

A MIXED METHODS STUDY OF THE AIR FORCE JROTC LEADERSHIP
PROGRAM AT AN URBAN HIGH SCHOOL IN SOUTHEASTERN VIRGINIA

by

Shafeeq A. Ameen

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia
Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

Travis W. Twiford

Carol S. Cash

Theodore B. Creighton

James T. Roberts

October 27, 2009

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords:

Keywords: JROTC, GPA, Attendance Rate, Disciplinary Referrals, Dropout Rate

A Mixed Methods Study of the Air Force JROTC Leadership Program at an Urban High School in Southeastern Virginia

Shafeeq A. Ameen

ABSTRACT

The JROTC program is one of service and commitment. Its mission is to build better citizens and give them a sense of pride in service to their fellow man. Today these core principles are still needed, but with the increase in the student dropout rate, the JROTC program can be one of many alternatives needed to help public education reach today's youth who are struggling to stay in school.

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to examine the impact of the Air Force JROTC Leadership Program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals, and dropout rate of JROTC students at an urban high school in southeastern Virginia. The study also addressed the perceptions of school administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents on students enrolled in the program during the 2005-2009 school years.

Descriptive statistics were used to determine the means, standard deviations and frequency distributions for the groups in the study. Three independent sample t-tests and seven one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA's) were used to determine where there was a statistically significant difference for each group. The Tukey post hoc procedure was used to determine where the difference occurred in the variables.

There were three major findings revealed in this study. The first finding indicated that students who participated in the JROTC program had lower grade point averages

($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.17$) than non-JROTC participants ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.94$). Second, administrators had higher levels of agreement (100%) than AFJROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents that leadership skills were developed in the AFJROTC program. Third, JROTC students (12%) and parents (7%) had lower levels of agreement than administrators, AFJROTC instructors and teachers that the AFJROTC program is used as a recruitment tool.

Focus groups results showed strong support for the program from administrators, teachers, JROTC students and parents. These findings suggest that if school districts and educational leaders are to benefit from implementing the AFJROTC program they must understand that the program is not designed to impact academics. The program is designed to develop leadership skills along with helping students become better citizens. Educational leaders in school districts should read the findings and consider utilizing the program as a possible alternative to help students to develop skills to keep them from dropping out of school.

DEDICATION

The writer dedicates this work to his beloved wife, Denise Ameen. You have supported me from the very beginning and encouraged me to be the man I am today. To my lovely daughters, Jahaan, Khadijah, and Maryam, thank you for making me proud to be a father.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my advisor, Dr. Travis Twiford, and my committee members, Dr. Carol Cash, Dr. Theodore Creighton, and Dr. James Roberts thank you for your support, knowledge, and advice.

To my wife, Denise and children, Jahaan, Khadijah, and Maryam your love and understanding have made this research process worth the effort.

To my cohort, thank you for your support and advice. You will all be life-long friends and colleagues.

To the staff of the urban high school, thank all of you for helping support me over the past ten years.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....iii

Dedication.....iv

Acknowledgement.....v

Table of Contents.....vi

List of Tables.....viii

Chapter 1 - Introduction.....1

 Need for the Study.....4

 Significance of the Study.....7

 Summary.....8

 Organization of the Study.....9

Chapter 2 - Literature Review10

 History of the JROTC Program.....10

 A Brief History of the Air Force JROTC.....11

 Controversy Regarding JROTC.....13

 Dissertations on JROTC.....15

 Summary.....23

Chapter 3 - Methodology.....25

 Design.....25

 Population and Sample25

 Instrumentation26

 Pilot Study.....27

 Participant Release.....28

 Data Collection Procedures.....29

 Data Analysis Procedures.....30

 Summary.....32

Chapter 4 - Analysis of the Data.....34

 Response Rates.....34

 Archival Data.....35

 Analysis of the Survey.....37

 Focus Group Data Analysis.....76

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Group One..... | 77 |
| Group Two..... | 80 |
| Summary..... | 83 |
| | |
| Chapter 5 - Summary of Recommendations..... | 86 |
| Findings..... | 86 |
| Limitations..... | 91 |
| Implications for Practice..... | 91 |
| Recommendations for Future Research..... | 96 |
| Concluding Remarks..... | 97 |
| | |
| References..... | 101 |
| | |
| Appendices..... | 104 |
| A. Pilot Survey..... | 104 |
| B. School Survey..... | 107 |
| C. Focus Group Interview Questions..... | 109 |
| D. Transcript of Focus Group Interview Questions..... | 110 |
| E. Parental Permission Form..... | 117 |
| F. Informed Consent for Participants..... | 118 |
| H. Human Subjects Approval..... | 120 |

List of Tables

Tables

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | Descriptive Statistics on the GPA, Attendance Rate and Disciplinary Referral for JROTC and Non-JROTC Students Combined.. | 35 |
| 1.2 | T-Test Means and Standard Deviations to Compare the JROTC and Non-JROTC Students in Three Categories GPA, Attendance and Discipline | 36 |
| 1.3 | Independent Sample T-Tests on GPA, Attendance, and Discipline. | 37 |
| 1.4 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question One that the JROTC Program Teaches Leadership Skills among the Five Groups. | 39 |
| 1.5 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Two that JROTC Students are in more Leadership Positions than Non-JROTC Students at the Urban High School among the Five Groups. | 40 |
| 1.6 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Three that JROTC Students are viewed as Leaders at the Urban High School among the Five Groups of Respondents. | 41 |
| 1.7 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Four that JROTC Students have Greater Leadership Skills than Non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups Of Respondents. | 42 |

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.8 | Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Leadership Skills Development Category..... | 43 |
| 1.9 | Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions on the Leadership Skills Development Category from the Five Respondents..... | 43 |
| 1.10 | Post Hoc Results of Perceptions of Leadership Skills Development Category Questions among the Five Respondent groups..... | 44 |
| 1.11 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Five that the JROTC Program Teaches Goal Setting Skills among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 45 |
| 1.12 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Six that JROTC Students have Greater Goal Setting Skills than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 46 |
| 1.13 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Seven that JROTC Students are more Goal Oriented than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 47 |
| 1.14 | Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Goal Setting Skills Category..... | 48 |

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.15 | Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of the Goal Setting Skills Category from the Five Respondents..... | 49 |
| 1.16 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Eight that the JROTC Students have a Greater Respect for Authority in General than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 50 |
| 1.17 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Nine that the JROTC Program Teaches Students to Respect Authority among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 51 |
| 1.18 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Ten that JROTC Students have a Greater Respect for Administrators than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 52 |
| 1.19 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale Responses to Question Eleven that JROTC Students Display more Respect to Teachers and Peers than Non-JROTC students among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 53 |
| 1.20 | Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Respect for Authority Category..... | 54 |
| 1.21 | Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of Respect for Authority Category from the Five Respondents..... | 54 |

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.22 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twelve that the JROTC Program Prepares Students for Life after High School among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 56 |
| 1.23 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Thirteen that the JROTC Program has a Positive Influence on Students Enrolled in the Program at the Urban High School among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 57 |
| 1.24 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Fourteen that the JROTC Program has been Effective at Helping Students Become more Responsible at the Urban High School among the Five Groups of Respondents | 58 |
| 1.25 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Fifteen that JROTC Students are a Valued Asset in Public High School among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 59 |
| 1.26 | Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Impact to School Category..... | 60 |
| 1.27 | Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of Impact to School Category from the Five Respondents..... | 60 |

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.28 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Sixteen that the JROTC Students have greater Citizenship Skills than Non-JROTC Students among the Five Group of Respondents..... | 61 |
| 1.29 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Seventeen that the JROTC Program Teaches Citizenship Development among the Five Group of Respondents | 62 |
| 1.30 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Eighteen that the JROTC Students are more Patriotic than Non-JROTC Students among the Five Group of Respondents..... | 63 |
| 1.31 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Nineteen that the JROTC Program Promotes Patriotism at the School among the Five Group of Respondents..... | 64 |
| 1.32 | Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Citizenship Development Category..... | 65 |
| 1.33 | Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of Citizenship Development Category from the Five Respondents..... | 66 |

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.34 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty that the JROTC Program Teaches Students Self Discipline among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 67 |
| 1.35 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty-One that JROTC Students Display Self Discipline in School among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 68 |
| 1.36 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty-Two that Self Discipline is a Major Component of the JROTC Program among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 69 |
| 1.37 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Twenty-Three that JROTC Students are more Disciplined than Non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 70 |
| 1.38 | Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Self Discipline Category..... | 71 |
| 1.39 | Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of Self Discipline Category from the Five Respondents..... | 71 |

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.40 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Twenty-Four that the JROTC Program Influences Students to Join the Military among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 73 |
| 1.41 | Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from the Responses to Question Twenty-Five that the JROTC Program Used as a Military Recruitment Tool among the Five Groups of Respondents..... | 74 |
| 1.42 | Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Opposing Viewpoint Category..... | 75 |
| 1.43 | Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of the Opposing Viewpoint Category from the Five respondents..... | 75 |
| 1.44 | Post Hoc Results for the Perceptions on the Opposing Viewpoint Category Questions among the Five Respondent Groups..... | 76 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the Air Force Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate on approximately 50 JROTC students at an urban high school in southeastern Virginia. The study also addressed the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents regarding leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline for students who were enrolled in the program during the 2005-2009 school years.

The researcher used a mixed methods study to investigate the topic. The quantitative portion of the study consisted of archival data on both JROTC and non-JROTC students. The researcher attempted to ascertain if there was a statistical difference in the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for the 50 JROTC student's verses non-JROTC students at the urban high school. The qualitative portion of the study was comprised of a survey directed towards administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents.

Preventing school dropout and promoting successful graduation are national concerns that pose a significant challenge for schools and educational communities (Christenson, 2004). Since its inception the Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program has had as its primary objective the education and development of student leaders. In 1989, under the leadership of Major General Arnold Wagner, the Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program has made a fundamental shift in its emphasis

from purely leadership training to lowering the dropout rate in American high schools in which they are stationed (personal communication, October 3, 2008).

“With millions of young lives at stake and an educational system in crisis, is it time to send in the troops?” (Smith, p.4). Over the past decade, the value associated with the acquisition of a high school education has increased, but attaining a high school education is becoming more challenging for many in our society. Several articles and national studies written over the past several years (Ramirez, E. 2008 & Christle, C; Jolivette, K; Nelson, C. 2007) have repeatedly demonstrated that far fewer American students are completing high school with diplomas than had previously been realized. In a special analytic report on high school graduation entitled, “Cities in Crisis”, Christopher B. Swanson, Director of Editorial Projects at the Education Research Center commented on the perception of high school graduation figures. Dr. Swanson observed that ... "the graduation rate is around 85 percent, but a growing consensus has emerged indicating that only seven in ten students are actually successfully finishing high school" (Swanson, 2008, p.1). Although students who are at a greater risk for dropping out of school can be identified, they disengage from school and drop out for a variety of reasons for which there is no one common solution (Christenson, 2004).

The term "dropout" was initially developed by the military. The usage of the term became applicable to educators because both the military and the educational community are social institutions that provide opportunities to their participants (Dorn & Johanningmeier, 1999).

The dropout problem has been a contention of study since the 1950's. Allen (1956) developed four characteristics that dropouts typically have in common:

1. Dropouts were unsuccessful in their school activities;
2. Most dropouts took little or no part in school activities;
3. Most dropouts placed a low value on schooling; and

4. Most dropouts were from low-income families and had difficulty in meeting school costs.

Students who drop out of school play a key role in reshaping the economic landscape of our society. For example, in 1997, the National Center for Educational Statistics indicated that in 1987 high school dropouts earned \$0.67 for every dollar a high school graduate earned; however, in 1995 the high school dropouts earned only \$0.48 for every dollar earned by a high school graduate (<http://nces.ed.gov/>). Recent estimates indicated that 10.5 percent of youth ages 16 to 24 are not attending school and have not completed high school. More than three out of every ten students in the U.S. drop out of high school, thereby lessening their chances of becoming productive, economically successful citizens (Holland, 2003). Despite the increased importance of a high school education, the high school completion rate for the nation has increased only slightly. As result of these figures in 2002, the United States General Accounting Office placed the Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program at the top of its list to receive federal funds for dropout prevention in public high schools (United States General Accounting Office, 2002).

To properly examine the Air Force Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and the dropout rate for approximately 50 JROTC students enrolled in the program at an urban high school in southeastern Virginia during the 2005-2009 school years was investigated. In addition, administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents completed a survey to determine their perceptions regarding the Air Force JROTC program at the urban high school. This chapter provides an overview of the purpose of the study, the need for the study, the research questions, the significance of the study, the summary and the organization of the study.

The Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program is a high school initiative funded jointly by local school districts and the Department of Defense (DOD). There are several branches of the military that sponsor JROTC programs in high schools throughout the country. The type of military branch programs being offered varies for school divisions throughout each state. In the urban school division where this study took place, the Air Force JROTC branch is operated in six out of the seven high schools. Like the other branches of the armed services, the Air Force JROTC program is specifically designed to develop leadership skills in high school students enrolled in their program. In addition, as a part of their new mandate, they are instructed to help reduce the dropout rate in schools in which they are located.

Need for the Study

An extensive search of the literature was conducted utilizing dissertations, empirical studies and official JROTC literature. Substantial data were collected on how the JROTC program develops leadership skills, but no information was obtained which examined the impact of the Air Force JROTC program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for students enrolled. In addition, no study was found on the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents on the Air Force JROTC program. Several of the studies focused primarily on leadership training and the benefits that the JROTC program had relevant to the school environment. In addition, the impact that the program had within their individual school buildings was reported by administrators, counselors and teachers (Bogden, 1984, Perusse, 1997, Taylor, 1999, Dohle, 2001, Morris, 2003, Long, 2003, and Mullholland, 2005). While other studies focused on the impact of the JROTC program on a national level, the researcher was unable to find an independent study which examined the Air Force JROTC program

relevant to both the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate and perceptions of administrations, JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents at one urban school.

There were six research questions which were utilized in the study. The questions evaluated the impact of enrollment in the program on the grade point average, attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and the dropout rate. Also, the questions evaluated if the participant's perceived that leadership skills development, respect for authority, citizenship skills development, goal setting skills and self discipline was observed on JROTC students and contributed to reducing the dropout rate. The six research questions were as followed:

1. What was the impact of enrollment in the Air Force JROTC program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and the dropout rate of those students who were enrolled for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
2. What are the opinions of school administrators that the JROTC program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
3. In what ways do JROTC instructors perceive that the JROTC program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
4. In what ways do teachers perceive that the JROTC program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?

5. In what ways do students who were enrolled in the JROTC program perceive that the program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
6. In what ways do parents of students who were enrolled in the JROTC program perceive that the program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?

An extensive search of the literature was conducted related to the history, curriculum and objectives of both the JROTC program generally and specifically the Air Force JROTC program at the urban high school. Substantial data were collected on how the JROTC program develops leadership skills, but little information was obtained on the examination of the Air Force JROTC program using a mixed methods format. There was one specific study conducted by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (Taylor, 1999) which focused on the benefits of the JROTC program at reducing the dropout rate and increasing the graduation percentage. The remaining studies utilized for this research focused primarily on leadership training and the benefits that the JROTC program had within their individual school building as reported by administrators, counselors and teachers (Bogden, 1984, Perusse, 1997, Dohle, 2001, Morris, 2003, Long, 2003, and Mullholland, 2005).

In a recent study, Smith (2008) found that the concept of hand in hand mentoring developed by the United States Air Force prepared JROTC students most effectively for success in school and life by positively presenting role models in the form of Air Force

JROTC instructors. Hand in hand mentoring utilizes the method of presenting Air Force instructors as positive role models for the students and allowing the instructors to detail their life experiences of hard work, determination and goal setting as a pattern for the students to follow. Smith (2008) further expressed that this example helped students to set their own goals and to look at the educational setting as a place to grow both individually and collectively.

The specific knowledge of administrators and teachers of the JROTC program's role in helping combat the national problem of high school dropouts has not been documented. Air Force JROTC instructors at this urban high school were given a survey questionnaire and participated in a focus group discussion to determine how they work with both the administrative team and teachers as they attempted to assist students in developing leadership skills, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline. The objective was to use these components to ultimately achieve the Air Force JROTC's goal of lowering the dropout rate in public high school.

Significance of the Study

Although studies attest to the overall benefit of JROTC programs within the high school setting, there is a gap in the literature relevant to the Air Force JROTC program impact on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, discipline referrals and the dropout rate. There is also a gap in the literature on the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents on the Air Force JROTC programs. This study attempted to fill this gap by specifically presenting new data on the Air Force JROTC program at an urban high school utilizing a mixed methods format. This approach helped the researcher collect quantitative data on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for students to see if there was a statistical difference for the group of students listed above. The 50 Air Force JROTC students who were enrolled

in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years were compared with fifty students from the general school population during the same school years. In addition, the researcher was able to utilize qualitative data through surveying administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents on their perceptions related to the program

Summary

“Dropping out of high school is a serious problem, not only for the individuals, the school system, and the community, but also for society” (Christle, Jolivet & Nelson, 2007 p.325). To help address this problem, the Air Force Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program, which historically has provided both leadership skills training for high school students, now has as its new mandate the reduction in the dropout rate at public high schools in which they are stationed. In the urban school district in southeastern Virginia where this study took place there are seven high schools. The Air Force JROTC program is instituted in six of the seven schools. The last school to begin the Air Force JROTC program in the urban school district occurred during the 2008-2009 school year.

The impact of JROTC program on reducing the dropout rate in the high school in which it is located was examined to see if there was a statistical difference in the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate of students enrolled in the program versus non-JROTC at the urban high school. The researcher also assessed the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents regarding the Air Force JROTC program. This mixed methods study helped investigate these items at an urban public high school in southeastern Virginia through both quantitative archival data and a qualitative survey on JROTC students enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years.

Organization of the Study

This study was divided into a series of five chapters. Chapter I featured the introduction to the study and build a foundation for the purpose of the study and reinforce the purpose with six research questions. The chapter also addressed the need, significance and organization of the study. Chapter II covered a review of literature by providing selected literature related to both the JROTC nationally and the Air Force JROTC program locally at the urban high school in southeastern Virginia. Chapter III presented the methodology by providing the population and sample, the instrumentation, the pilot study, the participant release, a description of the data collection procedures and the method of analysis. Chapter IV provided the data analysis of the findings as a result of the investigation. It included the response rate, archival data, analysis of the survey and an analysis of the focus groups. Chapter V concluded with a summary and recommendations of the research. This chapter provided the findings, limitations, implications for practice, recommendations for future research and concluding remarks.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of the JROTC Program

The Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) has been a part of the American educational system for nearly ninety years (Long, 2003). In 1911, Army Lieutenant Edgar R. Steevers founded the Army Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps program in Cheyenne, Wyoming. Inspector-instructor Lieutenant Steevers was placed in charge of the military command in the state. During his tenure, he conceived the idea of developing a noncompulsory cadet corps of public school students. The Navy, Marines, and Air Force operate JROTC training programs that are likewise governed by the same conditions as the Army JROTC (Coumbe & Harford, 1996). President George H. W. Bush gave a speech at the Lincoln Technical Institute in Union, New Jersey, where he praised the benefits of the JROTC program. Bush stated, "Today I'm doubling the size of our JROTC program... We're going to expand it from 1500 to 2900 schools... JROTC is a great program..." (Bush, 1992, p.22).

The National Defense Act of 1916 authorized a junior course for non-college military schools, high schools and other non-preparatory school Public Law 88-647, known as the JROTC Vitalization Act of 1964, directed the secretaries of each of the military services to establish and maintain JROTC units for their respective services (Smith, 2008). Further, in 1992, General Colin Powell, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, went to South Central Los Angeles after the riots of 1992. Powell declared that, "...youth needed the discipline and structure offered by the military..." (The Brookings Institute, 2007, p.16).

As a result of the National Defense Act of 1916, the Vitalization Act of 1964, the speech made by President George W. Bush in 1992 and comments made by General Colin Powell, more interest was generated by local school districts in utilizing the JROTC program in helping guide and direct the youth within public education (The Brookings Institute, 2007). One specific interest that districts nationwide wanted addressed was how to reduce the number of students who dropout of school.

Annually, the Air Force conducts studies pertaining directly to the impact that the JROTC program has within the public high school setting. The school administrators can easily access the annual studies. Each administrator can use these studies to reflect on the impact of the JROTC program on student's attendance, graduation rate and suspension issues (www.au.af.mil/au/).

Hugh B. Price from The Brookings Institution further emphasized these figures by indicating the need for the intervention of military resources in combating the issues facing public education. Price acknowledged that if properly matched to local needs, and coordinated with civilian efforts, the JROTC program can make a useful contribution to addressing the problems we face in schools and elsewhere (The Brookings Institute, 2007).

A Brief History of the Air Force JROTC

The Air Force JROTC program provides citizenship training and an aerospace science program for high school students. Enrollment in the Air Force JROTC program is open to all students who are in grades above the 8th grade, physically fit, and United States citizens. Each of the Air Force JROTC units must maintain an enrollment of at least 100 students or 10 percent of the school enrollment, whichever is less. The AFJROTC program is offered at 869 high schools throughout the country. Schools are selected upon the basis of fair and equitable distribution throughout the nation. Retired Air Force commissioned and

non-commissioned officers who are full-time faculty members of the participating high school and employed by the local school board teach Air Force JROTC classes (Air University, 2006).

The mission of the Air Force JROTC program is to develop citizens of character dedicated to serving their nation and community. The goals of the program are to instill a sense of accomplishment in high school students. The objectives of Air Force JROTC are to educate and train high school cadets in citizenship, promote community service, instill responsibility, character, and self-discipline, and provide instruction in air and space fundamentals (Air University, 2006).

Instructors in the JROTC program at the urban high school conduct themselves under the principles of the Air Force structured leadership studies curriculum. The curriculum is based on teaching effective leadership skills to cadets (JROTC students) through the art of modeling. Instructors were taught that the most effective way to teach is by example. Each instructor was promoted and elevated themselves through the highest ranks within the United States Air Force. Through their own experience, seniority and promotion, they were placed in positions that serve as a point of reference to the cadets. Instructors at the urban high school also lead through a process called hand in hand mentorship. This process illustrates through direct interaction with the instructors, the skills that the student will need in order to be a successful Air Force JROTC cadet. Mentors help prepare students for increased responsibilities that will help further their development in and outside of the classroom. Mentorship enhances morale and discipline and improves the educational environment while maintaining respect for authority (Smith, 2008).

The Air Force JROTC program is primarily a 3 – year course of military instruction, with an optional fourth year being for high school students. The fourth year is available in high

schools that have ninth through twelfth grade students. The fourth year curriculum is academically comparable to a secondary level science course. Each year is divided into two categories: Aerospace Science (AS) and Leadership Education (LE).

The Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program was initially designed to teach the foundations of leadership training. The Air Force JROTC instructors were commissioned to help build better citizens and leaders who are both self-confident and self-reliant. Instructors strongly believe that once a cadet commits to the Air Force JROTC leadership program he becomes a leader in the minds of teachers, administrators and fellow students in the school community. As a by-product of this belief, instructors feel that they are helping to achieve the goal of leadership by educating proud and patriotic cadets as tomorrow's leaders (Smith, 2008). In conjunction with the instructor's remarks, a fellow instructor from another state echoed similar comment, "A good leader is a good follower," says Sgt. Major Henry, an instructor from Rahway High School in New Jersey (Shearing, E. 2007, p.2). "We want to teach responsibility, self-reliant, self-disciplined to young adults. If students learn nothing else, the key lesson is taking responsibility for their own actions" (Shearing, E. 2007, p.2).

Controversy Regarding JROTC

Although there are several experts (Bogden, 1984; Taylor, 1999; Logan, 2000; Dohle, 2001; Morris, 2003; Marks, 2004; Mulholland, 2005; Perusse, 1997; Smith, 2008) who acknowledge the benefits of JROTC programs, the proliferation of the programs has led to criticism from peace activists who denounce the military training and tactics in schools. In addition, some political leaders claim the benefits of the program are suspect (Long, 2003). In July 2000, commentary and Veterans for Peace activist John Amidon researched a proposed Marine Corps JROTC program scheduled to begin at Albany (NY) High School in September 2000. The cost for the Albany School District would be \$25,000. Before the program could begin the approval process, the school board had to agree to institute a JROTC

program within their district. Groups such as: the Veterans for Peace, Albany Catholic Workers, Albany Friends Meeting (Quakers) and high school students objected to the Marine Corps JROTC in the high school. The pressure by these groups forced the district superintendent to rescind the plan.

Veterans for Peace outlined a plan of action to stop JROTC branches from opening in Albany public high schools. The plan of action was as follows:

1. Look for any challenges or issues in the targeted school and ask whether the military is the best solution.
2. Examine the JROTC curriculum and release information about its problems.
3. Ask if the administration or the school board has seen the curriculum.
4. Recognize issues of race and class.
5. Address budget information and the role of the military (Amidon, 2000).

The main focus of the opposing group was that JROTC programs present a growing perception of militarization within the high school setting and would eventually erode the quality of public education (Amidon, 2000).

Additional criticism was waged against the JROTC programs within the public high school setting (Lutz & Bartlett, 1995). In their analysis of the Army JROTC program they asserted that the claims associated with the curriculum of reducing the dropout rate and developing leadership training could not be substantiated with data reported by the JROTC program to the schools. Lutz & Bartlett's chief findings were that while schools may take on a JROTC unit hoping to gain resources, in fact, JROTC drains resources from other educational programs through cost-sharing requirements. Finally, Lutz & Bartlett state that it is difficult to properly validate the JROTC claims of reducing the dropout rate because of the high rate of attrition in the JROTC program (Lutz & Bartlett, 1995).

Dissertations on JROTC

There have been several studies that focus on JROTC programs and their effect on public education and specifically public high schools. Many of these studies investigate either the social or academic impact of the JROTC program on cadets, administrators, counselors, fellow students and teachers at the schools at which they are stationed (Perusse, 1997, Morris, 2003, Marks, 2004, Smith, 2008).

Bogden (1984) conducted a series of semi-structured interviews of high school administrators, teachers, guidance counselors, school committee members, and students associated with two high school JROTC programs in Massachusetts. The programs were made up of a Marine Corps JROTC program and an Air Force JROTC program. Bogden investigated through a series of interviews the perceived value of the JROTC at the public high schools. Bogden was able to identify self-esteem, self-discipline, camaraderie, social grouping, and student discipline as the six attributes that affect the JROTC program ((Santora, 2006). As a result, Bogden was able to use these six specific attributes of the perceived value of the JROTC program to schools and formulate a conclusion. Bogden concluded that the best measure of a JROTC program's effectiveness is the perception of those in the school community who are most responsible for the program and not goals derived from the military, or the school board (Bogden, 1984).

As Bogden was able to frame the argument for the value of the JROTC program based on the perceptions of the school community, Logan (2000) was able to look specifically at secondary school principals. He utilized an attitude inventory sheet to gather data on the secondary principal's beliefs regarding the Marine Corps JROTC at their schools. Logan sampled 100 secondary school principals in schools which host a Marine Corps JROTC program across the nation. Based on the findings he was able to conclude that the secondary principals were in general agreement that the Marine JROTC programs at their schools

should develop the traits of leadership skills, strengthen character, and form habits of self-discipline. All the secondary principals were not in complete agreement that the Marine JROTC programs at their specific schools were presently developing these traits.

Bogden concluded that based on questionnaires, surveys and interviews administered to principals that 55 of the principals (56.75%) strongly agreed leadership skills are currently being emphasized at their schools through the JROTC program, 33 principals (34%) agreed that it was emphasized; (8.2%) were neutral on the issue; and (1%) strongly disagreed that it was currently being emphasized. Thus, 90.75% of the principals agreed that the JROTC program taught leadership skills. On the statement of maintaining the Marine JROTC programs at their schools for the next five years, 100 principals responded. Out of the 100 respondents, 98 (98%) of the principals overwhelmingly agreed that the JROTC program should remain in their school building for the next five years.

Morris (2003) was able to continue with Logan's (2000) theme of viewing the perceptions of principal's relevant to the JROTC program at high schools in North Carolina. Morris (2003) investigated 184 high school principals in public high schools with JROTC programs as well as those whose schools did not host a program. Morris (2003) attempted to determine the perceptions of principals in North Carolina as to the benefits of the JROTC program relevant to the school, students and the community at large.

Morris (2003) was able to conclude that principals, in general, had a positive perception of the JROTC programs in their schools. There were three factors that Morris (2003) concluded had the greatest influence on principals beliefs. They were: their years of experience working with a JROTC program, the quality of the instructors, and being associated with a school that hosted a JROTC program (Santora, 2006).

Long (2003) further addressed the areas that were of the greatest concern to schools that host JROTC programs. The areas of concern were helping at-risk high school students with

discipline and motivation. Finally, Long concluded that the JROTC program's aim was to aid those students who are said to be lacking discipline, motivation, and hope. Long observed that Junior ROTC while being an attractive program at reaching at-risk high school students is not a quick-fix approach to the numerous structural and social barriers placed in front of our youth.

Marks (2004) took the previous studies by Logan (2000) and Morris (2003) a step further by analyzing the perceptions of public high school principals and their Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) senior Army instructors about the cost effectiveness and value of the JROTC in impacting student dropouts. The sample for this study included principals and senior Army instructors at each of those high schools, two of which were in northwestern North Carolina and one of which was in northeast Tennessee. Marks (2004) investigated the per-student costs for the operation of the JROTC programs and the dropout rates for JROTC and non-JROTC students. Only two of the three schools could determine their program costs and the average annual cost for those was \$731 per student. Marks (2004) used the 2002 student cohort method of comparison to determine both the JROTC group and the non-JROTC group to ascertain the similarity of dropout rates (22.2% versus 21.2% dropout rate) between the two groups. The perceptions of the administrators were gauged in pre-test/post-test scenarios where they were given a 30 question survey using a Likert-type scale which ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

Marks (2004) concluded that the data revealed that JROTC students had a 22.2% drop out percentage compared to 21.2% for non-JROTC students. The analysis of the research determined that principals and senior Army instructors both perceived the JROTC programs to be worth the \$731 cost per student.

Mullholland (2005) examined both the expansion of JROTC programs in public schools and the impact the program has on leadership development. A major focus of the author was

to highlight leadership training incorporated within the program. Mullholland noted that it states clearly in the textbook, *Leadership Education and Training*, that one of the largest components of the JROTC curriculum is leadership.

Perusse (1997) investigated the perceptions school counselors have towards the JROTC program. To gather information a survey was generated and mailed to school counselors. The survey focused on school counselors' perceptions about the relationship of JROTC to the military beliefs, and attitudes regarding possible benefits to students, characteristics of students for which JROTC is a recommended elective, and characteristics of students who might benefit most from the JROTC program. Perusse also incorporated a questionnaire containing statements about the claims of the JROTC program at developing leadership training and benefiting the overall school environment in non-academic terms. The questionnaire contained a combination of true/false questions, Likert-type scale questions, and a checklist of student characteristics, open-ended questions, and demographics. The investigator conducted follow-up interviews with selected school counselors.

Perusse concluded that school counselors were in general agreement that there was a benefit to JROTC programs within their schools. Counselors responded that the JROTC program has "turned around" the lives of several students who would have dropped out of school if they had not been involved in this program. However, school counselors did acknowledge that the JROTC program was not for everyone. They specifically identified academically advanced students who would have difficulty fitting the JROTC classes into their schedule (Perusse, 1997).

Dohle (2001) analyzed the impact of the JROTC on the public school. Dohle specifically researched the national and local factors that brought about the demise of one JROTC program at Christian Brothers College High School and the national acclaim associated with the Cleveland Naval JROTC.

The premise of his study centered on the contrast of the failure of one school (Christian Brothers College High School) to garner support from the community and parents while the other program at Cleveland Naval JROTC was a shining example of progress and change. The Christian Brothers College High School was established in 1934 to serve a purely military model of training future soldiers as mandated through official military literature. The program began to encounter resentment as a result of the Vietnam War. Enrollment numbers declined and parents had to fight to keep the program functioning. In contrast, The Cleveland Naval JROTC was started in 1981 to help revitalize the community and be a positive alternative for young adults within the school setting. In addition, the program looked for a way to change the negative image of the JROTC program and increase enrollment. The consensus was to move the program from a military to a social mission. The program continues to grow because the new focus of helping reduce the dropout rate in public high schools is attractive to both, parents, school districts, school boards and community leaders (Dohle, 2001).

Smith (2008) in a recent study focused on the need to address the issue of educating and developing leaders for tomorrow through the Air Force JROTC program. As a current Air Force instructor at an urban high school, Smith (2008) had first hand knowledge of both the student body and the specific directions the United States Air Force had relative to direct mentoring instruction. Smith (2008) used the model of hand in hand mentorship developed by the United States Air Force (*Air Force Manual*) to properly develop student leaders. This method required instructors to utilize the approach of hand in hand mentoring to model leadership skills to students. The instructors gave testimonials of the rise through the ranks of the Air Force and the hard work and determination it took to accomplish its goals. The aim of this approach was to have each instructor viewed as a living example of what it expects and requires from the young cadets.

Smith (2008) concluded that developing future leadership is a process that involves mentorship not only from instructors, but from administrators, teachers and other adults in the school building to be effective in today's society. He acknowledged that this process is challenging, but with the exposure to positive adults that students see each day, students' attendance and grades increase while their discipline issues decrease. Smith (2008) asserted that this is the perfect example of a program to improve the overall student and in turn the educational environment through the value of hard work and added responsibilities. Smith (2008) felt that the advancement of the next generation will benefit from this process.

Taylor (1999) from the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) conducted an extensive study of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Leadership Program in high schools throughout the United States. The CSIS is a private institution focused on international public policy issues. They provided a report in 1999 that analyzed the JROTC program using clear data based on interviews with administrators, guidance counselors, JROTC instructors and teachers nationwide. Three local school systems with JROTC programs of various sizes were studied (Chicago, Washington, D.C. and El Paso). The goal was to go beyond the rhetoric and give clear quantitative data on the claims that the JROTC program asserts on reducing the dropout rate and teaching leadership skills to young men and women at the high school level.

The overall findings by the CSIS was that JROTC cadets are more self-disciplined, attend class more frequently, are less likely to drop out of school, and (in the case of high school seniors) are more likely to graduate. Specific data indicate:

- . Disciplinary infractions: 5.18 percent of JROTC members vs. 13.94 percent of the overall school population
- . Attendance: 84.2 percent AFROTC vs. 74 percent overall population
- . Graduation: 94 percent AFJROTC vs. 89.4 percent overall populations

The Army, through its executive agency, U.S. Army Cadet Command, collects data concerning cadet performance annually (<http://www.mcjrotc.org/Documents/csisreport.pdf>)).

Bulach, (2001) an Associate Professor in the College of Education at State University of West Georgia, delivered a paper to the Eastern Educational Research Association Conference at Hilton Head, South Carolina entitled, “A Comparison of Character traits for JROTC students versus Non-JROTC students”. The presentation focused on the behavior of 277 JROTC students compared to 200 non-JROTC students relevant to their character traits. The students were measured in 15 specific areas on the survey. The areas listed the positive or negative responses of students relevant to the 15 items listed below.

The 15 character traits were:

- use of tobacco;
- use drugs and alcohol;
- take things that do not belong to them;
- control themselves when they need to;
- do what the teachers ask them to do;
- fight with each other;
- are positive about the need for rules and laws;
- call each other names;
- talk back to teachers and other adults;
- will cheat to win;
- are positive about themselves;
- believe that keeping your body clean is important;
- accept students who have a different religion;
- accept students who are from a different race; and

- quit trying if they know they are going to lose. (Bulach, 2001)

The research found that JROTC students measured more positively in all 15 character areas than the non-JROTC students. The researcher further observed that good character education, as outlined in the JROTC curriculum can change character traits. Finally, the researcher concluded that because JROTC students volunteer to be in the Air Force JROTC program they are more receptive to guidance from Air Force instructors and fellow cadets.

Lutz & Bartlett (1995) analyzed the JROTC curriculum, comparing the claims made by the JROTC program of reducing the dropout rate and developing leadership training. Lutz & Bartlett (1995) noted that there was an absence of data to substantiate most of the program's claims, which contrasts JROTC goals with those of public education, and raises serious concerns for parents, students, educators, and school boards. Specifically, the researchers observed the JROTC program's claim of helping reduce the dropout rate, developing leadership training for students enrolled in the program and the program's overall benefit to the schools in which they are stationed. Lutz & Bartlett found that the JROTC program's claim of reducing the dropout rate was not documented because most of the claims are not collected by the JROTC program. They asserted that Army JROTC promotional material stated that JROTC cadets graduate at a higher rate than non-JROTC students. The brief amount of information they provided does not prove that JROTC is an effective dropout prevention program. In addition, Lutz & Bartlett observed that the federal government continues to pay the pensions of the military instructors at the individual high schools. They felt that the money paid to the military instructors takes revenue away from academic programs needed by the schools. Lutz & Bartlett (1995) concluded that the high rate of student attrition within the JROTC program makes their claims concerning dropout reduction difficult, if not impossible, to validate.

Summary

A theme that continued to present itself in the studies was the benefit of the JROTC program within the high school setting. Each of the nine studies (Bogden, 1984; Taylor, 1999; Logan, 2000; Long, 2003; Morris, 2003; Marks, 2004; Mullholland, 2005; Dohle, 2001; Perusse, 1997 and Smith, 2008) attested to the positive influence of the JROTC program on both the student body and the overall population of the schools in which the programs are stationed.

An important aspect of the researcher's findings was the positive role that the Air Force JROTC instructors have on the program (Bogden, 1984, Marks, 2004 and Morris, 2003). Each of the three researchers viewed the role of the instructors as being a vital contributor to the program's success. Bogden further concluded that the best measure of a JROTC program's evaluation is the perception of those in the school community who are most responsible for the program and not goals derived from the military, or the school board.

Long (2000) observed the value of the JROTC program based on the perceptions of school principals. He was able to conclude that principals strongly agreed that the JROTC program should remain in their school building because of the positive influence that the program brought to the school.

Morris (2003) was able to take the observations of Long (2000) further by stating three factors that have the greatest influence on principals' belief concerning the JROTC program. The three factors were: their years of experience working with a JROTC program, the quality of the instructors, and being associated with a school that hosted a JROTC program.

The perceptions of school personnel toward the JROTC program were observed by several researchers (Bogden, 1984; Logan 2000; Morris, 2003; Long, 2003; Marks, 2004 and Perusse 1997). Specifically, Perusse indicated that school personnel were in general agreement that

the JROTC program helped turn around the lives of several students who would have dropped out of school if they had not been involved in this program.

Taylor (1999) referred to JROTC students' grades, discipline and attendance as a result of the JROTC program. Taylor's findings concluded that JROTC students are more self-disciplined, attend class more frequently, are less likely to drop out of school, and (in the case of high school seniors) are more likely to graduate.

Amidon, (2000) a vocal critic of JROTC programs, feared that programs such as these would give the perception of militarization within the school setting. He also felt the presence of JROTC at the high school level would eventually erode the quality of public education because the JROTC would take away academic programs from schools. Lutz & Bartlett (1995), another vocal critic of the JROTC program's presence in public schools stated that the claims by the program of reducing the dropout rate can not be substantiated by the JROTC program.

Finally, in 1996, a former Cadet Major, in the Army JROTC program in Alabama wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense, William Perry about the impact the JROTC program and the role the instructors had played in his life. He stated, "The program is a great success. It teaches discipline and leadership to everyone involved. Our instructor inspires his students to do their very best. Students who might have dropped out, now look forward to school" (personal communication, September 25, 1996). The researchers were unable to validate the claims of the JROTC program because no quantitative data were either collected or available for review.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the Air Force Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps (JROTC) Leadership Program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate of 50 students enrolled in the program. The study also addressed the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents regarding the program at an urban public high school in southeastern Virginia during the 2005-2009 school years. This chapter describes both the quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches that were employed to collect and examine the data and answers the research, survey and focus group questions.

Design

In order to answer the proposed research questions, a mixed methods study was utilized. A mixed methods study is defined as a design in which mixing both quantitative and qualitative approaches occurs in either portions or all stages of the study (Tashakkori & Teddie, 2003). For this current study, archival data were collected from JROTC and non-JROTC students at the urban high school. Also, data from the survey responses were collected from administrators, JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents. Finally, focus group interviews were collected and reported from the participants in the study. The reason this method was employed was because it provided the researcher with the best possible means to collect and analyze a combination of quantitative and qualitative data.

Population and Sample

The population in this study included one urban high school in southeastern Virginia. The purposeful sample included 50 students selected from an enrollment of 120 in the Air Force JROTC program. In addition, four administrators, two Air Force JROTC instructors, ten

teachers and twenty parents also participated. The urban high school was chosen because it provided the researcher with an atypical school in southeastern Virginia. The school is atypical because it is one of three schools in the district which meets the characteristics of an urban high school. In addition, the selected school has an Air Force JROTC program. The selected school also has an enrollment of 120 JROTC students. This provided the researcher with a cross section of juniors and seniors with at least two years of enrollment in the program to utilize for the study.

Instrumentation

There were three data sources utilized in this study (see Appendices A, B& C). The sources were archival data, a survey and focus groups. The three instruments were created by the researcher to assess the impact of the Air Force JROTC program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and the dropout rate of those students who were enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years. The instruments also addressed the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents related to leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline for JROTC students at the urban high school.

Archival data was collected on both JROTC and non-JROTC students utilizing the school district's computer starbase data system. The names of the JROTC students were compiled from the JROTC instructors at the urban high school for current juniors and seniors enrolled in the Air Force JROTC program. The criterion for the selection process was based on at least a two year enrollment in the program by the JROTC students. The names of non-JROTC juniors and senior's students were also collected from the urban high school. The non-JROTC students were selected based on their gender and ethnic groups compared to the

same grouping for the JROTC students. There was an equal number of male and female non-JROTC compared to JROTC students. Also, Black, White and Latino non-JROTC students were compared to the same number of JROTC students. A variety of sources were used to develop the 25 survey questions utilized in the study including: past dissertations and empirical studies conducted on JROTC, and official JROTC literature. The survey was sent to the committee chairperson prior to the implementation of the study (Appendix B). The committee chairperson reviewed the questions and gave his suggestions for improving both the wording and format. The researcher applied the suggestions made by the committee chairperson to strengthen the survey.

Focus groups were developed and organized after the completion of the survey (Appendix C). A focus group is defined as, “a carefully planned series of discussions designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment.” (Krueger and Casey, 2000, pg. 5). The participants in the focus groups included administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents. The researcher attempted to ascertain more indepth responses about the Air Force JROTC through conversations with participants from the school survey. Ten open ended questions were developed which were a follow-up to the completion of the survey. The researcher divided the participants into two groups. The researcher documented the responses of each group member and looked for similarities in their narrative responses. Narrative responses can be found in chapter four.

Pilot Study

A pilot study (Appendix A) with fifteen survey questions was administered to two assistant principals, two Air Force JROTC instructors who are employed at the pilot school in southeastern, Virginia where the Air Force JROTC program is offered. In addition, five

students who are currently enrolled in the Air Force JROTC program participated in the pilot study. Finally, five teachers who have taught JROTC students and five parents who have current JROTC students enrolled in the Air Force JROTC program participated in this pilot study. The survey addressed leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development, and self discipline of JROTC students. The researcher administered the survey to the two administrators; in their offices, two Air Force JROTC instructors during their planning block; and five JROTC students during their scheduled JROTC class. The five teachers who have taught JROTC students were administered their survey during their planning blocks. The researcher collected all of the responses at the high school. He reviewed the material from the participants. No changes were made to the survey instrument. Participants from the pilot study will not be involved in the final study.

After the survey was completed, the researcher attempted to address the issue of clarity in the relationship between the survey and research questions used in this study. The goal for the pilot study was to validate the survey questions for clarity and make sure the survey was aligned with the six research questions.

Participant Release

Institutional Review Board (IRB) permission was requested and approved from Virginia Tech (Appendix G). An informed consent letter was generated by the researcher and approved by the school district to conduct the study at the urban school. The informed consent document included: a signature acknowledging that the subject agrees to participate in the study, a statement that they can withdraw at any time, a statement that they realize the material will remain confidential and finally a statement that they acknowledge they read the introductory letter describing the dissertation study (Appendix F). A separate letter was developed and presented by the researcher to parents seeking their permission for both them

and their children to participate in this study (Appendix E). The official IRB approval from Virginia Tech and approval by the urban school district to conduct the study was obtained prior to beginning the study. A certification from Virginia Tech indicating successful completion of the Human Subjects Protection Training is also included in the appendix of this study (Appendix H).

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher utilized the computerized data base system from the school district to gather information on the student participants in the study. The material was categorized into two groups: JROTC students and non-JROTC students. The material was further categorized into sub groups: grade point average, attendance rate and disciplinary referrals.

A survey (Appendix B) were formulated and presented to administrators; Air Force JROTC instructors; teachers; JROTC students; and their parents at the urban high school. The researcher emailed the participants and outlined a schedule of the specific location and time that the survey would be conducted. The researcher administered the surveys to each participant. The participant's were asked twenty-five specific questions addressing the Air Force JROTC program at the urban high school. Their responses were compared with each other to determine similarities and differences. The goal of the researcher was to triangulate the data. The researcher surveyed four administrators, two Air Force JROTC instructors, ten teachers, fifty JROTC students, who have been in the program for at least two years and twenty parents.

The focus groups (Appendix C) were arranged into two individual groups after the surveys were completed by the participants. The researcher organized the one administrator; one AFJROTC instructor and one teacher into group one. One JROTC student and one parent were assigned to group two. The groups were divided based on having at least one participant from each of the five groups in the study. The researcher began the process by

arranging scheduled meeting times with the participants. The research then collected, documented and transcribed their responses.

Data Analysis Procedures

An independent sample t-test was the statistical method used to answer question one. The independent sample t-test was utilized because it was the best method to evaluate the difference between the means of two independent groups. First, the researcher retrieved names of 50 current students enrolled in the JROTC program from their instructors. Second, the researcher collected data on gender and race to determine the non-JROTC that would participate in the study. The researcher used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 17.0) software. All research questions were examined at the .05 level of significance. Descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviation were used to analyze the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate and disciplinary referrals for question one.

A One-Way ANOVA was used to answer questions 2-6. The One-Way ANOVA was utilized because it was the best method to evaluate each individual score on two variables: a factor and a dependent variable. First, the mean scores for administrators, AFJROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents were computed on their responses to 25 survey questions about the AFJROTC program at the urban high school. The survey questions utilized a five point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree) to collect the data. Second, the researcher coded JROTC students and non-JROTC (1=JROTC and 2=non-JROTC). Third, the researcher coded for grade point average, attendance rate and disciplinary referrals (1=gpa, 2=attendance rate and 3=disciplinary referrals). An ANOVA was utilized to assess the degree to which quantitative variables are related in the sample. All survey questions were examined at the .05 level of significance. Frequency and percentage, along with means and standard deviation was utilized to analyze

their perceptions of administrators, AFJROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parent regarding the AFJROTC program

The Constant Comparative Method of Analysis is the format used for the follow-up focus group interviews. This Constant Comparative Method was utilized because it was the best method to look for a consistency in the responses with one group compared to other groups. First, the researcher utilized data collected from the school surveys. Second, the researcher used the data to develop open ended questions that would give more indepth responses from the survey. Third, the researcher identified one participant from each category of participants and organized them into two groups. An administrator, AFJROTC instructor and teacher were place in group one. A JROTC student and parent were placed in group two. After organizing the groups the researcher used an interview process to ask five open ended questions (Appendix C) to each group on leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline for JROTC students. Each group was assigned their interview questions separately from the other group. The responses were recorded by the researcher at the urban high school. The researcher used a tape recorder to record the responses. The recorded responses were then written down for transcription. The data were analyzed by organizing the raw data by categories. The researcher looked for patterns that were repeated and determined from the pattern if there was any diversity in the perceptions of the participants. The researcher developed a brief summary utilizing critical points from the data. Finally, the researcher examined, categorized and tabulated the data using tables and graphs. The responses and transcription can be found in both chapters five and the appendix.

The participant's responses were analyzed for similarities in their responses. This allowed the researcher to compare similar responses and group them into categories. The goal of the constant comparative method of analysis is "to discern conceptual similarities, to refine the

discriminative power of categories, and to discover patterns” (Tesch, 1990, p.96). The procedure entailed triangulating the data ascertained from the survey questionnaire, compare the responses of each group, and place the responses into categories to look for patterns.

A lockbox was maintained at the home of the researcher. After the defense of the dissertation the pilot study questionnaire, archival data, survey questionnaire and focus group data will be shredded and destroyed

Summary

The results from the data helped the researcher assess the impact of enrollment in the Air Force JROTC program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and the dropout rate at the urban high school during the 2005-2009 school years. This information was ascertained by collecting archival material from the high school. In addition, the perceptions of school administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents related to leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of current JROTC students who were enrolled in the program for at least two years was investigated. Survey instruments utilizing the Likert-type scale helped facilitate this process. Administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents participated in the study. A survey was utilized by the participants at the pilot school as part of the study.

Responses to the pilot study were used to help develop and revise the survey to be used at the urban high school. Official Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was facilitated through Virginia Tech. An informed consent form for administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors and teachers was generated by the researcher and approved by the urban school district. A permission letter was also developed by the researcher for parents seeking permission to have their children to participate in the study. The permission letter was approved by the parents. The researcher received approval from the Institutional Review

Board (IRB) at Virginia Tech, the urban school district and the parents of the individual JROTC student before beginning the study.

A pilot study helped frame the questions utilized at the urban high school. The six “Research Questions” were utilized to facilitate the research and helped substantiate the research findings. The school administration (principal and three assistants), two Air Force JROTC instructors, ten teachers, approximately 50 JROTC students and twenty parents participated in the study. The survey was developed by the researcher with guidance from the committee chairperson. Finally, focus groups were utilized to gather further information from an administrator, Air Force JROTC instructor, teacher, JROTC student and parent regarding leadership skills, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship skills and self discipline observed by students in the JROTC program at the urban high school.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

There are four sections in this chapter which present the statistical findings from both the urban high school and the participants involved in this research. The first section is an analysis of the archival data on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for 50 students enrolled in the Air Force JROTC program at the high school during the 2005-2009 school years. The attendance rate indicated the total number of absences for the sample population. The researcher examined the data at the end of the 2009 school year. The second section is an analysis of the survey from administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents on their perceptions of the Air Force JROTC program. The third section is an analysis of the results from the focus groups. The fourth and final section summarizes the research obtained from the data analysis and the collection of the data.

Response Rates

A total of four administrators, two Air Force JROTC instructors, ten teachers, 50 JROTC students and 20 parents participated in the study at the urban high school. Of the four administrators (one principal and three assistant principals), two Air Force JROTC instructors and ten teachers contacted 100% agreed to participate. There were 50 JROTC students contacted by the researcher, 45 received permission from their parents to participate in the study. There were five students who dropped out of school and permission from their parents was not needed for the study. There were 91 letters sent to four administrators, two Air Force JROTC instructors, ten teachers, forty-five Air Force JROTC students and twenty parents to request their participation in the study. A total of 81 were returned, for a return rate of 90%. As a result, the data analysis is based on 81 participants.

Archival Data

The urban high school in southeastern, Virginia was the site where archival data was collected. The grade point averages, attendance rates, disciplinary referrals and dropout rates, for forty-five JROTC students between 2005-2009 school years were the subjects of the study. The JROTC students were compared to thirty-two non-JROTC students at the urban high school. The reason that there were forty-five JROTC students and thirty-two non-JROTC students was that five JROTC and eighteen non-JROTC students from the original sample dropped out of school. The JROTC students and non-JROTC students were matched by race and gender.

Descriptive statistics were conducted using the explore procedure in the SPSS 17 software. Table 1, provides the descriptive statistics for each of the dependent variables (grade point average, attendance rate and disciplinary referrals) of the combined seventy-seventy JROTC and non-JROTC student's utilized in the research. The researcher noted the GPA average ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.10$), for both JROTC and non-JROTC students. The average day's absent for each group was seven days ($M = 6.65$, $SD = 5.90$). The average disciplinary referrals were less than one ($M = 0.57$, $SD = 3.61$), for each group during the 2008-2009 school year.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics on GPA, Attendance Rate, Disciplinary Referral for the JROTC and Non-JROTC Students Combined

| | <i>n</i> | Min | Max | Mean | SD |
|------------|----------|-----|-------|------|------|
| GPA | 77 | .00 | 4.00 | 2.70 | 1.10 |
| Attn | 77 | .00 | 27.00 | 6.65 | 5.90 |
| Discipline | 77 | .00 | 27.00 | 0.57 | 3.61 |

Three independent sample *t*-tests were conducted to compare the JROTC students and non-JROTC students in three categories (GPA, Attendance, and Discipline), for significant interactions. Table 1.2, illustrates the means, and standard deviations. The T-Test distribution is not normal. The attendance distribution is flatter than normal. This could result in a potential limitation in distribution. Table 1.3 shows the three independent sample *t*-test results comparing the JROTC and non-JROTC students in three categories: GPA, attendance and discipline.

Table 1.2

T-Test Means and Standard Deviations to Compare the JROTC and Non-JROTC Students in Three Categories GPA, Attendance, and Discipline

| | JROTC | | non-JROTC | |
|------------|-------|------|-----------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD |
| GPA | 2.47 | 1.17 | 3.00 | 0.94 |
| Attendance | 6.71 | 6.56 | 6.56 | 4.93 |
| Discipline | 0.60 | 4.02 | 0.53 | 3.00 |

The results of the first independent sample *t*-test evaluated that JROTC students enrolled in the AFJROTC program at the urban high school had lower grade point averages opposed to non-JROTC students. The *t*-test was significant, $t(75) = -2.07, p = .04$. The practical significance versus statistical significance is that because of the small sample size the alpha level is close to .05. The students in the JROTC program ($M = 2.47, SD = 1.17$) on the average GPA was less than non-JROTC students ($M = 3.00, SD = 0.94$). The results of the second *t*-test evaluated that JROTC students enrolled in the AFJROTC program were absent

more days opposed to non-JROTC students. The *t*-test was not significant, $t(75) = 0.11, p = .91$. The non-JROTC students ($M = 6.56, SD = 4.93$) average attendance rate was more than the JROTC students ($M = 6.71, SD = 6.56$). The results of the third independent sample *t*-test evaluated that JROTC students enrolled in the AFJROTC program had fewer disciplinary referrals opposed to non-JROTC students. The *t*-test was not significant, $t(75) = 0.02, p = .98$. The non-JROTC students ($M = 0.53, SD = 3.00$) discipline referral rate was less than those in the JROTC program ($M = 0.60, SD = 4.02$).

Table 1.3

Independent Sample T-Tests on GPA, Attendance, and Discipline

| | F | Sig. | t | df | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|------------|------|------|-------|----|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| GPA | 1.97 | .04 | -2.07 | 75 | -.52 | .25 | -1.01 | -.02 |
| Attendance | .77 | .91 | .11 | 75 | .15 | 1.37 | -2.59 | 2.88 |
| Discipline | .05 | .98 | .02 | 75 | .01 | .30 | -.59 | .60 |

Analysis of the Survey

What are the opinions of school administrators, AFJROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students, and parents that the AFJROTC program had an effect on leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development, self discipline, impact to school, and opposing view point of students who were enrolled in the program for at least one year during the 2005-2009 school years?

Four administrators, two AFJROTC instructors, ten teachers, 45 JROTC students and 20 parents were asked 25 surveys questions regarding their perceptions of the program at the urban high school. Nineteen questions focused on five categories: leadership skills

development, goal setting skills, respect for authority, citizenship development and self discipline. These nineteen questions were selected to support research questions two thru six. Additionally, six questions were added to the survey which focused on two categories, impact to school and opposing view points. These questions were included to show the perceptions of the respondents from critics of the program. The sampled size of 81 ($n = 81$) represented the administrators, AFJROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents in the study. Responses were indicated using the following five point Likert scale: 5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – No Opinion, 2 – Disagree and 1 – Strongly Disagree. Using the SPSS 17.0 Statistical Software Package, an alpha level of $p = .05$ was chosen to determine statistical significance. Seven, one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were computed to determine differences of scores within and between the participating groups. Tables 1.9, 1.15, 1.21, 1.27, 1.33, 1.39 and 1.43 present data that the ANOVA's discern between the responses of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents on a school survey regarding the AFJROTC program. Additionally, the frequency distributions, percentages, means and standard deviations, for each of the twenty-five questions was also computed, see Tables 1.4 – 1.7, 1.11 – 1.13, 1.16 – 1.19, 1.22 – 1.25, 1.28 – 1.31, 1.34 – 1.37, and 1.40 – 1.41.

The first school survey question was:

The JROTC program teaches leadership skills.

Overall, 15 parents (75%), 4 administrators (100%), 1 AFJROTC instructor, (50%), 8 teachers (80%) and 41 JROTC students (82%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program teaches leadership skills. There were five parents (25%), four JROTC students (18%), two teachers (20%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed.

See Table 1.4, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.4

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question One that the JROTC Program Teaches Leadership Skills among the Five Groups

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(4)</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(3)</u> <u>No</u> <u>Opinion</u> | | <u>(2)</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>(1)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents</u> <u>Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----|----------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 4 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 |
| Teachers | 8 | 80 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.80 | .42 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 41 | 82 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.91 | .29 |
| Parents | 15 | 75 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.75 | .44 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The second school survey question was:

JROTC students are in more leadership positions than non-JROTC students at the urban high school.

Overall, 18 JROTC students (40%), 10 parents (50) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students are in more leadership positions than non-JROTC students. There were twenty-three JROTC students (51%), five parents (25%), five teachers (50%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were three JROTC students (7%), five teachers (50%), five parents (25%) and one administrator (25%) who had no opinion. There was one JROTC students (2%) who disagreed and three administrators (75%) who strongly disagreed. See Table 1.5, for the frequency distribution, percentages, means and standard deviations among the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.5

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Two that JROTC Students are in more Leadership Positions than Non-JROTC Students at the Urban High School among the Five Groups

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(4)</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(3)</u> <u>No</u> <u>Opinion</u> | | <u>(2)</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>(1)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents</u> <u>Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----|----------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.50 |
| Teachers | 0 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.50 | .53 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 18 | 40 | 23 | 51 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.29 | .70 |
| Parents | 10 | 50 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.25 | .85 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The third school survey question was:

JROTC students are viewed as leaders at the urban high school.

Overall, 17 JROTC students (37%), 8 parents (40%), 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) and 1 teacher (10%) strongly agreed that JROTC students are viewed as leaders at the urban high school. There were twenty-two JROTC students (48%), nine parents (45%), six teachers (60%), three administrators (75%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were three JROTC students (7%), three parents (15%), and three teachers (30%) who had no opinion. There was one administrator (25%) and three JROTC students (7%) who disagreed. See Table 1.6, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.6

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Three that JROTC Students are viewed as Leaders at the Urban High School among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5)</u> <u>Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4)</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(3)</u> <u>No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2)</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>(1)</u> <u>Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|----|----------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.50 |
| Teachers | 1 | 10 | 6 | 60 | 3 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.80 | .63 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 17 | 37 | 22 | 48 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.18 | .83 |
| Parents | 8 | 40 | 9 | 45 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.25 | .72 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The fourth school survey question was:

JROTC students have greater leadership skills than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 18 JROTC students (40%) 7 parents (35%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students have greater leadership skills than non-JROTC students.

There were twenty JROTC students (44%), nine parents (45%), nine teachers (90%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were five JROTC students (11%) two parents (10%) and one teacher (10%) who had no opinion. There were two JROTC students (4%), three administrators (75%) and two parents (10%) who disagreed. See Table 1.7, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means and standard deviation among the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.7

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Four that JROTC Students have Greater Leadership Skills than Non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Administrators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2.50 | 1.00 |
| Teachers | 0 | 0 | 9 | 90 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.90 | .36 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 18 | 40 | 20 | 44 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.20 | .82 |
| Parents | 7 | 35 | 9 | 45 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.05 | .95 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among the five difference group's perceptions of leadership skills development category questions. The independent variable, the respondents, included five levels: Administrators, Teachers, Instructors, Students, and Parents. The dependent variable was Leadership Skills Development category which is the sum of the scores for questions: 1. The JROTC program teaches leadership skills, 2. JROTC students are in more leadership positions than non-JROTC students at the urban high school, 3. JROTC students are viewed as leaders at the urban high school, and 4. JROTC students have greater leadership skills than non-JROTC students. See Table 1.8, for the means and standard deviations for the five respondent groups and their perceptions on Leadership Skills Development.

Table 1.8

Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Leadership Skills Development Category

| Respondents Variable | <i>n</i> | Mean | SD |
|----------------------|----------|-------|------|
| Administrators | 4 | 12.50 | 2.51 |
| Teachers | 10 | 16.00 | 1.56 |
| Instructors | 2 | 18.00 | 2.83 |
| Students | 45 | 17.58 | 2.51 |
| Parents | 20 | 17.30 | 2.77 |
| Total | 81 | 17.07 | 2.70 |

An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analyses. The one-way ANOVA results (see Table 1.9) revealed a statistically significant main effect, $F(4, 76) = 4.40, p < .05$.

As assessed by partial eta squared, $\eta^2 = .19$, the strength of differences between group's responses (DV) and the Leadership Skills Development (IV) category was strong, with the group factors accounting for 19% of the variance of the dependent variable between the five groups.

Table 1.9

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of Leadership Skills Development Category from the Five Respondents

| Source | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between | 109.38 | 4 | 27.34 | 4.40 | .00 | .19 |
| Within | 472.18 | 76 | 6.21 | | | |
| Total | 24195.00 | 81 | | | | |

Follow-up analyses to evaluate pairwise differences among the means were conducted. Because the differences among the five groups ranged from 18.00 to 12.50 (See Table 1.8), we chose not to assume that the differences were equal. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test procedure were used to determine which pair of the five group means differed significantly, see Table 1.10. The results of the analysis indicate that the respondents who were members of the instructors group ($M = 18.00$, $SD = 2.83$) responded greater to Leadership Skill Development questions than respondent who were members of the administrators ($M = 12.50$, $SD = 2.52$), teachers ($M = 16.00$, $SD = 1.56$), students ($M = 17.58$, $SD = 2.51$), and parents ($M = 17.30$, $SD = 2.77$). The only significant differences among the paired comparison are between administrators – students, $M = 5.07$ and administrators – parents, $M = 4.80$. The effect sizes for these significant pairwise differences were 2.03, and 1.93, respectively.

Table 1.10

Post Hoc Results of Perceptions of Leadership Skills Development Category Questions among the five Respondent groups

| Respondent Groups | Mean | Mean Differences ($X_i - X_k$) (Effect Sizes are indicated in parentheses) | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|-----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Administrators | 12.50 | -- | | | | |
| Teachers | 16.00 | 3.50 | -- | | | |
| Instructor | 18.00 | 5.50 | 2.00 | -- | | |
| Students | 17.57 | 5.07* (2.03) | 1.57 | .42 | -- | |
| Parent | 17.30 | 4.80* (1.93) | 1.30 | .70 | .27 | -- |

* $p < .05$

The fifth school survey question was:

The JROTC program teaches goal setting skills.

Overall, 32 JROTC students (71%), 14 parents (70%), 7 teachers (70%), 3 administrators (75%), and 1 AFJROTC instructors (50%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program teaches goal setting skills. There were ten JROTC students (22%), four parents (20%), two teachers (20%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were two parents (10%), one JROTC student (2%) and one teacher (10%) who had no opinion. There were two JROTC students (4%) who disagreed. See Table 1.11 for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations of the five groups of respondent.

Table 1.11

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Five that the JROTC Program Teaches Goal Setting Skills among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 | .50 |
| Teachers | 7 | 70 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.60 | .70 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 32 | 71 | 10 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.60 | .75 |
| Parents | 14 | 70 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.60 | .68 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The sixth school survey question was:

JROTC students have greater goal setting skills than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 15 JROTC students (33%), 8 parents (40%), 5 teachers (50%), 3 administrators (75%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students have greater goal setting skills than non-JROTC students. There were eighteen JROTC students (40%), six parents (30%), four teachers (40%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were ten JROTC students (22%) five parents (25%) and one teacher (10%) who had no opinion. There were two JROTC students (4%) and one parent (5%) who disagreed. Table 1.12 has the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations of the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.12

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Six that JROTC Students have Greater Goal Setting Skills than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5)</u> Strongly Agree | | <u>(4)</u> Agree | | <u>(3)</u> No Opinion | | <u>(2)</u> Disagree | | <u>(1)</u> Strongly Disagree | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|----|---------------------|----|--------------------------|----|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 |
| Teachers | 7 | 50 | 4 | 40 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.40 | .70 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 15 | 33 | 18 | 40 | 10 | 22 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.02 | .87 |
| Parents | 8 | 40 | 6 | 30 | 5 | 25 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.05 | .95 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The seventh school survey question was:

JROTC students are more goal oriented than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 16 JROTC students (36%), 8 teachers (80%), 5 parents (25%), 2 administrators (50%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students are more goal

oriented than non-JROTC students. There were twenty JROTC students (44%), eight parents (40%), two teachers (20%), two administrators (50%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were seven JROTC students (16%) and six parents (30%) who had non opinion. There were two JROTC students (4%) and one parent (5%) who disagreed. Table 1.13 has the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations of the five respondents.

Table 1.13

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Seven that JROTC Students are more Goal Oriented than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.50 |
| Teachers | 8 | 80 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.80 | .42 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 16 | 36 | 20 | 44 | 7 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.11 | .83 |
| Parents | 5 | 25 | 8 | 40 | 6 | 30 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.80 | 1.00 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among the five person’s perceptions on the Goal Setting Skills category questions. The independent variable, the respondents, included five levels: Administrators, Teachers, Instructors, Students, and Parents. The dependent variable was Goal Setting Skills category which is the sum of the scores for questions: 5. The JROTC program teaches goal skills, 6. JROTC have greater goal setting skills than non-JROTC students, and 7. JROTC students are

more goal oriented than non-JROTC students. See Table 1.14, for the means and standard deviations on the five respondent groups for their perceptions on Goal Setting Skills.

Table 1.14

Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Goal Setting Skills Category

| Respondents Variable | <i>n</i> | Mean | SD |
|----------------------|----------|-------|------|
| Administrators | 4 | 14.00 | 1.41 |
| Teachers | 10 | 13.80 | 1.69 |
| Instructors | 2 | 13.50 | 2.12 |
| Students | 45 | 12.73 | 2.33 |
| Parents | 20 | 12.45 | 2.50 |
| Total | 81 | 17.07 | 2.70 |

An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analyses. The one-way ANOVA results (see Table 1.15) revealed a non statistically significant main effect, $F(4, 76) = .913, p > .05$. As assessed by partial eta squared, $\eta^2 = .05$, the strength of differences between group's responses (DV) and the Goal Setting Skills (IV) category, was medium, with the group factors accounting for 5% of the variance of the dependent variable between the five groups reported in Table 1.15

Table 1.15

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of the Goal Setting Skills Category from the Five Respondents

| Source | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between | 18.92 | 4 | 4.73 | .91 | .46 | .05 |
| Within | 393.85 | 76 | 5.18 | | | |
| Total | 13843.00 | 81 | | | | |

Because no significant differences were found between groups, post hoc testing was not conducted. However, the group main effect indicated that administrations ($M = 14.00$, $SD = 1.41$) tended to have a higher response to the Goal Setting Skills category than the other four groups. See Table 1.14.

The eighth school survey question was:

JROTC students have a greater respect for authority in general than non-JROTC students. Overall, 27 JROTC students (60%), 9 parents (45%), 2 teachers (20%), 1 administrators (25%) and 1 AFJROTC instructors (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students have a greater respect for authority in general than non-JROTC students. There were twelve JROTC students (27%), eight parents (40%), four teachers (40%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were six JROTC students (13%), two parents (10%), two teachers (20%), and two administrators (50%) who had no opinion. There were two teachers (20%) one JROTC student (2%) and one parent (5%) who disagreed. The frequency distribution, percentages, means, and standard deviations are reported in Table 1.16.

Table 1.16

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Eight that the JROTC Students have a Greater Respect for Authority in General than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Administrators | 1 | 25 | 1 | 25 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.75 | .96 |
| Teachers | 2 | 20 | 4 | 40 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.60 | 1.08 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 27 | 60 | 12 | 27 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.44 | .79 |
| Parents | 9 | 45 | 8 | 40 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.35 | .67 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The ninth school survey question was:

The JROTC program teaches students to respect authority.

Overall, 33 JROTC students (73%), 17 parents (85%), 2 administrators (50%), 1 teacher (10%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program teaches students to respect authority. There were nine JROTC students (20%), five teachers (50%) three parents (15%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were three JROTC students (7%) and two teachers (20%) who had no opinion. There were two teachers (20%) and 2 administrators (50%) who disagreed. The frequency distributions, percentage, means and standard deviations are reported in Table 1.17

Table 1.17

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Nine that the JROTC Program Teaches Students to Respect Authority among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Administrators | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.50 | 1.73 |
| Teachers | 1 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.50 | .97 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 33 | 73 | 9 | 20 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.67 | .60 |
| Parents | 17 | 85 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.85 | .37 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The tenth school survey question was:

JROTC students have a greater respect for administrators than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 17 JROTC students (38%), 10 parents (50%), 4 teachers (40%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that respect for JROTC students have a greater respect for administrators than non-JROTC students. There were twenty JROTC students (44%), six teachers (60%), five parents (25%), three administrators (75%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were six JROTC students (13%) and five parents (25%) who had no opinion. There were two JROTC students (4%) and one administrator (25%) who disagreed. See Table 1.18, for the frequency distribution.

Table 1.18

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Ten that JROTC Students have a Greater Respect for Administrators than non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(4)</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(3)</u> <u>No</u> <u>Opinion</u> | | <u>(2)</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>(1)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents</u> <u>Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----|----------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.50 |
| Teachers | 4 | 40 | 6 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.40 | .52 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 17 | 38 | 20 | 44 | 6 | 13 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.16 | .82 |
| Parents | 10 | 50 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.25 | .85 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The eleventh school survey question was:

JROTC students display more respect to teachers and peers than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 17 JROTC students (38%), 9 parents (45%), 6 teachers (60%), 1 administrator (25%), and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students display more respect to teachers and peers than non-JROTC students. There were twenty-two JROTC students (49%), eight parents (40%), three administrators (75%), four teachers (40%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were three JROTC students (11%) and three parents (15%) who had no opinion and three JROTC students (7%) who disagreed. See Table 1.19, for the frequency distribution, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.19

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale Responses to Question Eleven that JROTC Students Display more Respect to Teachers and Peers than Non-JROTC students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | Groups Respondents <u>Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <u>n</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>n</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>n</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>n</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>n</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>n</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| | Administrators | 1 | 25 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.25 |
| Teachers | 6 | 60 | 4 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.60 | .52 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 17 | 38 | 22 | 49 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.18 | .83 |
| Parents | 9 | 45 | 8 | 40 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.30 | .73 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among the five levels of respondent's perceptions on the Respect for Authority category questions. The independent variable, the respondents, included five levels: Administrators, Teachers, Instructors, Students, and Parents. The dependent variable was Respect for Authority category which is the sum of the scores for questions: 8. JROTC students have a greater respect for authority in general than non-JROTC students, 9. The JROTC program teaches students to respect authority, 10. JROTC students have a greater respect for administrators than non-JROTC students, and 11. JROTC students display more respect to teachers and peers than non-JROTC students. See Table 1.20, for the means and standard deviations on the five respondent groups on their perceptions for Respect for Authority.

Table 1.20

Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Respect for Authority Category

| Respondents Variable | <i>n</i> | Mean | SD |
|----------------------|----------|-------|------|
| Administrators | 4 | 15.00 | 3.16 |
| Teachers | 10 | 16.10 | 2.88 |
| Instructors | 2 | 18.00 | 2.83 |
| Students | 45 | 17.44 | 2.87 |
| Parents | 20 | 17.75 | 2.45 |
| Total | 81 | 17.25 | 2.81 |

An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analyses. The one-way ANOVA results (see Table 1.21) revealed a non statistically significant main effect, $F(4, 76) = 1.33, p > .05$. As assessed by partial eta squared, $\eta^2 = .07$, the strength of differences between group's responses (DV) and Respect for Authority (IV) category was medium, with the group factors accounting for 7% of the variance of the dependent variable between the five groups.

Table 1.21

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of Respect for Authority Category from the Five Respondents

| Source | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between | 41.30 | 4 | 10.33 | 1.33 | .27 | .07 |
| Within | 589.76 | 76 | 7.76 | | | |
| Total | 24725.00 | 81 | | | | |

Because no significant differences were found between groups, post hoc testing was not conducted. However, the group main effect indicated that the instructors ($M = 18.00$, $SD = 2.83$) tended to have the greater responds Goal Setting Skills category than the other four groups. See Table 1.20.

The twelfth school survey question was:

The JROTC program prepares students for life after high school.

Overall, 23 JROTC students (51%), 8 parents (40%), 1 teacher (10%), 3 administrators (75%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program prepares students for life after high school. There were nineteen JROTC students (42%), nine parents (45%), six teachers (60%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were three JROTC students (7%), three parents (15%), two teachers (20%) and one administrator (25%) who had no opinion. There were two administrators (50%) and one teacher (10%) who disagreed. See Table 1.22, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.22

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twelve that the JROTC Program Prepares Students for Life after High School among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Administrators | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.25 | 1.50 |
| Teachers | 1 | 10 | 6 | 60 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.70 | .82 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 23 | 51 | 19 | 42 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.44 | .62 |
| Parents | 8 | 40 | 9 | 45 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.25 | .72 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The thirteenth school survey question was:

The JROTC program has a positive influence on students enrolled in the program at the urban high school.

Overall, 29 JROTC students (64%), 14 parents (70%), 2 teachers (20%), 3 administrators (75%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that the AFJROTC program positively influence students. There were twelve JROTC students (27%), six parents (30%), five teachers (50%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructors (50%) who agreed. There were four JROTC students (9%) and one teacher (10%) who had no opinion. There were two teachers (20%) who disagreed. See table 1.23, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.23

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Thirteen that the JROTC Program has a Positive Influence on Students Enrolled in the Program at the Urban High School among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 |
| Teachers | 2 | 20 | 5 | 50 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.70 | 1.06 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 29 | 64 | 12 | 27 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.56 | .66 |
| Parents | 14 | 70 | 6 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.70 | .47 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The fourteenth school survey question was:

The JROTC program has been effective at helping students become more responsible at the urban high school.

Overall, 28 JROTC students (62%), 14 parents (70%), 6 teachers (60%), 3 administrator (75%) and 1 AFJROTC instructors (50%) strongly agreed that the AFJROTC help students become more responsible. There were seventeen JROTC students (38%), five parents (25%), three teachers (30%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) agreed. There was one teacher (10%) and one parent (5%) who had no opinion. See Table 1.24, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.24

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Fourteen that the JROTC Program has been Effective at Helping Students Become more Responsible at the Urban High School among the Five Groups of Respondents.

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 |
| Teachers | 6 | 60 | 3 | 30 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 28 | 62 | 17 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.62 | .49 |
| Parents | 14 | 70 | 5 | 25 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.62 | .58 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The fifteenth school survey question was:

JROTC students are a valued asset in public high school.

Overall, 21 JROTC students (47%), 9 parents (45%), 6 teachers (60%), 4 administrators (100%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students are a valued asset in public high schools. There were fifteen JROTC students (33%), four parents (20%), two teachers (20%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were nine JROTC students (20%) seven parents (35%) and two teachers (20%) with no opinion. See Table 1.25, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.25

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Fifteen that JROTC Students are a Valued Asset in Public High School among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Administrators | 4 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | .00 |
| Teachers | 6 | 60 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.40 | .84 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 21 | 47 | 15 | 33 | 9 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.27 | .78 |
| Parents | 9 | 45 | 4 | 20 | 7 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.10 | .91 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among the five person's perceptions on the Impact to School category questions. The independent variable, the respondents, included five levels: Administrators, Teachers, Instructors, Students, and Parents. The dependent variable was Impact to School category which is the sum of the scores for questions: 12. The JROTC program prepares students for life after high school, 13. The JROTC program has a positive influence on students enrolled in the program at the urban high school, 14. The JROTC program has been effective at helping students become more responsible at the urban high school, and 15. JROTC students are a valued asset in public high school. See Table 1.26, for the means and standard deviations on the five respondent groups for their perceptions on Impact to School.

Table 1.26

Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Impact to School Category

| Respondents Variable | <i>n</i> | Mean | SD |
|----------------------|----------|-------|------|
| Administrators | 4 | 18.75 | 2.50 |
| Teachers | 10 | 16.30 | 3.27 |
| Instructors | 2 | 18.00 | 2.83 |
| Students | 45 | 17.89 | 2.39 |
| Parents | 20 | 17.70 | 2.47 |
| Total | 81 | 17.69 | 2.54 |

An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analyses. The one-way ANOVA results (see Table 1.27) revealed a non statistically significant main effect, $F(4, 76) = 1.00, p > .05$. As assessed by partial eta squared, $\eta^2 = .05$, the strength of differences between group's responses (DV) and the Goal Setting Skills (IV) category, was medium, with the group factors accounting for 5% of the variance of the dependent variable between the five groups.

Table 1.27

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of the Impact to School Category from the Five Respondents

| Source | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between | 25.79 | 4 | 6.45 | 1.00 | .41 | .05 |
| Within | 489.49 | 76 | 6.44 | | | |
| Total | 25867.00 | 81 | | | | |

Because no significant differences were found between groups, post hoc testing was not conducted. However, the group main effect indicated that administrations ($M = 18.75, SD =$

2.50) tended to have the greater responds Impact to School category than the other four groups. See Table 1.26.

The sixteenth school survey question was:

JROTC students have greater citizenship skills than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 20 JROTC students (44%), 9 parents (45%), 6 teachers (60%), 1 administrators (25%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students have greater citizenship skills than non-JROTC students. There were fourteen JROTC students (31%), five parents (25%), three teachers (30%), three administrators (75%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were eight JROTC students (18%) four parents (20%) and one teacher (10%) who had no opinion. There were three JROTC students (7%) and two parents (10%) who disagreed. See Table 1.28, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations on the five groups.

Table 1.28

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Sixteen that JROTC Students have greater Citizenship Skills than Non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(4)</u> <u>Agree</u> | | <u>(3)</u> <u>No</u> <u>Opinion</u> | | <u>(2)</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>(1)</u> <u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents</u> <u>Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 1 | 25 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.25 |
| Teachers | 6 | 60 | 3 | 30 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 20 | 44 | 14 | 31 | 8 | 18 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.13 | .94 |
| Parents | 9 | 45 | 5 | 25 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.05 | 1.05 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The seventeenth school survey question was:

The JROTC program teaches citizenship development.

Overall, 30 JROTC students (67%), 17 parents (85%), 3 teachers (30%), 3 administrators (75%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program teaches citizenship development. There were eleven JROTC students (24%), five teachers (50%), three parents (15%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) agreed. There were four JROTC students (9%) and two teachers (20%) who had no opinion. See Table 1.29, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.29

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Seventeen that the JROTC Program Teaches Citizenship Development among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 | .50 |
| Teachers | 3 | 30 | 5 | 50 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.10 | .74 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 30 | 67 | 11 | 24 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.58 | .66 |
| Parents | 17 | 85 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.85 | .37 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The eighteenth school survey question was:

JROTC students are more patriotic than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 16 JROTC students (36%), 8 parents (40%), 3 administrators (75%), 2 teachers (20%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students are more patriotic than non-JROTC students. There were nineteen JROTC students (42%), eight parents (40%), eight teachers (80%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were seven JROTC students (16%) and three parents (15%) who had no opinion. There were three JROTC students (7%) and one parent (5%) who disagreed. See Table 1.30, for the frequency distributions, percentage, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.30

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Eighteen that JROTC Students are more Patriotic than Non-JROTC Students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----|------------------|----|-----------------------|----|---------------------|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 |
| Teachers | 2 | 20 | 8 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.20 | .42 |
| Instructors | 2 | 20 | 8 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 16 | 36 | 19 | 42 | 7 | 16 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.07 | .89 |
| Parents | 8 | 40 | 8 | 40 | 3 | 15 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.15 | .88 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The nineteenth school survey question was:

The JROTC program promotes patriotism at the school.

Overall, 25 JROTC students (56%), 10 parents (50%), 5 teachers (50%), 3 administrators (75%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agree that the JROTC program promotes

patriotism at the school. There were thirteen JROTC students (29%), ten parents (50%), five teachers (50%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) agreed. There were seven JROTC students (16%) who had no opinion.

See Table 1.31, for the frequency distribution among the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.31

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Nineteen that the JROTC Program Promote Patriotism at the School among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | <u>(5) Strongly Agree</u> | | <u>(4) Agree</u> | | <u>(3) No Opinion</u> | | <u>(2) Disagree</u> | | <u>(1) Strongly Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----|------------------|----|-----------------------|----|---------------------|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 |
| Teachers | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.20 | .53 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 25 | 56 | 13 | 29 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.40 | .75 |
| Parents | 10 | 50 | 10 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.50 | .51 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among the five person's perceptions on the Citizenship Development category questions. The independent variable, the respondents, included five levels: Administrators, Teachers, Instructors, Students, and Parents. The dependent variable was Citizenship Development category which is the sum of the scores for questions: 16. JROTC students have greater citizenship skills than non-JROTC students, 17. The JROTC program teaches citizenship development, 18. JROTC students are more patriotic than non-JROTC students, 19. The JROTC program promotes patriotism at the school. See Table 1.32, for the means and

standard deviations on the five respondent groups for their perceptions on Citizenship Development.

Table 1.32

Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Citizenship Development Category

| Respondents Variable | <i>n</i> | Mean | SD |
|----------------------|----------|-------|------|
| Administrators | 4 | 18.50 | 1.73 |
| Teachers | 10 | 17.30 | 2.06 |
| Instructors | 2 | 18.00 | 2.83 |
| Students | 45 | 17.18 | 3.08 |
| Parents | 20 | 17.55 | 2.58 |
| Total | 81 | 17.37 | 2.76 |

An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analyses. The one-way ANOVA results (see Table 1.33) revealed a non statistically significant main effect, $F(4, 76) = .261, p > .01$. As assessed by partial eta squared, $\eta^2 = .01$, the strength of differences between group's responses (DV) and the Citizenship Development (IV) category, was a weak, with the group factors accounting for 1% of the variance of the dependent variable between the five groups.

Table 1.33

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of Citizenship Development Category from the Five Respondents

| Source | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between | 8.26 | 4 | 2.07 | .26 | .90 | .01 |
| Within | 600.63 | 76 | 7.90 | | | |
| Total | 25049.00 | 81 | | | | |

Because no significant differences were found between groups, post hoc testing was not conducted. However, the group main effect indicated that administrations ($M = 18.50$, $SD = 1.73$) tended to have rating on the Citizenship Development category than the other four groups. See Table 1.32

The twentieth school survey question was:

The JROTC program teaches students self discipline.

Overall, 29 JROTC students (64%), 14 parents (70%), 3 teachers (30%), 2 administrators (50%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program teaches students self discipline. There were fourteen JROTC students (31%), six parents (30%), three teachers (30%), two administrators (50%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were two teachers (20%) and two JROTC students (4%) who had no opinion. There were two teachers (20%) who disagreed. See Table 1.34, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.34

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty that the JROTC Program Teaches Students Self Discipline among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|------------------------|----|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.50 |
| Teachers | 3 | 30 | 3 | 30 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.70 | 1.16 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 29 | 64 | 14 | 31 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.60 | .50 |
| Parents | 14 | 70 | 6 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.70 | .47 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The twenty-first school survey was:

JROTC students display self discipline in school.

Overall, 17 JROTC students (38%), 9 parents (45%), 7 teachers (70%), 2 administrators (50%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students display self discipline in school. There were twenty JROTC students (44%), nine parents (45%), two teachers (20%), two administrators (50%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed.

There were eight JROTC students (18%) and two parents (10%) who had non opinion. There was one teacher 10%) who strongly disagreed. See Table 1.35, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups of respondents.

Table 1.35

Frequency Distribution, Percentage, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty-One that JROTC Students Display Self Discipline in School among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.50 |
| Teachers | 7 | 70 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.40 | 1.27 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 17 | 38 | 20 | 44 | 8 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4.20 | .72 |
| Parents | 9 | 45 | 9 | 45 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.35 | .67 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The twenty-second school survey was:

Self discipline is a major component of the JROTC program.

Overall, 17 JROTC students (38%), 12 parents (60%), 3 teachers (30%), 3 administrators (75%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that self discipline is a major component of the JROTC program. There were nine JROTC students (20%), eight parents (40%), five teachers (50%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed that self discipline is emphasized in the AFJROTC program at the urban high school. There were sixteen JROTC students (36%) and two teachers (20%) who had no opinion. There were three JROTC students (7%) who disagreed. See table 1.36, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.36

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty-Two that Self Discipline is a Major Component of the JROTC Program among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 3 | 75 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.75 |
| Teachers | 3 | 30 | 5 | 50 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.10 | .74 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 17 | 38 | 9 | 20 | 16 | 36 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 3.93 | 1.01 |
| Parents | 12 | 60 | 8 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.60 | .50 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The twenty-third school survey was:

JROTC students are more disciplined than non-JROTC students.

Overall, 15 JROTC students (33%), 7 parents (35%), 1 teacher (10%) and 1 AFJROTC instructor (50%) strongly agreed that JROTC students are more disciplined than non-JROTC students. There were eight parents (40%), five teachers (50%), four administrators (100%), two JROTC students (4%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) agreed. There were twelve JROTC students (27%) four parents (20%) and two teachers (20%) who had no opinion. There were fifteen JROTC students (33%), two teachers (20%) and one parent (5%) who disagreed. There was one JROTC student (2%) who strongly disagreed. See the frequency distribution for the five groups of respondents. See Table 1.37, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five respondent groups.

Table 1.37

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty-Three that JROTC Students are more Disciplined than Non-JROTC students among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|------------------------|----|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 0 | 0 | 4 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.00 |
| Teachers | 1 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.50 | .97 |
| Instructors | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.50 | .71 |
| Students | 15 | 33 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 27 | 15 | 33 | 1 | 2 | 45 | 3.33 | 1.31 |
| Parents | 7 | 35 | 8 | 40 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.15 | .75 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among the five person's perceptions on the Self Discipline category questions. The independent variable, the respondents, included five levels: Administrators, Teachers, Instructors, Students, and Parents. The dependent variable was the Self Discipline category which is the sum of the scores for questions: 20. The JROTC program teaches students self discipline, 21. JROTC students display self discipline in school, 22. Self discipline is a major component of the JROTC program, and 23. The JROTC students are more disciplined than non-JROTC students. See Table 1.38, for the means and standard deviations on the five respondent groups for their perceptions on Self Discipline.

Table 1.38

Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Self Discipline Category

| Respondents Variable | <i>n</i> | Mean | SD |
|----------------------|----------|-------|------|
| Administrators | 4 | 17.75 | .50 |
| Teachers | 10 | 15.70 | 3.80 |
| Instructors | 2 | 18.00 | 2.83 |
| Students | 45 | 16.07 | 3.45 |
| Parents | 20 | 17.80 | 2.14 |
| Total | 81 | 16.58 | 3.18 |

An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analyses. The one-way ANOVA results (see Table 1.39) revealed a non statistically significant main effect, $F(4, 76) = 1.49, p > .05$. As assessed by partial eta squared, $\eta^2 = .07$, the strength of differences between group's responses (DV) and the Self Discipline (IV) category was medium, with the group factors accounting for 7% of the variance of the dependent variable between the five groups.

Table 1.39

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions on the Self Discipline Category from the Five Respondents

| Source | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between | 58.87 | 4 | 14.72 | 1.49 | .21 | .07 |
| Within | 748.85 | 76 | 9.85 | | | |
| Total | 23075.00 | 81 | | | | |

Because no significant differences were found between groups, post hoc testing was not conducted. However, the group main effect indicated that instructors ($M = 18.00$, $SD = 2.83$) tended to have the greater responds Goal Setting Skills category than the other four groups. See Table 1.38.

The twenty-fourth school survey was:

The JROTC program influences students to join the military.

Overall, 10 JROTC students (22%), 5 parents (25%), 3 teachers (30%) and 2 administrators (50%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program influences students to join the military.

There were sixteen JROTC students (36%), eight parents (40%), five teachers (50%), two administrators (50%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who agreed. There were thirteen JROTC students (29%) and two teachers (20%) who had no opinion. There were four parents (20%), three JROTC students (7%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) disagreed. There were three JROTC students (7%) and three parents (15%) who strongly disagreed. See Table 1.40, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five respondent groups.

Table 1.40

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty-Four that the JROTC Program Influences Students to Join the Military among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|------------------------|----|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| | Administrators | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.50 |
| Teachers | 3 | 30 | 5 | 50 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.10 | .74 |
| Instructors | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.00 | 1.41 |
| Students | 10 | 22 | 16 | 36 | 13 | 29 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 45 | 3.60 | 1.12 |
| Parents | 5 | 25 | 8 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4.05 | .69 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

The twenty-fifth school survey was:

The JROTC program is used as a military recruitment tool.

Overall, 5 JROTC students (11%), 4 parents (20%) and 1 teacher (10%) strongly agreed that the JROTC program is used as a military recruitment tool. There were thirteen JROTC students (29%), five teachers (50%), four parents (20%) and three administrators (75%) who agreed in with the statement. There were twelve JROTC students (27%), two teachers (20%) and one parent (5%) who had no opinion. There were eleven JROTC students (24%), eight parents (40%), two teachers (20%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who disagreed. There were four JROTC students (9%), three parents (15%), one administrator (25%) and one AFJROTC instructor (50%) who strongly disagreed. See Table 1.41, for the frequency distributions, percentages, means, and standard deviations among the five groups.

Table 1.41

Frequency Distributions, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations on the Likert-scale from Responses to Question Twenty-Five that the JROTC Program is Used as a Military Recruitment Tool among the Five Groups of Respondents

| <u>Respondents</u> | (5) Strongly <u>Agree</u> | | (4) <u>Agree</u> | | (3) No <u>Opinion</u> | | (2) <u>Disagree</u> | | (1) Strongly <u>Disagree</u> | | <u>Groups Respondents Means and S.D.</u> | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|------------------------|----|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------|----|------|------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| Administrators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | | 4 | 3.25 | 1.50 |
| Teachers | | 1 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.50 | .97 |
| Instructors | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 1.50 | .71 |
| Students | | 5 | 11 | 13 | 29 | 12 | 27 | 11 | 24 | 4 | 9 | 45 | 3.09 | 1.16 |
| Parents | | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 40 | 3 | 15 | 20 | 4.30 | .57 |

Likert scale was defined as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 No Opinion, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among the five person's perceptions on the Opposing View Point category questions. The independent variable, the respondents, included five levels: Administrators, Teachers, Instructors, Students, and Parents. The dependent variable was Opposing View Point category which is the sum of the scores for questions: 24. The JROTC program influences students to join the military, and 25. The JROTC program is used as a military recruitment tool. See Table 1.42, for the means and standard deviations for the five respondent groups and their perceptions on Opposing View Point.

Table 1.42

Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Respondents Perceptions on the Opposing View Point Category

| Respondents Variable | <i>n</i> | Mean | SD |
|----------------------|----------|------|------|
| Administrators | 4 | 7.75 | 1.89 |
| Teachers | 10 | 7.60 | 1.65 |
| Instructors | 2 | 4.50 | 2.12 |
| Students | 45 | 6.70 | 2.22 |
| Parents | 20 | 8.35 | 1.09 |
| Total | 81 | 7.21 | 2.05 |

An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analyses. The one-way ANOVA results (see Table 2.39) revealed a statistically significant main effect, $F(4, 76) = 3.77, p < .05$. As assessed by partial eta squared, $\eta^2 = .17$, the strength of differences between group's responses (DV) and the Opposing View Point (IV) category, was a strong, with the group factors accounting for 17% of the variance of the dependent variable between the five groups.

Table 1.43

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of the Opposing Viewpoint Category from the Five Respondents

| Source | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between | 55.58 | 4 | 13.90 | 3.77 | .00 | .17 |
| Within | 279.84 | 76 | 3.68 | | | |
| Total | 4546.00 | 81 | | | | |

Follow-up analyses to evaluate pairwise differences among the means were conducted. Because the differences among the five groups ranged from 8.35 to 4.50 (see Table 1.42), we

chose not to assume that the differences were equal. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test procedure were used to determine which pair of the five group means differed significantly, see Table 1.44. The results of the analysis indicate that the respondents who were members of the parents group ($M = 8.35$, $SD = 1.09$) responded greater to Opposing Viewpoints questions than respondent who were members of the administrators ($M = 7.75$, $SD = 1.89$), teachers ($M = 7.60$, $SD = 1.64$), instructors ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 2.12$, and the students ($M = 6.69$, $SD = 2.22$). The only significant differences among the paired comparison was between students – parents, $M = 1.66$. The effect size for the one significant pairwise difference was 0.87.

Table 1.44

Post Hoc Results of Perceptions on the Opposing Viewpoint Category Questions among the Five Respondent Groups

| Respondent Groups | Mean | Mean Differences ($X_i - X_k$) (Effect Sizes are indicated in parentheses) | | | | |
|-------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Administrator | 7.75 | -- | | | | |
| Teachers | 7.60 | .15 | -- | | | |
| Instructors | 4.50 | 3.25 | 3.10 | -- | | |
| Students | 6.69 | 1.06 | .91 | 2.19 | -- | |
| Parent | 8.35 | .60 | .75 | 3.85 | 1.66* (0.87) | -- |

Focus Group Data Analysis

The 81 respondents in this study were contacted via telephone to participate in two focus groups. The participants were contacted on three separate occasions during the 2008-2009 school year. As a result of conflicts in either school or work schedules, only five individuals

agreed to participate. There were two sessions electronically recorded. Focus Group One consisted of an administrator, AFJROTC instructor and teacher. Focus Group Two was comprised of a JROTC student and parent. Focus group participants were selected based having at least one administrator, one AFJROTC instructor, one teacher, one JROTC student and one parent from the study sample. Each group was assembled to ascertain more in depth responses to the survey questions. Ten open ended questions were developed which addressed leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline for JROTC students enrolled in the AFJROTC program for at least one year from 2005-2009 at the urban high school. Group One responded to questions one, two, three, five, and ten. Group Two responded to questions four, six, seven, eight, and nine. The questions were customized to pertain to the specific interest of the participants.

The two focus groups were assembled during the school day at the urban high school. The groups were seated in an enclosed office or classroom at the school. The researcher had five open ended questions prepared for each group. The researcher, acting as moderator began the session with a general opening question for all group members. Responses to each question were recorded and transcribed. See Appendix D. The questions were divided into the ten specific questions about the AFJROTC program.

Group One:

Interview Question 1: Briefly explain your experience with the AFJROTC program?

The administrator spoke positively about his experience with the AFJROTC program. He reflected on his high school years and his enrollment in the program. The administrator stated, "Being a former AFJROTC cadet during my years of high school, I was able to develop citizenship, leadership and sense of responsibility for my community. As I work with students at the urban high school, I noticed that the students have learned the same values that I learned during my years at high school in the AFJROTC." The administrator

further elaborated that, “As a whole, I feel the AFJROTC program is a valuable asset to schools. It provides many opportunities to students and teaches essential life skills that are not taught in the regular classroom.”

The teacher concurred with the administrator about the value of the program. He stated, “I can only give accolades for the AFJROTC program at our school. Every JROTC student that I have taught has benefitted tremendously with the program. Setting goals allows JROTC students to be successful in my classroom. As a whole, I feel the AFJROTC program is a valuable asset to schools. It provides many opportunities to students and teaches essential life skills that are not taught in the regular classroom.”

The AFJROTC instructor quickly responded to the teacher by adding, “Over the past nine years of AFJROTC, I have noticed that the longer a student remains in the program, the graduation rate increases. If a student takes a second year of JROTC, I would estimate the graduation rate is at least 95%.”

Interview Question 2: Are you aware of any problems associated with the AFJROTC? Do you have any suggestions on how the program could be improved? Please explain.

Both the administrator and teacher felt there were some problems associated with the AFJROTC program. The teacher gave a detailed account of problems he associated with the program. He stated, “Well, what readily comes to mind is the overall involvement of the JROTC program in our school. I know they are making efforts to be more involved. For example, the last couple of years I believe they have been the sponsor of the annual blood drive here at school. I know they are making an effort, but there seems to be a lack of publicity about the blood drive over the past couple of years in comparison to previous years. I know, for example that Red Cross representatives will come out to the school and speak to

the classes, especially the senior classes – perspective donors to explain the importance of giving blood and how necessary it is because the blood banks are running so low. That seems to elicit a lot more participation than just all of a sudden one day hearing the announcement that tomorrow were having a blood drive and if you want to sign up you can. Maybe that particular school service program could be a little more organized. They could promote it more or advertise it more and supervise it a little better.”

The administrator had a different suggestion to improve the program. He stated, “Many students that are in danger of becoming dropouts are not aware of the benefits of the program and therefore never consider enrolling.” The AFJROTC instructor did not acknowledge any problems associated with the program.

Interview Question 3: What is the most important outcome of your enrollment in the AFJROTC program? Can you describe a specific story or event that characterizes your outcome?

The AFJROTC instructor, administrator and teacher all acknowledged positive outcomes regarding enrollment in the AFJROTC program. The AFJROTC instructor stated, “Learning to be leaders, setting goals and being responsible for one’s actions are positive outcomes associated with enrollment in the program.”

The administrator stated, “Because of the AFJROTC program a lot of our students who may be at risk have found leadership under the two instructors as well as now having the ability to make their mind up that they chose to pursue the military as a career.” He further added, “I believe that JROTC students lives are greatly affected by teacher quality, the AFJROTC program is as strong as its instructors.”

The teacher recounted what he noticed from the past school year. He stated, “One of the important outcomes is all of the awards and accomplishments they earned this past year.”

Interview Question 5: Has the AFJROTC program impacted self discipline of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.

The administrator, AFJROTC instructor and teacher were mostly in agreement about the impact of self discipline on students enrolled in the program. The administrator stated, “After being enrolled in the program, students appear to take greater responsible for their actions.”

The AFJROTC instructor’s response was somewhat different. He stated, “Self discipline depends on the student. Some students embrace the skills taught in the program, while others fail to see the value of improving their lives.”

The teacher concurred with the instructor and added, “I think it various with the age. You see the discipline come in a little bit more strongly from students that are in the JROTC program. I have noticed that again a stronger impact on some students than on others, but it is very noticeable on those that are taking that responsibility and stepping up.” The teacher added, “The AFJROTC program is a structured program that assists students in creating goals, improving self-discipline, and learning valuable skills.”

Group Two:

Interview Question 4: What is the most frustrating consequence of the AFJROTC program at the urban high school? Can you summarize a specific story or event that characterizes your opinion?

The JROTC student recalled his frustration with students at different levels of exposure to the AFJROTC program. He stated, “It’s difficult to get students on the same page because I get a lot of people completely clueless and it doesn’t matter if it’s 1st year, 2nd year, 3rd year. I got 4th year completely clueless when it comes to drill and everything like that and it’s not necessarily the programs fault it’s their part to live up to that standard.”

The parent's frustration related to mixing freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors together. He responded, "The maturity level of first year students could be a problem because of their age and their ability to follow directions."

Interview Question 6: Has the AFJROTC program impacted leadership skills of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.

The JROTC student and parent both strongly agreed that the program impacted leadership skills development for students. The JROTC student stated, "I learned a lot of leadership that I never knew. I've never really felt much like a leader until I took this class."

The parent was emotional in responding to this question. He stated, "My son was a good student academically, but he was soft spoken and did not like to take charge. The JROTC program gave him confidence and placed him in leadership positions to strengthen his ability to lead. After three years in the program, he has developed into a leader and I credit the program with providing him with that skill."

Interview Question 7: Has the AFJROTC program impacted goal setting skills of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.

The parent who is also a school teacher recounted his experience with the impact of the AFJROTC program on goal setting skills. He stated, "I can certainly see it and observed it in juniors and seniors, maybe even as far as the sophomores planning ahead, getting involved in activities, programs and awards that are offered through the program to position themselves for even getting into one of the military academies or going directly into military service. I find that JROTC students are thinking farther down the road, possibly even sooner than other high school students. Their thinking, well gee, I'm going to graduate in a couple of

years and here is what I'm going to do after graduation. You don't get that from as many high school students as I think who are not in the AFJROTC."

The JROTC student recalling the programs impact on goal setting skills stated, "It helps motivate me to graduate and work towards a service academy."

Interview Question 8: Would you recommend the AFJROTC program to your child or to another student? Why or Why not? Please explain.

Both the parent and JROTC student acknowledged that they would recommend the AFJROTC program. The parent stated enthusiastically, "I see students who need to build leadership skills, self confidence and maybe a little direction in their lives and I think of the JROTC as a place to start students thinking about the future. I also see the JROTC instructors put students in a good position and have students step into a position to say this is what I want. This makes me feel good because, as a teacher and parent, I wish this for every student who walks out of my class could feel that way, but unfortunately it's not that way."

The JROTC student quickly responded, "Yes, it is an excellent program that introduces cadets to the Air Force and its core values by instilling leadership, responsibility, and the spirit of the corp."

Interview Question 9: Has the AFJROTC program impacted citizenship development of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.

The JROTC student and parent viewed this question the same. They both felt that citizenship development must be observed directly in the school environment.

The JROTC student stated "Yes, AFJROTC instills discipline and respect in students and the dedicated cadets bring pride to the school."

The parent added, "Because of the program, my son is more concerned with upholding the goals and values of the Air Force."

Interview Question 10: Is there anything you would like to tell us about the AFJROTC program?

The JROTC student simply stated, “I love it. Its fun, has cool people, and helps my leadership.” He added, “Being in the program for only two years has already been a complete change for me. AFJROTC developed me as a better person with moral values.”

The parent concluded, “My child loved the program, but because he is not going into the military, I’m afraid he will lose the values he learned.”

Summary

The first research question (What was the impact of enrollment in the Air Force JROTC program on the grade point average, attendance rate, disciplinary referral and dropout rate of those students who were enrolled for at least one year during the 2005-2009 school years?) was answered through three independent sample t-test. The results revealed that the grade point average for non- JROTC students ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.94$) was higher than JROTC students ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.17$). The absentee rate for JROTC students ($M = 6.71$, $SD = 6.56$) was higher than non-JROTC students ($M = 6.56$, $SD = 4.93$). The disciplinary referrals were higher for JROTC students ($M = .060$, $SD = 4.02$) than non-JROTC students non-JROTC students ($M = 0.53$, $SD = 3.00$).

The second research question (In what ways do administrators perceive that the AFJROTC program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were enrolled in the program for at least one year during the 2005-2009 school years?) was answered through a one-way ANOVA. The results showed that administrators strongly agreed that enrollment for at least one year in the AFJROTC program had an effect on leadership skills development (75%), goal setting skills (75%), citizenship development (75%), self discipline (75%) and respect for authority (25%).

The third research question (In what ways do AFJROTC instructors perceive that the program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were enrolled in the program for at least one year during the 2005-2009 school years?) was answered through a one-way ANOVA. The AFJROTC instructors responded between strongly agree and agree that enrollment in the AFJROTC program for at least one year had an effect on leadership skills development (50%), respect for authority (50%), goal setting skills (50%), citizenship development (50%) and self discipline (50%).

The fourth research question (In what ways do teachers perceive that the program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students who were enrolled in the program for at least one year during the 2005-2009 school years?) was answered through a one-way ANOVA. The teachers strongly agreed that enrollment in the AFJROTC program for at least one year had an effect on leadership skills development (80%); respect for authority (60%), goal setting skills (70%), citizenship development (60%) and self discipline (70%).

The fifth research question (In what ways do students who were enrolled in the AFJROTC program perceives that the program had an effect on the leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline of students for at least one year during the 2005-2009 school years?) was answered through a one-way ANOVA. The JROTC students strongly agree that enrollment for at least one year in the AFJROTC program had an effect on leadership skills development (82%); respect for authority (73%), goal setting skills (71%), citizenship development (67%) and self discipline (38%).

The sixth research question (In what ways do parents perceive that the AFJOTC program had an effect on leadership skills development, respect for authority, goals setting skills,

citizenship development and self discipline of students for at least one year during the 2005-2009 school years?) was answered through a one-way ANOVA. The parents strongly agree that enrollment for at least one year in the AFJROTC program had an effect on leadership skills development, (75%); respect for authority (85%), goal setting skills (70%), citizenship development (85%) and self discipline (60%).

Focus group interviews were utilized as a follow up method to gather narrative responses to ten open ended questions regarding the five categories in the study. An administrator, AFJROTC instructor, teacher, JROTC student and parent participated in two individual groups. Overall, the participants responded positively about the skills that the AFJROTC program provided. In addition, the participants also had a favorable opinion of the impact that the program had on the climate at the urban high school. The meanings of these findings, and their implications and recommendations for future research will be discussed in chapter five.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for students enrolled in the Air Force JROTC program. In addition, the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents regarding the Air Force JROTC program at an urban high school in southeastern, Virginia were observed. This chapter contains a summary of the findings, limitations, implications for practice, recommendations for future research and concluding remarks.

Findings

Participation in the AFJROTC program did not result in higher academic achievement. The data gathered for research question one indicated that a negative statistical significance was indicated at a level of 0.5 in the grade point averages of JROTC versus non-JROTC students. JROTC students had significantly lower grade point averages ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.17$) than non-JROTC students ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.94$). These findings were consistent with other studies, (Dohle, 2001 & Taylor, 1999) that the program is not designed to improve grades, but to teach students skills to prepare them to set goals and to become better citizens.

Participation in the AFJROTC program did not result in a higher attendance rate. Data related to research question one indicated that there was no statistical significance in the attendance rate of JROTC students versus non-JROTC students. JROTC students had more absences ($M = 6.71$, $SD = 6.56$) than non-JROTC ($M = 6.56$, $SD = 4.93$), but it was not statistically significant. These findings were in direct contradiction to a study by Taylor (1999) that concluded that JROTC students have fewer absences than non-JROTC students.

Participation in the AFJROTC program did not result in reduced disciplinary referrals. A review of the data regarding research question one indicated that there was no statistical significance in the disciplinary referrals of JROTC students versus non-JROTC students. JROTC students had more disciplinary referrals ($M = 0.60$, $SD = 4.02$) than non-JROTC students ($M = 0.53$, $SD = 3.00$). No previous studies could be found that investigated disciplinary referrals for JROTC students. For focus group question 21, administrators strongly agreed at a level of 50%, AFJROTC instructors 50%, teachers 70%, JROTC students 38% and parents 45% that JROTC student's display self discipline in school. An AFJROTC instructor did comment in focus group interviews that, "Self discipline depends on the students. Some students embrace the skills taught in the program, while others fail to see the value of improving their lives" (S5. line1).

Participants in the AFJROTC program had a lower drop out rate than non participants. Eighteen non-JROTC students compared to five JROTC students dropped out of school from the original fifty students in this study. Because of the small number of students participating in the study the researcher was unable to statistically determine if the program impacted the dropout rate. Although, administrators in the focus group interviews indicated that the program did appear to help prevent at risk students from dropping out of school. The administrator's responses were contrary to Mark's (2004) study utilizing data from a 2002 student cohort method of comparison. The data revealed that JROTC students had a 22.2% dropout percentage compared to 21.2% for non-JROTC students.

Participation in the AFJROTC program resulted in an improvement in leadership skills. From the responses to survey questions 1, 2, 3, and 4, statistical significance was indicated at a level 0.5 in the area of leadership. Focus group interviews revealed that the participants had a positive view of the overall AFJROTC program. Administrators spoke highly of the

AFJROTC instructor's ability to develop leadership and citizenship skills, along with instilling a sense of responsibility to the school community for JROTC students. The administrators strongly agreed at a level of 100% on the school survey that enrollment for at least one year in the AFJROTC program had an effect on leadership skills development. One administrator stated, "Because of the AFJROTC a lot of our students who may be at risk have found leadership..." (S3. line 1). JROTC students strongly agreed at the 82% level that leadership skills were developed. One student stated, "I learned a lot of leadership that I never knew. I've never really felt much like a leader until I took this class" (S6. line1). Teachers strongly agreed at the 80% level and parents at the 75% level that leadership skills were developed. A parent reflecting on her son's experience with the program said, "After three years in the program, he has developed into a leader and I credit the program with providing him with that skill" (S6. line 3)). The AFJROTC instructors strongly agreed at a 50% level that enrollment for at least one year in the AFJROTC program had an effect on leadership skills development. Based on these findings, administrators, JROTC students, teachers and parents felt that the AFJROTC was strong at teaching leadership skills development. The findings of the study are consistent with Bogden (1984) who found that administrators agreed that leadership skills are emphasized and demonstrated in public high schools. Morris, 2003 and Smith 2008 also agreed with the findings that leadership skills development was observed by students enrolled in JROTC programs.

Participation in the AFJROTC program resulted in improved goal setting skills. From survey question 5 administrators strongly agreed at a level of 75%, AFJROTC instructors 50%, teachers 70%, JROTC 71% and parents 70% that the JROTC teaches goal setting skills. These findings are similar with Smith (2008) who found that the AFJROTC program helped students to set their own goals and to look at the educational setting as a place to grow

both individually and collectively. In a focus group interview a teacher stated, “Setting goals allows JROTC students to be successful in my classroom” (S1. line 1).

Participants in the AFJROTC program demonstrated improved citizenship skills. From survey question 17 administrators strongly agreed at a level of 75%, AFJROTC instructors 50%, teachers 30%, JROTC students 67% and parents 85% that the JROTC program teaches citizenship skills development. These findings are similar to the stated goals of the JROTC program to develop a respect for country and community.

Participants in the AFJROTC program exhibited a greater respect for authority than non participants. From survey questions 9 administrators strongly agreed at a level of 50%, AFJROTC instructors 50%, teachers 10%, JROTC students 73% and parents at 85% that the JROTC program teaches students to respect authority. These findings are similar to the goals of the JROTC program to develop a sense of respect for self and others.

The JROTC program is not viewed by JROTC students and their parents as a recruitment tool to influence students to join the military. The responses to survey questions 24 and 25 indicated statistical significance indicated at a level of 0.5 in the area of recruitment and influence for JROTC students and parents. The JROTC students responded strongly disagree at a level 7% and parents responded at a level of 15% that the AFJROTC program is used as a recruitment tool. The administrator’s views were contrary to both the JROTC students and parents. Administrators strongly agreed that the AFJROTC program is used as a recruitment tool at a level of 75%. The administrator’s response was similar to critics of the program. “Although officially JROTC insists it does not recruit students, a 2000 congressional report of the Chiefs of Staff revealed that between 30% and 50% of students that successfully complete JROTC enlist in the military” (Anderson, G.L., p. 271). Even though, administrator’s views were similar to critics that the program was being used as recruitment

tool, they still spoke highly of the program and the value it has to teach leadership skills.

School personnel, JROTC students and parents had a positive perception of the AFJROTC program to develop citizenship along with a sense of responsibility for the school community. From survey question 13 administrators strongly agreed at a level of 75%, AFJROTC instructors 50%, teachers 20%, JROTC students 65% and parents 70% that the JROTC program has a positive influence on students enrolled in the program at an urban high school. One administrator stated, “As a whole, I feel the AFJROTC program is a valuable asset to schools” (S1. line1). Teachers strongly agreed at a level of 60% that the program is a valued asset to the school. They cited school based community service projects as an example of the student’s contribution to the school. JROTC students strongly agreed at a level of 64% and parents strongly agreed at a level of 70% that the JROTC program has a positive influence on students enrolled in the program. The findings of the study were consistent with Morris (2003) who found that administrators, in general, had a positive perception of the JROTC programs in their schools. Borden, 1994; Curtin, 1991; and Marks, 2004 supported the researcher’s outcome that teachers view the entire JROTC program positively. The findings were generally similar to Perusse (1997) which revealed that parents have a positive impression of the JROTC program.

The students acknowledged that they loved the program and that it had helped them with character development and gave them a greater sense of serving the nation and community. Speaking about the positive impact of the program a student added, “AFJROTC developed me as a better person with moral values” (S10. line3). Parents also spoke of the positive impact that the program was having in the lives of their children. They felt that students, who were juniors or seniors, had a level of maturity that was greater than students who were not enrolled in the program. One parent stated, “The maturity level of first year students could

be a problem because their age and their ability to follow directions” (S4. line1). Teachers felt the program was teaching essential life skills that were not taught in other classes. A teacher stated, “The AFJROTC program is a structured program that assists students in creating goals, improving self-discipline, and learning valuable skills.” Finally, an administrator said, “After being enrolled in the program, students appear to take greater responsible for their actions” (S5. line1).

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the sample size was small, with only 50 JROTC students, 50 non-JROTC students, four administrators, two AFJROTC instructors, ten teachers and twenty parents who participated in the study. After taking into account the students who dropped out of school there were 45 JROTC students and 32 non-JROTC students.

Second, students who participated in the study came from one high school in southeastern, Virginia. Utilizing only one high school eliminates the ability of the researcher to have a cross section of school environments to sample for the study.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study have implications for school districts looking for alternative methods to help empower public high school students with skills to keep them in school. Participants in the AFJROTC program had a lower drop out rate than non participants. In addition, administrators in the focus group interviews indicated that the program did appear to help prevent at risk students from dropping out of school. There is little doubt the catastrophe effect of students who drop out of school leaves on our society. As this epidemic continues to grow, a concrete solution is needed to help educators contend with this societal problem.

The study also found that the AFJROTC program develops leadership and citizenship skills; while helping students respect authority and become actively involved in their communities. The skills observed by school personal, students and parents in this study could be useful in the educational community, to see if the AFJROTC program could be used as an alternative resource to impact students considering dropping out of school.

The quandary that educational leaders may face when considering implementing the AFJROTC program into their school buildings is that the program is designed to teach abstract skills such as; leadership, respect for authority, goal setting, citizenship, and self discipline. On the face on it, this may appear to be in direct contradiction with school districts attempting to introduce more academically rigorous programs for the 21st century student. In addition, the goals of the JROTC program are not designed for academic training or developing higher level thinking skills. Educational leaders could combat any argument regarding installing the program into public schools, by merely having classroom teacher's work in conjunction with AFJROTC instructors to utilize their tutorial services to help support the academic development of JROTC students. In turn, AFJROTC instructors could also incorporate tutorial activities as a required component to the JROTC curriculum. By working together, school districts could see the utility of having a partnership with a program that develops life skills while classroom teachers help them with academic skills. This concept would help the school system, the individual schools, the JROTC program, the teachers and most importantly the students.

In conjunction with utilizing school teachers to help support the JROTC program with tutorial services, this approach would encourage JROTC students to attend school more frequently. Students by nature want to have people such as administrators, AFJROTC instructors and teachers around them who care about their well-being and want them to

succeed. They internalize this feeling and want to replicate it through action. The AFJROTC provides educational leaders with the platform to help students achieve this objective.

Another issue that may occur with school districts is justifying the installation of an AFJROTC program when other non academic programs are being eliminated. Educators could point to the benefits of the AFJROTC program addressing the needs of at risk students. This hard to reach population is a major concern for schools districts throughout the country. This program teaches these students to become leaders and helps instill in them a sense of confidence. This confidence could translate to students being more motivated to attend school regularly to excel in their regular classroom settings.

The issue of self discipline is a problem that school and individual classroom teachers increasingly face today. This troubling trend has caused some skilled and dedicated administrators and teachers to leave the educational profession. Students who lack structure in their lives tend to display behaviors that are contrary to the goals of the individual schools and classroom teachers. These students keep other students off task and cause teachers to devote an inordinate amount of time redirecting their negative behaviors. One of the stated goals of the AFJROTC program is to instill in students a sense of personal responsibility, character and self discipline. These skills are paramount when considering a way to help these students. By implementing this program, school leaders would have at their disposal a program that focuses on addressing the needs of this population of students.

The primary issue of student dropouts continues to be a constant challenge for school districts around the nation. Students fail to see the benefits of receiving a high school diploma and lack both the motivation and guidance to combat this issue. The numbers of studies dedicated to this subject could fill a library, but a solution to this problem still appears to be out of reach. Educational leaders should utilize the positive data on the ability of the

JROTC program to develop concrete and realistic goals for students enrolled in the program to remain in school. This is a viable option that could actually work. School districts should see that by implementing this program students will increase their motivation to succeed and in turn the guidance and structure that the program provides could contribute to eliminating the dropout problem in public high schools.

Schools routinely face the challenge of having students take on leadership positions in the school building, especially males. Even though, the AFJROTC program has female students, the vast majority of the students are males. Administrators wishing to improve the visual presence of student leaders in their building should incorporate the program as part of the development portion of the school curriculum. They could also be a way for local school districts to prepare students with leadership skills that they could use both in and outside of the school setting. In addition, administrators could suggest that AFJROTC instructors visit feeder schools and develop a presentation showing that students enrolled in the program develop leadership skills which translate into a more focused and responsible student. Finally, as an added bonus, they could emphasize that by applying this approach, it could encourage students to get involved in school organizations and become active members of the school community.

In addition to the ability of the AFJROTC to develop leadership, the program also provides students with goal setting skills. Based on the results of the study, this is a perception that is widespread by administrators, students and teachers. There is no question that educators view the inability of students to plan and set goals as an obstacle to them succeeding in the classroom. Though this is not the only program to help students develop goal setting skills, it is one program that is readily available to school districts to utilize as an alternative for disorganized and frustrated students.

In conjunction with goal setting skills, students develop an appreciation of their role as a citizen of the community, through the JROTC program. This is paramount when educators continue to look for methods to help students connect with their individual schools. When students connect with their schools, they are much more likely to do better academically and become less disruptive in the classroom setting. Educators uniquely understand the fact that students, who are connected with their schools, become better students.

Along that same line, when students are in a program that fosters leadership, citizenship and an involvement in the community, they are more inclined to respect authority. The AFJROTC instructors act as both authority figures and role models. They model through their interaction with the students the need to respect the person in command. This concept is so important when viewing the JROTC program as effective an alternative to teach students life long skills. Educators need only see the skills offered in the program and match them with the skills students need to succeed both in and out of school.

School districts also have to contend with the perception of critics who believe that the JROTC program is merely a tool utilized by the armed services to recruit or influence students to join the military. Studies by Lutz & Bartlett (1995) indicated that the JROTC is a recruitment tool by the armed services. Students who enroll in the JROTC program are more likely to attend college on JROTC scholarships or join the military after high school. Educators should study the fact that many of these students do graduate and prepare themselves for careers after high school. Some of these students would have dropped out of school or graduated with no clear vision of what they could or would do with their lives. Administrators, teachers, students and parents in this study commented that the program provided students with a structured environment in which to learn life long skills. The skills learned and the positive responses of school personal, students and parents should alleviate

any fears school districts may have about incorporating the AFJROTC program into their schools. Administrators should implement this program with the full knowledge that parents not only felt that the program yielded tangible results in the classroom through positive comments by teachers, but also that the program helped their children develop into responsible citizens with self discipline and goals for the future.

Programs that are designated for schools do not always have the full support of school personal, students and parents. The program may meet the academic standards set forth by the school district, but school personnel and parents may feel that the value of the program does not meet the specific needs of the student body. The educational practitioners, who work tirelessly in their schools, uniquely know the most pressing needs for their students. The AFJROTC program is that rare exception. It combines the skills of leadership, respect for authority, goal setting, citizenship, and self discipline. This should be a prerequisite for school districts when considering programs to be implemented into individual schools.

In summary, school districts have struggled with methods and programs to halt the rise of student dropouts. In-house programs designed by districts have not yielded the desired outcomes. The AFJROTC program is a tried and proven program. Administrators, teachers, students and parents sing it praises. They look at the change made by students who apply the skills they learn to their daily lives. Educational leaders should view their fellow educator's perceptions of the program as an indication that the program has worked in their schools and should be incorporated district wide.

Recommendations for Future Research

Further study might include investigation into the following areas:

1. A statewide or national study examining the perceptions of school administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, Air Force JROTC students and their parents on the impact of the JROTC program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate,

disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for students enrolled in the program in more than one high school in an individual school should be conducted?

2. A study could examine the Air Force JROTC Leadership Program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for students enrolled in the program using race and gender as the variable in public high schools?
3. A study could examine the Air Force JROTC Leadership Program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout for students enrolled in the program using urban, suburban or rural schools as the variables in public high schools?
4. A study could examine the impact of the AFJROTC program on leadership development for JROTC students enrolled in honors and advanced placement classes versus non-JROTC students in honors and advanced placement classes in public high schools?
5. A study could examine the grade point average (GPA) of students in the JROTC program before and after enrollment in the program ?
6. A study could examine the cost of the JROTC and how that could impact the decision of school districts to implement the program in high schools?
7. A study could examine the disciplinary referrals issued to students before and after enrollment in the JROTC program?

Concluding Remarks

The goals of the JROTC program are to instill a sense of accomplishment in high school students. Its mission is to build better citizens and give them a sense of pride in service to their fellow man. Today these core principles are still needed, but with the increase in the student dropout rate, the JROTC program can be one of many alternatives utilized to help

public education reach today's youth. This study examined the problem of student drop outs through archival data on JROTC and non-JROTC students' grade point average, attendance rate and disciplinary referrals. Also, the study addressed the perceptions of administrators, AFJROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents through surveys and focus groups.

The results from question one concluded that the grade point averages were statistically lower for JROTC students, and the absences and disciplinary referrals were higher, for students enrolled in the program for at least one year. The program was still viewed by administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents as having a positive impact on JROTC students and the overall school environment. This knowledge appears to outweigh any criticism that the program may face.

Questions two through six indicated that the school administrators, Air Force JROTC instructor's, teachers, JROTC students and parents acknowledged the positive impact that the program had on students enrolled for at least one year. School administrators especially acknowledged the impact of leadership skills development on students enrolled in the program. The school administrators did not feel as strongly about the program's ability to teach students goal setting skills, citizenship development, respect for authority and self discipline. All five responding groups indicated that the AFJROTC program had on the overall benefit of preparing the student for life during their high school years, but also life after high school.

A theme that continued to present itself in the studies utilized for this research was the benefit that the JROTC program had on leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development, self discipline. Each of the nine studies attested to the positive influence of the JROTC program on population of the schools in which the

programs are stationed. The studies utilized in this research concurred with previous studies that administrators and teachers had a positive impression of the JROTC program at their public high schools.

Two focus groups were used to generate narrative responses to ten open ended questions regarding leadership skills development, respect for authority, goal setting skills, citizenship development and self discipline. An administrator, AFJROTC instructor, teacher, JROTC student and parent participated in the groups. The participants had a positive opinion of the JROTC program's role in developing skills for students enrolled in the program for the majority of the five categories. Administrators viewed the program as a valued asset and that students learn essential life skills that they would not have learned in a regular classroom. The teacher and parent felt that students enrolled in the program benefitted tremendously. Teachers felt it would be helpful if the AFJROTC program could promote the benefits of the program as preventing at risk students from dropping out of school. JROTC students felt that the program helped them overcome their fears of speaking in public and taking on leadership roles. They also acknowledged that the program provided them with motivation to succeed in life. The AFJROTC program has contributed to students developing skills that they can use in the school environment and in life. These skills also contributed to students realizing the importance of setting goals, staying in school and becoming positive members of society. Also, the administrators, teachers and parents acknowledged the impact that the AFJROTC program has had on the overall development of the student.

In conclusion, although the results from the study indicated that the JROTC students had lower grade point averages, higher absences and higher disciplinary referrals than non-JROTC students; the AFJROTC program was still viewed as essential to teaching life long skills of leadership, citizenship and a sense of responsibility to the community by

administrators, teachers, students and their parents. In addition, administrators and teachers especially, viewed enrollment in the program to be one of many factors which could contribute to students staying in school. As a result, with the help of teachers offering their tutoring services, school districts should view the AFJROTC program as one of many programs that could not only help students from dropping out of school, but also help students develop as productive members of society. Finally, as one AFJROTC instructor stated, “The longer a student remains in the program, the graduation rate increases” (S1.line 1).

References

- Air Force Publishing. (2003). *Air Force JROTC New School Official Overview*. Air University: The Intellectual and Leadership Center of the Air Force.
- Air University. (2006). *Air University Catalog: Academic Year 2006-2007*. Air University Press, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. July 2006.
- Allen, C. M. (1956). *Combating the dropout problem*. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates.
- Amidon, J. (2000). Community Opposition Sends Marine JROTC Unit Into Retreat. Retrieved February 25, 2008 from http://www.notinourname.net/resources_links/community-stops-jrotc-jul00.htm
- Anderson, G. L. (2009). *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Bogden, C. A. (1984). *The perceived value of JROTC*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Bulach, C. (2001). Comparison of Character traits for JROTC Students versus Non-JROTC Students, *Presentation at the Eastern Educational Research Association Conference, Hilton Head, NC 2-15-2001*.
- Bush, G. H. W. (1992). Remarks by President Bush at Lincoln Technical Institute. Union, NJ. August 24, 1992.
- Christenson, S. L. & Havsy, L. H. (2004). Family-school-peer relationships: Significance for social – emotional and academic learning. In J.E. Zins, R.P. Weissberg, M.C. Wang & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 59-75). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Christle, C., Jolivet, K. & Nelson, C. (2007). School Characteristics Related to High School Dropout Rates. *Remedial and Special Education* 28 no6 325-39.
- Coumbe, A. T. & Harford, L. S. *United States Army Cadet Command: The 10-Year History*. Fort Monroe, VA: Office of the Command Historian, U.S. Army Cadet Command, 1996.
- Dohle, J. P., Jr. (2001). JROTC: A Study of Two St. Louis Schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 2001).
- Dorn, S. & Johanningmeier, E. V. (1999). Dropping out and the military metaphor for schooling. *History of Education, Quarterly*, 39: 193-198.
- Holland, R. (2003, January 1). High School Crisis: 3 in 10 Drop Out. *School Reform News*: 1-5.

- Krueger, R. A. & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Logan, R. (2000). *Perceptions held by host Secondary School Principals toward the Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) Program* (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, 2000).
- Long, N. A. (2003). *The origins, early developments, and present-day impact of the junior reserve officers' training corps on the American public schools*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Lutz, C. & Bartlett, L. (1995). JROTC: Making soldiers in the public schools: An analysis of the Army JROTC curriculum. *Education Digest*, 61, 9-14.
- Marks, L. N. (2004). *Perceptions of high school principals and senior Army instructors concerning the impact of JROTC on rates of dropout and transition to college*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University.
- Morris, D. S. (2003). *North Carolina high school principal's perceptions of Junior Officer Training Corps (JROTC) Programs*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC.
- Mullholland, J. (2005). *"Tangibles and Intangibles" The search for an effective and comprehensive evaluation of JROTC, Philadelphia, PA, December 2, 2005*. Retrieved from www.temple.edu/cenfad/jrotc-mulholland. Pdf
- Perusse, R. (1997). *Perceptions of school counselors towards Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) in Virginia public schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute State University, 1997).
- Ramirez, E. (2008, May 26). Keeping Count of Students Who Drop Out. *U.S. News & World Report*, 144 no15 68-9.
- Santora, J. A. (2006). *A Case Study of the Naval JROTC Program at Passaic High School* (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, 2006).
- Shearing, E. (2007, September). Joining a JROTC Family. *Next Step Magazine* 22-3.
- Smith, T. (2008). *Educating Students Today and Developing Leaders for Tomorrow*
- Swanson, C. (2008, April). *Cities in Crisis: A Special Analytic Report on High School Graduation*. Editorial Project in Education Research Center.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Taylor, W. (1999). *Junior Officers' Training Corps: Contributing to America's Communities*. Final Report of the CSIS Political-Military Studies Project on the JROTC: The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative Research. Analysis Types and Sofeware*. London: Falmer press.

The Brookings Institution. (2007, May). Demilitarizing what the pentagon knows about developing young people. Center on Children & Families. Washington, DC: H. Price.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (2002). School Dropouts. Education Could Play a Stronger Role in Identifying and Disseminating Promising Prevention Strategies (GAO Publication No. 02-240). Washington, DC.

<http://www.au.af.mil/au>.

<http://nces.ed.gov>

<http://www.mcjrotc.org/Documents/csisreport.pdf>.

APPENDIX A

Pilot Survey

Dear Colleagues:

Listed below are five research questions followed by 15 survey questions. Please read each survey question and then circle the corresponding number of the research question that is in alignment with the survey question. In addition, please indicate by circling the degree of clarity between the research question and the survey question. (VC – Very Clear; C – Clear; SC – Somewhat Clear; NC – Not Clear)

Research Questions:

1. In what ways do school administrators, JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents perceive that the JROTC program had an impact on the leadership skills development for students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
2. In what ways do school administrators, JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents perceive that the JROTC program had an impact on respect for authority for students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
3. In what ways do school administrators, JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents perceive that the JROTC program had an impact on goal setting skills for students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
4. In what ways do school administrators, JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents perceive that the JROTC program had an impact on citizenship development for students who are currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?
5. In what ways do school administrators, JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and parents perceive that the JROTC program had an impact on self discipline for students who were currently enrolled in the program for at least two years during the 2005-2009 school years?

Survey Questions

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The JROTC program teaches leadership skills. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 2. JROTC students are in more leadership positions than non-JROTC students at the urban high school. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3. JROTC students are viewed as leaders at the urban high school. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 4. The JROTC program teaches goal setting skills. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 5. JROTC students have greater goal setting skills than non-JROTC students. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 6. JROTC students are more goal oriented than non-JROTC students. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 7. JROTC students have a greater respect for authority than non-JROTC students. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 8. The JROTC program teaches students to respect authority. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 9. JROTC students have a greater respect for administrators than non-JROTC students. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 10. The JROTC program has been effective at helping students become more responsible at the urban high school. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 11. JROTC students have greater citizenship skills than non-JROTC students. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |
| 12. The JROTC program teaches citizenship development. | Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5 Clarity - VC C SC NC |

13. JROTC students are more patriotic than non-JROTC students.

Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5
Clarity - VC C SC NC

14. The JROTC program teaches students self discipline.

Relevance to Research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5
Clarity - VC C SC NC

15. JROTC students display self discipline in school.

Relevance to research Questions: 1 2 3 4 5
Clarity - VC C SC NC

APPENDIX B

School Survey

This survey contains twenty-five statements about the Air Force JROTC Program in your high school. It should take 6-10 minutes to complete. The questions were designed to gauge your perceptions concerning the JROTC program.

Please answer each of the following statements with the answer that best describes your perceptions regarding the statement. There are five possible answers to each statement. The scales are (1) STRONGLY DISAGREE, (2) DISAGREE, (3) NO OPINION, (4) AGREE, or (5) STRONGLY AGREE with the statement. Circle the number that best describes your response.

| | STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NO OPINION | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------|---------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1. The JROTC program teaches leadership skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. JROTC students are in more leadership positions than non-JROTC students at the urban high school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. JROTC students are viewed as leaders at the urban high school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. JROTC students have greater leadership skills than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. The JROTC program teaches goal setting skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. JROTC students have greater goal setting skills than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. JROTC students are more goal oriented than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. JROTC students have a greater respect for authority in general than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. The JROTC program teaches students to respect authority. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. JROTC students have a greater respect for administrators than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NO OPINION | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------|---------------|-------|-------------------|
| 11. JROTC students display more respect to teachers and peers than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. The JROTC program prepares students for life after high school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. The JROTC program has a positive influence on students enrolled in the program at the urban high school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. The JROTC program has been effective at helping students become more responsible at the urban high school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. JROTC students are a valued asset in public high school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. JROTC students have greater citizenship skills than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. The JROTC program teaches citizenship development. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. JROTC students are more patriotic than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. The JROTC program promotes patriotism at the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. The JROTC program teaches students self discipline. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. JROTC students display self discipline in school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Self discipline is a major component of the JROTC program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. JROTC students are more disciplined than non-JROTC students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. The JROTC program influences students to join the military. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. The JROTC program is used as a military recruitment tool. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX C

Focus Group Interview Questions

- 1: Briefly explain your experience with the AFJROTC program?
- 2: Are you aware of any problems associated with the AFJROTC? Do you have any suggestions on how the program could be improved? Please explain.
- 3: What is the most important outcome of your enrollment in the AFJROTC program? Can you describe a specific story or event that characterizes your outcome?
- 4: What is your most frustrating experience with the AFJROTC program at the urban high school? Can you summarize a specific story or event that characterizes your opinion?
- 5: Has the AFJROTC program impacted self discipline of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.
- 6: Has the AFJROTC program impacted leadership skills of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.
- 7: Has the AFJROTC program impacted goal setting skills of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.
- 8: Would you recommend the AFJROTC program to your child or to another student? Why or Why not? Please explain.
- 9: Has the AFJROTC program impacted citizenship development of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.
- 10: Is there anything you would like to tell us about the AFJROTC program?

APPENDIX D

Transcript of Focus Group Interview Questions

Focus Group Question 1: Briefly explain your experience with the AFJROTC program?

Administrator: Being a former AFJROTC cadet during my years of high school I was able to develop citizenship, leadership and a sense of responsibility for my community. As I work with students at the high school, I noticed that the students have learned the same values that I learned during my years at high school in the AFJROTC.

Teacher: I can only give accolades for the AFJROTC program at our school. Every JROTC student that I have taught has benefitted tremendously with the program. Setting goals allow JROTC students to be successful in my classroom.

Administrator: As a whole, I feel the AFJROTC program is a value asset to schools. It provides many opportunities to students and teaches essential life skills that are not taught in the regular classroom.

AFJROTC Instructor: Over the past nine years of AFJROTC, I have noticed that the longer a student remains in the program, the graduation rate increases. If a student takes a second year of JROTC, I would estimate the graduation rate is at least 95%.

Focus Group Question 2: Are you aware of any problems associated with the AFJROTC? Do you have any suggestions on how the program could be improved?

Teacher: Well, what readily comes to mind is the overall involvement of the ROTC program in our school. I know their making efforts to be more involved. For example, the last couple of years I believe that have been the sponsor of the annual blood drive here at school. I know there making an effort, but there seems to be a lack of publicity about the blood drive over the past couple of years in comparison to previous years. I know, for example that Red Cross representatives will come out to the schools and speak to the classes, especially the senior classes – perspective donors to explain the importance of giving blood and how necessary it is because the blood banks are running so low. That seems to elicit a lot more participation than just all of a sudden one day hearing the announcement that tomorrow were having a blood drive and if you want to sign up you can. Maybe that particular school service program could be a little more organized. They could promote it more or advertise it more and supervise it a little better.

Administrator: Many students that are in danger of becoming dropouts are not aware of the benefits of the program and therefore never consider enrolling.

Focus Group Question 3: What is the most important outcome of your enrollment in the AFJROTC program?

AFJROTC Instructor: Learning to be a leader, setting goals and being responsible for one's actions are positive outcomes associated with enrollment in the program.

Administrator: Because of the AFJROTC a lot of our students who may be at risk have found leadership under the two instructors as well as now having the ability to make their mind up that they chose to pursue the military as a career. I believe that JROTC students

lives are greatly affected by teacher quality; the AFJROTC program is as strong as its instructors.

Administrator: Students who take on leadership roles are less likely to develop disciplinary problems and more likely to stay in school.

Teacher: One of the important outcomes is all of the awards and accomplishments they earned this past year.

Focus Group Question 4: What is your most frustrating experience with the AFJROTC program at the program?

JROTC Student: The most frustrating thing is probably getting everyone on the same page because I get a lot of people completely clueless and it doesn't matter if it's 1st year, 2nd year, 3rd year. I got 4th year cadets completely clueless when it comes to drill and everything like that and it's not necessarily the programs fault it's their part to live up to that standard.

Parent: The maturity level of first year students could be a problem because their age and their ability to follow directions.

Focus Group Question 5: Has the AFJROTC program impacted self discipline of students enrolled in the program?

Administrator: After being enrolled in the program, students appear to take greater responsible for their actions.

AFJROTC Instructor: Self discipline depends on the student. Some students embrace the skills taught in the program, while others fail to see the value of improving their lives.”

Teacher: I think it various with age. You see the disciplinary improvement come in a little bit more strongly from the students that are in the AFJROTC. I have noticed that again a stronger impact on some then others, but it is very noticeable on those that are taking that responsibility and stepping up. Now my son was the wing commander and he was on track, but he lost sight of his goals and I almost felt as though everything he had benefitted from the program he sat on the side. His intention was to go into an academy along with other pursues, but with that plan removed it pretty much sucked the life out of him in terms of why bother working on these great grades or accomplishing anything. I noticed a big difference last term. Last year we went to an award ceremony and he got all sorts of awards and this year he tells me he wasn't really decorated that much. It surprised me. I don't think that's typical of students involved in the program. It was an external influence for my son and he was not focused on his future, instead he took a heart swing. I think if he would have tired harder and stayed more focused and more disciplined or connected with the program he would have fulfilled his goals. AFJROTC students step into a position and said this is what I want. That makes me feel good because I wish every student who walks out of my class could feel that way, but unfortunately it's not that way.

Teacher: The AFJROTC program is a structured program that assists students in creating goals, improving self-discipline, and learning valuable skills.

Focus Group Question 6: Has the AFJROTC program impacted leadership development of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.

JROTC Student: I learned a lot of leadership that I never knew. I've never really felt much like a leader until I took this class.

Parent: My son was a good student academically, but he was soft spoken and did not like to take charge. The JROTC program gave him confidence and placed him in leadership positions to strengthen his ability to lead. After three years in the program, he has developed into a leader and I credit the program with providing him with that skills.

Focus Group Question 7: Has the AFJROTC program impacted goal setting of students enrolled in the program? Why or Why not? Please explain.

Parent: I think it's kind of a varied answer because your looking at the maturity levels and freshmen who come in may not be looking that far down the road, but I can certainly see it and observe it in juniors and seniors. Maybe even as far as sophomores planning ahead, getting involved in the activity, programs and awards that are offered through the program to position themselves for even getting into one of the military academies or going directly into the military service. When I discuss it with them because I have had some interaction with other students involved, for example my son, I find that they are thinking farther down the road, possibly even sooner than high school students are. They are thinking hey here is what I'm going to do after graduation. You don't get that from as many high school students as early as you do from AFJROTC students.

JROTC Student: Its help motivate me to graduate and work towards a service academy.

Focus Group Question 8: Would you recommend the AFJROTC program to your child or to another student? Why or Why not? Please explain.

Parent: I would recommend the program for some. I see students who need to build leadership skills, self confidence, maybe a little direction in their lives and I think of AFJROTC program as a place to start students thinking about the future before their walking across stage to grab their diplomas and think what now. I think AFJROTC serves that and I think, not to be negative, but there are some students who function better in a very controlled environment. When I think of some of my students and I step back and think, gee when they walk across the stage its obvious the interest is not there and the personal skills are not there. I think AFJROTC can prepare students not only for graduation, but the military. I see students who need to build leadership skills, self confidence and maybe a little direction in their lives and I think of the JROTC as a place to start students thinking about the future. I also see the JROTC instructors put students in a good position and have students step into a position to say this is what I want. This makes me feel good because, as a teacher, I wish this for every student who walks out of my class could feel that way, but unfortunately it's not that way.

JROTC Student: Yes, it is an excellent program that introduces cadets to the Air Force and its core values by instilling leadership, responsibility, and the spirit of the corp.

Focus Group Question 9: Has the AFJROTC program impacted citizenship development of students enrolled in the program?

JROTC Student: Yes, AFJROTC instills discipline and respect in students and the dedicated cadets bring pride to the school.

Parent: Because of the program, my son is more concerned with upholding the goals and values of the Air Force.

Focus Group Question 10: Is there anything you would like to tell us about the AFJROTC program?

JROTC Student: I love it. Its fun, has cool people, and helps my leadership. Being in the program for only two years has already been a complete change for me. AFJROTC developed me as a better person with moral values.

Parent: My child loved the program, but because he is not going into the military I'm afraid he will lose the values he learned.

APPENDIX E

Parental Permission Form

Dear Parent,

My name is Shafeeq A. Ameen and I am the new Assistant Principal at Oscar Smith High School. Presently, I am a candidate for the doctoral degree in Educational Leadership (K-12) at Virginia Tech. My research study is entitled, *A Mixed Methods Study of the Air Force Junior ROTC Leadership Program at an Urban High School in Southeastern Virginia*. The purpose of this study is to examine the Air Force JROTC Leadership Program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for fifty students enrolled in the program at the urban high school along with the perceptions of administrators, JROTC instructors, regular classroom teachers, students enrolled in the program and parents during the 2004-2008 school years.

I humbly ask for both you and your child's participation in the study. The *honest* response to the survey questions by both you and your child will greatly enhance the validity and reliability of this data collection tool.

All information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. The material will be presented in an aggregated format, with no individual participant identifiable in the study. Neither your name nor your child's name will be used in this study at any time. If you do not wish to participate in this research study or have your child participate in the study, please check the assigned section below. Please complete and return this form by February 28th if there is an objection to either you or your child's participating in the study. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

I do not wish to participate _____

I do not wish for my student to participate _____

Sincerely,

Shafeeq A. Ameen, Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX F

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent for Participants

My name is Shafeeq A. Ameen and I am an Assistant Principal at Oscar Smith High School. Presently, I am a candidate for the doctoral degree in Educational Leadership (K-12) at Virginia Tech. My research study is entitled, *A Mixed Methods Study of the Air Force Junior ROTC Leadership Program at an Urban High School in Southeastern Virginia*. The purpose of this study is to examine the Air Force JROTC Leadership Program on the grade point average (GPA), attendance rate, disciplinary referrals and dropout rate for fifty students enrolled in the program during the 2004-2008 school years. The researcher will also assess the perceptions of administrators, Air Force JROTC instructors, teachers, JROTC students and their parents regarding the program at the urban high school in southeastern, Virginia.

You will be asked to respond to a survey questionnaire regarding the Air JROTC program at the urban high school. The questionnaire will utilize a Likert-type format. This format requires the participants to answer the questions using 1- 5 for their response. The scoring scale will range from 1(strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). It will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete the questionnaire.

I am humbly asking for your participation in the study. Your *honest* response to the survey questionnaire will greatly enhance the validity and reliability of this data collection tool.

All information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. The material will be presented in an aggregated format, with no individual participant identifiable in the study. Your name will **not** be used in this study at any time.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE BOTTOM PORTION OF THIS FORM

I understand that I voluntarily agreeing to participate in this study. I also understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without risk of penalty. I have read the Consent Form and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent:

_____ Date _____
Subject signature

Should I have any pertinent questions about this research or its conduct, and research subjects' rights, I may contact:

_____ Investigator

_____ Telephone Number/e-mail

Faculty Advisor

Telephone Number/e-mail

Departmental Reviewer/Department Head

Telephone Number/e-mail

David M. Moore
Chair, Virginia Tech Institutional Review
Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Office of Research Compliance
2000 Kraft Drove, Suite 2000 (0497)
Blacksburg, VA 24060

[540-231-4991](tel:540-231-4991)/moored@vt.edu



DATE: February 26, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Travis W. Twiford
Shafeeq Ameen

FROM: David M. Moore 

IRB Expedited Approval: "A Mixed Methods Study of the Air Force JROTC Leadership Program at an Urban High School in Southeastern Virginia", IRB # 09-140

This memo is regarding the above-mentioned protocol. The proposed research is eligible for expedited review according to the specifications authorized by 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. As Chair of the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board, I have granted approval to the study for a period of 12 months, effective February 25, 2009.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report promptly proposed changes in previously approved human subject research activities to the IRB, including changes to your study forms, procedures and investigators, regardless of how minor. The proposed changes must not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.
2. Report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.
3. Report promptly to the IRB of the study's closing (i.e., data collecting and data analysis complete at Virginia Tech). If the study is to continue past the expiration date (listed above), investigators must submit a request for continuing review prior to the continuing review due date (listed above). It is the researcher's responsibility to obtain re-approval from the IRB before the study's expiration date.
4. If re-approval is not obtained (unless the study has been reported to the IRB as closed) prior to the expiration date, all activities involving human subjects and data analysis must cease immediately, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.

Important:

If you are conducting **federally funded non-exempt research**, please send the applicable OSP/grant proposal to the IRB office, once available. OSP funds may not be released until the IRB has compared and found consistent the proposal and related IRB application.

Invent the Future