has been foisted on the public (in terms of monetary loss) and then ultimately upon the poor. Poor, for more reasons than unemployment, this segment of the population absorbs a tremendous

loss in terms of the destruction of human resources. Even though it has become increasingly apparent that solutions resting solely upon governmental effort are not entirely successful in providing aid to the poor in employment, until the present time, we have continued to devise solutions to poverty based on the assumption of private sector disinterest. A good example of such apartheid is reported by Leon H. Keyserling, an economist, who finds that 60 percent of those considered in poverty were employed in some fashion during 1965 (Keyserling, 1966). Add to this figure those subsisting on public assistance and we have a good picture of the poor--not as the unemployed but as the casualties and walking wounded of our economic system.

The private and public sectors are, however, beginning to show signs of cooperation through efforts having a joint nature in terms of funding and administration. Industrial Relations News reports that this cooperation now extends to tax credits for appropriate employment activity.

One area of focus has been the employment of poor youth during the school year and the summer to provide "favorable" work experience in an effort to lower school "drop out" rates. The basis of this concern with youth seems to be the relationship between spiralling public assistance costs and the attendant concern for the possibility that "maintained" families beget children who are more likely to become chronically unemployed and thus public burdens (Lazarus, 1968). Additionally, concern is voiced that such youth being poor (and perhaps alienated) will possibly

engage in acts destructive to the "system" (riots). In short, the argument is that schemes of public assistance destroy the "work ethic" and therefore the sustaining value of a "free enterprise system." The logic of such a statement is not altogether clear as many public assistance recipients are constantly moving in and out of the labor market (Carter, 1968), and people in riots are as likely to be employed as not (Kerner, 1968). One purpose of this study is to note such rationale in its description of the poor youth employed by a private sector summer program.

Problem

National Dimensions. According to Government figures, 22 percent of the labor force will be comprised of people between the age of 16-22 by 1970. Unemployment in this age group falls disproportionately to poor youth with an average 17.4 percent of 16-19 year olds being unemployed. (Fifty percent beyond the national average for youth this age.) (Labor Dept. Manpower Report 1967).

According to Profile of Youth (1966), up to 30 percent of these low-income youth are high school dropouts and unemployment among this group soars to 27 percent. If sharing a disproportionate share of unemployment is problematic, then this problem of growing frustration begins early for the ghetto child and grows to full blossom upon entering the labor market as a dropout.

Racial Dimensions. If a young person is a member of a racial minority, the likelihood that he will be unemployed is more than twice

that of his white counterpart.

This unemployment and the special problem it poses for black Americans is dramatically stated by Moynihan:

The principal measure of progress toward equality will be that of employment. It is the primary source of individual or group identity. In America what you do is what you are: to do nothing is to be nothing; to do little is to be little. The equations are implacable and blunt, and ruthlessly public.

For the Negro American it is already, and will continue to be, the master problem. It is the measure of white bonafides. It is the measure of Negro competence, and also of the competence of American society. Most importantly, the linkage between problems of employment and the range of social pathology that afflicts the Negro community is unmistakable. Employment not only controls the present for the Negro American but, in a most profound way, it is creating the future as well. (1968, p. 252.)

The poor, young black has little to recommend employment as he lives with a knowledge of the following figures which are crushingly apparent in the patterns of ghetto life.

Table 1
Income Groups by Race

Income Group	Percentage of Negro Families 1966	Percentage of White Families 1966
\$7,000 and over	28%	55%
\$3,000 to \$6,999	41	33
under \$3,000	32	13

Source: Rennie (1969, p. 7)

Although it is growing, Negro family income is not keeping pace with white family income growth. In constant 1965 dollars, median non-white income in 1947 was \$2174 lower than median white income. By 1966 the gap had grown to \$3036.

The inequity in income potential is illustrated by the following figures on status and income potential of various job types for nonwhites as compared to whites.

Table 2
Distribution of Job Types and Income
by White and Nonwhite Population

	Percentage of Male Workers in Each Type of Occupation		Median Earnings of All Male Civilians in Each Occupation
	1966		1965
	<u>White</u>	<u>Nonwhite</u>	
Professional, Technical, Managerial	27%	9%	\$7, 603
Clerical and Sales	14	9	5, 532
Craftsmen and Foremen	20	12	6, 270
Operatives	20	17	5, 046
Service Workers	6	16	3, 436
Nonfarm Laborers	6	20	2, 410
Farmers and Farm Workers	7	8	1, 699

Source: Rennie (1969, p. 8)

Undoubtedly any program attempting to deal with unemployment among poor youth must take in account these racial dimensions. Such programs may place major emphasis on the utilization of employment for solution to racial parity as a primary goal with class parity only secondary in estimating its performance. This approach might focus the concern of the private sector more on inequity than perhaps one of its symptoms, violence and civil destruction. The extent to which such programs move beyond compensatory effort may reflect this concern. In any case a legitimate question is raised as to whether youth employment programs are motivated toward the problem of youth unemployment or the problem of youth violence.

The dimensions of racial violence on a national scale are very well known, over one billion dollars in property damage, and the more tragic loss of lives, barely illustrate the deepening division between races.

Local Dimensions. The specific problem to which this study gives attention is unemployment and attendant low education status in a large midwestern quasi-industrial city, Columbus, Ohio. The following table enumerates the total unemployment problem.

In addition, as much as 10 percent more of the total poor population were likely to have to quit high school before graduation. The number is somewhat higher for nonwhites (Rennie, 1969).

The statistics are sufficient to illustrate the presence in Columbus

Table 3

Labor Force Distributed by Employment Status,
Race, and Sex, Adjusted for Census Bureau
Undercount of Nonwhites,
Columbus, Ohio, 1960

	Nonwhite	White	Total
Male (14 and over)			
Labor Force	21,269	102,054	123,323
Employed	18,999	97,086	116,085
Unemployed	2,270	4,968	7,238
Female (14 and over)			
Labor Force	13,578	59,101	72,679
Employed	12,389	56,782	69,171
Unemployed	1,189	2,319	3,508
Totals			
Labor Force	34,847	161,155	196,002
Employed	31,388	153,868	185,256
Unemployed	3,459	7,287	10,746

Nonwhite Subemployment in a Standardized Disadvantaged
Area of Columbus, Ohio, 1960

	Unemployment	Underemployment	Total Subemployment
Male	1780	4005	5785
Female	<u>932</u>	<u>2097</u>	<u>3029</u>
Total	2712	6102	8814

Source: U. S. Census 1962, p. 50

of the problems mentioned under the section on "National Dimensions."

The importance of education as a variable of consideration in

defining this problem is underscored by Kenneth Clark, "The contempt of these children for school is clearly related to the high dropout statistics, aggression, and seeming unmanageability of children in such schools. They are in a sense revolting against a deep and pervasive attack upon their dignity and integrity as human beings." (1967, p. 129.)

This is an especially acute problem in the ghetto where levels of academic achievement vary strongly with race to the exclusion of both class and family structure variables (Tulkin, 1968). Consequently the decision of the private sector to provide employment as an alternative way of visualizing ones potential may in part be based on an awareness of the school's failure.

Cost of Unemployment. Recent activity in the area of social accounting has led to a variety of attempts to characterize certain social problems with a limited number of quantifiable datum (indicators). The usual form is utilization of a "systems" framework (dynamic flow) to determine the relative costs of certain problems, the various dimensions and costs of alternative solutions. At best, the technique is a geometry of options, at worst a confusing quagmire of data (Bauer, 1966). In general there are many costs to unemployment. The basic form the data takes is either tax or public income cost and loss to the unemployed person, himself, both in terms of income and certain intangibles. As the argument for private sector employment most often relates to the cost of Public Assistance (approximately 7.5 million people consuming

3.3 billion dollars per year in public income) and its reduction, perhaps we should examine the argument (Kerner, 1968).

The crux of the argument is that unemployment breeds unstable family conditions and the following table seems to support such contention.

Table 4

Unemployment Rate and Participation in Total Labor
Force, 25 to 54-Year-Old Nonwhite Men, by
Marital Status, March, 1967

	Unemployment Rate Nonwhite	Labor Force Participation (%) Nonwhite
Married, Wife Present	3.7	96.7
Other (Separated, Divorced, Widowed)	8.7	77.6

Source: U. S. Census (1962, p. 62)

This table is comprised of nonwhites consistent with the narrowing focus of private sector involvement described in the section on "Racial Dimension." However, the table does not indicate the number of such broken homes which presently receive welfare payments. In addition, the only way to guarantee reduction in cost would be to gainfully employ mothers receiving AFDC grants. However, the basic focus of present manpower efforts in the private sector is directed at men. There are 60,000 men whose families receive Public Assistance (AFDC-UP)

in 22 states whose employment would comprise an immediate savings of 120 million dollars, or \$2419 per annum per man (Kerner, 1968). Even in the most pessimistic cases involving special retraining, cost of employment is raised only \$1100 per person (Garity, 1968). The profit of such a move on the part of the private sector to remove what it presently considers a revenue loss is clear.

In addition, if nonwhite unemployment was reduced to the 3.4 percent level of white unemployment and in the process earnings attained an average of \$3,864 (nonwhite median), the additional income beyond cost would be 1.38 billion Dollars (Rennie, 1969). Considering this manner of stating the problem perhaps the impetus of the private sector is best understood in the strictly business fashion as a calculated maneuver to insure profit. If this is the case, then perhaps a flurry of cost benefit analyses will be the best indicator of private sector commitment to the solution of socio-economic problems.

The "Problem" Population. An effort designed to solve social problems inevitably targets on some segment of the population. The contention being that these definitional criteria are essential to efficient management of the program. Several agencies have evolved definitions of poor/disadvantaged which are actually used to screen persons in or out of manpower programming. The following is the definition utilized by the United States Employment Service:

A disadvantaged individual, for manpower program purposes,

is a poor person who does not have suitable employment, and who is either (1) a school dropout, (2) a member of a minority group, (3) under 22 years of age, (4) 45 years of age or over, or (5) handicapped. (1968, p. 1, emphases in original.)

The critical concept "poor" is defined along the lines of the now familiar poverty income scale illustrated in the following table.

Table 5
Classifying Disadvantaged Persons
Annual Net Income Criteria

Family Size	Income - Nonfarm	Income - Farm
1	\$1600	\$1100
2	2000	1400
3	2500	1800
4	3200	2200
5	3800	2700
6	4200	2900
7	4700	3300
8	5300	3700
9	5800	4100
10	6300	4400
11	6800	4800
12	7300	5100
13 or more	7800	5500

Source: U. S. Employment Service (1968, p. 2)

As an additional criteria, the National Alliance of Businessmen summer youth program attempted to base recruitment on a priority listing of inner-city high schools whose major population characteristics were nonwhite and low income.

A nondemographic approach to this youth population involving

consideration of attitudinal referents usually focuses on "problem behaviors" (i. e., delinquents). One outcome of such studies, in terms of public opinion, has been the tendency to consider young blacks in a homogeneous fashion, insofar as values are concerned. This dubious tendency is especially facilitated by the efficient stereotyping aspects of racial discrimination. The "red-neck" bigot sees colored as inherently inferior, the white businessman sees Negroes as "unmotivated, " and the social scientist sees blacks as "alienated. " All of these judgments are based, to some extent, on racist categorization. More dangerously, they have the aspect of the "wise men and the elephant" parable.

The fashion in which such programming responds to the needs of disadvantaged youth to a great extent depends on the harsh reality of screening procedures based on employer expectation for the population. To what extent can a poor black high school graduate be expected to be less alienated than a poor black dropout, or can he? Definitions should aim at answering these questions as well.

National Alliance of Businessmen

National. On January 23, 1968, an effort, which utilizes the resources of private industry in conjunction with governmental support, was launched: The National Alliance of Businessmen. Its advocates felt that this effort would begin to fulfill at least the promise of equal opportunity.

The National Alliance has committed itself to two goals: the provision of 500,000 permanent jobs by June, 1971 through the BASIC JOBS program and 200,000 jobs each summer for the youth employment program (Beebe, 1968). Because of potential for immediate results and wider variance in programming, the youth component is the subject of this study.

At a general level the stated purpose of the summer program is to expose young people to a favorable employment experience. Some black leaders see the program as no more than a "buying off" of angry black youth. To some extent, this opinion is mirrored by a businessman who reasons that, "... a riot is a lot more expensive." Most of the participants would agree that the problems confronting the summer youth program are essentially the elimination of: (1) widespread violence during the euphemistic "long hot summer," and (2) the vicious cycle of low employment skills growing out of the ghetto school. In other words, can these young people be encouraged to complete skill training? It is hoped by N. A. B. that most businessmen will take advantage of the summer program for reasons other than just "cooling off" an explosive situation and will, in fact, view it as an opportunity to compress into a few months the "rich" rewards of the free enterprise system.

In a more reflective mood, the view considers that today we are creating 1 1/2 million new jobs per year. Unemployment is at a low figure for the decade, varying from 3.2 percent to 4 percent of the "worker" population. In every sense of the word, the economists would see

this figure as approaching full employment. We have reached a point at which our economy, boosted by automation and affluence, continues to spiral upward at a rapid rate. Business may have reached a point of one limitation: the relative availability of necessary labor skills. Many poor youngsters do not have these skills. Any opportunity to encourage these youth to obtain skills, which might be successful, must be taken "to insure the continued growth of the business economy."

Local Alliances. In the great tradition of "republican" enterprise local N. A. B. organizations enjoy a considerable autonomy. An autonomy which, essentially, is related to local willingness to support the activity without federal subsidy. The Columbus Metropolitan Committee for N. A. B. lists the following functions:

- (a) Solicit job pledges, from private businessmen, for hard-core unemployed adults, and summer work for needy school-age youth.
- (b) Recruit job applicants among hard-core unemployed adults and needy school-age youth.
- (c) Procure commitments on hiring and training procedures from private employers.
- (d) Help private employers to develop government contracts for funds to offset abnormal costs of hiring and training hard-core unemployed. (National Alliance of Businessmen, 1969, p. 1.)

The role is basically promotional. If the business community can be made aware of its responsibility and enact a solution to specific problems utilizing the N. A. B. program as a format, then apparently the operation is viewed as a success. The extent of that success is apparent from

the following table.

Table 6

N. A. B. Job Goals, Pledge, and Actual
Employment for Summer Jobs, 1968

	Summer Jobs for Youth
Job Pledge Goal	1900
Job Pledges Received	1806
Actually on Job	366
Pledges Received as a Percent of Goal	95%

Source: Wightman, (1969, p. 1)

The data table is typical of information collected by N. A. B. officials and perhaps is the best possible argument for qualitative study of this program. To date attention has been given to publicizing numbers and success anecdotes with little apparent attempt to understand who the youth are that are employed and, further, what sort of employment experience is being provided.

The validity of such an experiment in the private sector seems to be summed up (at least for the Negro) by Kenneth Clark in *Nation's Business*, "Business and industry are our last hope. They are the most realistic elements of this society" (1967, p. 67). If we are to speak of solutions framed in terms of the present system, then indeed that is a most

accurate statement. Credibility, however, may be another matter.

If publicity will assist this credibility, then the private sector has many allies. "One thousand employed this summer," touts the Cleveland Press (DeCrane, 1968), then one reads further to discover that only 400 are from "poverty pockets." "Trainees Rise from Black Ghetto Despair" reads the hopeful title of an entire issue of Metal Working News (Trupp, 1968). For reasons of self-interest or newfound altruism, there is little doubt that the private sector is into the manpower work experience arena in an attempt to establish such credibility and show employment and the "work ethic" to be real poverty solutions. Our traditional WASP social set is certainly in the businessman's favor and, with few exceptions, so is this nation's economic structure.

"Work Experience" Programs

Extensive longitudinal research done by the Center for the Study of Unemployed on Neighborhood Youth Corps students brands this placement scheme a failure in terms of enriched or satisfactory employment experience. Most of the placement through N. Y. C. was made in the public sector but otherwise follows the basic tactic of N. A. B. "summer" placement. Apparently, the N. Y. C. jobs were so menial that satisfaction was judged on the easiness of work and dissatisfaction was based on rate of pay. In addition the report mentions "creaming" as a considerable problem with only the best youth being referred for jobs by counselors in order to demonstrate how nice "our ghetto kids" really are (Bensman,

1967). Nevertheless manpower experts seem to concur that it a program serves to bring youth in contact with the "facts of life" of the labor market it should be encouraged (Ginsberg, 1968).

Findings of a small follow-up study of poor summer employees of Bell Telephone Laboratories indicated little change. However, examination of the subject population revealed substantially "good behaving" youngsters with relatively few problems were recruited (Thomson, 1968). In general, the problems of programming seem to rest on an unclear perception of what to expect from ghetto youth and an inclination to expect these youth to, in many ways, be similar to each other and quite different from youth of previous acquaintance. The expected difference especially emphasized by findings of the Research Institute of America is the area of work orientation (1968).

An additional study of interest was done by Stanford Research Institute as an evaluation of a "C. C. C. camp" concept contemporized into a Youth Conservation Program at Glen Oak, California. The essential feature of this program was "work experience" with the added factor that such experience was carefully selected on the assessed individual needs of the youth. In addition, all job placements were contrived to be satisfactory as a "total experience" pointing up all benefits of employment. Findings were generally favorable to such programming indicating that participants were more likely to succeed in competitive employment markets than nonparticipants (Peterson, 1965). This employment effort was financed by government funds and involved a "total environment"

approach.

The private sector through N. A. B. was in operation two full summers with disadvantaged youth as of September, 1969. The indications of previous research would suggest private sector failure in providing "work experience" through the Neighborhood Youth Corps (Bensman, 1967). However, the private sector has committed itself to this task and might now devise appropriate strategy for the provision of a differentiated, favorable work experience.

Poverty Strategies

Since programs of "work experience" are devised to move young people into the employment market and out of long-term poverty, what factors must be considered beyond the immediate range of this study--the youth and summer jobs?

Many separate strategies are being advanced to solve the problem of employment and income inequity extant in our present economy. Two alternatives are especially interesting: income subsidy-demogrants and full employment.

Full employment certainly seems feasible, Leonard Lecht estimates that to achieve 16 designated national goals would require an employed labor force of more than 100 million in 1975--some 10 million more persons than are expected to be in the labor force in that year (1968). However, according to the Freedom Project, assuming seven and one-half weeks unemployed for those working at the minimum wage rate (1.60 per

hour), the annual income yield is about 13.1 percent below the poverty level designated by the Social Security Administration (Rustin, 1966).

If full employment is to be a successful scheme for eliminating poverty then employer benefits and minimum wage levels must rise. As an additional strategy, the utilization of an income maintenance--demogrant scheme would meet immediate needs as the more complicated task of adjusting employment conditions is carried out. The application of demogrant type children's allowance would likely have immediate feasibility and give substantial aid to a condition of critical need (Schorr, 1966). A more detailed discussion of the various approaches can be found in Wachtel (1968).

An additional issue should be raised, the traditional vehicle for wage standard demands and therefore, to a great extent, the agent of change has been the Trade Union. Studies reveal that raising wages in low-income employment have in the past been beyond the pale of union interest, influence and effectiveness (Levinson, 1966).

The arguments for and against these strategies seem to be best summarized by Goldberg:

The patchwork quilt which would be needed for an adequate income maintenance approach is hardly inspiring, but nevertheless deserves our support. If we choose to control inflation by means of a policy that would in effect keep the poor unemployed, we should recognize that full employment is being sacrificed to the undemonstrated correlate of national economic stability. At the very least, then, the poor would deserve generous income maintenance for the patriotism foisted upon them. It should also be remembered that measures which would reduce employment are not the only to control inflation, and that such policies

sacrifice not only the poor but the attainment of important national goals as well. The far preferable major attack on poverty would be full employment with an adequate minimum wage. If necessary, we would be willing to make anti-inflationary adjustments that for once would place whatever small burdens that ensue on groups more able to sustain them than the poor (1968, p.).

Instrumentation

Semantic Differential. The rationale behind the development of the Semantic Differential is outlined in the book, The Measurement of Meaning (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957) and it is appropriate to discuss the development as it relates to the instrumentation phase of this experiment.

The development of the instrument begins by

...postulating a semantic space, a region of some unknown dimensionality and Euclidean in character. Each semantic scale defined by pairs of polar (opposite in meaning) adjectives, is assumed to represent a straightline function that passes through the origin of this space, and a sample of such scales then represents a multi-dimensional space (Osgood, et al, 1957, p. 25).

The basic assumption involving the use of this instrument for this particular study is that individual reactions in this n-dimensional semantic space will imply a connotative process and, thus reveal certain concepts to have underlying meaning. It is important to note that Osgood, et al, (1957) postulate the existence of universal dimensions of meaning, and substantiates this notion by pointing out that in his studies using the Semantic Differential three major dimensions of meaning continually reappear. It will be the intention of the experimenter in this study to apply this dimensional map to the findings, so it is important to deal briefly

with original treatment of such dimensions as they appeared to Osgood, et al, (1957).

The dimension that usually accounts for the major part of variance is labeled the "Evaluative" dimension. It is evaluative in the sense that it seems to rely on judgment of a process nature, implying the goodness or badness of the concept as perceived by the subject. Various adjective pairs, other than good-bad, such as clean-dirty, cruel-kind, and fair-unfair, were used to elicit responses in this discussion.

The second dimension that appears consistently seems to be "... concerned with power and the things associated with it: size, weight, toughness, and the like" (Osgood, et al, 1957, p. 73). Such scale pairs as large-small, strong-weak, and sharp-dull are used to elicit responses to this "potency" dimension.

The third dimension which appears frequently as a separate and significant area of variance is labeled "Activity." It seems to relate to potential for excitement, warmth, and agitation. The typical adjective pairs used to elicit responses in this dimension are active-passive, fast-slow, and healthy-sick.

In addition to the above three dimensions, numerous other factors may emerge, and such phenomena are usually found to be characteristic of the concepts and scales chosen, artifact, or the method of factor analysis employed for evaluation of the data. Consistently, these other dimensions apply themselves to a rather small proportion of the total variance, except in the occasional case that the potency and activity dimension

appear to merge into a single or alternative dimension often referred to as "dynamism" (Osgood, et al, 1957, p. 73). It is interesting to note that perhaps one of the more attractive characteristics of the semantic differential is its flexibility of construction. The concepts and scales can be adequately selected with the necessary characteristics of denotative meaning, proper attention given to the verbal skills of the subject and the relevance of selection of concepts and scales to the subjects reference groups. It is also important to give attention to the interrelation of the concepts and scales that the subject might see them as being relevant to each other.

Task Analysis. Task definition is an area of personnel psychology replete with many scholarly works devoted to various classification schemes. A review of Stigers and Reed would suffice for a reasonable historical view (1944). A review of Miller will provide insights into the latest systems techniques in this area (1962).

A most succinct (perhaps the most succinct available) definition of task has been authored by Hare:

In its broadest sense, then, the definition of the task is the definition of the situation, and differences in behavior which appear between situations are the most general indication of differences in tasks (1962, p. 17).

The basic concept behind the utilized tasks is the building of behavioral job descriptions based on supervisory statement of presence of tasks and apparent relevance to the job. It is a "general performance" taxonomy and in standard practice has been relatively free of value

implications (Primoff, 1955).

Objectives

In order to obtain maximum utilization of the collected data, it has become acceptable in a scientific sense to perform diagnostic evaluation on the basis of a combination of specific measurements and utilization of descriptive analyses. The effectiveness of such a descriptive model for this problem hinges, basically, on developing an accurate assessment of those youth characteristics which most affect the nature of the employment program. This is vital to understanding the resulting data. It is advisable to incorporate as many variables as possible in such a model in order to facilitate flexibility in developing a discussion of the patterning of results. This somewhat pragmatic mode of operation has certain obvious disadvantages. However, in a situation where time is of great consideration and where the emphasis is perhaps more on application, such an evaluation model is not only useful but dictated by practical constraints. The validity of such an approach is supported best perhaps by the following statement made by John Tukey, a statistician:

In exploratory data analysis there can be no substitute for flexibility, for adapting what is calculated--and, we hope, plotted--both to the needs of the situation and the clues that the data have already provided. In this mode, data analysis is detective work--almost an ideal example of seeking what might be relevant (1969, p. 3).

This study has two major objectives which are of a diagnostic descriptive nature:

- (1) To provide descriptive data on N. A. B. summer youth

employees in order to better understand the nature of the population.

- (2) To combine such description with data on the nature of employment in order to suggest a broad strategy for summer employment based on the differentiated nature of the "dis-advantaged" population.

Such objectives are specified as an expected resultant of this study. The "Results" chapter will constitute a display amounting to the description specified in the first objective and the "Discussion" chapter will present the suggested strategy in addition to a discussion of research hypotheses.

The rationale for such objectives is, in part, an attempt to specify a "way in" for alienated poor youth. This "way in" concept is characteristic of the work of Merton and the earlier work of Cohen with delinquent youth (Merton, 1957, 131-160; Cohen, 1954). This fundamental rationale is that the poor want the goods and materials of the middle-class culture but they are simply locked out of legitimate means of obtaining them.

Hypotheses

Demographic Variables. It is expected that a few of the sociological datum will relate in cross tabulation as significant predictors of, or criterion measures for, other demographic data. Several hypotheses were generated concerning this phenomena after considerations of

theoretical and empirical evidence, reviewed in the previous pages, were made.

Hypothesis 1

In spite of desegregation efforts race emerges as a significant predictor of the location of school attended by subject and further this phenomena will be more apparent in the school attendance figures for low-income neighborhoods.

Hypothesis 2

As a specific resultant of large numbers of In-south black migrants to the industrial northeast race serves as a significant predictor of birthplace within and without Ohio.

Hypothesis 3

Because of the low-income nature of the sample population public transportation emerges as the primary vehicle for reaching employment with substantially more time required for transit in this form than any other.

Hypothesis 4

The location of ghetto black youth mitigates longer transit periods and thus race emerges as a significant predictor of time in transit.

Hypothesis 5

Popular conceptions of "large black families" propagating to obtain welfare would be generally disproven as race does not emerge as a significant predictor of family size and income source.

Hypothesis 6

That broken (single parent) families would tend at a significant level to be larger than stable nuclear families for both races.

Attitudinal Data. In addition, demographic variables will likely emerge as credible predictors of certain attitude conditions. Also, certain generally recognizable characteristics of the entire matrix of attitudinal data will substantiate some essential contentions of this study.

Hypothesis 7

P Factor analysis produces sufficient subgroupings of this population with both different attitudinal and demographic characteristics to disprove any theory postulating a monolithic community of black youth. The possible exception will be the question of black identity which asserts itself in a reversal of the traditional polarity of the scale "black-white."

Hypothesis 8

In spite of theoretical notions to the contrary, race and income source do not emerge as significant predictors of attitudinal patterns on concepts involving work orientation as a middle-class set.

Hypothesis 9

Consistent with current thinking on racial alienation and adolescent development race and age, respectively, emerges as predictors of attitudinal patterns on concepts relating to self and authority judgments.

Hypothesis 10

Due to current level of frustration the distribution of attitudes toward the concept "Fight" depends on race as a significant predictor

with more positive attitudes toward such concept being elicited by Negroes.

Hypothesis 11

Consistent with theoretical definition of scale "dimension" as having certain uniqueness (p. 23) separate demographic variables emerge as predictors for each emerging dimension over concepts utilized in step-wise regression.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

All subjects were summer employees of various companies in the Columbus, Ohio, metropolitan area. Their employment was listed by these companies as incremental fulfillment of jobs pledged for "disadvantaged youth" through the National Alliance of Businessmen.

In order to conduct the study and gain access to employee lists for sampling purposes acceptance of two basic constraints were required: (1) absolute confidentiality be guaranteed the participating companies, and (2) the author be available for discussion of study results if useful (both constraints have since been actively imposed).

Over 200 companies participated in hiring youth through N. A. B. during the summer of 1968 and obtaining data from all of them would have been beyond the budget and energy of the principal investigator. In order to solve this problem N. A. B. officials assisted the author in developing a representative listing of thirty companies. The companies were chosen basically by business type, and size. In addition locations were plotted to insure geographical mix. Of the thirty companies selected 27 were willing to participate in the study. Two expressed general dissatisfaction with the N. A. B. program and one doubted the usefulness of the study.

The number of youth employees for each of 200 companies ranged from 1 to 50. The range in the sampled companies was 1 to 37. Those who accepted the study did so with varying degrees of enthusiasm, but in general with a desire to assist in whatever fashion was necessary.

As a total sample of all subjects from each company might have been overly large and subject to internal ordering effects (a request for all employed youth not specified by name might have encouraged selectivity) the total roster of youth for 27 companies was treated as a population. A drawing utilizing a random numbers table of 125 subjects was made from this roster specifying each subject by name, race, and place of employment (Winer, 1962). The names were converted to code numbers and place of employment distribution was examined to determine valid stratification.

In general, the sample was adequately large being over 15 percent of the total N. A. B. youth population for 200 companies. The confidence limits are difficult to estimate as the instrument does not satisfy assumptions appropriate to a binomial model (Walker and Lev, 1953). Of the 125, 17 had terminated previous to data collection (3 terminated by the company), 11 were employed under a separate permanent adult program, and 14 were eliminated by the experimenter. Two basic criteria merged for the elimination of these 14 subjects. Either they did not have the verbal skill level necessary to understand either instructions or concepts, or as in the majority of those eliminated, they failed to follow instructions directly or responded reluctantly and returned incomplete instruments. This left

a total of 83 subjects to complete data analysis upon (comprising over 10 percent of the N. A. B. youth population). No single company could be regarded as failing in terms of subject response, consequently the carefully contrived company sample was not invalidated. The average age of these young people was 17.95 years; almost 80 percent were Negro males. All were assumed to fulfill basic N. A. B. criteria for disadvantaged youth (see above).

Materials

Semantic Differential. In general, the development of this instrument follows the previous work of the principal investigator with the application of semantic differential to a population of Neighborhood Youth Corps Subjects (Vincent, 1968). The written instructions themselves closely parallel the instructions implemented by Osgood, et al., (1957, p. 82). The page following the instructions contained the first of 12 concepts judged on 12 pairs of semantic differential scales. (The entire instrument is included in Appendix A of this study.) Nine of the semantic differential scales for this instrument were selected from those employed in the Thesaurus Analysis done by Osgood, et al., (1957, p. 43). These pairs of scales are sharp-dull, fair-unfair, kind-cruel, rich-poor, large-small, fast-slow, strong-weak, bad-good, and black-white. See factor loadings in Table 7. In addition, three scales were formulated as having particular relevance to the problem and the subject population. These scale pairs are hip-square, mine-theirs, and no place-someplace.

Table 7

Bipolar Adjectival Scales with Factor Loadings for
Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Dimensions

Scale Dimension	Factor Loadings		
	Evaluative	Potency	Activity
<u>Evaluative</u>			
good-bad	2.29	.84	.07
kind-cruel	2.40	1.49	-.18
fair-unfair	2.22	.89	.37
black-white	-2.11	.18	-.64
<u>Potency</u>			
large-small	.12	1.76	-.02
strong-weak	.38	1.81	.67
rich-poor	1.31	1.33	.22
<u>Activity</u>			
sharp-dull	.51	1.31	1.88
fast-slow	.42	1.10	1.50

Source: Osgood, et al. (1957, p. 43)

Previous loadings of the Thesaurus type are not available and utilization of these scales was viewed as experimental.

The scales were randomly ordered for each concept by arbitrarily assigning a number to each adjective pair and then ordering them in line of appearance of a random numbers table (Winer, 1962). The procedure was repeated until all scales had been ordered in a particular fashion for each concept. The polarity of the scales was then determined by assigning

a value of 0-1 to each adjective, then drawing from a group of slips containing an equal number of 0 or 1 designations.

Special attention was given to the development of concepts consistent with the communication tools of the adolescent's subculture comprising the subject population and equal attention was given to the use of relevant scales as described in previous pages.

To establish the relevance of the concepts used, interviews were conducted with about 20 N. A. B. youth, and special attention was given to word usage and argot. To elicit conversation, stimulus items from the Thematic Apperception Test were utilized. In most cases, this proved helpful in gaining free-association communications. In turn, this communication allowed for the development of a Semantic Differential better focused on observed cultural language patterns. The items used were "9 BM" and "14" from the original version of the T. A. T. (Murray, 1943). Method of utilization followed the directives of the original application with the exception that no attempt was made to interpret. Instead, language concepts were carefully recorded. The Rationale for use of the T. A. T. is to provide a non-directive stimulus that causes the subject to relate to non-interviewer stimulus, perhaps hopefully lessening demand character of the interview. In general, the approach seemed satisfactory, however, no validity technique was developed for the approach. Following the non-structured part of the interview several questions were directed to the youth in areas of particular concern to the study for the purpose of determining appropriate language. It was in this fashion that

the word COP was chosen over several options based on the youths perception of its relative neutrality.

Some of the relevant concept areas that were measured in this study by the Semantic Differential were:

- (1) Authority Concept: This variable has relevancy especially to that age group defined as adolescent and immediate post-adolescent. In a work-oriented sense, many of the immediate criteria for job success are measured or perceived by authority figures. In the sense that one's general ability to handle feelings about authority figures has much to do with the demands of work, this category is important across all age groups (Adams, 1968).

The items representing this concept in the instrument are:
COP, BOSS, and TEACHER.

- (2) Value System Orientation: For many people, the tenets of a work-oriented style of life constitute the basic rationale of their natural value system. Any value system is the component product of ethnic background, family structure, referencing grouping, and membership group cohesiveness. Inasmuch as some specific value systems exclude, or impose sanctions against, work-oriented behavior, these same value systems might tend to have a negative affect on work motivation if predominant (Wilensky & Lebeaux, 1958).

The items representing this concept in the instrument are:

NEW CAR, PAY CHECK, and WORK.

- (3) Self-Concept: It is axiomatic in psychology that successful social behavior in work or relaxation requires a positive view of self. Many failure syndromes are caused by the self-perception that one is not adequate to the performance of a task. Racial discrimination can contribute substantially to the development of a poor self-image (Maslow, 1954).

The items representing this concept in the instrument are:

MY LIFE, MY FUTURE, and SOUL.

These concepts were formulated, in tentative not exclusive areas of clustering. Since these clusters were chosen intuitively, it may be necessary to produce modifications for further research. The position of the concepts in the instrument was again randomly ordered by arbitrarily assigning a numerical equivalent to each concept and then referring to a random number table in order to determine the actual order in which they appear in the instrument.

Since this is the first usage of this instrument, it is apparent that only preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the data. In addition, it is expected that some of the concepts and scales will appear irrelevant. However, previous experience indicates that such a range of concepts should prove adequate to explicate experimental hypotheses (Vincent, 1968).

Task Analysis. Task analysis as used in this study provided for the development of a description of each job based on both positive and

negative aspects of work requirements. The items used were based on work done by Ernest S. Primoff (1955). Items were selected from a longer questionnaire (The Job Quotient Analysis). An item such as "independent activity" was viewed as more favorable, whereas "repetitive task" was viewed as less favorable (See Appendix B).

The tasks were then assigned arbitrary score values based on a positive (+1) or negative (-1) value as it might appear to ascribe good or poor work experience to a particular task. The items are then ranked by the immediate supervisor of the youth employee in terms of the relative presence of a particular task in the job situation. These rankings are then multiplied by the + or - rating to attain a weighted score. The end product was then a score for the particular task, with higher scores indicating more positive and difficult tasks in terms of work requirements. Each of these scores could then be compared with locations of job to determine a general task level for a variety of companies participating in the study.

Procedure

Semantic Differential. The employers involved agreed to request that the young people in their program fill out a questionnaire upon termination from the job. Although circumstances were probably not uniform, this was done most typically in the personnel office when the youth were processed for termination. Subjects were assured prior to the administration of the instrument that this was one of a variety of necessary

application materials one must fill out in order to complete the program. This assurance was offered primarily by the assigned supervisor and hopefully, reinforced in such a manner that the instrument did not give rise to undue anxiety caused by race of experimenter (Baratz, 1967).

Each employee was assured that his participation had no direct bearing on the relation he had with the company. In fact, the persons directly involved in the administration of the instrument made a point of informing the employee that this was a study which was being done by outside sources, and, consequently, the company would not review the questionnaire materials. None of the respondents were allowed more than 45 minutes to complete the instruments. The supervisor volunteered no information and answered no questions after the initial five minute period of instructions and filling out face sheets had passed. Consistent with the emphasis of written instruction, verbal emphasis was placed on the fact that this is not a "test," there were no right or wrong answers, and the subjects should respond naturally working as quickly as possible.

The instruments were then returned to the author by the various companies when all available employees in the summer-employment program sample were finished with the N. A. B. program.

Task Analysis. During the month of November, 1968, it was arranged with personnel officers in the participating companies to interview supervisors who had direct contact with summer youth. These interviews were conducted at the job site so that the interviewer might also gain a

general impression of working conditions. During this interview the appropriate items were rated by the supervisor in a checklist fashion as the interviewer read them from the instrument. Basic instructions were to advise the interviewer if a task were present in a particular job and rank it by presence always, often, and some. In most cases, the process was quite efficient, with the singular exception that some supervisors were uncomfortable until assured that this information was not being passed on to company officials. As a matter of procedure, considerable time was spent with the personnel office in order to gain some impression of their attitude toward the program. This information was utilized to check the accuracy of the various supervisor' reports and to develop general perception of the company management-level operation of the program.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

To accomplish the efficient analysis of data (see Appendix C) and in order to expedite conversion for computer encoding, the instruments were immediately transferred to a one-page data brief with integers being arbitrarily assigned to each response. Assuming equidistance responses were assigned values one through five with good-strong-fast-white polarized together, after Osgood, et al. (1957).

In addition to the instrument response certain demographic materials were coded for entry in the subject identification field to assist analysis. This information included the subject identification number carried forward from the instrument which allowed for random checks of the accuracy in data transferral. This code number was so constructed as to identify the subject and company designation previously mentioned. The following variables were coded for demographic tabulation: Length of Residence in Columbus, Birthplace, Number of Siblings, Family Structure, Source of Income other than Employment, Method of Transportation, Time in Transit, School Priority, Return to School, Attend College, Grade in School, Age, Sex, and Race (not included in appendix).

Demographic Data

Computer processing was accomplished by a Fortran IV statement program utilizing (DATMAN) which is described as a "problem oriented language developed for the manipulation, description, and analysis of data." (Powers, 1969, p. 60-61). Data was either summarized if it was a continuous measure or classified if it was a discrete variable. In addition, the cross-tabulations that follow were obtained by the utilization of DATMAN statements in a small routine devised by the author. All listed data manipulation in the "Results" section were performed on a Control Data 6400 digital computer. The system has a core storage of 65,536 60-Bit words, microsecond access time and is connected to 10 associated peripheral and control processors.

Each of the demographic measures has a significant and interesting meaning of its own. Understanding of all combined can assist in understanding those facts concerning this segment of the population that to some extent contribute to its difficulties. This is not to say that one of these factors, or even all of them together, are the major cause of poverty and potential unemployment among young people. It is simpler to say that to understand their problems and to assist them in gaining employment, one must first understand some facts about them. The following tables comprise the sociological segment of the description proposed as the first objective of this study.

The following tables are displayed as a summary description of the sample group. A section beyond contains demographic cross-tabulations

relevant to specific hypotheses and these tables are arranged in relationship to the order of the text in Chapter I.

Table 8

Personal Characteristics, All Subjects

Sex	Percentage	Age	Percentage
Male	77.6	16	15.4
Female	16.4	17	32.4
No response	6.0	18	21.6
		19	4.6
Race	Percentage	20	6.0
Negro	80.6	21	6.0
Caucasian	13.4	Over 21	9.6
No response	6.0	Mean	Standard Deviation
		17.95	2.14

As one can readily perceive the youth were as expected mostly black males under eighteen years of age. It is most interesting, however, that almost 10 percent were ineligible by way of age for the "summer employment" program. The high age mean was held up somewhat by the Ohio "minimum age" standards applicable to most heavy industries. In light of speculation that the program was in part devoted to "cooling out" young Negro males, the low percentage of females is not unexpected.

Of the youth in the program this summer, approximately half were born out of state, while the other half were born in Columbus. Of

Table 9

Birthplace and Length of Residence

Birthplace	Percentage
Columbus	44.8
Out of State	47.8
Not Columbus but Ohio	7.5
Number of Years in Columbus	Percentage
0-5	24.0
6-10	12.0
11-15	18.0
15-21	45.6
Mean 12.91	Standard Deviation 5.87

those born out of state, roughly 24 percent have lived in Columbus for 5 years or less. It would seem likely that most of those born in Columbus (44.8%) are those who have lived there for between 15 and 21 years (45.6%).

The information on birthplace and tenure in Columbus indicates the dual nature of the population as to geographic background. It seems to support the idea that there is a large amount of in-migration involving people who fall under poverty criteria as in this sample.

One critical consideration with this particular population is the

nature of the family structure. It is interesting to note that only 48 percent of the families from which these young people come consist of both a father and mother in the home. A third of these youngsters reside in fatherless homes. More than 10 percent do not live with either parent.

Table 10
Family Structure

Number of Siblings	Percentage
None	2.4
1	9.6
2	10.8
3	15.6
4	16.8
5	7.2
6 or more	37.3
Mean 4.82	Standard deviation 2.59
Adult Structure	Percentage
Both parents	48.0
Mother	36.0
Father	1.2
Relative or Friend	13.2
Alone	1.2

Another significant factor about these families is that almost 40 percent of these young people have six or more brothers and sisters.

The average middle-class American family has approximately 2.4 children, whereas the mean in this sample is 4.82. However, the statistic does not include childless households which might serve to bring the mean somewhat more in balance with the national average.

Table 11

Income Source

Source of Income Without Employment	Percentage
Other employment	42.3
Public assistance	20.4
No response	37.1

One of the questions inquired of sources of income other than employment if unemployment occurred. Twenty percent of the young people responding indicated that public assistance provided such source of income. In marked contrast to their willingness to respond on other questions, almost 40 percent made no response at all. This question was both poorly worded and somewhat threatening. Many of the respondents might have never considered the question and thus were not aware of the various alternative sources. Others may have simply wished to conceal such information. In any case because of missing data analysis depending on this table is at best speculative.

Over half of the young people responding required about 30 minutes to reach their place of work. This does not seem excessive, however, a

Table 12

Time in Transit and Method of Transportation

Time Required to Reach Job - Minutes	Percentage Requiring Indicated Transit Time
5	1.2
10	6.0
15	18.0
20	15.6
30	7.2
35	16.8
40	2.4
45	2.4
50	9.6
55	1.2
No Response	29.6
Mean 23.64	Standard Deviation 15.45
Method of Transportation	Percentage Using Indicated Method
Bus	43.3
Personal Car	23.9
Friend's Car	11.9
Other (i. e., car pool)	14.9
Walking	6.0

large number of people did not respond indicating either an inability to recall or possibly widely variant times.

The dominant role played by Bus transportation as the only form of public conveyance is somewhat predictable based on the age and income eligibility requirements. It is a matter of interest to some characteristic complaints such as tardiness which will be discussed further in this report.

Interest should be directed to the high percentage (68.7) claiming they will return to school in the fall. Either the question for the most part failed to detect those who intend to drop out or most of the youth in the sample are motivated to return. Of the almost 20 percent planning to attend college, 15 percent were able to specify the particular grade (freshman-senior) they would attend. The 31.3 percent who do not know whether they will attend school or who do not plan to attend seem to be the same 31.3 percent who do not list a grade for next years attendance. It is possible that most of these are seniors awaiting a chance to settle on some vocational choice and take a job.

The high mean age previously noted is confirmed by the disproportionate number of high school seniors in the sample who when combined with graduates indicate that almost 80 percent of the population will be in either higher education or on the labor market in the next twelve months.

Table 13

Education

Will You Return to School	Percentage
Yes	68.7
No	14.9
Don't Know	16.4
Plan to Go to College	Percentage
Yes	19.4
No	80.6
Priority of School	Percentage
1	14.9
2	47.8
3	4.5
No priority	32.8
Grade in Next School Term	Percentage
9	1.5
10	1.5
11	19.4
12	31.3
College	
Freshman	6.0
Sophomore	7.5
Junior	-
Senior	1.5
No response	31.3

Cross-Tabulations. The following tables were prepared for the major purpose of displaying the data in a fashion coherent to the research hypotheses. In addition they serve as useful arrays adding to the quality of the description of this population.

Table 14

Priority of School Attended by Race

Race	School Priority	Percentage
Negro	1	91.6
Caucasian		8.3
Negro	2	85.2
Caucasian		14.7
Negro	3	100.0
Caucasian		0.0
Negro	No priority	72.4
Caucasian		27.5

The rankings of the schools developed by N. A. B. are based on a geographical identification of inner-city low income schools. The high priority (1) schools are those most likely to enroll low-income students. Over 90 percent of (3) are ranked schools are Negro as compared to 70 percent in the no-priority school. As this is data from this sample alone it is interesting to note the disproportionate poorness of blacks in the suburban (no-priority) school. In other words, from schools that are mostly white, most N. A. B. enrollees are Negro.

Table 15

Place of Birth as a Function of Race

Race	Birthplace	Percentage
Negro	Ohio	49.1
	Out of State	50.9
Caucasian	Ohio	90.9
	Out of State	9.1

Most Negroes were born out of the state (Ohio) while very few whites were not born out of state. This seems to portray a less migratory white population and yet the white population may have shifted inside of the state.

Table 16

Time in Transit as a Function of Transportation Mode

Type of Transportation	Mean Time in Minutes	Standard Deviation
Personal Car	18.61	11.99
Friend's Car	21.81	8.33
Bus	30.76	17.54
Walking	17.25	5.71
Other (i. e., car pool)	17.69	10.11

It is quite apparent that public conveyance required more time in transit than any other form (31 minutes). No other method ranked higher than the mean time of 24 minutes. One reservation can be noted: If substantial numbers of the private car owners are from areas near the

industrial parks (near suburbs) than comparison is not quite accurate. However, predominant use of busses and the longer time spent is a factor of real consideration as will be noted in the Discussion Chapter.

Table 17

Time Spent in Transit as a Function of Race

Race	Mean Time (minutes)	Standard Deviation
Negro	24.32	15.80
Caucasian	23.18	13.36

No apparent patterns exist differentiating between races as to the amount of time spent in transit. This is perhaps inconclusive as mode of transport does not factor in as a third variable to this cross-tabulation.

Table 18

Source of Income Alternative as a Function of Race

Race	Source	Percentage
Negro	Employment	49.1
	Public Assistance	14.7
	No response	36.0
Caucasian	Employment	9.0
	Public Assistance	27.2
	No response	63.6

As has been noted this data is somewhat spotty in lending itself to any conclusion. One must speculate concerning the large percentage of non-responding whites. Perhaps the question was more threatening to

a poor young white in a suburban high school and thus less answerable. In any case one hesitates to develop any conclusion based upon such a small part of the data.

Table 19

Mean Number of Siblings Distributed by Race

Race	Mean Siblings	Standard Deviation
Negro	4.93	2.79
Caucasian	4.27	2.95

Considering both the mean and standard deviation (especially the latter) there seems to be little to differentiate the families size by race within this sample.

Table 20

Mean Number of Siblings Distributed by Family Structure

Family Structure	Mean Siblings	Standard Deviation
Single parent	5.76	2.46
Nuclear family	4.32	2.52

The presence of 1.44 more siblings in broken homes is certainly an interesting and unignorable statistic in this description of the population. Considering the data displayed in the previous table (19) it would appear likely that this would differentiate little by race.

Step-Wise Regression. A classic least squares (residual error) multivariate normal correlation analysis was performed on those demographic and attitudinal data postulated as dependent variables ("normal" being defined as a series of simultaneous linear equations). (Walker & Lev, 1953, p. 525). Postulated independent variables for the demographic analysis portion were each of the remaining sociological data not specified. All demographic data were allowed to enter the analysis as predictors of attitudinal data. In addition, one attitudinal datum, "My Life" for "Adolescent Value," dimension was entered to clear the regression as to whether it related more to technique than measure.

The general strategy was to calculate a multiple regression with the properties that, at each step: (1) the variable added has the highest partial correlation with the dependent variable of all the unentered variables--holding all entered variables constant, the highest F ratio and the largest contribution to the multiple correlation; (2) any entered variables which have lost their statistical significance are removed from the regression; and the residual mean-square error of the final specification is at its absolute minimum, given that all statistically significant variables have been entered (Cunnyngham, 1968).

The demographic regression analysis was performed assuming the parametric nature of the statistic. In some cases integer proxies were assumed to have an interval relationship (Siegel, 1956, p. 19). Each step produced an F statistic and a percent of direct effect analogous to a T representing variance accounted for by each independent variable

in the final regression equation.

The following tables are those that relate to hypotheses involving demographic variables (One through Six). The regression analysis produced a table of F ratios for all variables but only cites P values and percentage of variance for those variables having more than a 1.500 F ratio. (This specification was made to approximate the minimum requirement for a P .25.)

Table 21

Regression Statistics Utilizing Race as an Independent
Variable to Predict Certain Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Net Effect
Priority of School Attended	2.9179	4.3924	.05	4.36%
Birthplace	2.3009	5.3494	.05	5.72%
Time in Transit	-		-	-
Family Structure	-	.6776	-	-
Income Source	-	.1871	-	-

Although the percentage of net effect is somewhat low the relationship is certainly more pronounced for School Priority and Birthplace than any of the other demographic variables listed.

The high percentage of variance accounted for is one of the firmest indications of the strength in the correlation between these two variables.

Table 22

Regression Statistics Utilizing Mean Siblings as an Independent
Variable to Predict Family Structure

Dependent Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Net Effect
Family Structure	93.4215	15.7370	.01	21.25%

Hypothesis 1

In spite of desegregation efforts race emerges as a significant predictor of the location of school attended by subject and further this phenomena will be more apparent in the school attendance figures for low-income neighborhoods.

The first hypothesis received adequate support. Race predicted (Table 21) school attended at a better than $p = .05$ level. Cross tabulation (Table 14) placed a higher concentration of Negroes from inner-city schools. Although the Priority Three schools broke the trend of lowering concentration of Negroes related to lower priority the difference may be attributed to the small n .

Hypothesis 2

As a specific resultant of large numbers of In-south black migrants to the industrial northeast race performs as a significant predictor of birthplace within and without Ohio.

The second hypothesis received support. Place of Birth predicted race at a better than $p = .05$ (Table 21) level. Table 15 reveals over 50 percent of the blacks were born out of state, whereas only 9 percent of the

whites were out of staters. The statistic does not pinpoint the south as the source of this in-migration, however, it does point up the absorption of migrants into this disadvantaged (by definition) population.

Hypothesis 3

Because of the low-income nature of the sample population public transportation emerges as the primary vehicle for reaching employment with substantially more time required for transit in this form than any other.

The third hypothesis received logical support from the various demographic tabulations. According to Table 12, 43.3 percent of the youth utilized bus transportation. Table 16 points up that such transportation took between 9 and 13 minutes longer than other transport forms. In the extreme cases of 13 minutes, additional time comprises more than half the mean time of 24 minutes.

Hypothesis 4

The location of ghetto black youth mitigates longer transit periods and thus race emerges as a significant predictor of time in transit.

Hypothesis 4 received no support. In fact, Table 16 points up only 1.14 minutes difference in terms of racial differentiation in transit time. Possibly the statistic indicates that most youth took jobs at relatively same distributions of distance from their residence. Table 21 reveals that the F ratio though larger than most entering the question is still not a significant statistic.

Hypothesis 5

Popular conceptions of "large black families" propagating to obtain welfare are generally weakened as race does not emerge as a significant predictor of family size and income source.

According to Table 21, program specification indicates below $p = .25$ for both statistics. Table 18, however, indicates some disparity on income sources. However, as previously mentioned, the irregular response makes this table difficult to interpret. Table 19 is somewhat more affirming of Table 21 with mean siblings only .66 difference by race.

Hypothesis 6

That broken (single parent) families would tend at a significant level to be larger than stable nuclear families for both races.

This hypothesis received very strong support. Size of family (siblings) predicted family structure at $p = .01$. Table 20 clearly illustrates that single parent families were larger by 1.44 children than two parent families.

R Factor Analysis. In order to form a better understanding of the particular Semantic Differential designed for this study and also for the purpose of putting the experimental data in a more workable form, a factor analytic technique was utilized.

This method facilitates the detection of underlying variables among large numbers of measures (Kerlinger, 1964). More specifically, when factor analysis is applied to scores from a Semantic Differential the underlying variables emerging are referred to as "dimensions of meaning"

(Osgood, et al, 1957).

This particular analysis collapsed concepts across scales for all subjects and as an initial step produced a 12 by 12-intercorrelation matrix with scale value (from 1 to 7) providing entry for correlation. The complete matrix for scale intercorrelations is reproduced in Appendix D.

The method of analysis employed for this study is generally referred to as the principal components or centroid method. The solution of a R matrix extracts the maximum amount of variance for the factor being calculated and through iteration continues to reveal each factor as it accounts for a decreasing percentage of the total variance (Cattell, 1952).

Although a mathematical explanation of this method is particularly difficult, one can imagine the intercorrelations as clusters on "n" dimensional axes enclosing as much of the variance as possible (Kerlinger, 1964). In summary, this method of analysis provides an R-intercorrelation matrix for scales with scales and a varimax, blind rotated solution to the R matrix.

The means and standard deviation for scale dimensions by concept are shown in Appendices E, F, G, H, I. The rotated solution to both scale and concept R matrices depicted by factor analysis is found in Appendix J.

The first factor or dimension to emerge seemed to conform to the previously described parameters for a "potency" semantic dimension. From this factor four scales were selected for further analysis. The basis for selection as suggested by Kerlinger (1964) is not altogether a matter of mathematical procedure. The scales are viewed with respect

to loading and evaluated somewhat like correlation coefficients. In the same fashion, the original input intercorrelation matrix is examined to determine high coefficients. Finally, selection is somewhat based on the nature of experimentation, concepts and scale pairs used, and their predicted relevance to the subject groups. Tables 23, 24, 25, and 26 show intercorrelations of scales selected to represent activity, evaluative, adolescent value, and (two) potency dimensions. Although the percentage of variance by factor is not a product of the analytical technique utilized a total is available. These five dimensions account for 67 percent of the total variance.

Table 23
Intercorrelation of Scales in the Potency I Dimension

Scales	1	2	3	4
Strong - Weak	1.000			
Mine - Theirs	.5339	1.000		
Rich - Poor	.5429	.5402	1.000	
Large - Small	.6159	.5474	.6817	1.000

Basic rationale for the utilization of Potency I as the dimension name rests in the presence of the two scales large-small and strong-weak which would be expected to load in the dimension.

The next dimension to emerge involved one scale pair Black-White thus intercorrelation was unity. Although this scale normally emerges as evaluative and in some sense can be viewed as that in this analysis the usage seemed to measure each concept by its relevance to Blacks. Thus

it is ascribed as a separate Potency dimension. One of the most interesting aspects of this scale is its reversal of polarity. Typically white is polarized with good-strong-fast. However, white was polarized with bad-weak-slow in this factor analysis. This further emphasized the difference in usage by Negroes and thus the usefulness to isolating it as a "relevance" dimension (See Appendix J).

Table 24

Intercorrelation of Scales in the Evaluative Dimension

Scales	1	2
Good - Bad	1.000	
Fair - Unfair	.68431	1.000

The emergence of the evaluative dimension at this point may trouble purists. Moreover, since black-white traditionally loads evaluative, and the variations represented by the evaluative scales plus black-white would have likely caused them to emerge first, if polarity had not been reversed. The ascription of the "evaluative" name to this dimension is after the original thesaurus.

Table 25

Intercorrelation of Scales in the Activity Dimension

Scales	1	2
Fast - Slow	1.000	
Noplace - Someplace	.6370	1.000

Strong intercorrelation between fast-slow and large-small leads the author to suspect the possibility of these two dimensions emerging as a "dynamism" dimension accounting for a major portion of variance.

Table 26

Intercorrelation of Scales in the Adolescent Value Dimension

Scales	1	2
Hip - Square	1.000	
Sharp - Dull	.7109	1.000

This dimension was used separately and named thusly because of the "slang" word involved in the scales. The dimension itself was the last to emerge and likely accounts for very small proportion of the total variance.

These dimensions were all defined on the combined consideration of factor loadings and correlation coefficients. The factor analysis treatment produced clusters that could be interpreted as dynamism and evaluative emerging in that order. As further analysis was intended, the author chose to select down from this analysis to finer distinctions and in the process devolve meaningful collapsed measures for regression analysis.

P Factor Analysis. In cases involving large numbers of single discreet measures of relatively smaller numbers of subjects, P or Q Factor analysis is a useful descriptive technique (Christner, 1957). This technique is often described as "factors of covariation on trait

characteristics" (Cattell, 1957). Essentially, this technique involves collapsing measures to obtain clusters of subjects. The procedure is exactly the same as described for R matrix analysis with the exception described above. Although the 83 by 83 matrices produced by such analysis is too lengthy for presentation in this document, the analysis did consistently produce four factors.

A separate P Factor Analysis was conducted for each of seven concepts: boss, cop, work, paycheck, fight, my life and soul. These concepts accounted for major portions of variance in the scale dimensions utilized and are representative of each of the various areas from which concepts were originally devised.

Tables 27 through 40 present the demographic information for each subject cluster that emerged under the various concept P Factor Analyses. Each display is followed by a page denoting the mean semantic differential score for each dimension (Tables 23 through 26) plus one summary (all scales) dimension.

Each separate table is followed by an additional table describing the step-wise regression (see above) results for demographic predictors of various attitudinal dimensions by the mentioned seven concepts. These final analyses were conducted in order to both confirm or deny hypotheses and further the descriptive understanding of the particular subject population.

Table 41 is a compilation of the various companies matching subject attitudes toward work (by factor cluster) with task analysis scores.

Table 27

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and
Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Work"

P-1 (n = 29)					P-2 (n = 22)					P-3 (n = 7)					P-4 (n = 7)				
15.14					11.90					9.28					16.00				
1		2			1		2			1		2			1		2		
55.1		44.8			54.6		45.5			42.9		57.1			57.1		28.6		
4.82					4.09					6.14					3.83				
1	2		3		1	2		3		1	2		3		1	2		3	
34.4	48.3		18.2		31.8	54.5		13.6		42.9	57.1		0		57.1	14.3		28.6	
1	2		3		1	2		3		1	2		3		1	2		3	
41.4	20.7		37.9		45.5	18.2		36.4		28.6	28.6		42.7		57.1	14.3		28.3	
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3.8	20.7	41.4	3.4	20.7	36.4	4.5	45.5	4.5	9.1	42.9	0.0	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	0.0	28.6

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Work"

[illegible]

Table 27 (continued)

P-1 (n = 29)					P-2 (n = 22)					P-3 (n = 7)					P-4 (n = 7)				
27.58					17.95					17.00					22.14				
1 13.8	2 55.2	3 6.9	00 24.1		1 9.1	2 40.9	3 4.5	00 45.6		1 28.6	2 28.6	3 00	00 42.9		1 14.3	2 28.6	3 14.3	00 42.9	
1 69.0		2 17.2		3 22.8	1 63.6		2 18.2		3 17.2	1 71.4		2 14.3		3 14.3	1 57.1		2 14.3		3 28.6
1 20.7			2 79.3		1 18.2			2 81.8		1 14.3			2 85.7		1 28.6			2 57.1	
1 34.5	2 3.4	3 27.6	4 20.7	5 13.8	1 31.8	2 -	3 13.6	4 31.8	5 13.6	1 28.6	2 -	3 -	4 57.1	5 14.3	1 14.3	2 -	3 -	4 28.0	5 68.6
17.44					18.76					17.28					18.42				
1 86.2			2 10.3		1 54.1			2 27.3		1 71.4			2 14.3		1 74.4			2 14.3	
1 89.7			2 6.9		1 63.6			2 22.7		1 85.7			2 14.3		1 57.1			2 14.3	

Table 27 (continued)

Demography	P-1 (n = 29)				P-2 (n = 22)				P-3 (n = 7)				P-4				
Time in Transit (Mean minutes)	27.58				17.95				17.00				7.00				
Priority of School Attended (%)	1 13.8	2 55.2	3 6.9	00 24.1	1 9.1	2 40.9	3 4.5	00 45.6	1 28.6	2 28.6	3 00	00 42.9	1 14.3	2 28.6			
Return to School 1-Yes 2-No 3-Don't Know (%)	1 69.0	2 17.2	3 22.8		1 63.6	2 18.2	3 17.2		1 71.4	2 14.3	3 14.3		1 57.1	2 -			
Plans to Attend College 1-Yes 2-No (%)	1 20.7		2 79.3		1 18.2		2 81.8		1 14.3		2 85.7		1 28.6				
Grade in School 1-No response 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-College (%)	1 34.5	2 3.4	3 27.6	4 20.7	5 13.8	1 31.8	2 -	3 13.6	4 31.8	5 13.6	1 28.6	2 -	3 -	4 57.1	5 14.3	1 14.3	2 -
Age (Mean)	17.44				18.76				17.28				17.00				
Sex 1-Male 2-Female (%)	1 86.2		2 10.3		1 54.1		2 27.3		1 71.4		2 14.3		1 74.4				
Race 1-Negro 2-Caucasian (%)	1 89.7		2 6.9		1 63.6		2 22.7		1 85.7		2 14.3		1 57.1				

Table 27 (continued)

Semantic Differential Means by P-Cluster

SCALES	P-1 (n = 29)	P-2 (n = 22)	P-3 (n = 7)	P-4 (n = 7)
ONE - Evaluative	1.896	1.886	2.071	2.000
TWO - Activity	1.827	2.113	2.428	2.916
THREE - Potency I	1.973	2.488	2.428	2.107
FOUR - Potency II	3.592	3.136	2.714	3.166
FIVE - Adolescent Value	1.977	2.515	2.523	2.833
SIX - Grand Mean	1.961	2.318	2.38	2.530

Table 28

Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise
Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Work"

Scale Clusters	Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Direct Effect %
<u>Evaluative</u> Good - Bad Fair - Unfair	Plans to Attend College	6.41	6.80	.95	10.31
	"My Life"	4.46	5.07	.95	7.15
	Age	2.82	3.34	.90	5.34
	Total	4.57	5.41	.99	22.79
<u>Activity</u> Fast - Slow Noplace - Someplace	Plans to Attend College	1.69	1.97	.75	5.77
	Return to School	1.63	1.94	.75	3.57
	Total	1.66	1.97	.75	9.34
<u>Potency I</u> Strong - Weak Mine - Theirs Rich - Poor Large - Small	Age	3.12	10.05	.99	15.81
	"My Life"	3.41	13.37	.99	18.23
	Method of Transportation	.96	3.96	.90	3.91
	Family Structure	.49	2.08	.75	2.43
	Total	2.00	8.40	.99	40.37
<u>Potency II</u>					
(Racial Dimension) Black - White	Family Structure	2.88	2.79	.90	T 7.89
<u>Adolescent Value</u> Hip - Square Sharp - Dull	"My Life"	2.33	4.61	.95	9.30
	Return to School	1.34	2.73	.75	11.85
	Plans to Attend College	2.50	5.52	.95	8.39
	Time in Transit	.99	2.25	.75	3.50
	Total	1.79	4.04	.99	33.04
<u>General</u> All scales with the exception of Black - White	Plans to Attend College	2.09	5.84	.95	12.75
	Return to School	.60	1.69	.75	2.94
	Total	1.35	3.80	.95	15.69

Table 29

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and
Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Paycheck"

P-1 (n = 30)					P-2 (n = 24)					P-3 (n = 7)					P-4 (n = 5)				
14.3					12.82					9.28					12.75				
1 73.3		2 26.7			1 54.2		2 45.9			1 28.6		2 71.4			1 20.0		2 80.0		
4.10					5.87					5.00					4.00				
1 33.3	2 56.7	3 10.0			1 37.3	2 50.0		3 12.5		1 42.9	2 57.1		3 0.0		1 0.0	2 60.0		3 40.0	
1 40.0	2 23.3	3 36.0			1 29.2	2 12.5		3 54.2		1 57.1	2 14.3		3 28.6		1 40.0	2 20.0		3 40.0	
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
23.3	13.3	36.7	6.7	20.0	20.8	8.3	54.2	4.2	8.3	28.6	14.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	20.0

Table 29

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Paycheck"

[illegible]

Table 29 (continued)

P-1 (n = 30)				P-2 (n = 24)				P-3 (n = 7)				P-4 (n = 5)			
18.80				31.66				22.14				22.00			
1	2	3	00	1	2	3	00	1	2	3	00	1	2	3	00
10.0	50.0	6.7	33.3	46.7	41.7	4.2	47.5	14.3	42.9	0	42.9	20.0	60.0	0.0	20.0
1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3	
70.0	16.7	14.3		66.7	8.3	25.0		57.1	42.9	0.0		80.0	20.0	0.0	
1	2			1	2			1	2			1	2		
20.0	80.0			75.0	20.8			57.1	28.6			20.0	80.0		
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
6.7	3.3	20.0	30.0	20.0	41.7	4.2	25.0	16.7	12.5	28.6	-	-	57.1	14.3	20.0
															60.0
															20.0
17.71				18.10				17.57				18.2			
1	2			1	2			1	2			1	2		
80	10			75.0	16.7			85.7	14.3			60	20		
1	2			1	2			1	2			1	2		
70	20			83.3	8.3			85.7	14.3			80	20		

Table 29 (continued)

Demography	P-1 (n = 30)				P-2 (n = 24)				P-3 (n = 7)							
Time in Transit (Mean minutes)	18.80				31.66				22.14							
Priority of School Attended (%)	1 10.0	2 50.0	3 6.7	00 33.3	1 46.7	2 41.7	3 4.2	00 47.5	1 14.3	2 42.9	3 0	00 42.9	1 20.0			
Return to School 1-Yes 2-No 3-Don't Know (%)	1 70.0	2 16.7	3 14.3		1 66.7	2 8.3	3 25.0		1 57.1	2 42.9	3 0.0		1 80.0			
Plans to Attend College 1-Yes 2-No (%)	1 20.0	2 80.0			1 75.0	2 20.8			1 57.1	2 28.6			20.0			
Grade in School 1-No response 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-College (%)	1 26.7	2 3.3	3 20.0	4 30.0	5 20.0	1 41.7	2 4.2	3 25.0	4 16.7	5 12.5	1 28.6	2 -	3 -	4 57.1	5 14.3	1 20.0
Age (Mean)	17.71				18.10				17.57							
Sex 1-Male 2-Female (%)	1 80	2 10			1 75.0	2 16.7			1 85.7	2 14.3						60
Race 1-Negro 2-Caucasian (%)	1 70	2 20			1 83.3	2 8.3			1 85.7	2 14.3						80

Table 29 (continued)

Semantic Differential Means by P-Cluster

SCALES	P-1 (n = 30)	P-2 (n = 24)	P-3 (n = 7)	P-4 (n = 5)
ONE - Evaluative	2.333	2.208	2.357	2.600
TWO - Activity	2.816	1.958	2.357	2.500
THREE - Potency I	2.516	2.322	2.892	2.500
FOUR - Potency II	2.766	2.375	3.000	2.800
FIVE - Adolescent Value	2.933	2.486	2.952	2.800
SIX - Grand Mean	2.651	2.28	2.714	2.600

Table 30

Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise
Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Paycheck"

Scale Clusters	Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Direct Effect %
<u>Evaluative</u> Good - Bad Fair - Unfair	"My Life"	6.167	4.75	.95	8.82
	Sex	3.57	2.84	.90	2.95
	Grade in School	2.75	2.24	.75	3.82
	Total	4.16	3.38	.95	15.59
<u>Activity</u> Fast - Slow Noplace - Someplace	"My Life"	4.434	6.18	.95	10.72
	Age	2.627	3.84	.90	7.05
	Birthplace	2.13	3.25	.90	2.86
	Return to School	1.29	2.00	.75	2.53
	Total	2.62	4.06	.99	2.53
<u>Potency I</u> Strong - Weak Mine - Theirs Rich - Poor Large - Small	"My Life"	3.84	6.68	.95	11.64
	Age	3.19	6.04	.95	10.09
	Time in Transit	1.45	2.83	.90	2.12
	Return to School	1.77	3.63	.90	4.17
	Total	2.56	5.25	.99	28.03
<u>Potency II</u> (Racial Dimension) Black - White	Race	5.43	6.59	.95	5.88
	Grade in School	7.26	8.02	.99	18.09
	Method of Transportation	2.29	2.87	.90	3.69
	Priority of School Attended	1.62	2.07	.75	.48
	Time in Transit	1.80	2.36	.75	3.14
	Total	3.68	4.82	.99	31.29
<u>Adolescent Value</u> Hip - Square Sharp - Dull	"My Life"	4.901	10.56	.99	14.72
	Age	2.06	4.7	.95	6.65
	Source of Income	1.60	3.8	.90	2.96
	Total	2.85	6.89	.99	24.33
<u>General</u>					
All scales with the exception of Black - White	Grade in School	.97	1.82	.75	T 1.35

Table 31

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and
Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Boss"

P-1 (n = 23)					P-2 (n = 17)					P-3 (n = 11)					P-4 (n = 7)				
13.77					11.81					13.54					14.57				
1 52.1		2 47.8			1 53.0		2 47.0			1 72.7		2 27.3			1 52.1		2 42.9		
4.45					5.05					4.10					4.28				
1 34.8	2 52.2	3 8.6			1 53.0	2 37.3	3 11.8			1 9.1	2 54.5	3 36.4			1 42.9	2 57.1	3 0.0		
1 30.4	2 21.7	3 43.5			1 47.1	2 29.4	3 23.5			1 54.5	2 9.1	3 36.4			1 42.9	2 28.6	3 28.6		
1 21.7	2 8.7	3 39.1	4 4.3	5 21.7	1 21.7	2 8.7	3 39.1	4 4.3	5 21.7	1 45.5	2 9.1	3 36.4	4 0.0	5 9.1	1 14.3	2 14.3	3 28.6	4 0.0	5 42.9

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Boss"

[illegible]

Table 31 (continued)

P-1 (n = 23)				P-2 (n = 17)				P-3 (n = 11)				P-4 (n = 7)							
21.47				25.88				16.36				22.14							
1 8.7	2 43.5	3 8.7	00 34.7	1 17.6	2 47.1	3 5.9	00 29.4	1 18.2	2 27.3	3 0.0	00 54.5	1 28.6	2 57.1	3 0.0	00 14.3				
1 56.5	2 21.7	3 17.4		1 76.5	2 11.8	3 11.8		1 72.7	2 0.0	3 27.3		1 57.1	2 28.6	3 14.3					
1 30.4		2 65.2		1 11.8		2 88.2		1 27.3		2 72.7		1 14.3		2 85.7					
1 39.1	2 -	3 17.4	4 13.0	5 26.1	1 41.2	2 -	3 5.4	4 52.9	5 0.0	1 27.3	2 -	3 9.1	4 36.4	5 27.3	1 14.3	2 14.3	3 42.9	4 28.6	5 0.0
17.65				17.23				19.27				17.33							
1 78.3		2 8.6		1 58.8		2 29.4		1 90.9		2 9.1		1 85.7		2 14.3					
1 73.9		2 8.7		1 70.6		2 12.6		1 81.8		2 18.2		1 100.00		2 0.0					

Table 31 (continued)

Demography	P-1 (n = 23)				P-2 (n = 17)				P-3 (n = 11)							
Time in Transit (Mean minutes)	21.47				25.88				16.36							
Priority of School Attended (%)	1 8.7	2 43.5	3 8.7	00 34.7	1 17.6	2 47.1	3 5.9	00 29.4	1 18.2	2 27.3	3 0.0	00 54.5	1 28.6			
Return to School 1-Yes 2-No 3-Don't Know (%)	1 56.5	2 21.7	3 17.4		1 76.5	2 11.8	3 11.8		1 72.7	2 0.0	3 27.3		1 57.0			
Plans to Attend College 1-Yes 2-No (%)	1 30.4	2 65.2			1 11.8	2 88.2			1 27.3	2 72.7			1 100.0			
Grade in School 1-No response 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-College (%)	1 39.1	2 -	3 17.4	4 13.0	5 26.1	1 41.2	2 -	3 5.4	4 52.9	5 0.0	1 27.3	2 -	3 9.1	4 36.4	5 27.3	1 14.3
Age (Mean)	17.65				17.23				19.27							
Sex 1-Male 2-Female (%)	1 78.3	2 8.6			1 58.8	2 29.4			1 90.9	2 9.1						
Race 1-Negro 2-Caucasian (%)	1 73.9	2 8.7			1 70.6	2 12.6			1 81.8	2 18.2						100.0

Table 31 (continued)

Semantic Differential Means by P-Cluster

SCALES	P-1 (n = 23)	P-2 (n = 17)	P-3 (n = 11)	P-4 (n = 7)
ONE - Evaluative	2.456	1.500	1.636	1.928
TWO - Activity	2.818	2.470	2.227	2.500
THREE - Potency I	2.434	2.117	2.750	2.535
FOUR - Potency II	2.434	2.294	1.454	2.571
FIVE - Adolescent Value	2.797	2.019	2.181	2.809
SIX - Grand Means	2.673	2.042	2.297	2.493

Table 32

Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise
Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Boss"

Scale Clusters	Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Direct Effect %
<u>Evaluative</u> Good - Bad Fair - Unfair	Time in Transit	3.81	4.13	.95	7.31
	Source of Income	3.71	4.25	.95	8.43
	Family Structure	2.28	2.69	.75	4.01
	"My Life"	1.85	2.23	.75	3.44
	Total	2.91	3.51	.95	23.18
<u>Activity</u> Fast - Slow Noplace - Someplace	Time in Transit	4.03	4.64	.95	6.06
	Sex	2.45	2.92	.90	4.70
	Siblings	2.83	3.51	.90	7.82
	Plans to Attend College	1.72	2.19	.75	3.53
	Total	2.76	3.50	.95	22.11
<u>Potency I</u> Strong - Weak Mine - Theirs Rich - Poor Large - Small	Time in Transit	3.02	5.53	.95	7.67
	Siblings	1.39	2.62	.75	7.01
	Plans to Attend College	1.79	3.52	.90	5.66
	Total	2.06	4.07	.99	20.34
<u>Potency II</u> (Racial Dimension) Black - White	Family Structure	4.44	3.15	.90	T 5.60
<u>Adolescent Value</u> Hip - Square Sharp - Dull	Time in Transit	6.23	9.45	.99	14.22
	Source of Income	4.62	7.87	.99	12.89
	Method of Transportation	1.70	3.01	.90	4.02
	Total	4.19	7.38	.99	31.13
<u>General</u> All scales with the exception of Black - White	Time in Transit	4.19	9.64	.99	12.41
	Source of Income	2.45	6.14	.95	7.45
	Siblings	1.43	3.77	.90	6.95
	Plans to Attend College	.61	1.62	.75	2.35
	Total	2.17	5.78	.99	29.16

Table 33

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and
Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Cop"

P-1 (n = 26)					P-2 (n = 18)					P-3 (n = 14)					P-4 (n = 3)				
13.70					11.77					10.21					18.00				
1		2			1		2			1		2			1		2		
43.9		46.2			44.4		55.6			28.5		71.4			100.0		0.0		
4.79					4.72					5.70					2.33				
1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3		
23.1	50.1	26.4			44.4	44.4	11.1			64.3	35.7	0.0			33.3	66.7	0.0		
1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3		
30.8	15.4	53.8			27.8	27.8	44.4			64.3	21.4	14.3			66.7	0.0	0.0		
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
0.8	3.8	50.0	3.8	11.5	33.3	5.6	33.3	5.6	22.2	0.0	28.6	35.7	14.3	21.4	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0

Table 33

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Cop"

[illegible]

Table 33 (continued)

P-1 (n = 26)				P-2 (n = 18)				P-3 (n = 14)				P-4 (n = 3)							
26.153				20.50				23.21				33.33							
1 26.9	2 30.8	3 0.0	00 42.3	1 11.1	2 50.0	3 5.6	00 33.3	1 0.0	2 78.6	3 14.3	00 7.1	1 0.0	2 33.3	3 0.0	00 66.7				
1 76.9	2 15.4	3 7.7		1 61.1	2 22.2	3 16.7		1 85.7	2 14.3	3 0.0		1 33.6	2 66.0	3 0.4					
1 23.1		2 76.9		1 22.8		2 77.8		1 14.3		2 85.7		1 0.0		2 100.0					
1 26.9	2 1.0	3 11.5	4 38.5	5 22.1	1 22.8	2 5.6	3 27.8	4 16.7	5 22.3	1 21.4	2 -	3 28.6	4 42.7	5 7.1	1 66.7	2 -	3 -	4 33.3	5 -
18.09				18.47				17.00				18.00							
1 69.2		2 19.2		1 77.8		2 16.7		1 71.4		2 14.3		1 66.7		2 33.3					
1 76.9		2 11.5		1 72.2		2 22.2		1 78.6		2 7.1		1 100.0		2 0.0					

Table 33 (continued)

Demography	P-1 (n = 26)				P-2 (n = 18)				P-3 (n = 14)							
Time in Transit (Mean minutes)	26.153				20.50				23.21							
Priority of School Attended (%)	1 26.9	2 30.8	3 0.0	00 42.3	1 11.1	2 50.0	3 5.6	00 33.3	1 0.0	2 78.6	3 14.3	00 7.1	1 0.0			
Return to School 1-Yes 2-No 3-Don't Know (%)	1 76.9	2 15.4	3 7.7		1 61.1	2 22.2	3 16.7		1 85.7	2 14.3	3 0.0		1 33.			
Plans to Attend College 1-Yes 2-No (%)	1 23.1	2 76.9			1 22.8	2 77.8			1 14.3	2 85.7						
Grade in School 1-No response 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-College (%)	1 26.9	2 1.0	3 11.5	4 38.5	5 22.1	1 22.8	2 5.6	3 27.8	4 16.7	5 22.3	1 21.4	2 -	3 28.6	4 42.7	5 7.1	1 66.7
Age (Mean)	18.09				18.47				17.00							
Sex 1-Male 2-Female (%)	1 69.2	2 19.2			1 77.8	2 16.7			1 71.4	2 14.3						6
Race 1-Negro 2-Caucasian (%)	1 76.9	2 11.5			1 72.2	2 22.2			1 78.6	2 7.1						10

Table 33 (continued)

Semantic Differential Means by P-Cluster

SCALES	P-1 (n = 26)	P-2 (n = 18)	P-3 (n = 14)	P-4 (n = 3)
ONE - Evaluative	2.615	2.611	2.785	3.166
TWO - Activity	2.576	2.694	2.928	3.333
THREE - Potency I	2.682	2.638	2.553	3.000
FOUR - Potency II	2.923	3.000	2.642	3.666
FIVE - Adolescent Value	2.666	2.611	2.785	3.333
SIX - Grand Mean	2.646	2.636	2.720	3.181

Table 34

Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise
Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Cop"

Scale Clusters	Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Direct Effect %
<u>Evaluative</u> Good - Bad Fair - Unfair	Age	6.73	4.26	.95	6.90
	Return to School	6.59	4.42	.95	8.44
	Race	2.96	2.02	.75	10.52
	Sex	3.48	2.44	.75	5.92
	Total	4.94	3.46	.95	31.79
<u>Activity</u> Fast - Slow Noplace - Someplace	Age	8.19	6.67	.95	9.96
	Time in Transit	5.34	4.63	.95	8.02
	Plans to Attend College	4.99	4.60	.95	5.72
	"My Life"	2.20	2.07	.75	3.10
	Total	5.18	4.87	.99	26.54
<u>Potency I</u> Strong - Weak Mine - Theirs Rich - Poor Large - Small	Age	2.14	3.86	.90	7.25
	Plans to Attend College	1.43	2.65	.75	19.95
	Return to School	2.31	4.55	.95	13.09
	Grade in School	1.67	3.4	.90	7.53
	Total	1.89	3.89	.99	47.82
<u>Potency II</u> (Racial Dimension) Black - White	Return to School	2.72	2.46	.75	T 1.57
<u>Adolescent Value</u> Hip - Square Sharp - Dull	Age	7.37	6.97	.95	13.59
	Return to School	6.51	6.78	.95	23.95
	Grade in School	2.98	3.23	.90	9.33
	Priority of School Attended	2.08	2.31	.75	4.62
	Total	4.74	5.25	.99	51.49
<u>General</u> All scales with the exception of Black - White	Age	5.80	7.76	.99	13.98
	Return to School	2.97	4.19	.95	16.59
	Plans to Attend College	2.64	3.92	.90	14.88
	Grade in School	1.10	1.16	.75	4.49
	Race	1.03	1.57	.75	2.24
	Total	2.71	4.12	.99	52.19

Table 35

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and
Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "My Life"

P-1 (n = 36)					P-2 (n = 14)					P-3 (n = 13)					P-4 (n = 4)				
13.85					10.57					12.40					14.50				
1		2			1		2			1		2			1		2		
50.0		50.0			50.0		50.0			53.8		42.9			75.0		25.0		
4.76					4.78					4.92					5.00				
1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3		
28.9	41.7	19.5			35.7	57.1	7.1			38.5	53.8	7.7			25.0	75.0	0.0		
1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3		
38.9	25.0	36.1			42.9	14.3	42.9			46.2	0.0	53.8			25.0	25.0	50.0		
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5.0	13.9	38.9	2.8	19.4	35.7	0.0	42.9	14.3	7.1	15.4	15.4	53.8	0.0	15.4	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "My Life"

[illegible]

Table 35 (continued)

P-1 (n = 36)				P-2 (n = 14)				P-3 (n = 13)				P-4 (n = 4)							
22.70				21.00				30.00				20.00							
1 11.1	2 50.0	3 2.8	00 33.3	1 21.4	2 28.6	3 7.1	00 42.9	1 15.4	2 53.8	3 7.7	00 23.1	1 0.0	2 75.0	3 0.0	00 25.0				
1 72.2	2 16.7	3 11.1		1 50.0	2 35.7	3 14.3		1 76.9	2 15.4	3 7.7		1 75.0	2 25.0	3 -					
1 22.2		2 77.8		1 21.4		2 71.4		1 15.4		2 84.6		1 0.0		2 100.0					
1 30.4	2 2.8	3 19.4	4 30.6	5 13.9	1 42.9	2 -	3 -	4 35.7	5 21.4	1 23.1	2 -	3 30.8	4 30.8	5 15.4	1 0.0	2 25.0	3 50.0	4 25.0	5 0.0
18.09				17.70				17.80				18.00							
1 80.6		2 11.1		1 57.1		2 35.7		1 84.6		2 15.4		1 100.0		2 0.0					
1 86.1		2 5.6		1 78.6		2 14.3		1 84.6		2 15.4		1 75.0		2 25.0					

Table 35 (continued)

Demography	P-1 (n = 36)				P-2 (n = 14)				P-3 (n = 13)								
Time in Transit (Mean minutes)	22.70				21.00				30.00								
Priority of School Attended (%)	1 11.1	2 50.0	3 2.8	00 33.3	1 21.4	2 28.6	3 7.1	00 42.9	1 15.4	2 53.8	3 7.7	00 23.1	1 0.0				
Return to School 1-Yes 2-No 3-Don't Know (%)	1 72.2	2 16.7	3 11.1		1 50.0	2 35.7	3 14.3		1 76.9	2 15.4	3 7.7		1 75.0				
Plans to Attend College 1-Yes 2-No (%)	1 22.2	2 77.8			1 21.4	2 71.4			1 15.4	2 84.6							
Grade in School 1-No response 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-College (%)	1 30.4	2 2.8	3 19.4	4 30.6	5 13.9	1 42.9	2 -	3 -	4 35.7	5 21.4	1 23.1	2 -	3 30.8	4 30.8	5 15.4	1 0.0	2 2.0
Age (Mean)	18.09				17.70				17.80								
Sex 1-Male 2-Female	1 80.6	2 11.1			1 57.1	2 35.7			1 84.6	2 15.4							10.0
Race 1-Negro 2-Caucasian (%)	1 86.1	2 5.6			1 78.6	2 14.3			1 84.6	2 15.4							7.0

Table 35 (continued)

Semantic Differential Means by P-Cluster

SCALES	P-1 (n = 36)	P-2 (n = 14)	P-3 (n = 13)	P-4 (n = 4)
ONE - Evaluative	2.083	1.642	1.769	2.000
TWO - Activity	1.958	1.857	3.153	1.875
THREE - Potency I	2.277	2.696	2.190	2.750
FOUR - Potency II	4.000	2.928	3.767	1.750
FIVE - Adolescent Value	1.879	2.642	1.923	1.416
SIX - Grand Mean	2.075	2.337	2.210	2.090

Table 36

Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise
Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "My Life"

Scale Clusters	Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Direct Effect %
<u>Evaluative</u> Good - Bad Fair - Unfair	Family Structure	3.40	5.84	.95	8.43
	"My Life"	3.18	5.93	.95	7.80
	Source of Income	1.02	1.95	.75	2.85
	Total	2.53	4.81	.99	19.08
<u>Activity</u> Fast - Slow Noplace - Someplace	"My Life"	6.42	9.97	.99	19.74
	Time in Transit	4.12	7.09	.99	9.91
	Total	5.27	9.07	.99	29.64
<u>Potency I</u> Strong - Weak Mine - Theirs Rich - Poor Large - Small	"My Life"	10.43	37.36	.99	38.44
	Return to School	1.09	4.14	.95	1.37
	Sex	.71	2.79	.90	4.05
	Priority of School Attended	.66	2.66	.75	3.08
	Total	3.22	12.96	.99	46.94
<u>Potency II</u> (Racial Dimension) Black - White	Time in Transit	4.89	4.31	.95	7.25
	Race	9.41	6.51	.95	27.26
	Sex	5.25	4.05	.95	10.43
	Family Structure	2.61	2.05	.75	2.98
	Total	5.79	4.56	.99	47.92
<u>Adolescent Value</u> Hip - Square Sharp - Dull	Length of Residence in Columbus	2.24	3.87	.90	3.72
	Return to School	1.74	3.12	.90	6.72
	Sex	1.39	2.56	.75	12.96
	Race	1.45	2.76	.75	6.05
	Total	1.71	3.42	.90	29.90
<u>General</u> All scales with the exception of Black - White	Sex	.74	2.28	.75	T 1.51

Table 37

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and
Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Fight"

P-1 (n = 25)					P-2 (n = 23)					P-3 (n = 8)					P-4 (n = 8)				
13.08					14.52					10.37					10.70				
1 52.0		2 48.0			1 60.8		2 39.1			1 37.5		2 62.5			1 37.5		2 62.5		
4.72					4.45					5.85					4.75				
1 40.0	2 56.0	3 4.0			1 26.0	2 56.5	3 12.4			1 62.5	2 0.0	3 37.5			1 50.0	2 37.5	3 12.5		
1 40.0	2 8.0	3 52.0			1 52.0	2 17.4	3 30.0			1 12.5	2 50.0	3 37.5			1 50.0	2 12.5	3 37.5		
1 16.0	2 16.0	3 48.0	4 8.0	5 12.0	1 34.8	2 8.7	3 43.5	4 0.0	5 13.0	1 37.5	2 12.5	3 50.0	4 0.0	5 0.0	1 12.5	2 0.0	3 37.5	4 12.5	5 37.5

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Fight"

[illegible]

Table 37 (continued)

P-1 (n = 25)				P-2 (n = 23)				P-3 (n = 8)				P-4 (n = 8)							
28.20				20.65				24.37				21.75							
1 12.0	2 56.0	3 4.0	00 28.0	1 4.3	2 30.4	3 8.7	00 56.5	1 25.0	2 50.0	3 -	00 25.0	1 31.5	2 37.5	3 -	00 25.0				
1 76.0	2 16.0	3 8.0		1 47.8	2 21.7	3 30.5		1 75.5	2 12.5	3 12.0		1 100.0	2 0.0	3 -					
1 24.0		2 72.0		1 26.1		2 73.9		1 12.5		2 87.5		1 12.5		2 87.5					
1 24.0	2 -	3 28.0	4 24.0	5 20.0	1 47.8	2 -	3 13.0	4 21.7	5 17.0	1 25.0	2 -	3 12.5	4 50.0	5 12.5	1 12.5	2 -	3 12.5	4 2.5	5 72.5
17.45				18.65				18.37				17.37							
1 92.0		2 8.0		1 65.2		2 26.1		1 75.0		2 12.5		1 50.0		2 50.0					
1 80.0		2 12.0		1 82.6		2 8.7		1 62.5		2 25.5		1 87.5		2 12.5					

Table 37 (continued)

Demography	P-1 (n = 25)				P-2 (n = 23)				P-3 (n = 8)				P-4 (n = 1)				
Time in Transit (Mean minutes)	28.20				20.65				24.37								
Priority of School Attended (%)	1 12.0	2 56.0	3 4.0	00 28.0	1 4.3	2 30.4	3 8.7	00 56.5	1 25.0	2 50.0	3 -	00 25.0	1 31.5	01 0.0			
Return to School 1-Yes 2-No 3-Don't Know (%)	1 76.0	2 16.0	3 8.0		1 47.8	2 21.7	3 30.5		1 75.5	2 12.5	3 12.0		1 100.0				
Plans to Attend College 1-Yes 2-No (%)	1 24.0	2 72.0			1 26.1	2 73.9			1 12.5	2 87.5			1 12.5				
Grade in School 1-No response 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-College (%)	1 24.0	2 -	3 28.0	4 24.0	5 20.0	1 47.8	2 -	3 13.0	4 21.7	5 17.0	1 25.0	2 -	3 12.5	4 50.0	5 12.5	1 12.5	2 -
Age (Mean)	17.45				18.65				18.37								
Sex 1-Male 2-Female (%)	1 92.0	2 8.0			1 65.2	2 26.1			1 75.0	2 12.5			1 50.0				
Race 1-Negro 2-Caucasian (%)	1 80.0	2 12.0			1 82.6	2 8.7			1 62.5	2 25.5			1 87.5				

Table 37 (Continued)

Semantic Differential Mean by P-Cluster

SCALES	P-1 (n = 25)	P-2 (n = 23)	P-3 (n = 8)	P-4 (n = 8)
ONE - Evaluative	2.220	3.695	2.875	3.625
TWO - Activity	2.020	3.000	2.214	3.375
THREE - Potency I	2.360	3.000	3.281	3.281
FOUR - Potency II	3.625	3.130	3.000	3.375
FIVE - Adolescent Value	2.040	2.927	2.619	3.166
SIX - Grand Mean	2.185	3.106	2.987	3.329

Table 38

Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise
Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Fight"

Scale Clusters	Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Direct Effect %
<u>Evaluative</u> Good - Bad Fair - Unfair	Source of Income	9.6630	5.8301	.95	9.01
	Grade in School	3.3523	2.1000	.75	7.99
	Plans to Attend College	3.8120	2.4500	.75	4.85
	"My Life"	3.3380	2.0510	.75	3.83
	Total	5.0417	3.2420	.95	25.68
<u>Activity</u> Fast - Slow Noplace - Someplace	Birthplace	3.693	4.655	.95	13.55
	Age	5.170	7.250	.99	13.10
	Grade in School	2.313	3.382	.90	4.34
	"My Life"	9.039	10.700	.99	24.55
	Total	5.056	7.391	.99	55.54
<u>Potency I</u> Strong - Weak Mine - Theirs Rich - Poor Large - Small	Source of Income	4.0225	7.345	.99	9.57
	Grade in School	2.7024	5.307	.95	9.31
	"My Life"	1.959	4.058	.95	5.86
	Total	3.362	6.600	.99	24.64
<u>Potency II</u> (Racial Dimension) Black - White	Race	5.086	5.907	.95	9.43
	Source of Income	2.166	2.587	.75	3.10
	Siblings	2.055	2.522	.75	4.58
	Time in Transit	5.878	6.280	.95	8.56
	Total	3.796	4.660	.99	25.66
<u>Adolescent Value</u> Hip - Square Sharp - Dull	Method of Transportation	2.188	2.464	.75	2.03
	Length of Residence in Columbus	2.093	2.417	.75	4.72
	"My Life"	5.039	5.530	.95	9.63
	Total				15.38
<u>General</u> All scales with the exception of Black - White	Source of Income	3.83	5.79	.95	8.00
	Grade in School	1.41	2.18	.75	3.45
	Total	2.62	4.04	.95	11.45

Table 39

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and
Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Soul"

P-1 (n = 14)					P-2 (n = 5)					P-3 (n = 42)					P-4 (n = 1)				
12.64					10.20					13.22					n. s. *				
1		2			1		2			1		2			1		2		
88.6		21.4			80.0		20.0			47.6		52.4			n. s.		n. s.		
4.14					4.80					5.00									
1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3		
35.7	64.3	0.0			40.0	40.0	20.0			40.5	42.9	16.7			n. s.	n. s.	n. s.		
1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3			1	2	3		
28.6	21.4	50.0			80.0	0.0	20.0			38.1	21.4	40.5			n. s.	n. s.	n. s.		
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12.9	7.1	35.7	0.0	14.3	20.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	19.0	14.3	42.9	4.8	19.0	n. s.	n. s.	n. s.	n. s.	n. s.

Table 39

P Factor Analysis of Semantic Differential by Demographic Variables and Mean Scores for Six Scales for the Concept "Soul"

[illegible]

Table 39 (continued)

P-1 (n = 14)				P-2 (n = 5)				P-3 (n = 42)				P-4 (n = 1)							
27.14				25.80				23.21				n. s.							
1 21.4	2 42.9	3 14.3	00 21.4	1 20.0	2 20.0	3 0.0	00 60.0	1 9.5	2 52.4	3 0.0	00 37.7	1 n. s.	2 n. s.	3 n. s.	00 n. s.				
1 71.4	2 14.3	3 14.3		1 100.0	2 0.0	3 0.0		1 69.0	2 14.3	3 16.7		1 n. s.	2 n. s.	3 n. s.					
1 21.4		2 78.6		1 40.0		2 60.0		1 16.7		2 81.0		1 n. s.		2 n. s.					
1 21.4	2 7.1	3 14.3	4 35.7	5 4.0	1 40.0	2 -	3 20.0	4 20.0	5 20.0	1 33.3	2 -	3 19.0	4 33.3	5 11.9	1 n. s.	2 n. s.	3 n. s.	4 n. s.	5 n. s.
17.00				18.20				18.02				n. s.							
1 78.6		2 14.3		1 60.0		2 40.0		1 76.2		2 14.3		1 n. s.		2 n. s.					
1 71.4		2 21.4		1 80.0		2 20.0		1 90.5		2 4.8		1 n. s.		2 n. s.					

Table 39 (continued)

Demography	P-1 (n = 14)				P-2 (n = 5)				P-3 (n = 42)							
Time in Transit (Mean minutes)	27.14				25.80				23.21							
Priority of School Attended (%)	1 21.4	2 42.9	3 14.3	00 21.4	1 20.0	2 20.0	3 0.0	00 60.0	1 9.5	2 52.4	3 0.0	00 37.7	1 n. s.			
Return to School 1-Yes 2-No 3-Don't Know (%)	1 71.4	2 14.3	3 14.3		1 100.0	2 0.0	3 0.0		1 69.0	2 14.3	3 16.7		1 n. s.			
Plans to Attend College 1-Yes 2-No (%)	1 21.4	2 78.6			1 40.0	2 60.0			1 16.7	2 81.0			n.			
Grade in School 1-No response 2-Sophomore 3-Junior 4-Senior 5-College (%)	1 21.4	2 7.1	3 14.3	4 35.7	5 4.0	1 40.0	2 -	3 20.0	4 20.0	5 20.0	1 33.3	2 -	3 19.0	4 33.3	5 11.9	1 n. s.
Age (Mean)	17.00				18.20				18.02							
Sex 1-Male 2-Female (%)	1 78.6	2 14.3			1 60.0	2 40.0			1 76.2	2 14.3			n.			
Race 1-Negro 2-Caucasian (%)	1 71.4	2 21.4			1 80.0	2 20.0			1 90.5	2 4.8			n.			

Table 39 (continued)

Semantic Differential Means by P-Cluster

SCALES	P-1 (n = 14)	P-2 (n = 5)	P-3 (n = 42)	P-4 (n = 1)
ONE - Evaluative	2.071	2.700	1.202	n. s.
TWO - Activity	2.714	2.100	1.381	n. s.
THREE - Potency I	2.142	2.350	1.542	n. s.
FOUR - Potency II	3.142	2.800	4.476	n. s.
FIVE - Adolescent Value	2.142	2.200	1.349	n. s.
SIX - Grand Mean	2.233	2.327	1.408	n. s.

Table 40

Demographic Variables Calculated as Significant Predictors by Step-Wise
Regression over Six Scales for the Concept "Soul"

Scale Clusters	Variable	Mean Square	F Ratio	P	Direct Effect %
<u>Evaluative</u> Good - Bad Fair - Unfair	Race	7.20	13.60	.99	46.41
	Sex	3.54	7.44	.99	15.26
	Time in Transit	2.88	6.60	.95	7.73
	Total	4.54	10.51	.99	69.40
<u>Activity</u> Fast - Slow Noplace - Someplace	Race	4.15	7.17	.99	24.08
	Plans to Attend College	1.57	2.79	.90	7.90
	Priority of School Attended	2.07	3.88	.90	6.28
	Sex	1.16	2.23	.75	4.91
	Total	2.24	4.29	.99	43.16
<u>Potency I</u> Strong - Weak Mine - Theirs Rich - Poor Large - Small	Race	5.73	15.97	.99	42.86
	Method of Transportation	1.56	4.63	.95	5.17
	Sex	.68	2.07	.75	4.17
	Total	2.66	8.04	.99	52.20
<u>Potency II</u> (Racial Dimension) Black - White	Race	10.92	6.97	.95	25.35
	Return to School	4.48	2.95	.90	23.80
	Birthplace	4.61	3.15	.90	3.26
	Sex	3.31	2.33	.75	5.13
	Plans to Attend College	9.26	7.66	.99	15.37
	Total	5.51	4.56	.99+	73.51
<u>Adolescent Value</u> Hip - Square Sharp - Dull	Race	4.61	7.74	.99	39.05
	Sex	4.68	8.97	.99	13.80
	Time in Transit	2.07	4.19	.95	5.34
	Method of Transportation	1.84	3.92	.90	7.46
	Source of Income	2.48	5.75	.95	6.70
	Total	3.13	7.28	.99	72.35
<u>General</u> All scales with the exception of Black - White	Race	5.36	15.60	.99	51.69
	Sex	2.25	6.99	.95	12.52
	Time in Transit	.87	2.80	.90	4.12
	Method of Transportation	.77	2.54	.75	4.69
	Plans to Attend College	.74	2.52	.75	3.10
	Total	2.00	6.77	.99	76.12

Table 41

Task Analysis Scores for All Companies by
Factor Clusters for the Concept "Work"

Company	Percentage by Four Clusters				Task Score Range	Mean Task Score
	1	2	3	4		
1/11	18.1	45.4	18.1	18.1	12-23	18.25
2/11	54.5	27.2	0.0	18.1	19-27	23.00
3/10	50.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	10	10.00
4/1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	13	13
5/4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22-23	22.5
6/6	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	11	11
7/2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	14	14
8/6	50.0	16.6	33.3	0.0	12-17	17
9	83.3	16.6	0.0	0.0	10	10

Hypothesis 7

P Factor analysis produces sufficient subgroupings of this population with both different attitudinal and demographic characteristics to disprove any theory postulating a monolithic community of black youth. The possible exception will be the question of black identity which asserts itself in a reversal of the traditional polarity of the scale "black-white."

The Factor analysis produced several subject groupings for each of the seven concepts. Furthermore the groups were readily distinguishable by certain specific differences in the demographic characteristics of each group. Each group emerged in order of size in the same pattern as the proportion of variance accounted for by that cluster (the largest group accounting for the largest proportion of variance and thus "within" cluster deviation). However, one concept "Soul" produced a large cluster which accounted for a relatively small percentage of the total variance. The homogeneity of position on this concept and the .01 significance of the relationship between race and attitudes on this concept seem to assert "Soul" as a characteristic of ethnic identification. In general such evidence would seem to lend strong support to the experimental hypothesis. Any view of this community as homogeneous in opinion, except as such opinion reflects racial identity, would seem incorrect according to this data.

Hypothesis 8

In spite of theoretical notions to the contrary, race and income source do not emerge as significant predictors of attitudinal patterns on

concepts involving work orientation as a middle-class set.

Examination of the step-wise regression for the concepts "Work" and "Paycheck" suggest strong support for this hypothesis. The two variables, Race and Income Source, do not emerge in any scale dimension (including Potency II) for the concept "Work." Additionally, no high variance pattern is apparent in the distribution of the two demographic variables for the sub-groupings under "Work." Under "Paycheck" race predicts on the Potency II dimension $p = .05$ and income on the Adolescent Value dimension $p = .10$. However, neither enters into the other dimensions. The emergence of race in the Potency II dimension as significant seems to connote a racial observation concerning the use of the black-white scale pair. It is obvious by the negative loadings that black polarized with good. This polarization, that is the usage of the scale is heavily predicted by race in all concepts--but with enough difference to indicate that some concepts elicit stronger racial distinctions than others.

Hypothesis 9

Consistent with current thinking on racial alienation and adolescent development, race and age, respectively, emerges as predictors of attitudinal patterns on concepts relating to self and authority.

Self: Utilizing both concepts "My Life" and "Soul" to judge this hypothesis a sound rejection occurs. With the exception of race as relates to soul ($p = .01$), which is understandable given previous discussion, neither race or age are utilized in the step-wise regression format.

Authority: A mixed reaction is apparent in this area. Neither variables (age, race) are utilized in the regression analysis over the concept "Boss." However, Age emerges as a strong predictor ($p = .01$) of attitudes toward "Cop." Race although utilized in the equation produces only a $p = .25$.

Hypothesis 10

Due to current level of frustration the distribution of attitudes toward the concept "Fight" depends on race as a significant predictor with more positive attitudes toward such concept being elicited by Negroes.

This hypothesis seems to have been flatly rejected. Instead those most likely to view "Fight" in a negative vein were those more likely to name employment as an alternative source of income. Race does not enter the regression analysis at any point of this concept.

Hypothesis 11

Consistent with theoretical definition of scale "dimension" as having certain uniqueness (see above), separate demographic variables emerge as predictors for each attitudinal dimension regarding all concepts utilized in the step-wise regression.

Each Factor analysis was examined to determine how many attitude dimensions i. e. Evaluative, etc. were a major function of completely different demographic variables than any other attitude dimension in that Factor analysis. Only eighteen of the dimensions have substantially unique predictors, however when race is removed as a factor twenty-two appear

unique. This number does not seem to be strongly better than chance probability in terms of occurrence as the total number of dimension is thirty-five concepts. The data is inconclusive and thus the hypothesis is neither proven or disproven by the data, however, further discussion will follow in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Any understanding of this data including the ensuing discussion must be considered in light of the experimental design and its weaknesses. The population is not intended to be a probability sample of all youth employees or their employers. This is to say that generalizations concerning the N. A. B. program nationwide are not statistically valid. The sampling technique although adequate for the purposes of this study was somewhat constrained by the requirement of good relationships with the community of individuals involved in this study. For instance, it was very difficult to bring pressure on those groups or individuals sampled who refused to participate. The strengths are apparent.

The semantic differential is quite thorough and has a history of some reliability (Osgood et al, 1957). However, realistic objections have been raised concerning the assumption of an equidistant semantic space between scale intervals (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1967) and the author has raised previous questions concerning the subtle cross-cultural semantic differentiations on scale pairs (Vincent, 1968).

Although this form of critical self-examination could likely continue as a rather lengthy document, especially as relates to the theoretical

concepts surrounding the Semantic Differential, only one other factor seems appropriate for mention; the conditions under which the instrument was administered were not uniform. That is to say, physical environs varied and to some extent the attitude of those administering the instrument might have varied. Very strong precaution was taken in the form of instructing each person involved in some detail, nevertheless it would appear more likely than not that some situational "demand" influence has made itself felt in these results. I would, however, be very reluctant to ascribe a major explanation of variance to such error.

The issues of first interest to any researcher are likely to center about the experimental hypotheses and the reasons for which a confirmatory or rejection stance seem to be indicated. Although there is much intellectual gratification in postulating some particular statement and having it accepted, the most interesting items for discussion remain the unconfirmed or rejected hypotheses and those additional relationships which are essentially discoveries based on the data analysis. Additionally, practical recommendations should be summarized if indicated by the nature of the data.

The emergence of a statistic confirming de facto conditions of segregation was not unexpected. However, such dramatic illustration of the presence of blacks in such high proportion in low income areas, although suggested by other data, was not as expected. The argument concerning the connection between segregated educational facilities and the development of self perception was much discussed in the 1954 Supreme Court

desegregation orders. Although every effort may be made to provide good education, the economic base of an inner city is often inadequate and the relationship between failure of education and later failure in employment seems well documented (Clark, 1957).

If the N. A. B. program is to operate successfully with youth from inner-city schools then certainly an understanding of the inherent inadequacies of a segregated school system might significantly effect this success. Those employers that not only encourage but lend assistance to efforts to stimulate racial pride and strengthened identity are hopefully operating to mitigate against the effects of segregation. Those companies that, additionally, throw their economic muscle behind open housing, minority loan programs, and inner-city school projects such as Headstart or Upward Bound may move beyond pallative to the possibility of long-term solution (at least in the middle-class sense of success).

Although it is not possible to ascertain the specific birthplace of immigrants to the state the relevant factor is certainly the large movement of Negroes to this area of the country in the past twenty years. The disproportionately large percentage (24.0%) that have moved in the last five years would lead one to suspect at least a continuation of this phenomena over the next few years and thus an intensification of the burden implied upon the capability of the inner-city to serve a migrant population. Birthplace entered into prediction of attitudinal responses in a rather minor fashion, however two entries require some discussion. Birthplace predicts at a .05 level the Activity dimension of the concept

"Fight." (Table 38). The grouping showing the most negative attitude toward "Fight" contains the highest concentration of migrants (62.5%) and the most positive grouping shows only 48.0% migrants. This last group is also on the average a year younger than any other grouping (Table 37).

In addition, Birthplace predicts the Potency II dimension over the concept "Soul" at a .10 level (Table 40). The indication is that a slightly higher percentage of migrants (2.0%) tend to utilize this scale in a most positive relationship with "Soul." That is to say, literally, that migrants tend to see "Soul" as a black concept more often than those born in this area (Table 39).

In an indirect fashion the importance of adequate public transportation is indicated by the large proportion of youth utilizing bus transport. Whether this relates to being poor or just being young the fact remains that such transport on the average is more time consuming. It is also less subject to personal control and perhaps the source of some uncontrollable tardiness to work. "Method of Transportation" does emerge in the regression equation on several work related concepts "Work," "Paycheck," and "Boss." Those two groups having a high percentage of automobile owners were less likely to view "Work" as positive than the one large group (R1) having considerably less ownership. The two groups showing more ownership were either older or out-of-school and as a consequence one might suspect that these youth are less likely to view "Work" as a solution "com-pleat" than youth still influenced by the middle class values and optimism

of an unrealistic school system. It would seem to indicate that riding the bus does not elicit negative attitudes toward "Work" (Table 27). The relationships indicated between this variable and the two concepts "Pay-check" and "Boss" do not pattern themselves in a sufficiently logical fashion to be indicative of any explanation except the caveat that the relationship is spurious (Tables 29, 31).

The dominant presence of public transportation should at least confirm the concern of the Research Institute of America (1968) in its advice that every employer should consider the adequacy of public transportation to his "shop" when considering employment of the "hard-core."

The fact that race failed to predict time spent in transit must in most part be laid to the ineptness of the question. The intention of the hypothesis was to demonstrate the disparity in distance/time between races in terms of industrial locations. The analysis does not take in account the possibility that inner-city industrial sites would participate with greater frequency in the program (as they did in this city) or that the youngsters would be reluctant to select jobs outside the range of public transportation.

Over the concept "Boss" those spending the most time in transit and the least vied for the most positive attitudes toward "Boss." The time in transit variable (7) predicts these attitudes at a $p < .01$ over all dimensions except Potency II (Table 32). The group that spent the least time was older on the average and more likely to be out of school. The group spending the most time was more likely to return to school, be

from a broken family, and receive public assistance. The least time group had the highest percentage of college students, the "most" time group had the least number. It is relatively easy to ascertain the difference between the two groups, however, the fact remains that they view "Boss" more positively than two other groups averaging about the same amount of time to travel to work (Table 31).

The character of the least time group indicates youth with real reason for viewing "Boss" positively i. e. high college attendance, most likely to own automobile and from smallest families. The most time group seems to be the caricature of deprivation and yet are most likely to return to school. Perhaps positive affect toward "Boss" in the latter group is due more to aspiration than reality. Perhaps age (this is the youngest group) will blunt this response. In any case time in transit is an interesting factor to be considered in terms of work satisfaction as indicated by its emergence in both "Boss" and "Paycheck." The fact that over ten percent of the variance can be attributed to this variable on the concept "Boss" lends additional credence.

The public outcry concerning the alleged proliferation of black, welfare families to obtain more welfare funds is quite familiar. Whether a subject gave no response or indicated a choice between other employment and public assistance the pattern of response did not vary with the number of siblings. As previously mentioned, any discussion utilizing the pattern of response to the question concerning income source is somewhat invalid. However, the failure of race to predict family size seems

to give additional strength to a counter-argument concerning the growth of welfare rolls.

Considering the writing of Moynihan (Rainwater & Yancey, 1967), the expectation exists that race would make a considerable difference in the structure (stability) of the family. Among this low-income sample which is predominantly Negro the primary correlate of a broken family structure is the presence of large numbers of children. While this is not altogether inconsistent with the pressures enumerated by Moynihan which lead to broken families the dynamic certainty would seem to operate without discrimination for race. Although this data is not conclusive in the production of any new postulate it would seem that an emphasis on birth-control education would lend more assistance to low-income family stability than decreasing the size of assistance grants.

In its most insidious form racial prejudice tends to take the guise of generalization about a racial group and thus whether positive or negative the ascription of certain characteristics to that group (Allport, 1954). The emergence in this study of distinguishable sub-groupings not based on race is, of course, expected in a sampling of predominantly low income youth. If the analysis compared this grouping to a sample of middle income whites, race might appear as a criterion along with income but likely as an error in sampling. Poor black and white youth seem to share more in common as a class than they have in difference as separate races. The activities of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in organizing the now famous "Poor Peoples March" would seem to indicate the shift of

emphasis from civil rights to class rights. The current emphasis of the Students for a Democratic Society (Maoist Wing) is on a new found coalition initiated by the Black Panthers, a national group which is seemingly de-emphasizing black nationalism and emphasizing class struggle (Cleaver, 1968). In other words the evidence for monolithic social groups based on race is somewhat sketchy.

Excluding the Potency II (Black-White) dimension and the concept "Soul," race does not emerge as a significant demographic predictor (p .10) of attitudes concerning the various concept areas tapped.

The failure of race to emerge as a significant element in attitudes toward work related items, and the attendant lack of coherence to the pattern of income source would seem to confirm the suspicion that employability of low income persons is more related to education and reality factors such as transportation (Carter, 1968; Wille & Ridick, 1965).

Although attempts to understand the demographic correlates of the self concepts "My Life" and "Soul" (other than race in the case of the latter) is somewhat confusing the emergence of sex as a significant predictor seems understandable.

On "My Life" a consistent pattern inferring that females judge themselves less positively than males emerges. On the concept "Soul" a similar pattern is apparent with females judging themselves, "Soul" less positively. Perhaps the current emphasis on the role of the black male brought on by concerns for matriarchy coupled with the identity strengthening aspects of "soul brother" activity cause a somewhat amplified notion

of self-worth for the male respondents over the females. However, one is reminded of the young black man's answer during the T. A. T. interview to the question, "Do black women have soul?"; "Not as much as men," he responded, and then justified this by their "servant" role in white society.

Positive self perception seems little effected by other variables, however, the author is quick to remind that substantial contrast in, for instance, income (by definition) does not exist in this sample.

The attitudes toward "Cop" seem to provide for some interesting conjecture. That group (admittedly small) with "negative" reactions to the concept were least likely to return to school or live in stable families however they were of no significant age difference from the most positive in affect group. The next to most "negative" group while similar to the most "positive" group is the youngest. The most positive is simply that group more likely to return to school and on the average older. Perhaps the attitude toward policemen is a simple product of age and success in school. However, the equivocation of response toward policemen (a consistent 3.00) on the Potency II scale indicates some reaction to the instrument as no other concept elicits more negative to neutral responses.

Perhaps in the negative grouping the portrait of a drop-out as someone failing in school because of an inability to handle authority figures is indicated. In any case negativity toward "Cop," a single parent home along with low return to school rates seems to be a classic description of the educator's drop-out (whether or not a rational explanation exists).

The lack of sensible explanation for the pattern of attitudes toward "Fight" make it rather difficult to interpret. The only clear observation is that the group with the highest percentage of college students is least favorable in its response to this concept. Those most likely to answer no response to a question of income source are most favorable toward "Fight." The largest group views "Fight" more favorably than other groups and other than the college bound group is the youngest.

It would appear viewing both "Cop" and "Fight" together that if the system works for you regardless of age you view authority positively and are quite simply less frustrated. However, if one is young and frustrated by lack of success with the system (schools) then negative aggressive behavior might be expected to develop. As the individual begins to gain experience with the system perhaps he just gives up or develops a less aggressive attitude. In any case outside of the college bound youth, the oldest group views "Fight" most negatively.

The concept of uniqueness is not unfamiliar to those who have studied the development of the Semantic Differential. Each dimension is assumed to represent a single semantic space, unique and non interactive with other dimensions. That is to say, that a pure Evaluative dimension would not interact with a pure Activity dimension and so on (Osgood et al, 1957).

It would seem logical to assume that each dimension would interact with a separate demographic variable. This logic is somewhat speculative and the author is prepared to admit some whimsy in constructing this

hypothesis. However, to stretch the rationale a little further it would seem that if a dimension of meaning is unique, then its determinants would be unique over the same areas of judgment. As no Factor Analysis has yet produced a scale that loads cleanly on one dimension, the expectation of unique demographic predictors for each dimension becomes somewhat unrealistic. Since one dimension, Potency II, was reversed in polarity due to its use to make ethnic distinctions in judgments of concepts, it is difficult to include this dimension in the overall judgment of this rather stretched hypothesis. In 18 of 28 cases, excluding race, the demographic predictors are unique, that is to say different from other predictors relating to that concept. Although this information adds validity to the notion that valid judgments of a concept must be multi-dimensional it hardly proves the case for or against "unique" dimensions of meaning.

In retrospect the analysis seems to almost overpower the raw data. One is reminded that only a small number of youth are involved in this sample in comparison to the number of youth participating in summer employment programs throughout the country.

However, that which was learned may in some respect contribute to the major purpose of any such investigation: a practical consequence of benefit to the subject population as an outcome of increased understanding. One remark made by a program supervisor perhaps communicates the importance of adequate descriptive information, "We really expected 20 juvenile delinquents." The kids he got like the ones who took part in this study were much more likely to approach life in the fashion of the

middle-class than like the miscreants they were purported to be. Perhaps the program or this study or both failed to reach the malcontents of perhaps the possibility of absorbing poor youngsters into the middle class is still strong.

Although conclusions are uncertain job satisfaction did seem to relate in part to task complexity (Table 41) and further research should be done to determine the efficacy of an approach to evaluation involving the utilization of task analysis.

If this factor (task complexity) could eventually be proven as a strong correlate of work satisfaction then perhaps a revised view of the N. A. B. programs with an eye to the kind of summer "work" being provided should be undertaken. Many companies engaged in this program experienced much difficulty in keeping black youth in menial jobs--perhaps such jobs confirm expectation and either drive the hostility or apathy of the youth, whichever, further along.

In any case these questions still remain to be answered as this study may have dispelled some notions about the youth it offers little to confirm new generalizations. Perhaps none would be adequate.

To provide one final caveat, a Factor Analysis by two enterprising graduate students was given interesting interpretation by a learned colleague only to discover the raw data were random numbers (Armstrong & Soleberg, 1968).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This dissertation was an attempt to develop reliable descriptions of youth involved in a summer employment program sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen. The descriptors were both demographic and attitudinal. Relevant literature concerning manpower programming and characteristics of poor youth were reviewed. In addition, appropriate literature of a theoretical nature was utilized in the development of an experimental design especially as relates to instrumentation and analysis. Eighty-seven subjects were used in the final compilation of data and the information obtained included a twelve concept Semantic Differential.

The data was first treated by Factor Analysis from which scale dimensions were determined. Five dimensions--Evaluative, Potency, Activity, Potency II and Adolescent Value emerged. One dimension, Potency II, was comprised of one scale pair black-white and in reversal of traditional findings black polarized with good-strong-fast. The demographic data was summarized and cross-tabulations were performed where relevant to experimental hypotheses.

Data was then collapsed to form a matrix for one concept by all subjects and scales. The entry into the Factor Analysis was then an

inter-correlation matrix of subjects for all scales on one concept. Seven such Factor Analyses were performed. The output Factors were then displayed with demographic summaries calculated for each grouping of subjects (cluster). In addition demographic variables were subjected to Regression analysis to determine the best predictors of attitudinal scores by all scale dimensions and then displayed.

The following list of hypotheses were tested for validity as a purpose of the dissertation.

Hypothesis One: Race emerged as a significant predictor of school attended in low income areas.

Hypothesis Two: Race emerged as a significant predictor of birth place when considering migrant versus non-migrants.

Hypothesis Three: Public transportation was the most prevalent method of conveyance and required considerable more time than other methods.

Hypothesis Four: Black youth did not spend significantly more time in transit than white youth.

Hypothesis Five: It is confirmed that race does not predict family size or stability.

Hypothesis Six: Family size emerges as best predictor of family stability with larger families being less stable.

Hypothesis Seven: Conjectures speculating the emergence of a monolithic black community are specifically disproved in so far as this sample is concerned. However "black identity" is prevalent attachment

when considering the utilization of the black-white scale and the concept "Soul. "

Hypothesis Eight: Race and Income Source do not emerge as significant predictors of attitudes toward work.

Hypothesis Nine: Neither race nor age emerge as significant predictors of attitudes toward self. Age is a significant predictor of attitudes toward authority figures.

Hypothesis Ten: Race is not a significant predictor of positive attitudes toward the concept "Fight. "

Hypothesis Eleven: The possibility that "unique" scale dimensions would have "unique" demographic predictors although not confirmed received some support from the data.

For the most part the subjects appeared to be within the general eligibility requirements for the N. A. B. program. That is, they were Negro, poor, between 16 and 20 years of age and students of inner-city schools. The presence of defacto segregation in schools, the dominant usage of public transportation, the failure of race to predict either family stability or size were significant demographic findings. The failure of race to predict any attitudinal responses was somewhat surprising. The strong confirmation of emerging black identity on the concept "soul" was somewhat more expected. The failure to produce significant results on the subject of dimension uniqueness was not unexpected as the measures and analyses were designed for a different purpose.

The results were discussed, some practical suggestions along with

several caveats were introduced. Some future research possibilities were advanced.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. F. Understanding adolescents: Current development in adolescent psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.
- Advisory Council on Public Welfare. "Having the power we have the duty." Report to Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1966, p. 12.
- Allport, W. The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1954.
- Armstrong, I. S. & Soleberg, P. On interpretation of factor analyses. Psychological Bulletin. 1968, Vol. 70, No. 5, 361-364.
- Barntz, S. Effect of race of experimenter on instructions and comparison population upon level of reported anxiety in Negro subjects. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology. 1967, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 194-197.
- Bauer, R. A. Social inclinations. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1966.
- Beebe, L. Putting the jobless to work. Business Management. June, 1968, p. 26.
- Bensman, J. Study of the meaning, experience, and effects of the neighborhood youth corps on Negro youth who are seeking work. New York. Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, 1967.
- Carter, W. The employment potential of AFDC mothers: Some questions and some answers. Paper presented at the 95th Annual Forum, National Council on Social Welfare. San Francisco, May, 1968.
- Cattel, R. B. Factor analysis. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.
- Christner, A. An operating guide for factor analysis. The Ohio State University, Unpublished, Master's paper, 1957.
- Clark, K. Dark ghetto. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

- Clark, K. What business can do for the Negro. Nations Business. October, 1967, p. 66.
- Cleaver, E. "An interview with Eldridge Cleaver." Playboy, May, 1968, pp. 18-19.
- Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent boys. Chicago: Free Press, 1954.
- Cunyngham, J. "OSU/ELON step-wise regression." Computer Users Manual, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio: Unpublished, 1968, pp. 2-3.
- DeCrane, R. 400 hard-core on payroll. The Cleveland Press. August 16, 1968.
- Friedenberg, E. Z. "An ideology of school withdrawal," The School Dropout. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964, pp. 25-39.
- Garaity, J. T. Red ink for ghetto industries. Harvard Business Review. July, 1968.
- Ginsberg, E. Manpower strategy for the metropolis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
- Goldberg, G. S. "Strategies for closing the poverty gap." IRCD Bulletin. Columbia University, 1968, Vol. V, No. 2, p. 7.
- Hannerz, U. "What Negroes mean by 'soul'." Trans-Action. July-August, 1968, pp. 57-60.
- Hare, A. P. Handbook of small group research. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
- "Hiring the hard-core unemployed." The Conference Board Record. New York: The National Industrial Conference Board. June, 1968.
- Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioural research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kerner, O. Report of the national advisory commission on civil disorders. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.
- Keyserling, L. H. "The role of wages in a great society: stressing minimum wage gains to help the working poor." Conference on Economic Progress, Washington, D. C., 1966, p. 116.

- Labor, U. S. Dept. of. The human resources development concept. Manpower Administration, 1967. U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
- Lazarus, C. Y. Employing the unemployable. Fortune, July, 1968, Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 39-40.
- Lecht, L. "Manpower requirements for national objectives in the 1970's." Report to the Manpower Administration, Dept. of Labor, Washington, D. C., 1968, p. 39.
- Levinson, H. M. Wage policies of American unions. " in Labor in a Changing America. William Haber (Ed.) New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966, 197-210.
- Lewis, O. The children of Sanchez. New York: Random House, 1961.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- Merton, R. K. Social structure and anomic: Social theory and social structure, review. Chicago: Free Press, 1957.
- Miller, R. B. "Task description and analysis. " in Psychological Principles of System Development. T. R. M. Gagne (Ed). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962.
- Moynihhan, D. P. (quoted in) Report of the national advisory commission on civil disorders. New York: Bantam Books, 1968, p. 252.
- Murray, H. A. Thematic apperception test. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1943.
- National Alliance of Businessmen. "How National Alliance of Businessmen functions as a community catalyst. " Unpublished Pamphlet. Washington, D. C., 1968.
- Osgood, C., Suci, G. I., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Peterson, G. D. An evaluation of the concept of trainee groups for unemployed youth. Unpublished report: U. S. Dept. of Commerce, 1965.
- Powers, J. R. "DATMAN a programming language for data manipulation on statistical analysis. " 6400 Programming Bulletin, Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Memorial Institute, January 17, 1967, Bulletin 60.

- Primoff, E. S. Test selection by job analysis--the coefficient, what it is, how it works. U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 2nd Edition, 1955.
- Profile of Youth: A Report to the President. Dept. of Labor, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1966.
- Rainwater, L. & Yancey, W. L. The Moyihan report and the politics of controversy. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1967.
- Rennie, H. Hard-core unemployed in Columbus, Ohio. Unpublished report. Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio, 1969.
- Research Institute of America. What can you do about the hard-core unemployed. New York: 1968.
- Schorr, A. L. Poor kids: A report on children in poverty. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Sherif, C. W., Sherif, M. & Nebergall, R. E. Attitude and attitude change. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1965.
- Siegel, S. Non-parametric statistics--for behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1956.
- Stigers, M. F. & Reed, E. G. The theory and practice of job rating. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1944.
- Thomson, J. "Report on Western Electric summer program." Unpublished discussion paper. Columbus, Ohio, 1969.
- "Training the unemployables." U. S. News and World Report, July 1, 1968.
- Trupp, P. Trainees rise from black ghetto despair. Metal Working News. July 15, 1968.
- Tukey, J. "Exploratory Data Analysis." American Psychologist. January, 1969. Vol. 24, No. 1, p. 5.
- Tulkin, S. R. Race, class and family achievement. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology. 1968, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 31-37.
- U. S. Censuses of population and housing: 1960 census traits Columbus, Ohio, final report PHC (1)-32. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1962.
- U. S. employment service letter no. 960-HRD 9. United States Employment Service, unpublished, March 25, 1968.

- Vincent, R. "Attitudes of neighborhood youth corps participants." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Norman, Oklahoma, 1968.
- Wachtel, D. D. The working poor. Washington, D. C.: Dept. of Commerce, Unpublished (Federal Clearinghouse), 1968.
- Walker, H. and Lev, J. Statistical inference. Chicago: Rinehart and Winston, 1953.
- Wightman, T. Final report on 1968 summer program. Unpublished letter. Columbus, Ohio, January, 1969.
- Wilensky, H. L. & Lebeaux, M. Industrial society and social welfare. Russel Sage Foundation, 1958.
- Wille, C. V. & Riddick, W. E. "The employed poor: a case study." Poverty as a public issue. Ben B. Seligman, (Ed.), New York: The Free Press, 1965, pp. 139-151.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical principles of experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1962.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTATION

Age	Total Net Inc.
-----	----------------

Where were you born _____
city state

Do you list most of the time with your Father _____ or Mother _____

or both or someone else where

In case of unemployment, what is your family's source of income

What do you call your summer job

How do you get to work each morning? my car friend's car

bus walk other what

How long does it take to get to work _____

Where do you go to school _____ Will you return this fall _____

or go to a different school _____ what grade _____
where

Do not write below this line

P. A. _____ GPA _____

B. _____ RM _____

At the top of each page, there is a phrase (for example, MY BEST FRIEND) and beneath it several pairs of words with five spaces between them (for example, HAPPY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____SAD). Part of a page would look like this:

MY BEST FRIEND

happy: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____sad

weak: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____strong

kind: _____:_____:_____:_____:_____cruel

You are to describe what each phrase means to you by placing an "X" in one of the five spaces.

Here is how you use the spaces. If you feel that one of the two words in the pair is very closely related to the phrase at the top of the page, place your "X" like this:

happy; X : _____:_____:_____:_____sad

or

happy: _____:_____:_____:_____ X : sad

If you feel that one of the two words is rather closely related to the phrase, place your "X" like this:

happy: _____: X : _____:_____:_____sad

or

happy: _____:_____:_____ X : _____: sad

If you feel that the two words don't apply to the phrase use the middle space:

happy: _____:_____ X : _____:_____sad

Going back to the example on the first page, you would make one "X" to describe the phrase MY BEST FRIEND for the two words "happy-sad," a second "X" to describe the phrase for the two words "weak-strong," and so on.

IMPORTANT: 1. Place your "X" within the space, not on top of the two dots that separate the spaces.

2. Make one "X" but only one, for every two words.

3. Work fairly quickly, giving your first thoughts about the phrases, but please do not be careless in describing them.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

NEW CAR

theirs: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:mine

someplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:nowhere

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:unfair

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:white

large: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:small

slow: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:fast

dull: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:sharp

hip: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:square

poor: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:rich

kind: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:cruel

good: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:bad

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:weak

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

MY LIFE

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: weak

cruel: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: kind

dull: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: sharp

square: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: hip

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: poor

someplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: no place

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

fast: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: slow

small: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: large

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: good

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: theirs

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: white

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

FIGHT

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: good

large: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: small

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: theirs

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: poor

cruel: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: kind

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: weak

hip: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: square

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: white

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

dull: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: sharp

nowhere: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: somewhere

fast: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: slow

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

PAYCHECK

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: white

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: theirs

nowhere: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: somewhere

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: poor

unfair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fair

sharp: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: dull

kind: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: cruel

small: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: large

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: weak

fast: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: slow

square: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: hip

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: good

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

WORK

good: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:bad

large: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:small

kind: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:cruel

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:weak

hip: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:square

poor: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:rich

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:theirs

fast: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:slow

unfair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:fair

white: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:black

someplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:nowhere

sharp: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:dull

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

MY FUTURE

noplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: someplace

cruel: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: kind

slow: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fast

poor: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: rich

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: theirs

white: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: black

hip: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: square

good: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: bad

small: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: large

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

sharp: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: dull

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: weak

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

COP

unfair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fair

weak: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: strong

large: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: small

square: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: hip

good: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: bad

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: white

theirs: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: mine

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: poor

sharp: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: dull

slow: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fast

nowhere: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: somewhere

cruel: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: kind

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

"COOL IT"

cruel: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: kind

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: poor

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: theirs

nowhere: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: somewhere

dull: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: sharp

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: white

small: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: large

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: weak

square: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: hip

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: good

slow: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fast

unfair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fair

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

BOSS

square: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:hip

unfair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:fair

fast: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:slow

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:weak

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:good

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:white

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:poor

kind: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:cruel

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:theirs

someplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:nowhere

small: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:large

dull: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:sharp

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

JOB SKILLS

sharp: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: dull

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: theirs

small: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: large

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: poor

weak: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: strong

slow: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fast

someplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: no place

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: good

hip: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: square

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

kind: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: cruel

white: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: black

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

TEACHER

kind: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: cruel

black: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: white

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: poor

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

someplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: no place

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: good

large: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: small

square: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: hip

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: theirs

slow: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: fast

strong: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: weak

sharp: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: dull

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

SOUL

dull: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:sharp

weak: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:strong

fast: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:slow

square: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:hip

mine: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:theirs

small: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:large

someplace: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:nowhere

bad: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:good

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:unfair

rich: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:poor

white: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:black

cruel: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:kind

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

APPENDIX B

TASK ANALYSIS

TASK ANALYSIS

Yes	No	Task Characteristic	Impor- tance			Task: Duties, Tools, Machines, WorkMedia, Inputs, Outputs, etc.
			2	1	0	
		Ability to make decisions				
		Ability to plan				
		Initiative				
		Understand mechanical devices				
		Attention to details				
		Use graphic instructions				
		Do repetitive job				
		Teamwork				
		Appearance requirement				
		Setting own pace (independence)				
		Reference books or shop-manuals				
		Work under hazardous conditions				
		Work under unpleasant physical conditions (specify)				
		Work rapidly				
		Strength				
		Dexterity				
		Coordination of both hands				
		Estimate size of objects				
		Estimate quantity of objects				
		Perceive form of objects				

TASK ANALYSIS

Yes No	Task Characteristic	Importance <u>2 1 0</u>	<u>Task:</u> Duties, Tools, Machines, Work Media, Inputs, Outputs, etc.
	Memory for details (things)		
	Memory for ideas (abstract)		
	Memory for directions		
	Reasoning		
	Adaptability		

APPENDIX C

UNTABULATED DATA

The data is arranged in the following manner. All subjects with acceptable responses on the first concept (new car) are listed for all scales over that concept. The first three columns are an ID number for the location of the employer. The next two columns identify the subject within that employer grouping. The next column is a blank which is then followed by two columns which identify the concept. The concepts are ordered in the following manner: (1) new car; (2) my life; (3) fight; (4) paycheck; (5) work; (6) my future; (7) cop; (8) "cool it"; (9) boss; (10) job skills; (11) teacher; (12) soul. The scales are presented in the twelve columns that immediately follow the concept code in this order: good-bad; kind-cruel; fair-unfair; rich-poor; large-small; strong-weak; black-white; fast-slow; hip-square; mine-theirs; noplac-someplace; sharp-dull.

BI-13-01132313113111	CS002-01133121211231
BI-23-01133353123131	CS001-01122213322121
BI-22-01232332323322	BUR45-01232211413414
BI-17-01111011110501	BUR43-01222422522522
BI-09-01111351511121	BUR42-01131211423231
BORO2-01131111531513	BUR41-0133333322222
BTL12-01413414543533	BUR40-01330333333113
BTL04-01333313113513	BUR30-01422554224214
BTL03-01132322323333	CN-03-01321254112512
BTL11-01533131311533	CN-02-01545334242155
BTL02-01222421331433	CN-04-01211541513312
BTL08-01122251212131	CN-05-0133333333353
BTL07-01123214331531	CPC18-01133352511111
BTL05-01321321311121	FORO4-01112452524522
BTL06-01112351543221	CS008-01133113513131
BTL10-01131351321131	CS007-01132152533512
BTL01-01111411411511	CS006-01111111511131
BTL09-01211213111211	CS005-01353553551115
AB-01-01111511511111	CS004-01111331333412
BURO6-01221214521231	CS003-01131222321121
PORO4-01111321553533	JG-08-01111233510311
BUR44-01212331311511	BI-13-02342532133335
WEH03-01252515213113	BI-18-02111111531111
WEH01-01111551513131	BI-17-02112331110301

BI-09-02242242343222
BORO2-02111111511111
BTL11-02131331331133
BTL02-02332231423133
BTL08-02322222133222
BTL07-02135313332112
BTL05-02331311301121
BTL01-02333531332343
BTL09-02221311511121
AB-01-02213521531321
BUR01-02121442124122
POR03-0231101221511
JG-08-02111000510001
JG-02-02111313513111
FOR03-02113331333131
WEH03-02514111523423
WEH01-02111533331331
CSO02-0222222322332
CSO01-02442422522442
BUR45-02113242533153
BUR43-02222422532222
BUR41-02122232532312
BUR40-02515111513135
BUR30-02452125551442

CN-03-02233231422322
CN-02-02443551222343
CN-04-02131452524452
CPC18-02131432211231
CPC14-02553511512513
CPC09-02122221311112
CF-02-02121334323222
CCP03-02313421222023
BI-20-02111311551111
OB-16-02111433331113
OB-22-02311333311555
OB-07-02511521535421
OB-10-02121454344424
OB-09-02125511511121
OB-40-02113313523333
OB-15-02212442542202
OB-54-02222434322214
OB-31-02323554553354
OB-24-02223432132133
OB-49-02123332323313
OB-35-02232321222322
WEH02-02211351313332
WEH04-02311431431143
BUR05-02211221521111

BUR04-02454452333111	BI-18-01131111311131
BUR03-02221312422321	BI-08-01555155111151
BUR02-02332342322132	BI-11-01223322322312
BUR06-02432344532322	BI-20-01114511004505
SR-09-02111111511311	BI-01-01422432343533
SR-07-02322433333323	OB-16-01133353321513
SR-15-02313331322121	OB-22-01111333311131
SR-01-02111531332133	OB-07-01000040451001
POR04-02531152523333	OB-10-01221432134413
FOR04-02111422422212	OB-09-01414211311531
CSO08-02111431332111	OB-40-01333333333333
CSO06-02111222311111	OB-15-01112111121211
CSO05-02351331512133	OB-54-01312431322513
CSO04-02121333313114	OB-31-01113311312522
BI-08-02115515151551	OB-24-01133253313551
BI-01-02111111551111	OB-49-01311333511311
BUR44-02211342511111	OB-35-01131111312331
CPC16-01112111511511	WEH02-01211241312531
CPC14-01343551112513	WEH04-01231412421522
CPC09-01131311523513	BUR05-01222422511421
CPC11-01121241321332	BUR04-01122112313522
CPC01-01111121311511	BUR03-01113313511311
CF-02-01221422322122	BUR02-01222251412332
CCP03-01122441442521	BUR01-01222224112112

SR-09-01111111511311	OB-10-03255441313511
SR-07-01221331332523	OB-40-03313353333533
SR-15-01111221311511	BTL11-03553333335533
SR-01-01331353353133	BTL01-03431313423431
POR03-01440245334520	AB-01-03333431323423
JG-02-01111313513111	WEH01-03333333333333
FOR03-01131311513331	CSO01-03244411523133
BTL06-02212431321311	BUR41-03333531113132
BUR42-02212221342221	CPC11-03533353333333
BTL10-02111311331111	CPC01-03131321313211
CSO07-02111411312311	BI-11-03333333333333
BTL03-02242433534134	BI-01-03111111511511
BI-23-02233333333334	OB-31-03555551551353
CPC16-02221443422224	BUR01-03141222224152
BTL04-02141133314112	BI-22-03444333333334
BI-22-0223222333232	BOR02-03131111511131
CPC11-02223432332222	BTL12-03442331233233
CPC01-02111311212212	BTL02-03332332422233
CN-05-02111422322112	CSO02-03343332333333
BI-11-02222232322112	BUR42-03335333333353
BTL10-03535333333333	CN-02-03155242223332
BUR40-03131051511301	CF-02-03254344353324
BUR30-03313331533233	OB-22-03511353311535
BI-20-03115311511111	WEH02-03132432323333

BUR02-03332313333512
JG-02-03111313513111
BI-13-03333333333333
BI-23-03555333333333
BTL03-03444333333333
BUR03-03555333313353
WEH03-03142454211552
BUR43-03244443334423
CN-03-03323342322422
CCP03-03200050000000
POR03-03200050000000
FOR03-03331333333333
CSO03-03133331313133
BTL04-03553335335333
FOR04-03211442424242
BUR44-03211342511211
CN-04-03351535453155
CPC14-03155511512113
OB-54-03354433335233
OB-24-03455352333113
WEH04-03131331323123
BUR04-03555351313251
POR04-03555331333133
CSO04-03551351313331

BTL05-03221312311331
BUR45-03321333315211
CN-05-03555335335555
OB-15-03242442422140
OB-35-03333333333333
BUR05-03421224522411
CSO05-03351311513131
BTL06-03513333333333
CPC16-03555313335353
BUR06-03535323335332
CSO06-03555555355515
BI-17-03311331113331
BTL07-03555555355555
OB-07-03110101050500
SR-07-03422434333323
CSO07-03555511315533
BTL08-03553551315533
CPC18-03131432312332
BI-18-03151331313311
BI-08-03553532151355
JG-08-03111000510011
CSO08-03553333333333
BI-09-03553533335353
BTL09-03241312322231

CPC09-03211211331333
OB-09-03555551511111
OB-49-03333353333133
SR-09-03555111311351
SR-15-03352422333422
SR-01-03555333335353
BI-13-04133313333133
BI-23-04435353333333
BI-22-04232223333233
BI-17-04323332333233
BI-09-04332243333133
BOR02-04535253335133
BTL12-04122353314112
BTL04-04333333333133
BTL03-04332443333133
BTL11-04133153333133
BTL02-04323232423233
BTL08-04111113131131
BTL07-04223342314322
BTL05-04313311311131
BTL06-04432243323113
BTL10-04131331333131
BTL01-04233333344113
BTL09-04233443333133

AB-01-04221322333123
BUR02-04443444443154
BUR06-04333233313113
CPC01-04222332223122
BI-08-04110524151313
WEH03-04111511155111
WEH01-04331353333133
CSO02-04242222233233
CSO01-04231243334113
BUR45-04535351115155
BUR44-04111111211111
BUR43-04123244131112
BUR42-04131253333233
BUR41-04333133533113
BUR40-04301533533115
CN-03-04222333332222
CN-02-04323434152112
CN-04-04531122423214
CN-05-04111241311132
CPC18-04211452434132
CPC16-04232443333214
CPC14-04120211312113
CPC09-04131223333133
CPC11-04444443244144

CF-02-04232443333123	SR-09-04111113313111
CCP03-0430233310343	SR-07-04233443323233
BI-18-04111111111111	SR-15-04222332322122
BI-11-04424254343112	SR-01-04131353333113
BI-20-04510155511112	POR03-04221232131112
BI-01-04501155511111	POR04-04153313133111
OB-16-04131223333133	JG-08-04111000510011
OB-22-04513355355533	JG-02-04111313513113
OB-07-04505555511555	FOR03-04333353333133
OB-10-04111232344111	FOR04-04422444514152
OB-09-04334124333335	CSO08-04334443333133
OB-40-04333333333333	CSO07-04131232123233
OB-15-0422222224112	CSO06-04111111315111
OB-54-04233223333133	CSO05-04113131311111
OB-31-04123553213253	CSO04-04133323333133
OB-24-04231223333133	CSO03-04131223333133
OB-49-04131323433133	BUR30-04333333533333
OB-35-04232323333223	BI-13-05133111313331
WEH02-04232223333233	BI-17-05113311133233
WEH04-04311333333433	BI-09-05132333322333
BUR05-04121222522111	BOR02-05133311315153
BUR04-04111131333111	BTL11-05123322421133
BUR03-04121111311111	BTL08-05131133313131
BUR01-04424444343214	BTL07-05123122322311

BTL05-05123331311112	CCP03-05312331031012
BTL01-05122332332113	BI-18-05131311311311
BTL09-05	BI-20-05104202400122
AB-01-05121321311121	OB-16-05131323333433
OB-35-05132233332322	OB-22-05335313331533
SR-01-05131333333113	OB-07-05100050000000
JG-08-05111000510011	OB-10-05221122313111
CSO08-05134433333133	OB-09-05114533313311
WEH03-05214142411224	OB-40-05313333333333
WEH01-05133333333333	OB-15-05221422022112
CSO02-0522222333334	OB-54-05434223312115
CSO01-05242441333113	OB-31-05131422313112
BUR45-05533331355133	OB-24-05131133331113
BUR43-0522222322112	OB-49-05231232313333
BUR41-05133131533311	WEH02-05232342323234
BUR40-05113511531355	WEH04-05131133333123
BUR30-05330035003000	BUR05-05112222122124
CN-03-05143232523222	BUR04-05331311333533
CN-02-05543443433245	BUR03-05421312323311
CN-04-05144154153511	BUR02-05333423433233
CPC18-05211332414335	BUR01-05111331312113
CPC14-05131111512113	BUR06-05233333353433
CPC09-05131333323333	SR-09-05111111311111
CF-02-05121222322212	SR-07-05223333322222

SR-15-05222321323222	BI-22-05333332333333
POR03-05121112111111	CPC11-05344422454154
POR04-05111513313313	BUR42-05211221323212
FOR03-05133333313133	JG-08-06011000510011
FOR04-05222322323432	POR04-06131112313112
COS06-05111111315111	POR03-06111211223112
CSO05-05555111533113	SR-01-06111111311111
CSO04-05111331323312	SR-15-06111111151111
CSO03-05131331313332	SR-07-06232322332322
JG-02-05111313513113	BUR06-06333344353314
BI-01-05151511110051	BUR01-06111111323111
BUR44-05111111311111	BUR02-06222222432112
CPC01-05133331312111	BUR03-06132122321112
CN-05-05111211311311	BUR04-06224241513113
BTL10-05111331311111	BUR05-06111111511111
CSO07-05121233323211	WEH04-06121342343333
BTL03-05133323333133	WEH02-06111331342222
BI-08-05113511341353	OB-35-06232332322312
BI-23-05435333313333	OB-49-06111222132111
BTL06-05111322513213	OB-24-06111133331113
BTL12-05122321343113	OB-31-06211321433212
BI-11-05443322333133	OB-54-06111231332111
BTL04-05131333331313	OB-15-06111231222111
CPC16-05432433323223	OB-40-06113233303412

OB-09-06113211321111	BUR44-06111111111111
OB-10-06223341334414	BUR45-06111111515111
OB-07-06011011005111	CSO01-06131111513111
OB-22-06113333311513	CSO02-0612222222112
OB-16-06111223332113	WEH01-06133333333333
BI-01-06151151551111	WEH03-06111111223112
BI-20-06101401142054	CPC14-06121211512113
BI-11-06121211322111	CN-05-06111222322112
BI-08-06111113315313	FOR03-06133333333333
CCP03-06212202012012	JG-02-06111113513113
CF-02-06111422322211	SR-09-06111111311111
CPC01-06123331323123	AB-01-06111211522111
CPC11-0622222322222	BTL09-06223112432123
CPC09-06133222313213	BTL01-06112433331113
CPC16-06233232433213	BTL10-06111111333113
CPC18-06123422312111	BTL06-06111223321112
CN-04-06144551553351	BTL05-06221311311331
CN-02-06111111115111	BTL07-06111211521211
CN-03-06322132525112	BTL08-06113111311111
BUR30-06243322225533	BTL02-06212222412232
BUR40-06513133515513	BTL11=-6133333331113
BUR41-06122231522112	BTL03-06231223333113
BUR42-06112221343212	BTL04-06103233344113
BUR43-06122222521112	BOR02-06111111311111

BTL12-06232211353111	BTL08-07122432333333
BI-09-06232232322323	BTL07-07555515135515
BI-17-06311313113321	BTL05-07355211355455
BI-22-06233232333223	BTL06-07144211144333
BI-23-06133333333333	BTL10-07331331331331
BI-13-06133331333113	BTL01-07345311354242
CSO03-06113233531111	BTL09-07233332333333
CSO04-06111211313111	AB-01-07333512333523
CSO05-06131111531111	BUR05-07202211334532
CSO06-06111111311111	BUR01-07141331315113
CSO07-06131111313111	CN-02-07335251322423
CSO08-06111231333111	CF-02-07111221321312
FOR04-06222422344222	BI-08-07515331325131
BI-13-07113331333333	WEH03-07555211554545
BI-23-07121333333333	WEH01-07333333333333
BI-22-07333322333332	CSO02-07342422344344
BI-17-07131311133513	CSO01-07244323143553
BI-09-07111331313333	BUR45-07543355355355
BOR02-07333333333333	BUR44-07553505155555
BTL12-07442331333333	BUR43-07333322323432
BTL04-07221332333333	BUR42-07224311353323
BTL03-07222332323322	BUR41-07444333534333
BTL11-07555113335533	BUR40-07333333333333
BTL02-07212221322232	BUR30-07423241533334

CN-03-07554312135555	OB-49-07224433335314
CN-04-07145115455512	OB-35-07333333333333
CN-05-07222311311311	WEH02-07455331325312
CPC18-07455425435355	WEH04-07334331334344
CPC16-07333333333333	BUR04-07454311313331
CPC14-07122111512113	BUR03-07111321311311
CPC09-07234333344343	BUR02-07232322432243
CPC11-07444444444444	BUR06-07455321333313
CPC01-07111331313511	SR-09-07111111311111
CCP03-07233303012000	SR-07-07233343343332
BI-18-07353331355333	SR-15-07243322332333
BI-11-07133322343222	SR-01-07225333333333
BI-20-07425140252554	POR03-07121221111413
BI-01-07151515510111	POR04-07111311313311
OB-16-07224312333333	JG-08-07111000510011
OB-22-07555335135333	JG-02-07111113513113
OB-07-07	FOR03-07555331333333
OB-10-07232411115111	FOR04-07331333333333
OB-09-07323411321311	CSO08-07224333333333
OB-40-07111333333313	CSO07-07141311313531
OB-15-07222242422222	CSO06-07224444355512
OB-54-07445333323341	CSO05-07555555155355
OB-31-07333111324451	CSO04-07122331314311
OB-24-07121411113311	CSO03-07233333333333

BI-17-0833333333333	BUR45-08111111515111
BI-09-0833333333354	BUR44-08111111511111
BOR02-08131311311311	BUR43-08122232522222
BTL12-08222322423222	BUR42-08111331323101
BTL04-08333333333333	BUR41-08131331522333
BTL03-08223333331333	BUR40-08315535333515
BTL11-08313533331133	BUR30-08221323544411
BTL02-08111222421132	CN-03-08423331243411
BTL08-08434444444444	CN-02-08111421111151
BTL07-08111252551111	CN-04-08533133555255
BTL05-08222311311421	CN-05-08223231321311
BTL06-08233333231333	CPC18-08131231311411
BTL10-08333333331333	CPC16-08123212511112
BTL01-08233332331132	CPC14-08554211513110
BTL09-08333333333333	CPC09-08333333332333
AB-01-08111221511221	CPC11-08111111511111
BUR03-08121331311321	CPC01-08555333331331
POR03-08513335244433	CF-02-08444444344354
POR04-08533513341531	CCP03-08
FOR04-08133332333333	BI-18-08351133331111
WEH03-08111444545242	BI-08-08224331131553
WEH01-08333333331333	BI-11-08111221312112
CSO02-08343444432344	BI-20-08552250552222
CSO01-08445335535143	OB-16-08133333331 23

OB-22-08111331511111

FOR03-08333333333333

OB-07-08

CSO08-08131333331333

OB-10-08433314511141

CSO07-08433444344444

OB-09-08333333311333

CSO06-08131343311312

OB-40-08333333333333

CSO05-08131331111111

OB-15-0822222422222

CSO04-08323334452432

OB-54-08333422331332

CSO03-08133233331333

OB-31-08335425544152

BI-01-08511151550555

OB-24-08233302331332

BI-13-08333333333333

OB-49-08331333321251

BI-23-08333333331333

OB-35-08333333333333

BI-22-08333333333333

WEH02-08333333322223

BI-13-09113333333333

WEH04-0833333332333

BI-17-09335341155334

BUR05-08312211511111

BI-09-09224121135333

BUR04-08313232513312

BOR02-09551555151355

BUR02-08221222433223

BTL11-09331133335333

BUR01-08111331331331

BTL02-09111221221131

BUR06-08331334332322

BTL08-09121232331223

SR-09-08515111111111

BTL07-09111211115513

SR-07-08333333333333

BTL05-09323254155135

SR-15-08232332332422

BTL01-09211242341111

SR-01-0823333332423

BTL09-09223233333332

JG-08-08111000510011

AB-01-09111321111122

JG-02-08111113513113

JG-08-09111003513011

WEH03-09125422412125	OB-40-09111333233313
WEH01-09333333333333	OB-15-09111111121211
CSO02-09222233222223	OB-54-09343333233345
CSO01-09222132133333	OB-31-09333212321511
BUR45-09135111155325	OB-24-09112122232133
BUR43-09221222332442	OB-49-09333333124315
BUR41-09221332533333	OB-35-09222233322332
BUR40-09333333333333	WEH02-09224332434332
BUR30-09223332523514	WEH04-09223331134313
CN-03-09123543111545	BUR05-09122232122333
CN-02-09333513553315	BUR04-09443221313334
CN-04-09423323313125	BUR03-09221412131322
CPC18-09111111323322	BUR02-09221332244452
CPC14-09214411522113	BUR01-09111331332133
CPC09-09222323332333	BUR06-09333333433333
CF-02-09222222122312	SR-09-09111111311311
CCP03-09	SR-07-09222323323321
BI-18-09111111331331	SR-15-09323233133233
BI-20-09555555155155	SR-01-09111331132513
OB-16-09131253332333	POR03-09111331111511
OB-22-09333133133333	POR04-09111251113121
OB-07-09111011501001	JG-02-09111113513113
QB-10-09111232342112	FOR03-09333333333333
OB-09-09121221142332	FOR04-09221432123532

CSO08-0932223333333	OB-16-10133333313331
CSO06-09111121311511	OB-22-10355333133333
CSO05-09312353323333	OB-07-10110000501101
CSO04-09233221343312	OB-10-10322434533143
CSO03-09121233131333	OB-09-10122211313111
BI-01-09111551155511	OB-40-10333333323312
CN-05-09112222112111	OB-15-1022222222122
BTL10-09111131311131	OB-54-10231342512123
CSO07-09121221312231	OB-31-10311543352331
BTL03-09222233132133	OB-24-10131331231131
BI-08-09335331115113	OB-49-10131323322222
BTL06-09344131233533	OB-35-10333223333332
BUR42-09111235333433	WEH02-10233312333224
BTL04-09111331332333	WEH04-10232242323233
BI-22-09333342323333	BUR05-10233322321331
CPC11-09334331333333	BUR04-10131211313231
BUR44-09313114133344	BUR03-10533555343325
CPC16-09442342123234	BUR01-10231342343323
BI-23-09212233132332	BUR06-10233343331232
CPC01-09313231333422	SR-09-10111111511111
BTL12-02222531511332	SR-07-10322322322222
BTL12-09222232232232	SR-15-10212322322222
BI-11-09141222111212	SR-01-10131331313111
BUR02-10324442322222	POR03-10112111211111

POR04-10111321312212	CPC18-10131515341312
JG-08-10111000510011	CPC16-10232222322222
JG-02-10111113513113	CPC14-10111111513113
FOR03-10133331313131	CPC09-10233323323333
FOR04-10231322322332	CPC11-10222222422222
CSO08-10111431433131	CPC01-10132321311212
CSO07-10233222333122	CF-02-10211221312111
CSO06-10111121311112	CCP03-10
CSO05-10311331511131	BI-18-10111111311111
CSO04-10233333333313	BI-08-10323334314313
CSO03-10233333333333	BI-11-10131222322212
CSO02-10233332323233	BI-20-10100115011011
CSO01-10131141131211	BI-01-10111155551101
BUR45-10323241445335	BI-13-10333333333333
BUR44-10111111131111	BI-23-10333353333331
BUR43-10233324433222	BI-22-10333333333232
BUR42-10231223323111	BI-17-10111211113331
BUR41-10133111513111	BI-09-10233322322332
BUR40-10111155511111	BOR02-10131311315111
BUR30-10321444544243	BTL12-10223422323222
CN-03-10122122522211	BTL04-10131333331123
CN-02-10155111111111	BTL03-10232343422122
CN-04-10533511153121	BTL11-10111301311131
CN-05-10222444342132	BTL02-10111221311131

BTL08-10333333233333	BUR05-11231334300331
BTL07-10222442222113	BUR04-11444211313325
BTL05-10132311313131	BUR03-11111221311311
BTL06-10235342223234	BUR02-11222232333332
BTL10-10131311311331	BUR01-11221333325332
BTL01-10223443312133	BUR06-11334222333313
BTL09-10232323333322	SR-09-11111111111111
AB-01-10121321312222	SR-07-11433433343232
WEH01-10333333333333	SR-15-11233233133243
WEH03-10442252411244	SR-01-11111333331513
OB-16-11111033322233	POR03-11112331315321
OB-22-11335333133333	POR04-11111232343313
OB-07-11211533122343	JG-08-11111000510011
OB-10-11222433144324	JG-02-11111111513113
OB-09-11232434332312	FOR03-11111333333133
OB-40-11313333333333	FOR04-11222231123232
OB-15-11111241121111	CSO08-11222432333331
OB-54-11332433323312	CSO07-11222222323232
OB-31-11233255354524	CSO06-11111251312511
OB-24-11112422222111	CSO05-11412432541122
OB-49-11324323155335	CSO04-11333433313331
OB-35-11333333333333	CSO03-11122333332333
WEH02-11224331234233	CSO02-11433443344343
WEH04-11222331334423	CSO01-11222232434323

BUR45-11122351215123	BI-13-11313333333333
BUR44-11223235155324	BI-23-11111233132332
BUR43-11222342323422	BI-22-11322333333333
BUR42-11111231323421	BI-17-11333333333333
BUR41-11444333544334	BI-09-11111332322332
BUR40-11115151555151	BOR02-11111255155355
BUR30-11512413533344	BTL12-11222333333232
CN-03-11454334255335	BTL04-11111331331333
CN-02-11333155555135	BTL03-11212222134132
CN-04-11511231540211	BTL11-11444333335335
CN-05-11311301111311	BTL02-11111221322131
CPC18-11121245355335	BTL08-11223432333333
CPC16-11212232344212	BTL07-11515334132552
CPC14-11115155155511	BTL05-11433223355335
CPC09-11222333332333	BTL06-11222233343133
CPC11-11232322322222	BTL10-11111331311331
CPC01-11111331312211	BTL01-11323433333133
CF-02-11211221322211	BTL09-11222033333333
CCP03-11	AB-01-11111221511211
BI-18-11111131311111	WEH01-11130333333333
BI-08-11132432111254	WEH03-11111111112114
BI-11-11222332322221	OB-16-12111321521113
BI-20-11014111051135	OB-22-12111111511111
BI-01-11511115510511	OB-07-12000003000001

OB-10-12222444444124	JG-02-12111113513113
OB-09-12233332311313	FOR03-12333333333333
OB-40-12333333333333	FOR04-12111111323111
OB-15-12112221521111	CSO08-12111131531111
OB-54-12313333331111	CSO06-12111231311311
OB-31-12133421521142	CSO05-12111111511111
OB-24-12131311311153	CSO04-12222333233333
OB-49-12121111511111	CSO03-12133111531131
OB-35-12333334334333	CSO02-12233333333223
WEH02-12333334334333	CSO01-12111111511111
WEH04-12131311311111	BUR45-12111111511111
BUR05-12111111511131	BUR43-12111211511111
BUR04-12111111511311	BUR41-12131331531031
BUR03-12131111311111	BUR40-12111111511111
BUR02-12333322322222	BUR30-12432543543323
BUR01-12432334334333	CN-03-12111111511111
BUR06-12122211521211	CN-02-12111111111111
SR-09-12111511311111	CN-04-12553153135315
SR-07-12322121422121	CPC18-12111111521111
SR-15-12111111311111	CPC14-12151111511113
SR-01-12111111311111	CPC09-12232332332333
POR03-12112321421521	CF-02-12221212322312
POR04-12241211323122	CCP03-12
JG-08-12111000510011	BI-18-12111111531131

BI-20-12510150105455

BI-23-12113331331333

BI-13-12133331113333

BTL06-12113331411123

BI-17-12333333333333

BUR42-12133311333113

BI-09-12233321323333

BTL04-12133331333333

BOR02-12111111511113

BI-22-12333333333233

BTL11-12111521311111

CSO07-12233222323322

BTL02-12111221412131

BTL08-12113131333111

BTL07-12121411511111

BTL05-12111311311111

BTL01-12111111511111

BTL09-12111133531133

AB-01-12111111511311

WEH01-12333333331333

WEH03-12111142154444

BTL03-12131211531111

BI-08-12512531413131

BI-01-12111111511511

CPC01-12111311311111

CN-05-12313411335311

BTL10-12111331511131

BTL12-12111421513211

CPC16-12111231511111

CPC11-12111111511111

Intercorrelation of Scales

Good-bad	1.0000
Clean-dirty	.70564 1.0000
Kind-cruel	.80247 .67826 1.0000
Fair-unfair	.79658 .58878 .79691 1.0000
Worthless- valuable	.49725 .55746 .36641 .42902 1.0000
Large-small	.26990 .37118 .25692 .38503 .38038 1.0000
Strong-weak	.59122 .73993 .57142 .52083 .68224 .47332 1.0000
Heavy-light	.16744 .24445 .13116 .20289 .26337 .60539 .28804 1.0000
Sharp-dull	.59059 .63897 .68314 .71665 .30415 .42530 .53798 .22785 1.0000
Active- passive	.39720 .30671 .38206 .52304 .29400 .30678 .34985 .22583 .39088 1.0000
Fast-slow	.53788 .67644 .60659 .51672 .44413 .40778 .67895 .30260 .62476 .25329 1.0000
Bright-dark	.42265 .59353 .46075 .40004 .29946 .38889 .45033 .20017 .63425 .22521 .69565 1.0000
Near-far	.21222 .20304 .31286 .32884 .01005 .45850 .05218 .38329 .22206 .16305 .22960.21975 .10000

APPENDIX E

CONCEPT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION BY THE EVALUATIVE DIMENSION

	Means by Concepts	Standard Deviation
1. New Car	1.8313	.8960
2. My Life	1.9699	.9063
3. Fight	2.9819	1.3408
4. Paycheck	2.1867	1.0775
5. Work	1.8735	.9658
6. My future	1.5422	.6503
7. Cop	2.7229	1.2924
8. Cool-It	2.3855	1.1547
9. Boss	2.0422	.9915
10. Job Skills	1.9036	.8933
11. Teacher	2.0964	1.0222
12. Soul	1.6205	.8594

APPENDIX F

CONCEPT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION BY THE ACTIVITY DIMENSION

	Means by Concepts	Standard Deviation
1. New Car	1.9277	.8682
2. My Life	2.2169	.9190
3. Fight	2.5482	1.0227
4. Paycheck	2.4096	.8109
5. Work	2.0241	.9937
6. My Future	1.8193	.8380
7. Cop	2.6687	1.1778
8. Cool-It	2.4940	1.1153
9. Boss	2.4578	.9700
10. Job Skills	2.0482	.8664
11. Teacher	2.5663	1.0113
12. Soul	1.8072	.8912

APPENDIX G

CONCEPT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION BY THE POTENCY I DIMENSION

	Means by Concepts	Standard Deviation
1. New Car	2.6114	.7242
2. My Life	2.4006	.7634
3. Fight	2.8102	.8229
4. Paycheck	2.4518	.7814
5. Work	2.1777	.6915
6. My Future	1.8253	.7432
7. Cop	2.5633	.7672
8. Cool-It	2.5211	.8697
9. Boss	2.4488	.7612
10. Job Skills	2.2319	.8411
11. Teacher	2.5602	.7835
12. Soul	1.8163	.8039

APPENDIX H

CONCEPT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION BY THE POTENCY II DIMENSION

	Means by Concepts	Standard Deviation
1. New Car	3.3253	1.3719
2. My Life	3.6024	1.2509
3. Fight	3.1928	1.0580
4. Paycheck	2.9880	1.0470
5. Work	2.9759	1.1191
6. My Future	3.2169	1.2029
7. Cop	2.8795	1.0687
8. Cool-It	3.4096	1.1927
9. Boss	2.2771	1.2830
10. Job Skills	3.1205	1.1020
11. Teacher	2.7229	1.2254
12. Soul	3.7108	1.3129

APPENDIX I

CONCEPT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION BY THE ADOLESCENT VALUE DIMENSION

163

	Means by Concepts	Standard Deviation
1. New Car	1.9518	.7695
2. My Life	2.0080	.7898
3. Fight	2.5060	1.0012
4. Paycheck	2.6948	.7412
5. Work	2.2450	.7849
6. My Future	2.0161	.7279
7. Cop	2.6225	1.0110
8. Cool-It	2.1847	.9916
9. Boss	2.4618	.8930
10. Job Skills	2.1084	.8101
11. Teacher	2.5502	1.0584
12. Soul	1.7028	.9052

APPENDIX J

Rotated Matrix of Scale Factors

Variable							
164	1	good-bad	.21905	.01359	.63072	.36205	.17035
	2	kind-cruel	.44478	-.18155	.55455	.16556	.25103
	3	fair-unfair	.21811	.10492	.73199	.20646	.29200
	4	rich-poor	.43374	.20728	.34454	.41942	.27415
	5	large-small	.59483	.16096	.28630	.44332	.33642
	6	strong-weak	.33162	-.06725	.17769	.56177	.40925
	7	black-white	-.02723	-.46995	-.00957	-.04768	.03521
	8	fast-slow	.68235	-.00176	.28370	.34142	.28872
	9	hip-square	.28542	-.06112	.24497	.32702	.58893
	10	mine-theirs	.18497	.18828	.30552	.59825	.15877
	11	noplace-someplace	.51681	.17043	.41453	.12237	.35611
	12	sharp-dull	.31841	-.09743	.38390	.21304	.70847