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Problem

The social issues at the end of the 20th century have not left the Seventh-day Adventist church untouched. This present study sought to determine the differences that may exist between one- and two-parent students in the area of home learning environment, self-esteem, and academic achievement.

Method

Eighty-eight male and female students from 14 Ohio Seventh-day Adventist schools in grades 5-8 were studied. Data for the study were collected from three
instruments: the Hare Self-Esteem Scale, the modified Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale, and the Family Survey. Additional data were gathered from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills student scores. The Hare Self-Esteem Scale is a 30-item instrument that measures self-esteem of school-age children 10 years old and above in three areas: peers, school, and home. Students involved in the study completed the survey at their own school administered by the researcher. The modified Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale is a 55-item questionnaire that was reduced to 40 items to match the students in this study. The scale was sent to each participating family and completed and sent back to the researcher. The Family Survey is a 12-item demographic instrument designed to obtain information about the families participating in this study. The survey was sent to each participating family and completed and sent back to the researcher. Students' test scores from the 1995 Iowa Test of Basic Skills were used for the study. The scores were gathered by the researcher from the Ohio Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

The Spearman rho for two ordinal variables and t-test for two independent samples were used to analyze the data for this study.

Results

There was found to be a significant difference between one- and two-parent students in one area. Two-parent students' home learning environment was found to be more positive than that of their one-parent peers ($p < .05$). No significant differences were found in the Subject scores and Composite scores of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills of one- and two-parent students ($p < .05$). No significant difference was found in the self-esteem of one- and two-parent students ($p < .05$). No significant difference was found in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
time that one-parent students spent with their relatives and the influences of that time on the student's academic performance ($p < .05$).

**Conclusion**

No significant differences in academic achievement and self-esteem were found between students from one-parent families and their two-parent peers. No significant differences were found between the duration a student had been part of a one-parent family and their academic performance. No significant differences were found between the academic performance of students from one-parent families and the frequency of contact with their relatives.

Significant differences in the home learning environment do exist between one- and two-parent Seventh-day Adventist students of Ohio. The Church’s educational leadership should look at the whole system so as to determine how we can assist one-parent students at school and support their single parent at home.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The process of educating children is influenced by many variables. In an analysis of the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress test scores, Robinson and Brandon (1994) found that 89% of the state differences in mathematics test score averages could be explained by a variation in four demographic variables over which schools have no control. One of those variables, the number of parents living at home, is the subject of this research. Homes that have only one parent have touched the lives of 26% of all American children under 18 years of age (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1992). In Europe, 5 to 17% of the youth under 18 have felt the effects of this occurrence (“Single Parents: The Facts of Life,” 1993).

The single-parent family has only a father or mother living in the home. Creation of such a family is due to a variety of reasons: death, divorce, separation, spouse absent, or unwed parent (Hanson & Sporakowski, 1986). The issue of the single parent is becoming ever more important as the number of single parents in this society increases. In the United States, more than one in four (about 1.2 million a year) births occur outside of marriage (Lerman, 1993). The majority of single parents who are raising children are female (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1992, 1997), which causes the single-parent issue
to become very intertwined with the issue of socioeconomic status. The number of single-parent fathers has increased by 59% since 1970 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1992). In most cases, the single parent is employed, which also influences the home environment and opportunities for the parent to interact with his or her child/children (Taylor, 1986).

Studies have shown that single-parent children tend to:

1. Watch more television (Milne & Myers, 1986; Pearl, 1982)
2. Use one or more illicit drugs plus alcohol and tobacco (Beck, 1993; Ryan, 1992; Sivobodny, 1982; Wilken, 1986)
3. Be more likely to have a child out of wedlock or have an abortion (Alberta Department of Education, 1989; Children's Defense Fund, 1985; Johnson & Sum, 1987; Ryan, 1992)
4. Be more likely to be arrested (Beck, 1993; Davis, 1993; Ryan, 1992; Schaeffer, 1996).

The problems carry over into the school, with children exhibiting disruptive behavior (NAESP, 1980; Toro & Weissberg, 1990; Whitehead, 1993), poor grades (Feistritzer, 1985; Ryan, 1992; Shreeve & Goetter, 1985; Taylor, 1986; Whitehead, 1993), low self-esteem (Hare, 1985; Ryan, 1992; Sivobodny, 1982) and "over all bad attitude" (Palker, 1980). Using data from a large nationally representative sample of adolescents, Dornbusch et al. (1985) found that children from single-mother families had significantly more deviant behavior than those from two-parent families. The effects were not related to race, SES, or family decision-making styles, but were larger for boys than for girls. Every single-parent child does not fit the above descriptions, but the likelihood
of problems is enhanced by parental absences (Alessandri, 1993; Glick, 1984a, 1984b; McDermott, 1990; Wallerstein & Kelley, 1975, 1976; Westman, 1972).

Society has traditionally viewed single-parent families as abnormal and treated the members as inferiors (Bilge & Kaufman, 1983). Changing social values, including the acceptance of the single-parent status, particularly single mothers, have lessened the stigmas against single-parent families (Bello, 1993; Whitehead, 1993).

Most family disruptions are caused by divorce. Americans are getting divorced more often. Married persons now make up only 61% of all adults, down from 72% in 1970 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1992). An increased divorce rate and the number of births outside of marriage have escalated the single-parent population at an alarming rate. As the 21st century approaches, predictions by Frost (1986) and Morris (1984) that 50% of all American children under 18 will experience major family disruption in the 1990s and beyond seem plausible.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church has not been immune to the problem of single-parent families. Studies by Dudley (1978), Crider and Kistler (1979), Allison (1985), and Kangas (1988) found that 17 to 27% of the Adventist families studied fell into the category of single parent. During the same time period, 1978 to 1988, 17 to 20.5% of all American families were headed by a single parent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979, 1980, 1986, 1989). Little data have been gathered that looks at the effects of single-parent families on the academic performance of Seventh-day Adventist students. This information would assist educational leaders in the development of strategies to help meet the needs of these young people. By determining the academic needs of single-parent
students, educators of school personnel and staff would have a basis for developing and delivering relevant courses and programs that would help a school to be effective with regard to single-parent students.

Statement of the Problem

This study examines the relationship between parent status (one- or two-parent family) and home learning environment, self-esteem, and academic achievement of fifth- to eighth-grade students from selected Seventh-day Adventist schools of the Ohio Conference. The following specific research questions were investigated:

1. What is the relationship between family status (one- or two-parent family) and the academic achievement of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

2. What is the relationship between family status (one- or two-parent family) and the home learning environment of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

3. What is the relationship between family status (one- or two-parent family) and the self-esteem of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

4. Is length of time of being a part of a single-parent family related to the academic performance of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

5. Among students from a single-parent family, is there a relationship between the frequency of contact with relatives and their academic achievement?

Significance of the Study

Academic achievement may be influenced by self-esteem or home environment as a result of either the mother or the father not present in the home. Studies have been
conducted to determine the effects of self-esteem on academic achievement. Tidwell (1980) found that gifted students have very positive academic self-esteem as compared to their peers. Hansford and Hattie (1982) found there was a relationship between self-esteem and student performance. Colangelo, Kelly, and Schrepfer (1987) discovered a positive association of academic achievement and social self-esteem. Kelly and Jordan (1990), replicating the previous study, concluded academic performance to be related to academic self-esteem. Hare (1985) found that self-esteem of Chicago youth directly affected their academic achievement. Additional studies have been conducted to determine the effects of the home learning environment on academic achievement. Laosa (1979, 1984) suggested that a child's ability to be successful in a school environment depends on his or her competencies in the home environment. Valencia and Rankin (1985) reported direct correlations between home environment and students' cognitive performance. Henderson (1972) found that student performance could be predicted based upon the home learning environment. The combination of the above-mentioned variables, along with family marriage status, has not been used to study their influence upon academic achievement.

This information is important to middle-grade educators since these are the formative years of scholastic growth, self-esteem, and maturation (Allen, 1985; Cahoon, 1991; Dixon, 1986). Studies have shown that family displacement has lasting effects on the middle-grade student (Ryan, 1992; Zakariya, 1982).

For Seventh-day Adventist education it is important to discover the distinct effects that single-parent families may have on the students within this system. The data from this
study will assist educators and school administrators in becoming more aware of the special needs of the single-parent student. It is hoped that this information will aid in the development of teacher training programs, support systems, and curriculum materials that will meet the academic and self-esteem needs of the single-parent students.

Conceptual Framework

The idea that single-parent students do poorly in the area of academic achievement has been the subject for much empirical data. Other factors have also been studied to determine their influence upon academic achievement. Those factors include self-esteem (McAdoo & McAdoo, 1985), home learning environment (Kitonyi, 1980, parent education background (Henderson, 1972), race (Allen & Tadlock, 1986), gender (Bane, 1976), demographic location (Sciara, 1975), physiological needs (Feldhusen, 1986), and socioeconomic status (Whitehead, 1993). For the purpose of this study, the relationship between parent status and home learning environment, academic performance and self-concept is shown in Figure 1.

![Diagram](image-url)

Figure 1. A conceptual framework of the relationship of parent status to home learning environment, academic performance and self-esteem.
Academic Achievement

In a study (Brown, 1980) involving 8,556 students, the results indicated that there was disparity between academic achievement by single-parent students as compared to their two-parent peers. In 1985, Shreeve and Goetter found that two-parent students out-scored their one-parent peers on the California Achievement Test. Milne and Myers (1986) came to the conclusion that the number of parents in the home had significant effects upon students. In a 1992 study by Barton and Coley, evidence was found that the proportion of two-parent families varied widely from state to state and was related to variations in academic achievement in those states. Studies by Feistritzer (1985) and Hetherington, Cox, and Cox (1978) reported that single-parent students scored significantly lower on achievement tests as compared to their two-parent-family peers.

Contrary to the previous findings, Fowler and Richards (1978), Hammond (1979), Marsh (1989), and a study conducted by the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities (1980) concluded that the one-parent environment was not the only variable involved in student achievement. Each of the studies indicated there were more variables that needed to be considered.

Home Learning Environment

Parents constitute the first and most important teachers in a child's life (White, 1913; Wlodkowski & Jaynes, 1990). Particularly when they are growing, children tend to perceive the world largely through the eyes of their parents who act as models and interpreters.
Children's initial associations with learning are primarily an outgrowth of what they experience and observe in their home environment. Children pick up on the subtle and not-so-subtle attitudes and values that are held by their parents. When parents nurture their children's natural curiosity about the world by welcoming their questions, encouraging exploration, and familiarizing them with resources that can enlarge their world (such as the library), they are giving their children the message that learning is a worthwhile endeavor that can often be fun or satisfying as well. Adversely, parents who are disinterested or unresponsive to their children's natural desire to learn have a negative influence on a child's motivation to learn. Evidence suggests that parents, regardless of race, ethnic background, and marital status, or educational and socioeconomic levels, play a key role in the success of their children's education (Hepworth-Berger, 1991).

Laosa (1984) put forth the idea that child-parent interaction could be a determining factor in academic performance. McAdoo and McAdoo (1985), Marjoribanks (1984), Meyers (1982), and Henderson (1981) have identified this factor as the Home Learning Environment variable. Valencia and Rankin (1985) concluded that the home environment could be used as a predictor of cognitive performance. Laosa (1979, 1984) concluded that environments overlap and that success or failure in one environment could be influenced by another environment. The number of parents living in the home, in the above studies, was reported to have significant influence on academic performance.

Self-Concept

The construct known as self-esteem/self-concept has been of interest to
educational professionals for some time. By the age of 3, children are thought to be knowledgeable about a "self" that is private, and not generally known to others. Educators from time to time have focused upon the development of a positive self-concept in learners as a means of enabling them to positively value their competence and thereby maximize their school performance. With Laosa's idea of overlapping environments, the variable of self-concept was one that was found to influence academic performance (Whitmore, 1980). Educators have discovered through experience that self-concept and academic achievement are interrelated (Feldhusen, 1986). Kelly and Jordan (1990) found direct correlations between academic achievement and self-concept. Findings by Tidwell (1980), Ross and Parker (1980), and Colangelo and Pfleger (1978) indicated that gifted students had very positive self-concepts. A study by Hare (1985) showed that students from one-parent homes tended to have a lower self-concept, which directly influenced their academic performance. In divorce situations, feelings of low self-concept are due to the blame that children place upon themselves for the divorce (Frost, 1986). With most single parents working, less time can be given to affirming the child; therefore, self-concept could be impacted by the home environment (Taylor, 1986). It is often felt that race, not family status, has an effect on self-esteem that transfers to poor academic performance (Reynolds & Allen, 1987).

Research Hypotheses

The following are the research hypotheses:

1. There is a difference between the academic achievement of students from one-
and two-parent families.

2. There is a difference between the home learning environment of students from one- and two-parent families.

3. There is a difference between the self-concept of students from one- and two-parent families.

4. There is a positive correlation between the length of time a student is a member of a single-parent family and his or her academic achievement.

5. There is a positive correlation between the frequency of contact a single-parent student has with relatives and his or her academic performance.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used in this study.

Adventist. Term used by the constituents of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in place of the full name of the Church.

Home Learning Environment. The learning environment created in the home through parent-child interaction, activities, habits, and support.

ITBS. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, a nationally recognized achievement test.

Ohio Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. A geographical and administrative unit of the Seventh-day Adventist Church that is made up of the State of Ohio.

Seventh-day Adventist Church. A conservative Christian body which is worldwide in extent, evangelical in doctrine, and professing no creed but the Bible.

Self-concept/Self-esteem. An evaluation of self as an active agent in the world.
Self-concept and self-esteem are used interchangeably in this paper and current literature.

**Single-Parent Family/Home.** A family/home with one parent with no spouse, with children under 18 years old.

**Two-Parent Family/Home.** A family/home with two parents with children under 18 years old.

**Delimitation of the Study**

The population of this study was delimited to include only the 397 fifth- through eighth-grade students attending 1 of 19 Seventh-day Adventist schools in Ohio during the 1995-1996 school year and their families.

**Limitations of the Study**

One of the limitations of the study might be the lack of responses by parents to the Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale and the Family Survey. A second limitation might be the parents not giving their consent for their children to participate in the Hare Self-Esteem Scale. A third limitation might be that the ITBS scores may not be accurate or available for all the students.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters:

Chapter 1 has presented the rationale, statement of the problem, the research questions, significance of the study, conceptual framework, research hypotheses,
definition of terms, delimitations and limitations of the study, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 surveys the related literature pertaining to the impact of the marital status on the academic achievement, socioeconomic status and race, home learning environment, and self-concept of children.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed in the data collection.

Chapter 4 discusses the presentation and the analysis of the results.

Chapter 5 provides the summary, the discussion of the results, the implications of the findings for the field, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is a review of the literature as it relates to student academic achievement as influenced by family marital status, socioeconomic status and race, home learning environment, and self-concept.

Current Family Structure in America

A brief look is given to the current status on family structure with regards to number of one- and two-parent families, head of household of one-parent families and the impact that a one-parent family status has on SES.

The most recent (1996) statistics show that 37,619,000 families reside in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1997). Of this group, 68% of the families have two parents, while 32% of these families have one parent. Of the 12,042,000 one-parent families, 17% are headed by a male whereas 83% are headed by females. The data show that 27% of all families in the U.S. are headed by women.

The impact on the income of the families is even more significant. The U.S. Department of Commerce (1997) presented data that the median income for a two-parent family was $49,858 for 1996. In contrast, one-parent families headed by a male had a
median income of $35,658 for 1996 and one-parent families headed by a female had a median income of only $21,564 for 1996. With one-fourth of U.S. families coming from homes with the lowest median income for a family unit, the SES of those families is negatively impacted.

**Academic Achievement**

For generations educators have assumed that children living with one parent have more trouble in school than children from two-parent families. Cooley (1993) suggested that student achievement could be predicted by three variables found in the U.S. Census reports. One of these variables is the single-parent home. In his study for the State of Pennsylvania, Cooley found that one-parent families made up about 17% of families with school-age children for the average school districts. In some districts the numbers were greater than 57%, whereas for others it was less than 6%. The study went on to concluded that districts which have more single-parent families have a more difficult educational task than do districts with very few such families.

In the last 2 decades, findings regarding academic achievement have varied. Early research substantiated that children from single-parent families did indeed score significantly lower on achievements tests, had more behavioral problems in school, and received lower teacher-assigned grades than did children in two-parent families (Feistritzer, 1985; Hetherington et al., 1978). Barton (1991) found a direct correlation between the percentage of eighth-graders living in two-parent families and their average mathematics proficiency score. However, Hetherington, Camara, and Featherman (1981)
and Zakariya (1982) reexamined earlier research for methodological and statistical adequacy and concluded that single-parent children are at less academic risk than previously thought. Other studies have found that single-parent children actually improved in academic performance and did better than two-parent children since becoming members of a single-parent family (Allison, 1985; Voza, 1982). Another study found children of divorced parents to be more independent in school and at home (Doering, 1980).

In their 1973 review, Herzog and Sudia examined the effects of father absence on juvenile delinquency, academic achievements, and adjustment. Studies in their review had to have a control or comparison group that was in some way matched for socioeconomic status (SES) and cultural background. Given the stereotyped beliefs of the time, the most important conclusion may have been: "However inconclusive present evidence may be, there is firm basis for rejecting blanket generalizations about the consequences of father's absence. Its behavioral and psychological effects are probably much less uniform and much less uniformly handicapping than widely assumed" (p. 215). For school achievement, Herzog and Sudia concluded that "it seems unlikely that father's absence in itself would show significant relationship to poorer school achievement if relevant variables (including type of fatherlessness and SES) were adequately controlled" (p. 157). Hanusek (1992) found similar results regarding adult male presence or absence. Regardless of an adult male being present or absent from the home, academic achievement was not hampered if the family's income was stabilized.

In her review of the effect of father absences on children's cognitive growth, Shinn
(1978) established the minimal conditions of methodological adequacy to be "studies of nonclinical populations that included control groups of father-present children that made some effort to control for SES by matching subjects, stratifying the sample in analysis, or selecting subjects from homogeneous backgrounds" (p. 296). Despite the minimal nature of these criteria, only 28 of 50 studies met her criteria. Other desirable characteristics cited by Shinn included details about the father absences (reason, duration, child's age at onset), representative samples that included middle-class children before they reach college, studies of parent-child interaction in intact and single-parent families, particularly longitudinal studies "to determine whether cognitive effects precede or follow father absences" (p. 321). Of the 28 minimally adequate studies in her review, Shinn reported that 16 showed detrimental effect of father absence, 9 found no effect, and 3 found mixed positive and negative effects. Svanum, Bringle, and McLaughlin (1982) noted, however, that even the 16 studies showing negative effects were frequently small in magnitude and not statistically significant for all subgroups.

In their extensive review, Emery, Hetherington, and Dillalla (1984) reported that children in single-parent families performed more poorly on a variety of academic indicators, and that differences were typically confounded by SES, but cautioned that the comparison of SES is difficult in one- and two-parent families. Age differences were not clear; however, several studies suggested that differences may be more pronounced among late-school-age children. Emery et al. found that boys from divorced families generally showed greater academic deficits than did girls.

Ganong and Coleman (1984) reviewed studies of the effects of remarriage on
children. Noting an array of methodological problems and conflicting evidence, the authors concluded that there was little evidence to suggest that the remarriage of parents was related to problem behaviors, self-attitudes, school grades, academic achievement, personality characteristics, or any of the other variables that they considered.

Svanum et al. (1982) examined the effects of father absence on cognitive performance for a large representative sample of 6- to 11-year-old children. Father absences was weakly associated (less than 1% of variance explained) with lower cognitive performance. After correcting for SES, however, there were no decrements and in some instances small but statistically significant increments associated with fatherless families. Duration and onset of father absences had little systemic effect on the findings. Cause, however, had a weak effect on some measures in the children from divorced families who performed somewhat better than those from families in which father absence was due to separation or death.

Kinard and Reinherz (1986) found that, after controlling for selected background variables, children from recently disrupted single-mother families achieved less in some academic areas than did those from two-parent families and single-mother families that had not been recently disrupted. The authors suggested that parental separation or divorce may not have long-term effects. The results also suggest that the disruption of a stable configuration may be responsible for lower academic achievement rather than the family configuration.

In a 1978 study on father absence, Fowler and Richards often found no difference in the academic achievement between father-present and father-absent lower-class Black
children. They also revealed, even at that time, that the child's sex may be a determining factor in achievement, even more so than the father's presence (Fowler & Richards, 1978).

In a 1979 article by Hammond, various areas were analyzed regarding the effect of divorce on a child's school achievement and behavior. In the academic measurement of reading and mathematic achievement, no significant differences were found between children from divorced and intact families. In mathematics, achievement by single-parent boys was lower than that of boys from intact homes, but not at a significant level. Little differences were found in the girls studied (Hammond, 1979). Frank Brown in 1980 compared differences in school achievement and numerous other areas and found that the children in one-parent families rated lower in all areas studied (Brown, 1980). Another study conducted in 1980 by the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities confirmed this theory that children living with only one parent had more trouble in school than did children from intact families, including lower academic achievement. It did, however, cite that there was a problem as to just what features of the one-parent environment tended to foster lower achievement and what variables were responsible (Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, 1980).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) published a report in 1980 which presented the results of a study which looked at the school needs of elementary school children from single-parent families. It was found that 38% of the children from one-parent families were rated low achievers (attaining grades of D-F) as compared to 23% from intact families. On the other hand, only 17% of children from one-parent families were rated high achievers (attaining grades of A-B 80-100%) as compared
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to 30% from intact families (NAESP, 1980).

The NAESP in a 1982 report, based on a reanalysis of this same data collected in 1980, revised the earlier study which implicated the single-parent family as a major cause of low school achievement and behavior problems in children. By considering additional variables, it was found that the number of parents in the home seemed to have lesser influence on achievement than did family income and the child's gender. Generally, children from families with high incomes and especially girls tended to have better grades. It was even concluded that girls from high income homes with only one parent got better grades than boys from high income homes with two parents (Zakariya, 1982).

In 1984, Hetherington and Camara conducted an extensive review of 58 studies. They found that differences between children in one- and two-parent families on tests of intelligence and aptitude were usually small and became less significant when socioeconomic status was considered. They noted that the difference in IQ between children in single- and two-parent families is smaller than the difference in teacher-assigned grades and postulated that the greater disparity in grades may be due to:

1. Teachers perceived students who do not conform to school routines and requirements as less competent.

2. Students function in school being influenced by home conditions surrounding separation and divorce.

3. Children had less time for homework because of household and child-care tasks.

It is probably realistic to assume that the disruption in home life that typically accompanies death, separation, or divorce is enough to impair a child's school
performance to some degree. The question here is: Is it the one-parent environment itself which tended to lower achievement? Single-parent children comprise a substantial minority who are likely to have academic trouble in school and may need additional help from educators (Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, 1980).

The purpose of a study by Marsh (1989) was to determine the effect of living in two-parent, single-parent, and step-parent families on changes in children's academic achievement, attitudes, and behaviors during the last 2 years of high school. Data used was from the commercially available data file for second follow-up of the sophomore cohort of the High School and Beyond study. It included data from 1980, when respondents were sophomores, 1982, when respondents were seniors, and 1984, 2 years after the normal time for high-school graduation. Cluster sampling was done for the High School and Beyond study and the total number in the sample was 14,825. Family configurations were identified: two parents (mother and father); single parent (mother or father and no stepparent); stepparent (mother or father and a stepparent of the opposite sex); and other (neither mother nor father). Since information was obtained during both the sophomore and senior years, there were 16 possible combinations. In different analyses of family configurations, effects were estimated in comparisons of stable family configuration, in comparisons of recently divided families, and in comparisons of recently reconstructed families. These effects were tested on a diverse set of 22 outcomes representing academic achievement, attitudes, and behaviors. The conclusion was that family configuration had remarkably little influence on student growth and changes during the last 2 years of high school (Marsh, 1989).
According to Shreeve and Goetter (1985), a study conducted in the secondary school of a rural Washington State school district dramatically confirms that single parenthood adversely influences students' school achievement. The Eastern Washington University Department of Education surveyed 201 students from Grades 7 through 12 in the district. Thirty-seven of the students were from single-parent homes and 158 were from two-parent homes. The California Achievement Tests (Reading Comprehension, Language, and Math) were administered, and the grade point averages of all students were collected and compared. Findings regarding grade point averages indicated that in every grade, except the recently graduated senior class, two-parent students outranked their single parent counterparts. When students were classified as "high," "medium," or "low" achievers by grade point average, the two-parent students ranked higher in every instance. On the California Achievement Test, a higher percentage of two-parent students scored at or above grade level than single-parent students in every instance in reading, language, and math (Shreeve & Goetter, 1985).

Milne and Myers (1986) studied the effect of family structure and parents' work patterns on students' achievement. Data were taken from two previous studies: The Sustaining Effects Study of Title I and the High School and Beyond study. Data including parents' marital status were taken from a parent questionnaire. Achievement data were obtained from the reading and math sub-tests of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. The studies concluded that both the number of parents in the home and the employment status of the mother have significant effects (Milne & Myers, 1986).

Grissmer, Kirby, Berends, and Williamson (1994) analyzed the effects of family
changes on achievement scores of a national sample of students ages 14 to 17 in 1970 to 1974 and 1990 using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth of 1980 and the National Education Longitudinal Survey of Youth of 1988. These studies consist of 25,000 students and their families. Using the test scores as the sole measure of the effects of changes in the family, the study found no evidence of a deteriorating family environment for youth in 1990 compared to the same age group in 1970-1975. It was concluded that the most significant family characteristics associated with test scores are parental education level, family income, family size, and age of mother at child's birth. The study did put forth the thought that younger students' academic performance may be more influenced by family status than the group being studied.

In 1986, a study by Taylor (1986) tested whether a significant difference exists between academic performance scores of eighth-grade students from one-parent homes and those from two-parent homes in the areas of reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and English. The population included all eighth graders from three schools, who had submitted free lunch applications and who had taken the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. School records for the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the free-lunch applications were used to collect data. Generally, the number of parents in the home was found to be statistically insignificant. However, academic achievement was found to be significantly related to father's presence in the home (Taylor, 1986).

In a study by Melekian (1990), family characteristics of dyslexic children were studied; in particular, one of the characteristics was matrimonial status. The sample consisted of 249 children with severe reading retardation who were attending a full-time
center for dyslexia at Saint Cloud, near Paris, France, between 1970 and 1986. To assess reading achievement, two tests were administered: L'Alouette, a standardized reading test that evaluates reading skill without assessing comprehension, and Jeannot et Georges, which assesses both skill and comprehension. Family characteristics, such as marital status, were obtained from admission records. Melekian found that mother's marital status did not seem to bear any significant relation to dyslexia in this group. In addition, while indicating that single-parent status has attracted little attention, Melekian refers to earlier studies by Anderson and Kelley, 1970; Hallgren, 1950; and Rutter et al., 1974, which indicate that single parent homes do not contribute to reading and writing retardation (Melekian, 1990).

Hill and O'Neill (1993) found that the marital status variables have only weak and statistically insignificant effects on children's test scores. Other factors such as mother's characteristics and family resources have more of an effect on children's test scores. Desai, Chase-Lansdale, and Michael (1989) also found that family structure has very little effect on children's academic outcomes, holding other factors constant.

The majority of findings on academic achievement concluded that one-parent children showed lower achievement in school than their two-parent classmates. It was seen that with the absence of a parent (usually the father) there was such a decrease in both the quality of the family intellectual environment and the quality of the family moral and emotional environment (Disibio, 1981; Whitehead, 1993).
Socioeconomic Status and Race

Some of the most pervasive stresses confronting members of single-parent families are those associated with finances and downward economic mobility. In 1985, McLanahan found that lower economic status and stress of family disruption were found to account for almost half of the negative effects on children's attainment among Whites, whereas results were mixed among Blacks. Divorce, separation, and death of spouse were associated with a marked drop in income for women (Hoffman, 1977; Weiss, 1984; Weitzman, 1985). Although divorce resulted in reduced income for women a majority of the time, it did not for most men (Bane, 1976; Duncan, 1984; Hoffman, 1977; Hoffman & Holmes, 1979). This was in part attributable to the fact that less than one-third of ex-husbands contributed to the support of their families (Bahr, 1983; Giraldo, 1980; Kriesberg, 1970; Seal, 1979; Weitzman, 1985; Whitehead, 1993; Winston & Forsher, 1971). It should be noted that fathers' financial status was in fact less adversely affected by divorce even among those who continued to pay child support or alimony (Little, 1982).

Most single mothers typically retain custody of the children, thereby, lowering the women's income to needs ratio at every income level (Little, 1982). The major issue facing single mothers and their children is poverty (McEddy, 1976; Pearce, 1979; Ross & Sawhill, 1975). Between 1970 and 1984, the fraction of poor people living in mother-only non-elderly families climbed from 34% to 43% (Duncan & Rodgers, 1987). By 1989, the percentage had risen to nearly 50% (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1988, 1989).
The downward economic mobility of the mother-head families after becoming a single-parent family might entail a return to work. Fifty-three percent of single mothers with children under 6 (1.9 million workers) are in the labor force (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1988, 1989). This reduces contact between a working mother and children, a lower standard of living, relocation into a combined household, usually with the mother's family of origin, and a shift to more modest housing in poorer neighborhoods (Brandwein, Brown, & Fox, 1974). Research on the effects of maternal employment suggested that if a divorced mother worked and if adequate provisions were made for child care and household maintenance, maternal employment might have no adverse effect on children (Hetherington et al., 1978). However, recent studies have shown that a substantial number of mothers in low income but not moderate income single-parent families experience stress in coordinating their roles as mother and employee (Coletta, 1978; Weinraub & Wolf, 1983). Greater task overload was experienced by working, divorced mothers of young children. Furthermore, if the mother began to work at the time of divorce or shortly thereafter, preschool children seemed to experience the loss of both parents, which was reflected in a higher rate of behavioral disturbances (Hetherington et al., 1978).

A recent study conducted by Walker, Greenwood, Hart, and Carta (1994) examined the impact of low family income specifically on achievement test scores. In this longitudinal study in which children were followed from age 7 months to 10 years, it was found that children from low income homes continued to achieve lower scores on standardized reading and spelling achievement tests across grades in elementary school.
Thus, poverty has consistently been found to be a significant environmental risk factor for children’s academic achievement.

Although family status may be a determinant of school achievement, several studies agree that low income is a factor in the probability of daughters dropping out of high school; another factor listed is the female head of household who is often less skilled and educated than the average man who acquires custody of his children (Dawson, 1981). Milner (1983) found that children from two-parent homes have lower achievement if the mother works, and the magnitude of the effect is directly related to the amount of time worked. For Black children from two-parent homes the direct effect is negative, but the total effect is offset by enhanced family income. No such offsetting, positive effect appears for comparable White children. Black children from one-parent homes have higher achievement if the mother works, mediated to a large extent by increased family income (Milner, 1983). Results of Mann’s (1983) study of children of working mothers indicated that these children do as well in school as the children of mothers who stay at home (Mann, 1983). Shaw (1979) found that low income is the single most significant factor in accounting for the probability of a daughter dropping out of high school, both for Blacks and Whites.

In a study (Pungello, Kupersmidt, & Burchinal, 1997) of 1,253 children, Grades 2 to 7, to determine the long-term effects of low family income it was discovered that low family income and minority ethnic status are significant predictors of children’s achievement over time.

A high proportion of these children are adversely influenced by social conditions.
such as urban poverty and poor schools. Urban Black children living with their mother had only lower mathematics and verbal achievement than urban Black children living with both parents (Sciara, 1975).

Sciara's (1977) study of 1,073 reading and math scores of fourth-grade Black children in a Midwestern metropolitan school system concluded that youngsters from father-present homes scored significantly higher than those from father-absent homes (Sciara, 1977).

Socioeconomic characteristics exert much stronger effects on grade retention among Hispanic, Black, and White children than do family compositional factors (Allen & Tadlock, 1986; Taylor, 1986). LeGault (1985) researched and found significant differences were obtained in scholastic achievement using Iowa Tests of Basic Skills for 217 Black children in the sixth grade in New York state when classified according to home background factors, including family income and one or two parents. Nichols's (1977) research findings agreed and recorded that with equal education opportunity, academic achievement of economically disadvantaged children, White or Black, cannot be distinguished from non-disadvantaged White majority children (LeGault, 1985).

In a study by Young and Smith (1997), focus was on that as the family structure is shifting, Black and Hispanic children are much more likely to live in poverty than White children. Minority students attend schools with high levels of poverty, which is associated with poor school outcomes.
Home Learning Environment

Social scientists have sought to understand the relations between family characteristics and the intellectual performance of offspring since Galton (1869) reported on the association between family membership and the attainment of eminence among Englishmen more than a century ago. Although casual inferences cannot be drawn from correlational data, the description of patterns of association between home environments and group and individual differences remains an important task, contributing to the development of testable models, such as that proposed by Laosa (1982). The model advanced by Laosa posits child-parent interactions as a mediating variable between social status and school performance (cf. Marjoribanks, 1984). Milne (1989) and Walberg (1984) have found that parental home involvement correlates more highly with and is more predictive of student learning than a family's SES. Keith et al. (1993) expressed the idea that school reform has failed due to the fact that parental home influence has not been part of the solution.

During the 1960s and 1970s, family background characteristics found to be associated with low achievement were widely interpreted to reflect cultural deficits in the socialization of minority group and poor families. Deficit explanations have generally fallen into disrepute (Henderson, 1981), but the search for explanation of patterns of association between family characteristics and intelligent performances remains vital to an understanding of interactions between the intellectual repertoires children bring with them when they enter school and the expectations of school culture as they now exist. Laosa (1979, 1984) has suggested that each environment has its own set of specific demand
characteristics, and a child's success or failure may depend on the degree to which the competencies required to negotiate different environments overlap. In a 1985 study (Valencia & Rankin), family status, family constellation, and home environmental variables were studied to determine if they could be used as predictors of cognitive performance of Mexican-American children. It was concluded that there are direct correlations between the three variables and cognitive performance.

The impact of the home learning environment varies with the age of the child. Epstein (1991) and Stevenson and Baker (1987) found that parent involvement at home is important and influences the learning of elementary-age students. Other studies (Keith, 1991; Keith, Reimers, Fehrmann, Pottebaum, & Aubey, 1986; Natriello & McDill, 1986) have found that parent home involvement has no effect on the learning of high-school students. Keith et al. (1993) could find very little information on the effects of parental home involvement and the learning of middle-school youth.

In 1984, based on an extensive review of parent-involvement literature, McShane-Becher identified several key family process variables that are clearly related to student achievement. Children with high achievement scores have parents with high expectations for them, who respond to and interact with them frequently, and who see themselves as teachers of their children. McGowen and Johnson's (1984) research with Mexican-American preschool children indicated that early intellectual stimulation and the quality of the home environment contributed to their children's success in school.

In a study of 21,814 eighth-grade students, Keith et al. (1993) found that a correlation does exist between parental home involvement and student learning. The
study was an expansion of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (National Center for Education Statistics 1990a). The group found that parents' educational aspirations, communication with child, and home structure (family rules about homework, students' GPA, and TV viewing) did influence student achievement. Keith et al.'s (1993) study also correlated with studies by Christenson, Rounds, and Gorney (1992) and Seginer (1983) in the discovery of the reciprocating influence that parent involvement and student achievement have on each other. Each study found that a home learning environment that consists of quality parent involvement directly influences student achievement. It appears that higher academic performance results in greater parental home involvement, which in turn leads to still higher academic performance.

Peng and Wright (1993) also studied the results of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988. It was found that home learning environment accounts for most of the differences in student achievement among racial-ethnic groups. Further findings indicated that a positive home learning environment is an important factor in student academic achievement. It was concluded that students from families supportive of learning are likely to have high achievement scores.

Sui-Chu and Willms (1996) took the data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 24,599 eighth-graders and selected a sample of 1,052 students. The parent involvement variables had to do with how often a child talked to parents about school, how much the parents monitored homework, how much they limited television, how often the school contacted the parents, and the parents' contact with the school. The findings indicated that SES influences parent involvement with their child and/or the
Dornbusch (1986) found that "authoritative" parenting was associated with good grades for both sexes across the high-school years for all ethnic groups, family structure, and levels of parental education studied. "Authoritative" was defined as encouraging children to look at both sides of an issue, encouraging participation in decision making, and responding to good grades with encouragement and offers of help. In a study of poor Black senior high-school students classified as high achievers, Clark (1983) found that the students came from families characterized by frequent and warm interactions between parents and children and strong parent encouragement of academic pursuits. In the analyses of 18 studies on the correlation between home environment and learning, Iverson and Walburg (1982) found that ability and achievement are more closely linked to the socio-psychological environment and intellectual stimulation in the home than they are to parental socioeconomic status indicators.

In a study by Akimoff (1996), parents were asked to review their child's schoolwork, read with the child, and monitor child's academic progress. The results indicated that parental involvement was essential in helping students achieve optimum success in school. Parent involvement was found to send a positive message to students about the importance of their education.

**Self-Concept/Self-Esteem**

Self-concept is a variable that has drawn considerable empirical study and has been identified as crucial to realization of potential by students (Whitmore, 1980). Nurius
(1986) defined self-concept as a view of oneself based on past experience and attainments, current motives and accomplishments, and a sense of what one can become. The term self-concept is used in this review to represent an evaluation of self as an active agent in the world (Levy, 1970).

Development of a positive, robust self-concept has been cited as an important objective by educators (Feldhusen, 1986). Harris and Covington (1993) performed a 3-year study for the state of California to answer the question, "What effect does self-esteem have on academic achievement?" It was concluded that a low magnitude of association exists between self-esteem and achievement. There are, however, a number of inconsistencies in the research regarding the relation of academic achievement to self-concept. First, self-concept does not seem to be unidimensional. Findings have differed depending on the dimension of self-concept examined—its general, academic, or social aspects. Second, findings have not been totally consistent even within these dimensions of self-concept. Third, the association between academic achievement and self-concept may be different for girls and boys.

Several studies have found gifted students to have more positive general self-concepts than normative samples (Karnes & Wherry, 1981; Ketcham & Snyder, 1977; Tidwell, 1980). There have been mixed results in studies involving comparison groups. Lehman and Erdwins (1981) and O'Such, Twyla, and Havertape (1979) found gifted samples to have more positive self-concepts than their non-gifted peers. Milgram and Milgram (1976) reported mixed results. Coleman and Fults (1982) found gifted students to have less positive self-concepts than their non-gifted peers. The confusion regarding
the relationship of academic achievement to general measures of self-concept is mirrored in Tidwell's (1980) findings that gifted students were significantly higher than age-appropriate norms on one self-concept measure and lower on another. Following their review of the self-concept literature, Hansford and Hattie (1982) noted that there was a tenuous relationship between global self-concept measures—such as the ones used in these studies—and performance measures.

The picture regarding the relation of academic achievement to academic self-concept is clearer. Again, studies involving comparison of gifted samples to test norms (Colangelo & Pfleger, 1978; Ross & Parker, 1980; Tidwell, 1980) indicate that gifted students have very positive academic self-concepts. These findings have been corroborated by studies using comparison groups of students not identified as gifted (Kelly & Colangelo, 1984; Winne, Woodlands, & Wong, 1982). Marsh's (1990) study of longitudinal data on self-concept and achievement measures showed that a stable correlation does exist between the two. The only exception has been the Colangelo et al. (1987) findings that academic achievement was related to academic self-concept for girls but not for boys.

There is considerable ambiguity regarding the relationship of academic achievement to social self-concept. Ross and Parker's (1980) gifted sample scored lower in social than in academic self-concept. Winnie et al. (1982) found gifted students to be lower in social self-concept than students with learning disabilities. Others (Karamessini, 1980, Kelly & Colangelo, 1984) have found academic achievement to be positively associated with social self-concept. The findings from Colangelo et al. (1987) indicated
that achievement was related more clearly to social self-concept in adolescent boys than girls.

In a study by Kelly and Jordan (1990), an attempt to replicate and extend the Colangelo et al. (1987) study found that academic achievement is directly related to academic self-concept; students in gifted programs did not seem to experience any self-perceived advantages or handicaps with respect to social functioning. It was concluded that high achievers were both different from and similar to their peers of more modest achievement. Kelly and Jordan showed that there was a striking association between success, positive feedback, and recognition of ability in academic and positive self-concept in the domain of functioning. It was concluded that the real gains in other areas of self-concept were likely to be facilitated through a similar combination of tangible attainment, positive feedback, and recognition of one's ability by peers, educators, and family. With regard to family influence, Kurtz (1993) found a correlation between the self-esteem of children from divorced homes and the length, not frequency, of visits with the non-custodial parent. As length of visits increased so did the children's views of their own self-worth.

Yeger and Miezitis (1980) determined that academic achievement of children with a positive self-esteem was higher than children with low or negative self-esteem. However, Calsyn, Pennel, and Harter (1984) found no relationship between self-esteem and achievement in the early adolescent.

It is often reported that Black children—because of high rates of single-parent homes and too few male role models—tend to demonstrate less positive self-esteem than
their White peers (Reynolds & Allen, 1987). A study by Morgan (1993) showed the opposite occurring. In his study of 975 fifth-grade students, it was found that Black students reported higher percentages of positive self-esteem than their White peers. Desired SES seemed to have more effect on self-esteem than race. In a review of self-esteem literature by Gecas (1982), it was concluded that either research found no differences in the self-esteem of Blacks and Whites or that Blacks were found to be slightly higher than Whites.

In a study of 72 African American inner-city high-school students, Mayo-Booker and Gibbs (1997) discovered that academic achievement of the students was positively related to their global and racial self-concept. SES did not play as major a role regarding how students viewed themselves and world around them.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed the literature related to academic achievement, socioeconomic status and race, home learning environment, and self-concept as impacted by the single-parent family. A review of current research has been inconclusive regarding the influence of single-parent homes on student academic achievement. Several studies reported that the lower income of single-parent homes made the difference in achievement, whereas a few others espoused that race was the strongest predictor. The home learning environment was shown to have an impact on academic achievement in that, regardless of the family status, the factor that influenced student academic achievement most was the intellectual stimulus provided by the parent or parents. With
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respect to self-concept, the literature was once again not totally conclusive. Self-concept/self-esteem is another variable that is not so much affected by the family marital status but the positive or negative feedback that is received from the parent or parents and the school.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine if there existed any correlation between parent status, home learning environment, self-concept, and academic achievement of fifth- through eighth-grade students who attended an Ohio Seventh-day Adventist school. This chapter contains information on the sample, the Hare Self-Esteem Scale, the Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale, the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, the Family Survey and methods used to gather data for this study. The procedure for the analysis of the data is contained in this chapter as well.

Design of the Study

This study employed the survey research methodology in which the data were gathered by using three surveys: the Hare Self-Esteem Scale, which was filled out by the students; the Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale, which was filled out by parents; and the Family Survey, a demographic instrument, that was filled out by parents. Data on academic performance were gathered from the Department of Education, Ohio Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Academic performance was measured using the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. These sets of data were analyzed to determine if there are relationships between family status (one- or two-parent family) and self-esteem, family
interaction, and academic performance.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was the fifth- through eighth-grade students who attended the 19 Ohio Seventh-day Adventist schools during the 1995-1996 school year. Middle-school students were chosen for this study because this period is a very important development stage emotionally and cognitively (Cahoon, 1991). In addition, students from these 19 schools were geographically and ethnically diverse. All 397 students in the 19 schools were invited to participate in this study. However, 14 of the school’s principals gave permission for their students to participate in the study. This left 364 of the 397 remaining. Of these, 88 parents signed the consent form that allowed their children to take part in the study. Scores were available for all 88 students.

Instrumentation

A battery of four instruments was used in this study: the Hare Self-Esteem Scale (HSS), Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale (HELPS), the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), and the Family Survey.

Hare Self-Esteem Scale (HSS)

The Hare Self-Esteem Scale is a 30-item instrument that measures self-esteem of school-age children 10 years old and above (see Appendix B). Students respond to each question by indicating one of the following: a = strongly disagree, b = disagree, c = agree, or d = strongly agree. The HSS consists of three 10-item subscales that are arena-specific
(peer, school, and home) and are presented as distinct units. The sum of all 30 items is viewed as a general self-esteem measure. The instruments includes both self-evaluative and other-evaluative items. The items are also intended to induce respondents to report a general sense of the self-feeling within each arena. The rationale for concluding that the sum of the three sub-scales produces an overall measure of self-esteem is that peer, home, and school are the major areas of interaction for the child in which he or she develops a sense of self-worth. Thus, they represent something close to the child's universe for self-evaluation. The HSS can be administered individually or in groups, orally or in writing.

The HSS was tested on fifth- and eighth-graders. Subsamples included 41 Blacks and 207 Whites, 115 boys and 137 girls. Means ranged from 90.4 to 95.

Scoring is done by reverse scoring negatively worded items and the items for the subscale are summed using the following scoring scheme: \( a = 1, b = 2, c = 3, d = 4 \). The three subscales scores are totaled to produce the score for the general self-esteem scale. Higher scores indicate higher self-esteem.

No internal consistency data have been reported regarding the HSS. Test-retest correlations indicate fair stability with 3 month correlations ranging from .56 to .65 for the three subscales and .74 for the general scale.

The HSS general scale correlated .83 with both the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, indicating excellent concurrent validity. The HSS subscales also correlate significantly with changes in life status and with predicted arena-specific activities (e.g., reading achievement scores with school subscale).
Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale

The Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale is a 55-item interview instrument using a Likert-type response format designed to measure home environmental characteristics that have been found to correlate with intellectual performance and to predict scholastic achievement for students in Grades 1-12 (see Appendix B). The environmental process variables were derived from the work of Dave (1963) and Wolf (1964). The items composing this instrument focus primarily on specific experiences provided for children and on patterns of interaction among the family members. Items for the HELPS were generated to elicit responses related to aspiration level, environmental stimulation, models, guidance, and reinforcement.

The HELPS general scale correlated .37 to .65 with total test scores from the Standford Early Achievement Test and the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts. The HELPS also correlated with SES. The HELPS has a reliability estimate of .80.

For the present study, two modifications were made from the original HELPS. First, the number of questions was reduced from 55 to 40. Some of the items on the HELPS were deemed not appropriate for the population under study. For example, since the study compares one-parent and two-parent families, questions pertaining to husbands/wives were eliminated. For example, the item “How many organizations does your husband belong to?” was eliminated. Second, the instrument was modified from being an interview questionnaire to a self-report questionnaire after consultation with the author, Ronald Henderson (personal communication, June 3, 1994). Positive responses
(e.g., almost always, a great deal, very often) were assigned scores of 1 whereas negative
responses (e.g., almost never, very unlikely, seldom) were assigned scores of 5. Similar to
a study by Valencia (1985) and Kitonyi (1980), a total score based on the unweighted sum
of the items served as the measure for the home environment.

A pilot study was conducted in October of 1995 with families of fifth- to eighth-
grade students from Hinsdale Junior Academy located in Hinsdale, Illinois. The pilot
study was conducted for clarity of instruction and items. No significant changes were
made to the modified HELPS. Based on the sample of 88 students in this study, the
reliability estimate for the modified HELPS is .86.

**Iowa Tests of Basic Skills**

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills provides for comprehensive and continuous
measurement of growth in the fundamental skills: vocabulary, reading, the mechanics of
writing, methods of study, and mathematics. These skills are crucial to current day-to-day
learning activities as well as to future educational development. The Multilevel Battery is
intended primarily for use in Grades 3-9. The tests are nongraded. Each test consists of a
continuous scale from low-level (Grade 3) to superior (Grade 9) performance. There are
six levels, numbered to correspond roughly to chronological age. Pupils take the one level
judged to be the most suitable for his or her level of development. The test consists of 11
subtests. Raw scores are converted to grade equivalents, and developmental standard
scores are converted to percentile ranks in grade, stanines, and normal curve equivalents
for fall, midyear, and spring (Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1993a).

Reliability varies from test to test and grade to grade. Internal consistency
reliability coefficients for the five main area scores range from .84 to .96; composite
reliability is .98 for all grades (Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1993a).

Content specifications are based upon more than 40 years of continuous research in curriculum, measurement procedures, and interpretation and use of test results. The 248 skills objectives represented in the tests were determined through systematic consideration of courses of study, statements of authorities in method, and recommendations of national curriculum groups. The item selection process involved a combination of empirical and judgmental procedures, including evaluation by representative professionals from diverse cultural groups (Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1993a).

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills was standardized jointly with Cognitive Abilities Test and the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency. Approximately 15,000 pupils per grade were used in establishing fall norms in 1984. Spring norms were established on a 33% representative subsample in 1985. Criteria used in selecting and weighing were: region, size of school district, family income, and education (Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1993a).

Family Survey

The Family Survey is a 12-item demographic survey designed to obtain information about the fifth- through eighth-grade families participating in this study. Completion of the survey provides information regarding marital status, child's grades, parents' working status, income level, age, ethnic background, sex, home location, and relative interaction. The Family Survey was patterned after the Institute of Church Ministry's (1982) New Member Survey and Caring Church Survey.
Permission to conduct this study was obtained from both the Ohio Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and Andrews University. Approval to survey minor children was given by the Office of Scholarly Research, Andrews University.

Each school was sent a request for the names and addresses of the fifth- through eighth-grade students along with samples of the Hare Self-Esteem, Henderson Home Learning Environment, the Family Surveys (see Appendix B), and a copy of the consent form that the parents and students would sign (see Appendix, C). A permission form (see appendix C) for the principals to sign giving consent for their school to be a part of this study and for the Hare Self-Esteem Inventory to be administered at their school was also sent.

After obtaining the addresses of the families, each household was sent the HELPS, Family Survey, a copy of the HSS, copies of the Informed Consent Form (see appendix C) --one copy for each student and one copy to retain--accompanied by a cover letter (see appendix A) explaining the purpose of the study. A stamped self-addressed envelope was enclosed.

After obtaining the permission from the schools' principals, parents, and students, I went to each of the schools to supervise the administration of the HSS (see appendix B). Information on academic achievement was gathered from the Ohio Conference Office of Education by obtaining the subscores and composite scores of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills from the printouts available for students in Grades 5 through 8 who attended Ohio Seventh-day Adventist schools in 1995-1996.
Treatment of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills Scores

In order to treat the ITBS scores of the sample of fifth- through eighth-grade students as a group, it was necessary to convert their percentile scores into some standard scores since percentile scores for different grade levels were not comparable. Accordingly, each student's percentile score was converted to a developmental standard score. A developmental standard score "is a number that describes the student's location on an achievement continuum. The continuum is a line that describes the lowest level of skills or knowledge on one end (lowest numbers) and the highest level of development on the other end (highest numbers)" (Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1993a, p. 10). Table 1 shows the development standard scores that correspond to typical performance of grade groups on each ITBS test. As the table indicates, the median developmental standard score for fourth-grade students was defined to be 200.

TABLE 1

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD SCORES FOR GRADE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median SS</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From ITBS, Norms and Score Conversions (p. 12), 1993, Riverside Publishing, Chicago, IL.
The scale also shows that the average annual growth decreases as students move up through the grades. To interpret the developmental standard score, the values associated with the typical performance of students in each grade must be used to estimate a student's developmental level. For example, a student's score of 230 on ITBS Reading Comprehension means that the student's reading level is like that of a student who has just finished sixth-grade (Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1993b).

Null Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are stated in the null form.

Hypothesis 1. There is no difference between the academic achievement of students from one- and two-parent families.

From this hypothesis, seven sub-hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 1a. There is no difference between the language achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 1b. There is no difference between the mathematics achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 1c. There is no difference the reading achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 1d. There is no difference between the science achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 1e. There is no difference between the study skills achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.
Hypothesis 1f. There is no difference between the social studies achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 1g. There is no difference between the achievement (as measured by the Composite Score of the ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 2. There is no difference between the global home environmental characteristics (as measured by the Henderson Environmental Learning Processes Scale) of one-parent and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 3. There is no difference between the self-esteem (as measured by the Hare Self-esteem Scale) of students from one- and two-parent families.

From this hypothesis, four sub-hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 3a. There is no difference between the global self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 3b. There is no difference between the peer self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 3c. There is no difference between the home self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 3d. There is no difference between the school self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.

Hypothesis 4. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and their academic achievement.

From this hypothesis, four sub-hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 4a. There is no relationship between the length of time students are
members of single-parent families and language achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 4b. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and mathematics achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 4c. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and reading achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 4d. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and science achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 4e. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and study skills achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 4f. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and social studies achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 4g. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and academic achievement (as measured by the composite score of the ITBS).

Hypothesis 5. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and their academic performance.

From this hypothesis, four sub-hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 5a. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and language achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 5b. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and mathematics achievement (as
measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 5c. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and reading achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 5d. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and science achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 5e. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and study skills achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 5f. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and social studies achievement (as measured by ITBS).

Hypothesis 5g. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and academic achievement (as measured by the composite score of the ITBS).

**Data Analysis**

Hypotheses 1 was tested using two-way analysis of variance since the Developmental Standard Score (DSS) appears to be a function of grade level. Hypotheses 2 and 3 were tested using a $t$ test for two independent samples. Hypotheses 4 and 5 were tested using Spearman rho. The $t$ test for two independent samples is used to determine
the statistical significance of the difference between two group means. In this study, a comparison was made between academic performance, general home environmental characteristics, and self-esteem of students from one-parent and two-parent families.

Spearman rho is used when a correlation is desired between two ordinal variables. In Hypothesis 4, at least one variable (length of time the students have been members of one-parent families) is measured ordinally. In Hypothesis 5, the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives is also measured ordinally.

Summary

This chapter presented the research design, population and sample, the instruments and procedure used, the null hypotheses, and the statistical techniques were used to test these hypotheses. Chapter 4 presents the results of this study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between parent status (one- or two-parent) and home learning environment, self-esteem, and academic achievement of fifth- through eighth-grade students from selected Seventh-day Adventist schools of the Ohio Conference. This chapter presents results of the analysis of the data. A description of the demographic data is given first, followed by the presentation of each of the hypotheses.

Description of the Sample

Eighty-eight (22%) of the 397 students of the Ohio Conference during the 1996-97 school year participated in this study. Table 2 presents the description of these students. Seventeen (19%) of the 88 students were from single-parent families. Forty-seven (53.4%) were males. Most (61.4%) lived in rural or small town areas. Approximately 45% have weekly or daily contacts with other relatives. Fourteen (16%) were from Grade 5, 24 (27%) from Grade 6, 21 (24%) from Grade 7, and 29 (33%) from Grade 8.
TABLE 2

DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Spent With Other Relatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays only</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the characteristics of the parents who responded to the Family Survey. It also shows the income level of the family. All but one of the single-parent families were headed by a female. Most (88.2%) were under 50 years old, predominantly White (70.6%), and had an income level of $15,000-$50,000 (76.4%). The two-parent families were also predominantly White (85.9%) but appeared to have higher income level. Approximately 70% had income levels of $50,000 or more.
### TABLE 3

**DESCRIPTION OF THE FAMILY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Single-Parent (N=17)</th>
<th>Two-Parent (N=71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 35 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 50 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 65 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4 shows the distribution of 88 students in this study by grade levels and group (one-parent and two-parents). It does appear that there are proportionately more students from one-parent family in the lower grade levels compared students from two-parent family.

**TABLE 4**

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY GROUP AND GRADE LEVEL**
(Percentages in Parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
<th>One-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 (14.1)</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 (25.4)</td>
<td>6 (35.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19 (26.8)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24 (33.8)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71 (100)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Testing the Null Hypotheses**

**Null Hypothesis 1**

Null Hypothesis 1 states: There is no difference between the academic achievement of students from one- and two-parent families. The sub-hypotheses are:

la. There is no difference between the language achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.
1b. There is no difference between the mathematics achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

1c. There is no difference between the reading achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

1d. There is no difference between the science achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

1e. There is no difference between the study skills achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

1f. There is no difference between the social studies achievement (as measured by ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

1g. There is no difference between the achievement (as measured by the Composite Score of the ITBS) of students from one- and two-parent families.

As Table 1 (p. 44) suggests, the Development Standard Score (DSS) is a function of grade levels. And since Table 4 appears to show that there are proportionately more students from one-parent family who are in the lower grade compared to students from two-parent family, it is necessary to consider grade levels in comparing the achievement of students from the two groups of students. For this reason, two-way analysis of variance was used to test the above hypotheses.

Tables 5 and 6 show the means and standard deviations of the Development Standard Score in Language, Mathematics, Reading, Science, Reference Skills, Social Studies and Composite Score by Group (one-parent and two-parent) and grade level. Table 7 shows the Two-Way Analysis of Variance results using Grade level and Group as
Independent Variables and DSS for each of the subject area and the composite score as the dependent variables. As the result shows, no interaction between grade level and group were found for any of the seven dependent variables. Consequently, one need only to examine the group main effect since the primary interest of this study is group differences (one-parent vs two-parents). No significant group main effect was found, suggesting that students of one-parent family did not differ significantly from students of two-parent family on all seven dependent variables. Thus, hypotheses 1a through 1g are all retained.

### TABLE 5

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION (IN PARENTHESES)
BY SUBJECT AND GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>228.00</td>
<td>233.00</td>
<td>232.25</td>
<td>229.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(36.74)</td>
<td>(22.08)</td>
<td>(33.26)</td>
<td>(28.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td>238.67</td>
<td>242.17</td>
<td>242.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19.99)</td>
<td>(13.65)</td>
<td>(18.70)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>256.00</td>
<td>238.00</td>
<td>247.50</td>
<td>274.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.49)</td>
<td>(14.14)</td>
<td>(14.85)</td>
<td>(22.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250.80</td>
<td>265.00</td>
<td>253.20</td>
<td>274.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15.87)</td>
<td>(24.96)</td>
<td>(20.58)</td>
<td>(28.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>223.20</td>
<td>214.60</td>
<td>226.20</td>
<td>222.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19.15)</td>
<td>(18.82)</td>
<td>(14.14)</td>
<td>(22.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>247.61</td>
<td>234.89</td>
<td>243.28</td>
<td>253.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>277.05</td>
<td>256.33</td>
<td>260.11</td>
<td>260.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29.90)</td>
<td>(27.44)</td>
<td>(18.30)</td>
<td>(32.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>276.79</td>
<td>280.13</td>
<td>275.42</td>
<td>287.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(40.18)</td>
<td>(40.91)</td>
<td>(32.57)</td>
<td>(31.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Reference Skill</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>224.00</td>
<td>224.25</td>
<td>227.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31.27)</td>
<td>(37.13)</td>
<td>(30.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>242.33</td>
<td>240.17</td>
<td>241.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14.90)</td>
<td>(21.78)</td>
<td>(15.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>241.00</td>
<td>245.00</td>
<td>246.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.24)</td>
<td>(12.73)</td>
<td>(7.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>271.00</td>
<td>268.20</td>
<td>266.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(26.80)</td>
<td>(24.18)</td>
<td>(19.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>223.00</td>
<td>226.40</td>
<td>222.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(28.86)</td>
<td>(19.58)</td>
<td>(18.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>244.39</td>
<td>239.11</td>
<td>244.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29.73)</td>
<td>(26.18)</td>
<td>(21.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>266.32</td>
<td>258.16</td>
<td>263.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(34.99)</td>
<td>(33.23)</td>
<td>(27.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>284.00</td>
<td>274.38</td>
<td>284.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(32.88)</td>
<td>(52.88)</td>
<td>(30.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR GROUP BY GRADE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1407.44</td>
<td>1407.44</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12112.33</td>
<td>4037.44</td>
<td>4.161</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade*Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2218.94</td>
<td>739.65</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77629.58</td>
<td>970.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>394.23</td>
<td>394.23</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21688.52</td>
<td>7229.51</td>
<td>8.418</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade*Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1700.37</td>
<td>566.79</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68705.82</td>
<td>858.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>653.48</td>
<td>653.48</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9175.70</td>
<td>3058.57</td>
<td>5.557</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade*Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1651.08</td>
<td>550.36</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44031.72</td>
<td>550.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>701.96</td>
<td>701.96</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21500.16</td>
<td>7166.72</td>
<td>7.787</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade*Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>841.87</td>
<td>280.63</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73624.14</td>
<td>920.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1134.34</td>
<td>1134.34</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21367.09</td>
<td>7122.36</td>
<td>7.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade*Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1036.44</td>
<td>345.48</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76355.72</td>
<td>954.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>305.36</td>
<td>305.36</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16203.19</td>
<td>5401.07</td>
<td>3.989</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade*Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>295.67</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>108306.71</td>
<td>1353.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>829.74</td>
<td>829.74</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18795.10</td>
<td>6265.03</td>
<td>9.772</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade*Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1170.75</td>
<td>390.25</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51289.51</td>
<td>641.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis 2

Null Hypothesis 2 states: There is no difference between the global home environmental characteristics (as measured by the Henderson Environmental Learning Processes Scale) of one-parent and two-parent families.

As Table 8 indicates, the global home environmental learning characteristics in two-parent families ($\mu=78.72$, $SD=14.09$) were significantly more positive than the home learning characteristics in one-parent families ($\mu=88.76$, $SD=16.23$). Thus, Hypothesis 2 is rejected. Item means and standard deviations for the two groups are found in Appendix D, Table 10.

There were six items of the home environmental learning survey whose results indicated a significant difference between one- and two-parent families. From these six items, a profile of the two-parent family can be developed. The adults in a two-parent family ($\mu=1.62$, $SD=0.66$) tend to give more verbal affirmation of how their children do in school than the adult in one-parent family ($\mu=2.06$, $SD=0.23$). Also, adults in a two-parent ($\mu=1.52$, $SD=0.92$) family give more physical (hugs, pat on the shoulder) affirmation than the adult in a one-parent ($\mu=2.12$, $SD=1.11$) family. School projects that are brought home by students receive more attention by the two-parent ($\mu=1.20$, $SD=0.52$) family adults and less attention by the adult in a one-parent ($\mu=1.65$, $SD=0.93$) family. The two-parent ($\mu=1.91$, $SD=1.26$) family adult has more reading materials in the form of magazines for themselves and their children as compared to the one-parent ($\mu=2.82$, $SD=1.29$) family adult. The adults in the two-parent ($\mu=2.24$, $SD=1.21$) family keep up on current events and model reading by reading the newspaper more often than
the adult in a one-parent (M=3.11, SD=1.50) family. The educational attainment by the two-parent (M=1.17, SD=1.71) family adults is higher than that of the one-parent (M=1.71, SD=0.59) family adult. Thus, it appears that the home learning environment is more positive for students from two-parent families than students from one-parent families because adults in the two-parent setting tend to be more educated, more affirming, provide more reading materials, and model good reading habits.

TABLE 8
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t-TEST RESULTS BY SUBJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-parent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.76</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78.72</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 3

Null Hypothesis 3 states: There is no difference between the self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families. The sub-hypotheses are:

3a. There is no difference between the global self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.

3b. There is no difference between the peer self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.
3c. There is no difference between the home self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.

3d. There is no difference between the school self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families.

Table 9 shows the means and standard deviations as well as the test statistics for the global, school, peer, and home self-esteem of students from one- and two-parent families. As the table indicates, there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups of students. Thus, Hypotheses 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d were retained. Item means and standard deviation for the two groups of students are found in Tables 11, 12, and 13 (Appendix D).

TABLE 9
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND t-TEST RESULTS BY TYPE OF SELF-ESTEEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>1-parent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-parent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>1-parent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-parent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1-parent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-parent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1-parent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-parent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis 4

Null Hypothesis 4 states: There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and their academic achievement. The sub-hypotheses are:

4a. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and language achievement (as measured by ITBS).

4b. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and mathematics achievement (as measured by ITBS).

4c. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and reading achievement (as measured by ITBS).

4d. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and science achievement (as measured by ITBS).

4e. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and study skills achievement (as measured by ITBS).

4f. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and social studies achievement (as measured by ITBS).

4g. There is no relationship between the length of time students are members of single-parent families and academic achievement (as measured by the composite score of the ITBS).

Table 10 shows the distribution of the number of years that the family has been in a single-parent status. Approximately two-thirds of the single-parent families were in that status for 6 or more years.
Table 10 shows the relationships between the number of years of single-parent family status and academic performance. As the table indicates, no significant relationships existed between academic performance and the length of time that the student had been in a single-parent family status. Consequently, Hypothesis 4 and sub-hypotheses were retained.

Null Hypothesis 5

Null Hypothesis 5 states: There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and their academic performance. The sub-hypotheses are:

5a. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and language achievement (as measured by ITBS).

5b. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from
single-parent families have with their relatives and mathematics achievement (as measured by ITBS).

5c. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and reading achievement.

5d. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and science achievement (as measured by ITBS).

### TABLE 11

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUBJECTS WITH INTERACTION WITH RELATIVES AND NUMBER OF YEARS OF SINGLE PARENTHOOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Interact*</th>
<th>Years*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>-0.03191</td>
<td>0.36823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9032)</td>
<td>(0.1459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0.05552</td>
<td>0.34119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8324)</td>
<td>(0.1802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>-0.22578</td>
<td>0.06434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3836)</td>
<td>(0.8062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>-0.10473</td>
<td>0.28214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6891)</td>
<td>(0.2726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0.05003</td>
<td>0.23290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8488)</td>
<td>(0.3683)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td>-0.08738</td>
<td>0.12610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7388)</td>
<td>(0.6296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td>-0.13530</td>
<td>0.28840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6046)</td>
<td>(0.2616)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequency of interaction with relatives.

b*Number of years of single-parenthood.

*Probability.
5e. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and study skills achievement (as measured by ITBS).

5f. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and social studies achievement (as measured by ITBS).

5g. There is no relationship between the frequency of contact students from single-parent families have with their relatives and academic achievement (as measured by the composite score of the ITBS).

Table 12 shows the frequency of interactions between relatives and students from single-parent families. Slightly over half of the 17 students from single-parent families had some form of interaction with relatives on a weekly or daily basis. The correlation between the frequency of interactions with relatives among students from single-parent families and academic performance is shown in Table 11. As the table indicates, there was no significant relationship between academic achievement and frequency of interactions. Thus, Hypothesis 5 and all sub-hypotheses were retained.
TABLE 12

FREQUENCY OF INTERACTION WITH RELATIVES OF STUDENTS FROM SINGLE-PARENT FAMILIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holidays only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The analysis of data produced six major findings. The data indicated that there was no significant difference in any of the subject scores as measured by ITBS between two-parent students and their single-parent peers. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, and 1f were retained. The data also indicated that the overall composite score as measured by ITBS of two-parent students was not significantly higher than their single-parent peers. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis 1g was retained. The data for the home learning environment and its positive effect on students showed that students from single-parent homes had a less positive home learning environment than their two-parent peers. The Null Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

In analysis of the data for self-esteem, no significant differences were found in the global, peer, school, and home self-esteem of students from two-parent and single-parent
homes. Therefore, Null Hypotheses 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d were all retained. The relationship between length of time in a single-parent family and academic performance was found to be non-significant. Thus, Null Hypothesis 4 was retained. Finally, the data on the relationship between academic performance of single-parent students and frequency of contact with their relatives showed that no significant relationship existed. Therefore, the Null Hypotheses 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, and 5g were retained.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents five sections: the introduction, summary of methodology, the major findings, discussion of the major findings, and recommendations.

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to study the effects of family marital status on the home learning environment, self-esteem, and academic achievement of fifth- through eighth-grade students of the Ohio Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. This study identified areas of academic concern for students. This information may be used by educational leaders in the Seventh-day Adventist school system to address issues related to the variables that influence academic achievement. In this chapter a summary of the methodology, the major findings, discussion of the findings, and recommendations are presented.

Summary of Methodology

The population for this study consisted of fifth- through eighth-grade students who attended the 19 Ohio Conference Seventh-day Adventist schools and their families at the time of this study (April 1996). The total number of students to participate in this
study was 88. The students were from one-teacher, two-teacher, three-teacher, or multi-teacher schools from different geographical and demographical areas.

I obtained permission to conduct this study from the administration of the Ohio Conference Board of Education and the Graduate Dean of Andrews University. Further permission was sought from the Office of Scholarly Research Department of Andrews University for permission to study minor children. Each school was sent a request for the names and addresses of the fifth- through eighth-grade students along with samples of the Hare Self-Esteem (see appendix B), Henderson Home Learning Environment (see appendix B), the Family Surveys (see appendix B), and a sample of the permission that the parents and students would sign. A permission form (see appendix C) for the principal to sign giving consent for his school to be a part of this study and for the Hare Self-Esteem to be conducted was also sent.

After obtaining the addresses of the families, each household was sent a copy of the Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale, Family Survey, and the Hare Self-Esteem Scale, copies of the Informed Consent Form (see appendix C)—one copy for each student and one copy to retain—all accompanied by a cover letter (see appendix A) explaining the purpose of the study. A stamped self-addressed envelope was enclosed.

After obtaining the permission from the school principals, parents, and students, I went to each of the schools to supervise the administration of the Hare Self-esteem Scale (see appendix B).

Information on academic achievement was gathered from the Ohio Conference Office of Education by obtaining the sub-scores and composite scores of the Iowa Tests of
Basic Skills from the printouts available for students in Grades 5 through 8 who attended Ohio Seventh-day Adventist Schools in 1995-1996.

**Major Findings**

The following research questions were proposed for this study:

1. What is the relationship between family status (one- or two-parent family) and the academic achievement of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

2. What is the relationship between family status (one- or two-parent family) and the home learning environment of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

3. What is the relationship between family status (one- or two-parent family) and the self-esteem of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

4. Is length of time of being a part of a single-parent family related to the academic performance of fifth- to eighth-grade students?

5. Among students from a single-parent family, is there a relationship between the frequency of contact with relatives and their academic achievement?

As a result of answering the research questions these were the major findings:

1. The subject scores (as measured by ITBS) were not significantly higher for students from two-parent families than the subject scores of students from single-parent families.

2. The composite score (as measured by ITBS) was not significantly higher for students from two-parent families than the composite score of students from single-parent families.
3. The home learning environment of students from single-parent families was significantly less positive than the learning environment of students from two-parent families.

4. No significant differences in global self esteem, peer self-esteem, school self-esteem and home self-esteem were found between students from single-parent families and students from two-parent families.

5. No significant relationships were found between academic performance of students and the length of time they had been part of single-parent families.

6. No significant relationships were found between the academic performance of students from single-parent families and the frequency of contact with their relatives.

Conclusions

The major conclusions of the study are discussed in this section. The subject scores (as measured by ITBS) were not significantly higher for students from two-parent families than the subject scores of students from single-parent families. The composite score (as measured by ITBS) was not significantly higher for students from two-parent families than the composite score of students from single-parent families as was expected based upon the review of literature. In 1984, Hetherington conducted an extensive review of 58 studies and found that the IQ difference between children in one- and two-parent families was not significant. In reexaminations of earlier research, Hetherington, Camara, and Featherman (1981) and Zakariya (1982) concluded that single-parent children are no more at risk academically than their two-parent peers. Other studies have found that
single-parent children actually performed better academically than children from two-parent families (Allison, 1985; Voza, 1982). In a study which consisted of 25,000 students and their families, it was concluded that student achievement was not significantly influenced by family configuration (Grissmer, Kirby, Berends, & Williamson, 1994). Hill and O’Neill (1993) found that the marital status variables have only weak and statistical insignificant effects on children’s achievement test scores.

In this study differences in the home learning environment of students existed between single-parent and two-parent families. There were differences in six items between one- and two-parent families. Three items showed two-parent adults were more affirming to their children when it comes to school matters than the one-parent adult. It may not be that a single parent is less interested in their child’s school activities and learning, but time a single-parent spends in the home interacting with the children in this study maybe less than the two-parent families. The majority (94.1%—see Table 3) of the single-parent families in this study are headed by a female. It is very possible that this parent had to return to the work force or increase his or her income with a second job (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor, 1989). In an effort to meet the financial needs of the family, one of which is their child’s school tuition, the amount of time a single parent spends in the home interacting with the children in this study was less than the two-parent families. Studies by Epstein (1991), Keith et al. (1993), Peng and Wright (1993), and Sui-Chi and Willms (1996) all found that parental involvement and the home learning environment that the parents create are factors that affect student academic achievement. Akimoff (1996) found that time spent by parents in the home with the child directly has an
impact on the child’s academic performance.

Another between the one- and two-parent family was the amount of education of the parents. The two-parent adults had more education than the one-parent adult. Henderson (1981) found that the parent’s level of education directly impacted a child’s academic performance. With the single-parent families of this study being headed for the most part by females, it is highly likely that several of these individuals did not finish college but married and were homemakers or worked at jobs that did not require a college degree. Lack of higher education would limit the types of jobs a single parent could obtain, thus impacting income potential. This parent, due to lack of education, may have to work more than one job or longer hours and decrease the amount of time spent in the home interacting with their family.

The final two differences were that two-parent adults read the newspaper more often and provided more magazines in the home than the one-parent adult. In all likelihood, the amount of free time the single parent have each day and perhaps his or her limited resources contributed to the differences.

No significant differences in global self-esteem, peer self-esteem, school self-esteem, and home self-esteem were found between students from single-parent families and students from two-parent families. The literature was mixed with findings on the effects of self-concept/self-esteem of a single-parent student’s academic achievement, but as a whole the studies support the general findings. Reynolds and Allen (1987) stated that students from single-parent homes had less positive self-esteem than their two-parent peers, but that there were other factors that could account for the differences. Morgan
(1993), however, found that single-parent students had as good as or higher self-esteem than their two-parent peers.

No significant differences were found between academic performance of students and the length of time they had been part of single-parent families. Studies by Allison (1985) and Voza (1982) found that despite time spent in a single-parent home the students did as well or better academically as their two-parent peers. Svanum et al. (1982) found that duration of single-parent status had no significant effect on student achievement. In the High School and Beyond study (Marsh, 1989) the conclusion was that time spent in a single-parent home had little influence on student achievement.

No significant differences relationships were found between the academic performance of students from single-parent families and the frequency of contact with their relatives. It appears that whatever is needed to minimize the adverse effect on the academics of the single-parent child has been accomplished through relative contact (59%—weekly and daily) or limited relative contact (41%—one or twice a month). Brandwein, Brown, & Fox (1974) found that many single-female parents return to their parents' home after becoming single.

Recommendations

The analysis of the data in this study revealed that the home learning environment of single-parent students was found to be less positive than that of their two-parent peers. It is therefore recommended that the Seventh-day Adventist church and educators should address the following issues:
1. With an increase of the number of Seventh-day Adventist young people attending Adventist schools being affected by divorce, it is recommended that college education majors and teachers working on re-certification be given opportunity to take course work that gives instruction on dealing with non-traditional families with special focus on the home learning environment.

2. With the majority of single-parent families being headed by women (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1997), it is important that the Seventh-day Adventist church provide tuition assistance so that students can attend school without their parent having to work additional jobs, diminishing the time spent in the home and thus jeopardizing the home learning environment.

3. It is recommended that local Seventh-day Adventist churches support working single parents by providing free before- and after-school childcare and tutoring in order to enhance missing aspects of the home learning environment due to parent absence.

**Recommendations for Practice**

The following recommendations for are based upon my personal observation:

1. It is recommended that the General Conference Education Department or Union Conference Education Departments develop in-service training and curriculum materials to assist teachers in dealing with non-traditional families with special focus on the home learning environment.

2. It is recommended that a better system be put in place so that statistical data on the single-parent and non-traditional families served by the Seventh-day Adventist
educational system can be more easily obtained.

3. It is recommended that Union Conference Education Departments present an in-service to their principals, associate superintendents, and superintendents on the topic of non-traditional and single-parent families so that they may go back to their schools and conferences and in-service their teachers.

4. It is recommended that Local Conference Education Departments and/or large schools present an in-service to their administrators and teachers on the topic of non-traditional and single-parent families looking at research and addressing issues effecting these families.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following issues are recommended for further study:

1. Due to the opposition of several parents regarding testing of self-concept, another study should be conducted without that variable in order to increase participation.

2. A research study is needed to discover the reasons single-parent students are leaving Seventh-day Adventist schools.

3. Based on the review of literature, I expected to find a significant difference in the self-esteem of single-parent students and their two-parent peers. No differences were found in this study. Further investigation is needed to discover why this did not occur.

4. Based upon the idea that more family support/contact is positive for the single-parent student, I expected to find a positive correlation between frequency of family contact with a single-parent student and the student’s academic achievement. Further
study is needed to determine why this was not true.

5. In gathering the data from the Family Survey, a problem was discovered in Item #2. Parents were asked to indicate how long the current marital status had been in effect. A parent could have been single for several years and married for the last year—the student would be classified as from a two-parent home. The parents could have been separated for 4 years and divorced 2 years. The child would be classified as 2 years in a single-parent home rather than 6 years. In future research, the problem associated with the way the length-of-time-in-current-marital-status question is asked in the Family Survey needs to be addressed to avoid incorrect data (length of time at that marital status) or wrong classification of the family.

6. No significant difference between the two types of families were found for four of the five research questions. Perhaps the retention of only 1 research hypothesis was due to the small number of single parents and single-parent students who participated in this study. Future studies should be conducted with the aim of involving significantly more single parents and their children.
Dear Parent:

My name is Joe Allison. I am currently the Vice principal at Spring Valley Academy. I am also working on my Doctoral program at Andrews University. As part of my program requirements, I must write a dissertation. I have chosen the Ohio Conference Seventh-day Adventist schools to be a part of a study to determine if there is any correlation between parental status, home learning environment, self-esteem and academic achievement of fifth through eighth grade students. I feel that this information would help in the development of materials and curriculum not only for our schools here in Ohio, but all across the United States.

Enclosed you will find several items. The Henderson Environmental Learning Scale and the Family Survey are to filled out by a parent and returned in the self-addressed stamped envelop. Two copies of the Informed Consent form for the Hare Self-Esteem Scale are enclosed. One copy should be completed and returned in the same envelop with the surveys if you want your child to participate in the Hare Scale and the other copy is for your records. Once I have the Informed Consent forms back, I will begin to visit all the Seventh-day Adventist schools in Ohio to administer the Hare Self-Esteem Scale. Completion takes no more than fifteen minutes. Your child may withdraw from the study at anytime. A copy of the Hare Self-Esteem Scale has been enclosed so that you might see what it is your child is being asked to complete as part of this study. If you have any questions about any of the materials, please feel free to call me collect at (513) 848-8149.

Completing and returning all these materials is a very important part of my study. Your help will be greatly appreciated. Names and addresses will not be used at anytime. Only the anonymous data collected will be reported. All information collected will be destroyed after the study is complete. As a Thank you for your assistance, the data that is gathered will be shared with you. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Joseph R. Allison
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APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORMS
A research study is being conducted to discover if there is any correlation between parental status, home learning environment, self-esteem and academic achievement of fifth through eighth grade students who attend an Ohio Seventh-day Adventist school. Students in these grades will be asked to complete a Hare Self-Esteem Scale. The survey consist of 30 questions divided into three areas that influence a child's self-esteem (Peers, Home and School). A score is given that corresponds to the responses a child gives. A high score means a high self-esteem. A low score means a low self-esteem. The proposed dates for the completion of the scale are March 25 to May 30, 1996. This research is being done with hopes of assisting educators in the development of new materials and curriculum that would be of value to students.

The researcher will conduct a fifteen minute session to complete the scale at each Ohio Seventh-day Adventist school. These surveys will be kept in the researcher's confidential files. The information will be coded so that the identity of the parent, the student and their school will be protected. All information gathered will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

Your students' participation is totally voluntary. Your students may discontinue their participation at anytime during the process.

I, ____________________________________________________________________________, principal of ___________________________, give permission for Joe Allison to administer the Hare Self-Esteem Scale to our students whose parents have given consent for them to be a participant in the study described above. I do this with the knowledge that this study has been approved by the Ohio Conference Board of Education and the Scholarly Research Department of Andrews University.

Signed: ____________________________________________ Date: __________

(Principal)
A research study is being conducted to discover if there is any correlation between parental status, home learning environment, self-esteem and academic achievement of fifth through eighth grade students who attend an Ohio Seventh-day Adventist school. Students in these grades will be asked to complete a Hare Self-Esteem Scale. The survey consists of 30 questions divided into three areas that influence a child's self-esteem (Peers, Home and School). A score is given that corresponds to the responses a child gives. A high score means a high self-esteem. A low score means a low self-esteem. The proposed dates for the completion of the scale are March 25 to April 30, 1996. This research is being done with hopes of assisting educators in the development of new materials and curriculum that would be of value to students.

The researcher will conduct a fifteen minute session to complete the scale at each Ohio Seventh-day Adventist school. These surveys will be kept in the researcher's confidential files. The information will be coded so that the identity of the parent, the student and their school will be protected. All information gathered will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

Your child's participation is totally voluntary. Your child may discontinue their participation at anytime during the process. If you have any questions about this study, please call collect at the number given for the researcher at the top of the page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Two-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>One-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Two-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>One-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-3.80</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Two-Parent Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>One-Parent Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Prob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11

COMPARISON BETWEEN ONE-PARENT AND TWO-PARENT FAMILY ON THE HSS - PEER ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Two-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>One-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**TABLE 12**

**COMPARISON BETWEEN ONE-PARENT AND TWO-PARENT FAMILY ON THE HSS - HOME ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Two-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>One-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 13

**COMPARISON BETWEEN ONE-PARENT AND TWO-PARENT FAMILY ON THE HSS -SCHOOL ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Two-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>One-Parent Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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