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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (MCJROTC) training has been in existence as an elective course for over 36 years (Logan, 1999). Throughout its history, the basic MCJROTC philosophy and objectives have remained oriented toward the social/psychological development and broad education of secondary students. This general orientation of MCJROTC is in marked contrast to the more military orientation of Navy Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (NROTC) which has always been considered as one of the Department of the Navy’s primary sources of introductory officer training (Department of the Navy, 1998).

Currently, under authority of Public Law 88-647, the ROTC Revitalization Act of 1964, and Title 10 of the United States Code, MCJROTC exists as an academic course for students who are:

a) Citizens of the United States or a United States National, and are at least 14 years of age or will have reached their 14th birthday in the current school year,

b) Enrolled in and attending a regular course of instruction at the school where the unit is located,

c) Be of good moral character as determined by the principal of the school and the Senior Marine Instructor,

d) Be physically qualified to participate fully in the school’s physical
education program (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

Public high schools located across the United States, its territories, and foreign countries with Department of Defense (DOD) schools, hosting a MCJROTC unit, do so voluntarily with financing and administrative control shared jointly by the school district and the United States Marine Corps (Department of the Navy, 1989b). Thus, the local program exists under the direct influence of, and in line with, the perceptions of the school principal.

Each MCJROTC program remains under the direct control of the school principal and is taught by at least one Senior Marine Instructor (SMI), who is a Commissioned/Non-Commissioned Officer and/or one Marine Instructor (MI) who is also a Commissioned/Non-Commissioned Officer. The instructors are retired Marine Corps personnel who are normally paid jointly by the Marine Corps and the school district (a very small number of units are financed entirely by the Marine Corps). These instructors remain as an integral part of each host school’s faculty.

The total area served by the Marine Corps JROTC has been administratively divided into six districts that coincide with the Marine Corps Recruiting Districts. The nationwide headquarters is located in Quantico, Virginia and served 174 secondary schools in 38 states during the 1998-1999 school year (D. A. Fernandez, personal communication, 15 October, 1999).

While the philosophy and objectives of MCJROTC have remained virtually unchanged over the last 36 years, there has been some question that individual principals may not fully agree with those objectives or emphasize them in their programs. This disunity, if it exists, might result in the misapplication of Marine Corps JROTC
within the host school. Further, if a national pattern of this disunity is revealed, there might be indications for at least a careful reconsideration of the objectives and practices of MCJROTC by the Training and Education Division at Quantico, Virginia.

Lutz and Bartlett (1995), among others, believed that there were a number of other related questions concerning how principal’s perceived the MCJROTC program nationally, that should be addressed. In the absence of data, indicating principal’s perceptions about these selected areas of concern, the Training and Education Division currently lacks the necessary information upon which to make an accurate overall evaluation of MCJROTC. The current annual District inspection results have indicated only that instructors were supposedly adhering to the Standing Operating Procedures each year (D. A. Fernandez, personal communication, 15 October, 1999).

To date, there have been no academic studies undertaken to ascertain and find possible solutions to the various questions confronting Marine Corps JROTC specifically. One study, Harrill (1984), examined the Army JROTC’s Third Region in regards to the attitudes held by host principals, but over the past 16 years, the JROTC program, as a whole, has significantly expanded to warrant a study of the greatly enlarged Marine Corps JROTC. The potential areas that might warrant study are considered to include the following:

1. The administrative attitudinal interaction of the school principal and his/her MCJROTC program.

2. The MCJROTC curriculum.

3. The teaching personnel and students involved in MCJROTC (to include recruitment of students into the program).
4. Analysis of unique characteristics of both the MCJROTC program and its activities.

5. MCJROTC's use as a Marine Corps recruiting tool.

This study will address the general question of administrative attitudinal interaction of the school principal and his/her MCJROTC program. This emphasis was chosen because of the predominant role played by the school principal in any course of instruction offered by the school. Without an understanding of how principals view MCJROTC's objectives and what they believe about the program, any other study of questions or problems would be premature due to the administrative power residing in the principal. Further, without this information, both the Marine Corps and the school districts currently lack an accurate source of data from which to determine how MCJROTC is perceived and used by host school principals. Because of these needs, and the specific need to study the principal's interaction first, this study is of significance both to the Marine Corps, present civilian administrators and educators and potential school districts desiring to host a MCJROTC program.

In pursuit of this problem, the following assumptions were made:

1. It is assumed that the instructors of Marine Corps JROTC at each school were following the official policies and procedures in accordance with the pertinent Marine Corps Orders as directed by the Training and Education Division. This assumption is based on annual District inspections conducted by District Project Officer's which indicate general adherence to the stated program requirements.

2. It is assumed that each principal, of each host school, is in general agreement with the stated objectives of MCJROTC. The reason for this assumption is
that because MCJROTC has specific objectives and is jointly funded by the school
district and the Marine Corps, the principal, as the local administrator, should be in
general agreement with those objectives.

3. It was assumed that the principals should perceive the program of
instruction at each school as currently emphasizing the objectives of MCJROTC.

4. It was assumed that data concerning the present state of principal’s
perceptions of Marine Corps JROTC could be used to better understand the relationship
between military and civilian instruction. This assumption was based on the fact that
there has been no previous data compiled on this in regards to MCJROTC. The data
currently being sought attempts to evaluate the administratively significant area of
principal’s beliefs about the program.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine what principals believe about the official
objectives of MCJROTC and what they believe about other selected aspects of the
MCJROTC program. More specifically, the following questions are to be addressed:

1. Are host principals in agreement concerning the stated objectives of
   MCJROTC, as established by the Training and Education?

2. Do principals agree that the MCJROTC program provides district services
   that no other subject provides in their schools and should continue unchanged in the
   future?

3. Do principals agree that MCJROTC is not primarily a method of
   recruiting and preparing students for later entry into the military service?

4. Do principals agree that their Marine Corps JROTC instructors are as
good as, or better than, other teachers of electives at their schools?

5. Do principals agree that they would like to see Marine Corps JROTC remain at their schools for the next five years?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are considered necessary for the proper understanding of this study:

Cadet: A student enrolled in a MCJROTC unit (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

Elective course: A course of instruction designed to give specific instruction on subjects not normally required as part of a general education (Tanner & Tanner, 1995).

NROTC: Established to educate and train qualified young men and women for service as commissioned officers in the unrestricted line Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve (Duke University, 1999).

Senior Marine Instructor (SMI): A Marine Corps Officer or Staff Non-Commissioned Officer, normally retired, employed by a secondary school for supervising the operations of a MCJROTC unit (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

Marine Instructor (MI): A Marine Corps Staff Non-Commissioned Officer or Commissioned Officer, normally retired, employed by a secondary school to assist the Senior Marine Instructor (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

Marine Corps Orders: An order is a directive of continuing authority or information, a permanent reference, and/or requires continuing action. An order is directed to the command's overall functions rather than to individualized office functions (Department of the Navy, 1989a).

Training and Education Division: That organization with overall responsibility
for the administration of the MCJROTC. Headquartered at Quantico, Virginia
(Department of the Navy, 1989b).

Program of Instruction: MCJROTC curriculum designed to emphasize leadership
education and leadership development (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

Leadership education: The three levels of instruction within the MCJROTC that
gives basic training in leadership tenets, physical fitness and health, drill and ceremonies,
marksmanship, and military organization (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

General education: That part of the curriculum designed to provide for a common
universe of discourse, understanding, and competence. Ordinarily referred to as the
common core, or that part of the curriculum in school or college that is required of all
students (Tanner & Tanner, 1995).

District Project Officer: An active duty Marine Corps Officer assigned the
responsibility of overseeing the operations and administration of specific host schools
within a defined geographic region year (D. A. Fernandez, personal communication, 15
October, 1999).

Principal, high school: An administrative and supervisory officer in charge of a
high school, giving to administrative duties full time in large public schools and usually
carrying a teaching load in small ones (Good, 1959).

School year: The period that commences August 1 and ends July 31 (Department
of the Navy, 1989b).

Vocational education: Programs in secondary and post-secondary education
designed to prepare the learner for employment in a specific occupation or industry
(Spring, 1997).
Significance of the Research

In examining this topic, the researcher found that original works addressing the Marine Corps JROTC program were virtually non-existent. This is an important aspect in addressing the significance of this research. Future studies will be able to build on this research, thereby expanding information and knowledge regarding the Marine Corps JROTC program. In addition, future potential schools contemplating introducing Marine Corps JROTC into their curriculum will be able to review clinical data relevant to issues raised by concerned individuals as to the effectiveness and potential of the program.

Limitations

This study is conducted in view of the following limitations:

1. This study is limited to current principals, or administrative personnel acting in the capacity of principal, at public and parochial high schools offering Marine Corps JROTC.

2. The Marine Corps JROTC program's curriculum is legislated by Congress and is best received as a national high school or secondary level curriculum. Secondary level curriculum can be researched from the local, state and national perspectives. With a minimum of three one year courses with 96 hours of instruction per year (Department of the Navy, 1989b) mandated by the national JROTC headquarters, this is clearly a national curriculum focusing on a specific program, which makes this focused area a limitation of research.

3. The population is finite (178 units) and very structured. Structure and discipline within the program is based on the military affiliation making this curriculum unique when compared to most other secondary programs. This limitation is particularly
noteworthy with any generalization efforts in applying this research to other secondary curricula.

4. The researcher realized that original research in the Marine Corps JROTC program is finite and extremely limited in breadth. This limitation led to the researcher’s development and implementation of a survey instrument based on the attitudes of host school principals. The survey was administered in the spring of the 1999-2000 school year. Perceptions were based on individual principal’s views during this period and these perceptions may change over time.

**Organization of the Research**

This research is organized into five chapters. Chapter I, Introduction, provides the introduction to the problem, and includes definition of terms, the research question, significance of the research and the limitations of the research.

Chapter II, Review of Relevant Literature, provides the review of selected literature related to Marine Corps JROTC and its role in society.

Chapter III, Methodology, provides the design of the study, the description of the population, the description of the instrument and its development, the data collection process, and the statistical treatment of the data. Validity measures will be incorporated throughout due to the use of a modified survey instrument.

Chapter IV, Results and Findings, details the outcomes of the methodology chapter including response rate, respondent demographics, principal’s beliefs concerning objectives and selected statements, principal’s ranking of electives and the principal’s comments.

Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations condenses all of the
information into a summary of the purpose of the research, summary of findings, conclusions, recommendations and recommendations for future research.

**Summary**

Throughout its history, Marine Corps JROTC has been intimately associated with the civilian educational system and civilian administrators. Despite this long-term relationship, there has been a lack of data, which would indicate how host principals view MCJROTC and its objectives at their schools. This study seeks to provide and analyze this data as well as other related data concerning the current programs.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Selected Literature Related to Marine Corps JROTC

The Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) program is nearly as old as
the nation itself. In 1783, George Clinton, a prominent statesman and six-term Governor
of New York, introduced an idea that called for the inclusion of military
instruction at one civilian college in each state. Under Mr. Clinton’s plan, students, after
completing their degree and the prescribed course in military instruction would be
commissioned junior military officers and serve a short stint of active military service.
Upon returning to civilian life, they would form a trained officer reserve that would be
available in time of national emergency. A system of inspections and regular reports was
to give coherence and uniformity to his officer education program (Coumbe & Harford).

One must remember the circumstances surrounding this idea. The nation had just
won its independence after a long, hard fought rebellion, which saw a poorly equipped,
often poorly trained army narrowly outlast the most powerful country in the world. Mr.
Clinton did not want to chance another such calamity by ensuring America had a core of
trained and educated officers that could be called upon when needed. Unfortunately his
plan never came to be.

The University of Georgia claims to have hosted on-campus military instruction in
early 1807. In the early nineteenth century Georgia State law required all male citizens
between 18 and 45 "to assemble five times a year for a military muster" (Logan, 1999, p.
1. Because most university students fell into this group, they attended drills on campus. The purpose of this training was not to prepare its recipients to receive commissions, but to allow them to fulfill their state-mandated military obligation (Coumbe & Harford).

Modern Reserve Officers' Training Corps can trace its heritage to the first recorded civilian institution of higher learning in the United States to actually include military education into its curriculum, the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy, now Norwich University. Captain Alden Partridge, a former superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point, founded the school in 1819 in Norwich, Vermont.

Captain Partridge's educational experiment was driven by the ideal of a citizen-soldier. He wanted officers who would be "identified in views, in feelings, and in interests, with the great body of the community" (Logan, 1999, p. 1) and a college that would reconcile the efficiency and discipline demanded by a regular army with the republican values and popular sentiments inherent in the militia system.

Between 1819 and the Civil War, a number of other essentially military schools were established. Lafayette College, Oak Ridge Academy, and Kemper and Marion Institutes were private institutions while the Virginia Military Institute and The Citadel were state-supported schools.

At The Citadel and the Virginia Military Institute the civilian-soldier ideal was not as important as at Norwich. Their founders were bound up with the Southern military tradition and the practical need to provide a management education for the sons of the planter aristocracy.

In addition to military schools of the period, a number of civilian institutions
hosted military instruction during the first half of the 1800's. St. John's College in Annapolis, Maryland began in 1826. The University of Tennessee and Indiana University were reported to have it as early as 1840 and William Tecumseh Sherman introduced it at Louisiana State in 1859 (Coumbe & Harford).

The University of Virginia had military training for a relatively short time in the 1820's and 30's beginning when Thomas Jefferson founded it in 1825. He made tactical drill and training mandatory hoping to produce qualified officers for a national militia. Jefferson foresaw military education developing into a recognized academic field of study. Unfortunately, within a decade of its activation, the University's cadet corps was disbanded after a confrontation with the university's faculty.

At the start of the Civil War, the Union found that it did not have nearly enough trained officers to lead the Armed Forces. The 20,000 officers initially required overwhelmed the 1,500 West Point and Norwich graduates available for service. Most leadership in the Army was via appointments of politically connected novices or election within the companies (McPherson, 1988). The officer crisis required Congress to develop some provision for the education of civilian-soldier military leaders.

Representative Justin S. Morrill of Vermont, a friend and neighbor of Alden Partridge, introduced legislation which came to be known as the Land-Grant College Bill in December 1861 (Swomley, 1950; McPherson, 1988). The proposed act gave every state 30,000 acres of public land for each of its members in Congress. Funds generated from the sale of the land were to be used in establishing and sustaining at least one agricultural and industrial college in each state. Specifically the income was for the:

endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and
including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts, in such manner as legislatures of the States may respectfully prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (Logan, 1999, p. 2)

Soon after the passage of the Morrill Act, land-grant colleges began to be endowed and military instruction became part of many college curriculums. Professors with Civil War experience headed most college military programs, while still performing their full-time duties in other fields. The training offered was the most basic kind and left much to be desired. In most cases the training consisted exclusively of drill in its most rudimentary form. Not much else could be expected since the program had no defined objective, no authorized provisions for uniforms or equipment, no syllabus, and no prescribed outline of courses. Even if the training had been better, the Union officer procurement problems would not have been alleviated since the Morrill Act came too late to have played a significant part on the course of the war.

In the post-Civil War era Congress enacted a number of measures designed to improve collegiate military training and encourage its growth. In 1866 it authorized the President to detail 20 officers to teach military science at land-grant colleges; in 1870, small arms and equipment were authorized to be issued; in 1880, retired officers were granted permission to teach; in 1888, War Department assistance was made available to schools outside the land-grant community, to include high schools; and in 1893, legislation raised officer authorizations for detached college duty to 100 (Coumbe & Harford).

By the turn of the century some 42 institutions, including both state and private colleges, had established Departments of Military Instruction. Among the land-grant
institutions the tradition of military training took firmest root and the concept of citizen-soldier education became embedded. At most land-grant colleges, one year of military training had been made compulsory by 1900.

Because there was no uniform policy on the part of the various land-grant colleges as to the precise nature of the training in "military tactics" prescribed by the Morrill Act, in 1916 Congress passed the National Defense Act authorizing the War Department to establish Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) units in schools and colleges. This Act standardized the policy relating to ROTC and the land-grant colleges yielded to pressure and military training was made compulsory for all first and second year male students.

The Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC), like its senior counterpart ROTC, came into being with the National Defense Act. It authorized high schools the loan of federal military equipment and the assignment of active or retired military personnel as instructors on the condition that they followed a prescribed course of training. At its inception, the JROTC course consisted of a minimum of three hours of military training per week for a period of three years. Any JROTC graduate who completed this course of military instruction was authorized a certificate of eligibility for a reserve commission to be honored at age 21 (Komarow, 1999). This provision was phased out after World War I as the need for reserve officers dwindled. Unfortunately, when the United States entered World War I, few resources were available for JROTC. Between 1916 and 1919, the War Department established only 30 Army JROTC units.

Leavenworth High School in Kansas was the only public high school with a JROTC unit during World War I. It was established on 19 January 1917 and
disestablished on 10 October 1917 in accordance with War Department policy, which then limited JROTC units to essentially military schools, automatically excluding high schools (Coumbe & Harford). A unique exception to the establishment of high school JROTC and military training was at Gloucester High School, Gloucester, Massachusetts, where military training was implemented in September, 1885 by A. W. Bacherel.

Funding for uniforms and weapons were raised by "public subscription". This cadet organization continued independently until 1920 when Army JROTC was officially introduced (One Hundredth Anniversary History Committee, 1985).

Federal support for and assistance to the JROTC program remained limited between the world wars. Due to funding constraints and a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the War Department, the number of JROTC units increased only gradually during 1919 to 1939. By 1939, 295 Army JROTC units were in operation.

There are many reasons for the limited growth during these years. Many high schools scheduled military classes and training at inconvenient and undesirable times. Some restricted JROTC instruction to the lunch hour while others accorded it time in the late afternoon or early evening. Shortages of space and resources resulted in student participation and enthusiasm dropping. If his facilities were only inadequate, a Professor of Military Science could count himself as fortunate; some instructors did not even have a desk to operate from (Coumbe & Harford).

In addition to a lack of support from the secondary education institutions, the JROTC found itself competing for qualified students from another high school training program called the National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC). The main difference between the programs centered on the amount of support they received from the federal
government. Whereas JROTC units received instructors and uniforms from the War Department, NDCC programs did not. Weapons and a few training aids were the most NDCC schools could expect in the way of material assistance. Many NDCC units wanted to join the JROTC program but were unable to do so due to the lack of funds to support JROTC expansion.

Because the supervision and funding of NDCC units rested solely in the hands of local school authorities, the War Department ability to exert its influence over them was limited. As a result, the War Department displayed less interest in the NDCC than it did the JROTC. As a result the NDCC took on a second class status and never attained the degree of military acceptance the JROTC had. By 1939, NDCC had only 34 programs in operation.

The two decades following World War II were austere times for JROTC. Due to funding and manpower constraints, the Army froze JROTC growth. This resulted in a boom for the NDCC, which did not rely on federal funding. As schools on the waiting list for JROTC units realized that they would not be allowed a unit, they turned to the NDCC program to fill the void. Seventy-five NDCC units were established and by 1963 totaled 109 units (Harford, 1992).

The first significant increase in JROTC units occurred when Robert S. McNamara became the Secretary of Defense in 1961. Mr. McNamara turned intense scrutiny on the program by questioning the $4.7 million needed annually to run the program and the 700 active duty personnel needed as instructors. He felt the cost excessive for a program that, despite its title, produced no officers and made no direct contribution to military requirements. Mr. McNamara’s solution to this problem was to convert JROTC into
NDCC units. His reasoning was based on the fact that the cost of the entire NDCC program was less than $100,000 a year to administer and hence, a substantial saving was realized. The FY 1964 budget contained no provision for funding the JROTC, with the exception of military schools. Some money was set aside to convert JROTC units into NDCC units.

Mr. McNamara failed to realize the number of supporters of the JROTC program both in and out of Congress. Letters and telegrams flooded his office and members of Congress insisting that JROTC was an irreplaceable national asset and the effect it had on juvenile delinquency alone was worth its cost. JROTC supporters in the House of Representatives introduced legislation proposing the expansion of the program from the existing 254 units to a maximum of 2,000 units, and its extension to both the Navy and Air Force (prior to this the Army was the sole service represented in JROTC).

After an exhaustive survey of secondary school officials, community leaders and parents, an 11 member Department of Defense commission determined that, although Mr. McNamara was correct that the JROTC produced no officers and served no direct military purpose, it supported the desirability of the expansion and the importance of the JROTC to the nation. The Department of Defense realized it could not block the expansion and decided to guide the expansion as best they could. The most important decision in that respect was the elimination of the 700 active duty members and their replacement by military retirees as JROTC instructors. Unfortunately for the NDCC, the commission recommended the elimination of the program due to the lack of resources and support by the Army for the program. By 1973 only 17 NDCC units remained in operation.
On October 13, 1963, President Kennedy signed Public Law 88-647, the ROTC Vitalization Act of 1964. It required the services to increase the number of JROTC units and to achieve a more homogeneous geographical distribution of units across the nation. Specifically, Public Law 88-647 requires:

The Secretary of each military department shall establish and maintain a Junior ROTC, organized into units, at public and private secondary educational institutions which apply for a unit and meet the standards and criteria prescribed pursuant to this section. Not more than 200 units may be established by all of the military departments each year beginning with the calendar year 1966, and the total number of units that may be established and maintained by all the military departments under authority of this section, including those units already established on the date of enactment of this section, may not exceed 1,200. The President shall promulgate regulations prescribing the standards and criteria to be followed by the military departments in selecting the institutions at which units are to be established and maintained and shall provide for the fair and equitable distribution of such units thought the Nation, except that more than one unit may be established and maintained at any military institute. (Department of the Navy, 1989b, p. 1-3)

Of the 1,200 units authorized, 275 were allocated to the Secretary of the Air Force, 650 to the Secretary of the Army, and 275 to the Secretary of the Navy, of which 52 were made available to the Marine Corps.

On July 14, 1974, Congress further expanded the JROTC program to a maximum of 1,600 units, 200 to the Army, 100 to the Air Force and 100 to the Navy, of which the Marine Corps received 30. Due to the lack of funding, actual establishment of new units was limited to only 20 by 1980 (United States Code Annotated, 1983). In addition, provisions concerning participation were changed when Congress modified the law to allow females to be enrolled as cadets. Since that time enrollment of women has grown steadily and, according to the MCJROTC Project Office (1999b), females within the current Marine Corps JROTC program consists of 33 % of the 1999-2000 school year
The most recent expansion of the JROTC occurred on August 24, 1992 when Congress expanded the program to 3,500 units, resulting in the Marine Corps reaching a total allocation of 200 units (Congressional Record, 1992). This dramatic raise was a direct result of General Colin Powell successfully lobbying for the expansion as a result of two significant events: the recent Los Angeles riots and the victory in Operation Desert Storm. General Powell believed that the riots underscored the lack of opportunities for teenagers in economically disadvantaged areas and, since the American people were once again proud of their military, he wanted to ride the momentum to help high school youths, particularly those in troubled inner cities (Powell, 1995). Komarow (1999) reports that JROTC will expand again in September 2000.

While the sex composition is relevant to an overall understanding of the program, a discussion of the administration command structure is also important. The administration of the current Marine Corps JROTC program is directed by the U. S. Marine Corps Training and Education Division headquartered in Quantico, Virginia. Under the direction of the Training and Education Division, each of the six Marine Corps Districts, headed by a Commanding Officer, (Fig. 1) is responsible for the conduct of the program in each of the host schools in that district (Department of the Navy, 1989b). Presently there are 178 programs in 40 states and Japan, or 80% of the United States that have schools that host the program (Table 1) and 95 schools in 30 states have an application for activating a unit filed (Table 2) (MCJROTC Project Office, 1999d).

Under the direct supervision of each District Commanding Officer is a MCJROTC Project Officer who is responsible for administrative and logistical support to
Figure 1. MCJROTC Command Structure (Marine Corps Reserve Guidebook, 1997)
Table 1

States with schools that host MCJROTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st District</th>
<th>4th District</th>
<th>6th District</th>
<th>8th District</th>
<th>9th District</th>
<th>12th District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>South Michigan</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>North Michigan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

States with school applications pending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st District</th>
<th>4th District</th>
<th>6th District</th>
<th>8th District</th>
<th>9th District</th>
<th>12th District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the individual schools within the district. This Project Officer also conducts, at a minimum, an annual inspection of all MCJROTC units to ensure that the highest standard of instruction and administration is being maintained (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

Within each individual unit is a commissioned officer or Staff Non-commissioned officer designated as the SMI who is responsible to the school principal at the host school. Table 3 shows the current number of 1999-2000 MCJROTC units, by District, according to the MCJROTC Project Office (1999a).

Table 3

1999-2000 MCJROTC units by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st District</th>
<th>4th District</th>
<th>6th District</th>
<th>8th District</th>
<th>9th District</th>
<th>12th District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Marine Corps provides program guidance, office and classroom equipment, cadet uniforms, instructional material, funding for transportation that supports the MCJROTC program and pays the host school one-half the difference between the retired pay of the retired members employed by the host school and the members' active duty pay and allowances which they would receive if ordered to active duty (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

While the MCJROTC program was never intended to support the military procurement programs, some organizations and individuals believe that MCJROTC participation has resulted in increased enlistments, NJROTC enrollments, and NJROTC scholarship applications (Lutz & Bartlett, 1995). Although MCJROTC cadets represent .16 percent of the high school students in the United States (MCJROTC Project Office, 1999b; Snyder, 1999), they represent 1.05 percent of the Marine Corps enlistment's (MCJROTC Project Office, 1999c; Nofi, 1997), 2.45 percent of the 1999 NROTC enrollment scholarships (B. Weatherholtz, personal communication, 16 December, 1999), and less than four percent of the 1999 four-year Navy ROTC scholarship selectees, not including 12 percent of the Navy ROTC nursing scholarships (B. Weatherholtz, personal communication, 16 December, 1999).

The actual objectives of the Marine Corps JROTC, as stated in the Department of the Navy (1989b) MCJROTC Standing Operating Procedures, MCO P1533.6C, continue to be as follows:

1. Develop informed and responsible citizens.
2. Develop leadership skills.
3. Strengthen character.
4. Promote an understanding of the basic elements and requirements for national security.


6. Develop respect for, and an understanding of, the need for constituted authority in a democratic society.

The MCJROTC curriculum is a three-year academic program with units authorized to implement a fourth year. The minimum academic program required for nonmilitary secondary schools is three one-year courses with 96 hours of instruction per year. The first year program is entitled “Leadership Education I” (LE-I) and is designed for freshman or sophomores and introduces the cadets to the major subjects to lay a foundation for the grade levels to follow. LE-I emphasizes followership, development of leadership traits, and Marine Corps drill and ceremonics. Included in every year are:

1. Leadership Tenets.

2. Physical Fitness and Health.

3. Drill and Ceremonies.

4. Marksmanship.


The second year of instruction is entitled “Leadership Education II” (LE-II), which emphasizes leadership theory, style, and principles. The third year is “Leadership Education III (LE-III), which emphasizes leadership training and leadership application. The fourth year, Leadership Education IV (LE-IV), consists entirely of leadership training which involves leadership research and presentation of leadership talks to student or community groups. The Marine Corps recognizes that each school is unique in some
manner, thus substantial flexibility is incorporated into leadership education courses
giving the Senior Marine Instructor responsibility for assuring that the program becomes
an integral part of the overall educational program.

Satisfactory completion of a minimum of two years of instruction in the
MCJROTC program entitles the student to a meritorious promotion to the next higher
grade upon completion of recruit training, and/or upon enrollment in college offering the
ROTC course, may be entitled to credit for one year of basic ROTC by the college
concerned. These benefits are applicable to all branches of the armed forces.

The actual instructional staff at each host school consists of both Officers and
Staff Non-Commissioned Officers (SNCO’s). Each program is authorized one Officer
instructor per 750 enrolled cadets, or a fraction thereof. A second Officer instructor will
be authorized when cadet enrollment exceeds 750. A second Marine Instructor (MI) will
be authorized when cadet enrollment exceeds 150. For every additional 100 cadets, an
additional MI will be authorized. As an exception, the MCJROTC Project Officer at the
Training and Education Division may authorize substitution of Officer for enlisted
instructors and vice versa. Any school qualifying for an MCJROTC unit will have at
least one SMI and one MI (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

The requirements for having a MCJROTC program are:

1. Establish a Leadership Education Department as an integral academic and
   administrative department with a minimum three-year course of instruction
   with the SMI on all faculty committees whose recommendations affect the
   Leadership Education Department.
2. Require each cadet to devote at least 96 hours to Leadership Education per year.

3. Make Leadership Education classes equally convenient to students as other academic courses.

4. Require each cadet to have a current school physical and adequate health insurance.

5. Maintain an MCJROTC enrollment of no less than 100 students, or 10 percent of the student enrolled in the school who are at least 14 years of age or will be 14 during the school year and are citizens of the United States.

6. Conduct a program of non-discrimination.

7. Grant appropriate academic credit for completion of Leadership Education courses.

8. Ensure the leadership education faculty receives equal treatment as other faculty members.

9. Provide adequate storage space and drill space.

10. Permit the wearing of the MCJROTC uniform.

11. Appoint a Military Property Custodian and employ retired Officers and Staff Non-Commissioned Officers as instructors (Department of the Navy, 1989b).

A predominance of literature supports the role of JROTC. Jordan (1998) addressed the American Legion’s support as follows:

What is taught shows good results. Cadets are much less likely to pose discipline problems than the average student. Their attendance rate is slightly higher, as are grades and test scores, and their graduation rate significantly so. JROTC helps keep kids in school. (p. 1)
The United States Conference of Mayors, in their 1998 National Action Plan on School Violence and Kids recommended that:

Junior ROTC for high school students should be considered as an inexpensive resource which provides the opportunity for collaboration, and offers discipline, structure and recreation. (p. 4)

Additionally, Blair (1999) reports that the Center for Strategic and International Studies recently released the independent study Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps: Contributing to America's Communities that concluded:

JROTC builds self-discipline, teamwork, motivation, and confidence in young people. (p. 1)

Corps Curriculum (1999) reports that students in Chicago public schools:

perform a half-grade to a full grade higher academically. The kids are motivated. It helps them to develop self-confidence, self-esteem and comradeship. It helps develop character. (p. 5)

The relevant research specifically connected to the Marine Corps JROTC program is very limited. However, the researcher found one dissertation that included a Marine Corps JROTC. Bogden (1984) completed his dissertation, The Perceived Value of JROTC, with Harvard University. Built upon a previous paper that was written to inform practitioners and school districts on the realities of JROTC, the study researched the question: Now that we know what these programs are, why are they valued by their sponsoring schools and school districts, and what are the implications for local program evaluation and future research? Using interviews and a survey instrument, Bogden's analysis suggested that JROTC programs can be characterized as having changing goals and poorly defined processes, depending upon the type of students enrolled and the
inclination of the instructors. This research was limited to two schools with different service JROTC programs (Marine Corps and Air Force). Two dissertations were completed that were related by examining perceptions and attitudes. Harrill (1984) completed his dissertation, *Attitudes Held by Host Principals Toward Army JROTC in the Third Region*, with the University of Northern Colorado. Specific program aspects such as development of self-discipline, improvement of self-concept, growth of patriotism, and leadership were addressed using a Likert scale to measure attitudinal responses. In his research, Harrill determined that principals in the Third Region held favorable attitudes toward the program objectives and outcomes. This research was limited to the population of 160 Army JROTC units of the largest region at the time.

Perusse (1997) completed her dissertation titled, *Perceptions of School Counselors Towards Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) in Virginia Public Schools*, with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The study focused on four research questions: Knowledge, beliefs and attitudes about benefits to students, the extent to which JROTC is recommended to all students, and the appropriateness of JROTC for particular students. A questionnaire consisting of true/false questions, Likert scaled questions, a checklist, open-ended questions and a section on demographics was sent to the counselors with follow-up interviews with selected individuals. In her research, Perusse concluded that Virginia school counselors generally have a positive perception towards JROTC.

The Center for Strategic and International Studies (1999) conducted an extensive study that was designed to provide an objective evaluation of JROTC and to develop useful recommendations for policymakers. The study, *Junior Reserve Officers' Training*
Corps – Contributions to America's Communities, gathered its data from three school systems of various sizes: Chicago, Illinois, Washington, DC, and El Paso, Texas. The yearlong study concluded that JROTC indeed is beneficial to communities and should be expanded and provided with requisite resources.

Most prior JROTC research used a questionnaire to collect facts about the program. Because this study, like Harrill's (1984), included both factual and attitudinal questions directed towards JROTC programs, a combination survey instrument including both a questionnaire and an attitude scale was determined to be most appropriate. The questionnaire format was seen as the best alternative for data collection due to the geographic and numerical constraints of the respondents.

The next chapter details the specifics of the survey instrument, the collection process and the treatment of the data.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

Design of the Study

The purpose of this research is to analyze the perceptions held by host secondary school principals toward the Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) program. This chapter addresses the basic design, data collection, and method of analysis for this research. Each element was carefully constructed using two texts: Designing and Conducting Survey Research: A Comprehensive Guide (2nd ed.), (Rea & Parker, 1997) and Practical Program Evaluation. (Pietrzak, Ramler, Renner, Ford & Gilbert, 1990). Additionally, other dissertations were analyzed to identify consistencies and common trends.

Since this study is involved with the description of existing facts about MCJROTC programs and the principals’ attitudes toward those programs, and since it determines existing practices in program operation and makes comparisons and evaluations of the programs, it is best classified as a descriptive study.

As a descriptive study of a total population, the first consideration is the method required for gathering data. The method chosen for instrumentation consists of two parts: First, the questionnaire used for gathering factual data, Second, the attitude inventory used for gathering data on beliefs. Through the use of this combined approach it was felt that a clearer picture of the population could be gathered than would have been possible through the use of either method individually.
**Description of the Population**

The population of this study is comprised of the host principals at public secondary schools offering the Marine Corps JROTC nationwide. From a total population of 178 principals, there were 100 secondary school principals available for the study. MCJROTC Project Office (1999a) provided a list of the addresses of these individuals. Due to the manageable size of the population, there was no attempt to reduce the population using a sampling.

**Description of the Instrument and its Development**

The instrument used in this study is a combination of a questionnaire and an attitude inventory similar to Harrill's (1984). The instrument was constructed using established parameters (Pietrzak et al., 1990). The instrument questions had their creation via the researcher's personal relationship with JROTC, review of similar studies, and interviews with Marine Corps JROTC personnel. A five-point Likert scale is used with 1 (Strongly Disagree) being lowest and 5 (Strongly Agree) being highest. The instrument was constructed to address all six of the stated objectives of the Marine Corps JROTC program.

The first section was a fill-in-the-blank response giving the basic characteristics of the population. The second section is used to determine the principals' belief about whether current JROTC objectives should be emphasized and whether they currently are being emphasized at their school.

The third section measures the respondents' belief about selected statements deemed valuable by MCJROTC personnel interviewed. The responses, using a Likert scale, indicate whether the host school principals held strong opinion, negatively or
positively, about the statements presented.

The fourth section measures the host principals’ beliefs concerning the relative importance of Marine Corps JROTC classes within a group of seven other commonly encountered elective subjects. Rather than a Likert scale, a list of eight electives is provided with directions to rank them by number according to the degree of importance assigned to each as a curricular offering in any high school. This ranking method was chosen for this section because it was believed to be more applicable to the type of data required.

The final section consists of a space made available for the principal’s comments, if any, and positive or negative, concerning any aspect of the MCJROTC program. This section is deemed important as a means of gathering input that was not provided for in any other section of the instrument.

Once the instrument was constructed, with the directions for each section being put in boxes and placed immediately before the section referred, the researcher checked the quality of the instrument by conducting a pilot test, or pretest, as recommended by Rea and Parker (1997).

This process of content validation addressed clarity and acceptability by insuring the vocabulary is suitable for educators and the questions were presented in a non-technical and unbiased manner. Only presently serving principals could adequately assess these areas.

The pilot test principals were not omitted from the final survey in that they did not have any advantage over those principals that had completed the instrument for the first time. Selecting more than three principals for the pilot test would reduce an already finite
population. Simple random sample selection was utilized by assigning a number in ascending order to each school in descending alphabetical order (1 = A, 2 = B, etc.). Using a random number table from Witte & Witte (1997), three numbers were chosen at random by a process that does not tend to favor certain numbers or patterns of numbers (Rea & Parker, 1997).

The Data Collection Process

The total instrument packet that was sent to the principals consisted of a cover letter to the principal informing him/her of the nature of the study, an “information page” which explains both the instrument format and confidentiality, and the instrument itself.

In order to increase the probability of both usable returns and a high rate of returns, several procedures were utilized in this study’s data collection. First, participants in this study were informed of the confidentiality of the returns in the explanation page of the information packet. This reassurance is considered critical in order to secure the most reliable responses possible. Next, the survey instrument, an explanation page, cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope was sent directly to the principal at each school. Three weeks were allowed for initial returns after the mailing. A follow-up letter consisting of the survey instrument, an explanation page and a self-addressed, stamped envelope was sent to those not responding in three weeks.

In working with the respondent’s academic calendar, the researcher conducted the pilot test in March 2000. After the pilot test was completed, the researcher began data collection from 11 April 2000 to 20 May 2000. All host principals of MCJROTC units were sent the survey instrument, less those in the pilot test. Rea and Parker (1997), recommend a 50 percent sample size for small populations (less than 500) because the
assumption of normality does not apply in such cases.

**Statistical Treatment of Data**

The statistical treatments used in this study were separated into sections corresponding to the instrument’s sections. Data collected in the first section, dealing with factual data and used to describe the respondents, was treated in a descriptive manner. Responses were generally categorized based on the range of responses. These categories were then used to determine the mean, median, and range of the responses statistically.

All data collected, and through the use of the Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS), version 10.0 for Windows, a computer based software package, and the text SPSS for Windows (George & Mallery, 2000), was analyzed as follows:

Data collected in the second section, dealing with the principal’s beliefs about MCJROTC, was divided into two responses per question. A Chi-square ($\chi^2$) goodness-to-fit was computed for both the labeled “should be” and “currently is” responses to determine if the distribution was different from chance. This procedure answered the first research question for each of the six objectives. The .05 level of significance was used to reject any null hypothesis for which there is no strong agreement concerning what “should be” and what “currently is”. The Chi-square formula (expected frequency, one-way test) used is:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$$

where:  
- $o$ = the observed frequencies.
- $e$ = the expected frequencies (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1998, Rea &
Parker, 1997, and Witte & Witte, 1997). The expected values are calculated based on all categories being equal.

Data collected in the third section dealing with beliefs of principals about selected aspects of MCJROTC was treated in a very similar manner as data in section two. Rejection of the hypothesis, that there was no strong agreement concerning the beliefs about the question, was set at the .05 level. The data is presented in a tabular format and answers research questions two through five.

Data collected in the fourth section which deals with the ranking of electives, was treated through a table of responses divided into columns representing electives and rows representing ranking on the scale of one-to-eight. The responses of one-to-eight have been tabulated for each elective.

Data collected in the final section that deals with either positive or negative aspects of MCJROTC that principals might wish to comment on was examined to determine categorization. Categories of responses were made and titled for reporting the number of respondents who answered the final section with their written comments.

The actual results and findings using this methodology are enumerated in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data collected concerning the perceptions held by host principals toward the Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) program. As indicated in Chapter I, the questions to be answered were related to principals’ attitudes toward the official objectives of JROTC as well as their beliefs about other selected aspects of the JROTC program. Data was collected to indicate both the respondent school’s and principal’s characteristics in reference to the study. All data is reported both in tabular form and descriptively. In accordance with the 4th edition of the American Psychological Association Publication Manual (1994), the researcher has opted to incorporate the associated tables and figures throughout the text, vice using separate pages for each item (American Psychological Association, 1994). In addition, as much as possible, repetitive text and semantics are used to maintain uniformity and consistency of the data analysis.

Response Rate

The survey was piloted on 18 March 2000 using three randomly selected schools from a population of 178 Marine Corps JROTC units. The principals returned two of the three surveys within three weeks (66% response rate). There were no issues with the survey questions or its design.

On 11 April 2000, the remaining 176 surveys were personally signed and mailed.
Each mailing consisted of a personal cover letter, an information page, survey instrument and self-addressed stamped envelope. From 11 April to 5 May 2000, the researcher received 68 completed surveys (38.2 %). A second mailing was conducted on 5 May 2000, and from 5 May 2000 to 20 May 2000, the researcher received 32 completed surveys (18 %). The response rate is calculated at 56.18 % (100 of 178). According to Rea and Parker (1997), this response rate gives this research a 99% (±4 %) level of confidence that the 100 respondents statistically represent the entire population of 178. One letter was received and determined unresponsive and one survey was returned indicating that the principal had no intention of completing the survey instrument. These two letters can also be interpreted as a professional courtesy, by informing the researcher of their non-participation.

Respondent Demographics

Respondents were asked to provide four important elements of background information. The first two elements were to identify their school's total student population and JROTC enrollment. From the 100 respondents, 86, or 86 %, indicated both their school’s population and their JROTC enrollment. The total student population represented by these 86 responses was 129,183 with a JROTC enrollment of 10,705, indicating an 8.29 % average JROTC enrollment. The student population mean was 1,502.13 and the JROTC enrollment mean was 124.48. Table 4 portrays the associated information.

The third element of background information centered on the population of the community that the respondent's school was in. Overall, of the 82 respondents who reported the community population, only 9.8 % of the schools were located in
Table 4

Total student population/JROTC enrollment of responding schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>129,183</td>
<td>1502.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JROTC enrollment</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>124.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The actual numbers for total student population/JROTC enrollment are higher because several respondents failed to indicate their school and JROTC unit size on the returned survey instrument.

cities/communities with very low populations (under 5,000). The lower medium sized areas, those with populations between 5,001 and 20,000, accounted for 18.3% of the schools, while 14.6% of the schools were located in areas with populations between 20,001 and 50,000, the upper medium sized areas (33% collectively for the two medium sized population categories). Large cities/communities with over 50,000 inhabitants contained 57.3% of the units that were reported by the respondents. Table 5 portrays the associated information.

Table 5

City population for schools reported by respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 5,000 inhabitants</th>
<th>5,000 – 20,000 inhabitants</th>
<th>20,001 – 50,000 inhabitants</th>
<th>over 50,000 inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cities or Communities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Respondents</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth element of background information represents the administrative experience of the respondents in regards to their association with JROTC programs.

While the 87 principals who responded indicated that their experience was spread over a range of one to 35 years, those reporting one year or less accounted for 4.6%. The
The largest group with experience is the administrators with 2–5 years' experience, which was 46% of the 87 respondents that reported the data. Those principals with 6–10 years experience accounted for 24.1%, which is nearly the same for those with the most experience, over 10 years, with 25.3%. Collectively, those in the two groups with the most experience accounted for 49.4% of the respondents. Table 6 portrays the associated information.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative experience with JROTC programs by respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal’s Beliefs Concerning Objectives

Respondent's beliefs about MCJROTC objectives were taken from the second section of the survey, which consisted of six statements. Section two of the survey asked the respondent's their belief as to the extent that the missions of the Marine Corps JROTC should be emphasized and the extent they believe the missions are currently being emphasized at their school. Responses were indicated using the following Likert scale: 1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, and 5 – Strongly Agree. Likert scaling was used to facilitate data analysis and survey completion by the respondents. These six statements were then divided into two parts: the "Should be" portion identifying what the principals considered the program should emphasize and the "Currently is" portion identifying what the principals considered is currently being
emphasized. The responses are analyzed according to: (a) the number of responses in each portion of the question, and (b) a $\chi^2$ Goodness-of-Fit at the .05 level of significance for determining if each of the two portions of each question had responses differing from chance. All $\chi^2$ data was tested at the .05 level of significance using appropriate degrees of freedom. Each belief statement is analyzed in this section.

The first belief statement was:

"The student will develop into an informed and responsible citizen."

Overall, 94 (94 %) principals responded to both parts of this question and 80 (85.1 %) of the respondents strongly agreed that this should be emphasized while 13 (13.8 %) agreed and one (1.1 %) strongly disagreed. Also, 50 (53.2 %) strongly agreed that this is currently being emphasized at their school, 33 (35.1 %) agreed that is was, ten (10.6 %) were neutral on the issue and one (1.1 %) strongly disagreed that it was currently emphasized. Tables 7 and 8 portray the associated frequency statistics.

These statistics indicate that there is a low positive correlation of .381 at the .01 level (Hinkle et al., 1998).

The $\chi^2$ values for Goodness-of-Fit were 115.681 for "should be" and 63.021 for "currently is". Both of these values indicate that the responses were not different from those, which would be expected by random chance, and that a generally positive belief about the statement existed.
Table 7

The student will develop into an informed and responsible citizen (Should be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 115.681  df = 2  Significance = .000

Table 8

The student will develop into an informed and responsible citizen (Currently is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 63.021  df = 3  Significance = .000

The second belief statement was:

"The student will develop leadership skills."

Overall, 95 principals (95%) responded to the "should be" part of the question and 97 (97%) responded to the "currently is" part. Of those, 84 (88.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed that this should be emphasized while 10 (10.5%) agreed and one (1.1%) strongly disagreed. Also, 55 (56.7%) strongly agreed that this is currently being emphasized at their school, 33 (34%) agreed that is was, eight (8.2%) were neutral on the issue and one (1%) strongly disagreed that it was currently emphasized. Tables 9 and 10 portray the associated frequency statistics.

These statistics indicate that there is a low positive correlation of .351 at the .01
level (Hinkle et al., 1998).

The $\chi^2$ values for Goodness-of-Fit were 131.011 for “should be” and 75.330 for “currently is”. Both of these values indicate that the responses were not different from those, which would be expected by random chance, and that a generally positive belief about the statement existed.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will develop leadership skills (Should be)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 131.011  
$df = 2$  
Significance = .000

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will develop leadership skills (Currently is)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 75.330  
$df = 3$  
Significance = .000

The third belief statement was:

“The student will strengthen his/her character.”

Overall, 95 principals (95 %) responded to the “should be” part of the question and 97 (97 %) responded to the “currently is” part. Of those, 83 (87.4 %) of the respondents strongly agreed that this should be emphasized while 11 (11.6 %) agreed and
one (1.1%) strongly disagreed. Also, 55 (56.7%) strongly agreed that this is currently being emphasized at their school, 36 (37.1%) agreed that it was, five (5.2%) were neutral on the issue and one (1%) strongly disagreed that it was currently emphasized. Tables 11 and 12 portray the associated frequency statistics.

These statistics indicate that there is a low positive correlation of .422 at the .01 level (Hinkle et al., 1998).

The $\chi^2$ values for Goodness-of-Fit were 126.400 for “should be” and 82.258 for “currently is”. Both of these values indicate that the responses were not different from those, which would be expected by random chance, and that a generally positive belief about the statement existed.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will strengthen his/her character (Should be)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 126.400  df = 2  Significance = .000

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will strengthen his/her character (Currently is)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 82.258  df = 3  Significance = .000
The fourth belief statement was:

"The student will develop an understanding of the basic elements of national security."

Overall, 95 (95%) principals responded to both parts of this question and 47 (49.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed that this should be emphasized while 31 (32.6%) agreed, 16 (16.8%) were neutral and one (1.1%) strongly disagreed. Also, 31 (32.6%) strongly agreed that this is currently being emphasized at their school, 30 (31.6%) agreed that is was, 32 (33.7%) were neutral on the issue and two (2.1%) disagreed that it was currently emphasized. Tables 13 and 14 portray the associated frequency statistics.

These statistics indicate that there is a moderate positive correlation of .549 at the .01 level (Hinkle et al., 1998).

The \( \chi^2 \) values for Goodness-of-Fit were 49.295 for "should be" and 26.642 for "currently is". Both of these values indicate that the responses were not different from those, which would be expected by random chance, and that a generally positive belief about the statement existed.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will develop an understanding of the basic elements of national security (Should be)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 49.295  \( df = 3 \)  Significance = .000
The fifth belief statement was:

"The student will form habits of self-discipline."

Overall, 95 principals (95 %) responded to the "should be" part of the question and 97 (97 %) responded to the "currently is" part. Of those, 84 (88.4 %) of the respondents strongly agreed that this should be emphasized while ten (10.5 %) agreed and one (1.1 %) strongly disagreed. Also, 55 (56.7 %) strongly agreed that this is currently being emphasized at their school, 33 (34 %) agreed that it was, seven (7.2 %) were neutral on the issue, one (1 %) disagreed, and one (1 %) strongly disagreed that it was currently emphasized. Tables 15 and 16 portray the associated frequency statistics.

These statistics indicate that there is a low positive correlation of .322 at the .01 level (Hinkle et al., 1998).

The $\chi^2$ values for Goodness-of-Fit were 131.011 for "should be" and 117.691 for "currently is". Both of these values indicate that the responses were not different from those, which would be expected by random chance, and that a generally positive belief about the statement existed.
Table 15

**The student will form habits of self-discipline (Should be)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 131.011  
**df = 2**  
Significance = .000

Table 16

**The student will form habits of self-discipline (Currently is)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 117.691  
**df = 4**  
Significance = .000

The sixth belief statement was:

"The student will develop respect for, and an understanding of, the need for constituted authority in a democratic society."

Overall, 95 principals (95 %) responded to the "should be" part of the question and 97 (97 %) responded to the "currently is" part. Of those, 72 (75.8 %) of the respondents strongly agreed that this should be emphasized while 21 (22.1 %) agreed, one (1 %) were neutral and one (1 %) strongly disagreed that this should be emphasized. Also, 48 (49.5 %) strongly agreed that this is currently being emphasized at their school, 34 (35.1 %) agreed that it is, 13 (13.4 %) were neutral on the issue, one (1 %) disagreed, and one (1 %) strongly disagreed that it was currently emphasized. Tables 17 and 18
portray the associated frequency statistics.

These statistics indicate that there is a moderate positive correlation of .502 at the .01 level (Hinkle et al., 1998).

The $\chi^2$ values for Goodness-of-Fit were 141.926 for “should be” and 90.165 for “currently is”. Both of these values indicate that the responses were not different from those, which would be expected by random chance, and that a generally positive belief about the statement existed.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 141.926  df = 3   Significance = .000

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 90.165  df = 4   Significance = .000

Principal’s Beliefs Concerning Selected Statements

Respondent’s beliefs about selected statements were taken from the third section
of the survey, which consisted of nine statements. Section three of the survey asked the respondent's their perception on statements regarding the Marine Corps JROTC and the degree to which the respondent is in agreement with the statement. Responses were indicated using the following Likert scale: 1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, and 5 – Strongly Agree. Likert scaling was used to facilitate data analysis and survey completion by the respondents. The responses are analyzed according to: (a) the number of responses in each portion of the question, (b) a $\chi^2$ Goodness-of-Fit at the .05 level of significance for determining if each statement's responses was different from chance. All $\chi^2$ data was tested at the .05 level of significance.

Statement One

"Marine Corps JROTC serves a distinct purpose which no subject provides."

Overall, 100 principals (100 %) responded to the question and 67 (67 %) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 28 (28 %) agreed, two (2 %) were neutral and one (1 %) disagreed. Only two (2 %) strongly disagreed with the statement.

The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 164.100 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 19 portrays the associated frequency statistics.
Table 19

Marine Corps JROTC serves a distinct purpose which no subject provides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 164.100  df = 4  Significance = .000

Statement Two

“I believe that the Marine Corps JROTC instructional program is adequate at present and should continue unchanged in the future.”

Overall, 100 principals (100%) responded to the question and 43 (43%) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 37 (37%) agreed, 15 (15%) were neutral and four (4%) disagreed. Only one (1%) strongly disagreed with the statement.

The \( \chi^2 \) value for this statement is 73.000 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 20 portrays the associated frequency statistics.
Table 20

I believe that the Marine Corps JROTC instructional program is adequate at present and should continue unchanged in the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 73.000        df = 4        Significance = .000

Statement Three

“Marine Corps JROTC does not have preparation for later entry into military service as one of its primary purposes.”

Overall, 97 principals (97 %) responded to the question and 25 (25.8 %) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 19 (19.6 %) agreed, 35 (36.1 %) were neutral and eight (8.2 %) disagreed. Only ten (10.3 %) strongly disagreed with the statement. Of those responding “neutral”, one-half can be directly related to their administrative experience with JROTC level (5 years or less).

The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 25.423 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 21 portrays the associated frequency statistics.
Table 21

Marine Corps JROTC does not have preparation for later entry into military service as one of its primary purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 25.423 df = 4 Significance = .000

Statement Four

"Marine Corps JROTC is primarily considered to be general education (versus academic or vocational education)."

Overall, 100 principals (100%) responded to the question and 17 (17%) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 46 (46%) agreed, 22 (22%) were neutral and eight (8%) disagreed. Only seven (7%) strongly disagreed with the statement. Of those responding "neutral", one-half can be directly related to their administrative experience with JROTC level (5 years or less).

The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 50.100 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 22 portrays the associated frequency statistics.
Table 22

| Marine Corps JROTC is primarily considered to be general education (versus academic or vocational education) |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Valid                                           | Frequency | Percent | Valid | Percent | Cumulative | Percent |
| Strongly Disagree                               | 7         | 7.0     | 7.0   | 7.0      |
| Disagree                                        | 8         | 8.0     | 8.0   | 15.0     |
| Neutral                                         | 22        | 22.0    | 22.0  | 37.0     |
| Agree                                           | 46        | 46.0    | 46.0  | 83.0     |
| Strongly Agree                                  | 17        | 17.0    | 17.0  | 100.0    |
| Total                                           | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0 | 100.0    |

Chi-Square = 50.100  df = 4  Significance = .000

Statement Five

"The name "Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps" is an accurate description for the course content of JROTC."

Overall, 100 principals (100%) responded to the question and 38 (38%) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 26 (26%) agreed, 25 (25%) were neutral and nine (9%) disagreed. Only two (2%) strongly disagreed with the statement. Of those responding "neutral", one-half can be directly related to their administrative experience with JROTC level (5 years or less).

The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 41.500 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 23 portrays the associated frequency statistics.
Table 23

The name "Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps" is an accurate description for the course content of JROTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100 100.0

Chi-Square = 41.500  df = 4  Significance = .000

Statement Six

"Some branch of JROTC should be ideally made mandatory for all high school students."

Overall, 100 principals (100 %) responded to the question and 26 (26 %) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 13 (13 %) agreed, 16 (16 %) were neutral and 25 (25 %) disagreed. Also, 20 (20 %) strongly disagreed with the statement.

The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 6.300 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite belief about the statement existed. Table 24 portrays the associated frequency statistics.

Table 24

Some branch of JROTC should be ideally made mandatory for all high school students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100 100.0

Chi-Square = 6.300  df = 4  Significance = .178
Statement Seven

"I, as chief administrator of my school, feel that I have been adequately informed of the philosophy and objectives of Marine Corps JROTC by its military representatives."

Overall, 100 principals (100 %) responded to the question and 83 (83 %) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 12 (12 %) agreed, two (2 %) were neutral and 2 (2 %) disagreed. Only one (1 %) strongly disagreed with the statement.

The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 252.100 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 25 portrays the associated frequency statistics.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 252.100  \( df = 4 \)  Significance = .000

Statement Eight

"I would like to see Marine Corps JROTC remain at my school for the next five years."

Overall, 100 principals (100 %) responded to the question and 98 (98 %) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while one (1 %) agreed. Only one (1 %) strongly disagreed with the statement.
The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 188.180 at two degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 26 portrays the associated frequency statistics.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 188.180  df = 2  Significance = .000

Statement Nine

“I think my Marine Corps JROTC instructors are as good, or better than, other teachers of electives at my school.”

Overall, 100 principals (100 %) responded to the question and 70 (70 %) of the respondents strongly agreed with this statement while 19 (19 %) agreed, nine (9 %) were neutral and one (1 %) disagreed. Only one (1 %) strongly disagreed with the statement.

The $\chi^2$ value for this statement is 167.200 at four degrees of freedom. This value indicates that the responses were not chance responses and that a definite positive perception about the statement was present. Table 27 portrays the associated frequency statistics.
Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 167.200  df = 4  Significance = .000

Principal’s Ranking of JROTC

Of the 100 principal’s who returned the survey instrument, there were between 73 and 78 usable responses to the ranking request. The principal’s were asked to rank, using numbers to represent the relative positions, eight common electives often found in secondary schools, with Marine Corps JROTC as one of the eight electives listed. The ranking was based on the principal’s belief on the elective’s importance as a curricular offering in any high school.

A remarkable situation developed as the survey instrument was returned. A significant number of principal’s refused to rank the electives for various reasons that included, the listed electives were required courses at their school, the electives simply couldn’t be ranked because each had its place within the school, or, its position was relevant to the particular student. Many simply refused to rank the electives with no reason.

Table 28 presents the total rankings of the 73 to 78 percent of the respondents who provided usable data. Two-thirds (66.6 %) of the 78 respondents that ranked electives placed JROTC in the first or second highest ranking. More than 84 % (84.5 %)
placed JROTC in the first three positions. Only one respondent (1.3%) selected the 8th, or lowest ranking.

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking of Electives</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearbook</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps JROTC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal’s Comments

Qualitative data was provided in the form of a final comments section that allowed respondents to provide either negative or positive comments on any aspect of Marine Corps JROTC or their feelings towards it. A total of 60 (60%) of the principal’s that completed the survey instrument responded with a comment regarding the Marine Corps JROTC in the fifth section of the survey instrument.

Analysis of the data was completed after reviewing the recommendations of Krathwohl (1998), focusing on Chapters 14 (Qualitative Data Analysis, pp. 302-325) and Chapter 24 (Optimizing Research Effectiveness Through Multiple Methods, pp. 617-627). This review provided significant guidance and the recommendations of Bogdan and Biklen (1998) were adopted for specific qualitative analysis methods and the
following application. By combining the information provided by these experts, the researcher was able to ascertain some of the common concerns and issues that the 60 respondents provided as qualitative input by using qualitative coding.

From the 60 respondents, a total of 102 coded comments were analyzed. Every comment was of a positive nature except one, which recommended that the Marine Corps JROTC's Standard Operating Procedures Manual be presented to school personnel so that the administration could better understand the program and its objectives. Although the comment was not specifically positive in nature, it nevertheless was not negative either.

Some respondents used singular comments while many expressed multiple comments. Of the 60 qualitative respondents, 59 made at least one coded comment, 24 made two coded comments, eight made three coded comments, and one made four coded comments. No respondent was coded with using more than four comments. Figure 2 displays the final qualitative frequencies and coding system. For a complete listing of all 60 principal's comments, see Appendix F.

The qualitative data supports the quantitative data, especially in regards to the statement "I would like to see Marine Corps JROTC remain at my school for the next five years". An overwhelming 99% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement and 98.33% of the comments considered the JROTC an "outstanding program" (9.83%), "excellent/exceptional program" (15.25%), "great" program (15.25%), or had positive feelings towards the program (59.32%).

The results and findings will now answer the research and subsidiary questions. All of these elements will be summarized and concluded in the next chapter, including recommendations for future research.
Qualitative Codes

1. Positive feelings towards the instructors
2. Outstanding program
3. Excellent/Exceptional program
4. Develops leadership & discipline
5. Positive feelings toward the program
6. Asset to the community/school
7. Great program
8. Viable option for students

Figure 2. Qualitative Coding System and Frequencies among 102 comments
CHAPTER V
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

The Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps program has been in existence as an elective course in secondary schools for over thirty-six years. Despite this continued existence and the fact that 178 schools, both within the United States and in foreign countries, there has never been an academic study to indicate new avenues of research and find possible solutions to the various questions confronting the program.

This study, as a starting point in the academic study of the Marine Corps JROTC, addressed the general question of administrative perspective of the school principal towards his/her Marine Corps JROTC program. This direction was chosen because of the significance the school principal plays in any course of instruction offered by the school.

Using professional Marine Corps officer and enlisted instructors representing differing levels of JROTC experience and performance, coupled with significant personal experience, as a source of initial information, it was determined that the principal’s perceptions toward current objectives as well as other selected aspects of the JROTC program should be studied. Borrowing from earlier attitudinal research methods (Harrill, 1984), the Likert-type scale was deemed most appropriate to gain the needed information.

Summary of the Purpose of this Research

The purpose of this study was to determine what principals believe about the official objectives of MCJROTC and what they believe about other selected aspects of
the MCJROTC program. More specifically, the following questions are to be addressed:

1. Are host principals in agreement concerning the stated objectives of MCJROTC, as established by the Training and Education?

2. Do principals agree that the MCJROTC program provides district services which no other subject provides in their schools and should continue unchanged in the future?

3. Do principals agree that MCJROTC is not primarily a method of recruiting and preparing students for later entry into the military service?

4. Do principals agree that their Marine Corps JROTC instructors are as good as, or better than, other teachers of electives at their schools?

5. Do principals agree that they would like to see Marine Corps JROTC remain at their schools for the next five years?

In conducting this research, it was necessary to place four limitations on the study. These limitations were:

1. This study is limited to current principals, or administrative personnel acting in the capacity of principal, at public and parochial high schools offering Marine Corps JROTC.

2. The Marine Corps JROTC program's curriculum is legislated by Congress and is best received as a national high school or secondary level curriculum. Secondary level curriculum can be researched from the local, state and national perspectives. With a minimum of three 1 year courses with 96 hours of instruction per year (Department of the Navy, 1989b) mandated by the national JROTC headquarters, this is clearly a national curriculum focusing on a specific program, which makes this focused area a limitation of
3. The population is finite (178 units) and very structured. Structure and discipline within the program is based on the military affiliation making this curriculum unique when compared to most other secondary programs. This limitation is particularly noteworthy with any generalization efforts in applying this research to other secondary curricula.

4. The researcher realized that original research in the Marine Corps JROTC program is finite and extremely limited in breadth. This limitation led to the researcher's development and implementation of a survey instrument based on the attitudes of host school principals. The survey was administered in the spring of the 1999-2000 school year. Perceptions were based on individual principal's views during this period and these perceptions may change over time.

To gather data which would answer the questions addressed in this study, a survey instrument was sent to all 178 principals identified by the Training and Education Division as being host to a Marine Corps JROTC program. One hundred principals, 56.1% of those contacted, returned responses within the established timeframe. Of those who responded, 82 to 87% returned responses that were usable for the first section dealing with background information. Due to incomplete provision of data by some respondents, only 94 to 97 responses or 52.8 to 54.5% were usable for the second section that dealt with the principal's beliefs concerning the objectives of the JROTC. Section three, focusing on principals beliefs concerning selected statements, had every response usable except with one statement that had only 97% usable. The principal's ranking of eight common electives had between 73 and 78% usable responses and the final
comments section had 60 responses.

Summary of Findings

Although it was not a major stated purpose of the study, the professional and personal data obtained from the respondents was reported and analyzed. The respondents reported 129,183 students enrolled in their schools with a mean enrollment of 1,502.13 students and a medium enrollment of 1322.5 students. However, the actual numbers for total enrollments of the respondents schools are higher because 14 respondents failed to indicate their school size on the returned survey instrument.

Respondents reported 10,705 cadets enrolled in the Marine Corps JROTC with a mean of 124.48 and a medium of 115.0 cadets per school. Once again however, the actual total JROTC enrollment is higher because several principals failed to report their JROTC size on the returned survey instrument.

Overall, 82 respondents reported their community/city population and the majority (57.3 %) of the reported schools were located in cities/communities of over 50,000 residents. The smallest group (9.8 %) were located in communities/cities of under 5,000 inhabitants.

The administrative experience with JROTC indicated that 25.3 % (22) of the 87 principals that responded to this area had over ten years experience while 4.6 % (4) had one year or less experience with JROTC. The administrators with 2-5 years experience were the largest group with 46 % (40) responding.

There are strong indications that the respondents did believe that their JROTC program should ideally develop informed and responsible citizens. In addition, while not responding with the same level of agreement, the respondents generally agreed that their
JROTC programs were currently emphasizing the development of informed and responsible citizens.

The responses to the second belief statement indicated that the respondents were in agreement or strong agreement that students in JROTC should develop leadership skills. Although the same levels of strong agreement and agreement was not indicated, the respondents believed even more that their JROTC program currently is developing leadership skills.

In the third belief statement, the respondents overwhelmingly believe that students should strengthen his/her character while in the JROTC program. The respondents were slightly less strong in their agreement that students are currently strengthening their character in their JROTC program.

The respondents indicated that a large number were in agreement or strong agreement with the belief that students should develop an understanding of the basic elements of national security. A similar majority, although not as large, were in agreement and strong agreement that their JROTC program currently was developing a understanding of the basic elements of national security in their students.

The responses to the fifth belief statement indicated that the respondents were in agreement or strong agreement that students in JROTC should form habits of self-discipline. Although the same levels of strong agreement and agreement was not indicated, the respondents believed that their JROTC program currently is teaching students to form habits of self-discipline.

There was definite indication that most respondents were in agreement or strong agreement with the belief that students should develop respect for, and an understanding
of, the need for constituted authority in a democratic society. The one respondent who was in strong disagreement and the one respondent who disagreed with the statement were not significant. A large portion of respondents also believe that their JROTC program is currently stressing the need to develop respect for, and an understanding of, the need for constituted authority in a democratic society.

Responses indicated that the vast majority of respondents believed that Marine Corps JROTC does serve a distinct purpose which no subject provides. Neutral, disagreeing and strongly disagreeing responses were not significant from an overall perspective.

The respondents were generally in agreement or, strongly agreed that the present JROTC program is adequate at the present time. However, 20% of the respondents were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statement. This demonstrates that one-fifth of the respondents believe that the JROTC program could use improvement.

The respondents were mixed concerning the statement that Marine Corps JROTC does not have preparation for later entry into military service as one of its primary purposes. In contrast to the Standing Operating Procedures, 35 respondents were neutral towards this statement and 18 respondents expressed disagreement or strong disagreement in the belief that JROTC does not have this preparation as its primary purpose.

A large percentage of the respondents consider JROTC to be general education. However, a significant portion of the respondents believes that the JROTC falls under an academic or vocational education curriculum.

The majority of the respondents indicated that they believe the current name of
JROTC is an accurate description for the course content. However, more than one-third of the respondents had either a neutral belief or, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the current name.

More than one-half of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that some branch of JROTC should be ideally made mandatory for all high school students. A significant number of respondent’s (39) agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that JROTC should be mandatory.

A vast majority of respondents believe that they have been adequately informed of the philosophy and objectives of JROTC by its military representatives. The three respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement must not have been present during an annual inspection by the district representative.

The responses to the statement concerning maintaining the Marine Corps JROTC at their school for the next five years were overwhelmingly positive. Only one respondent indicated strong disagreement with this statement. This can possibly be explained in that the respondent misunderstood the Likert scale and indicated the reverse for his/her response. The unmistakable overall indication is that, if the respondents have their way, Marine Corps JROTC will remain as a curriculum offering in the schools responding to this study.

The majority of the respondents believe that their JROTC instructors are as good, or better than, other teachers of electives at their school. The one strong disagreement and the one disagreement are not numerically significant although they do indicate that some instructors are not as good as they should be. The nine respondents who indicated a neutral belief probably had not formed a clear judgement concerning the ability of the
instructors or believed that their instructors were only mediocre.

When asked to rank eight commonly offered high school electives, including JROTC, there were only 78 respondents who completed the instructions, leaving 22 respondents who failed to rank the electives for whatever reasons. Of the 78 who did respond, two-thirds ranked JROTC in the first or second position. More than 84% ranked JROTC in the top three positions. Overall, the respondents indicated a very positive ranking of JROTC when compared to other electives.

Those who responded to the opportunity to provide comments, either negative or positive, 60 respondents indicated concerns. Only one comment was anywhere near unfavorable and it recommended that the JROTC Standard Operating Procedures Manual be presented to school personnel so that the administration could better understand the program and its objectives.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were developed based on the responding principals, their school characteristics, and the effects of those characteristics on the JROTC program:

1. The Marine Corps JROTC is meeting its objective of establishing a majority of its programs in areas where the school population can meet or exceed 1,000 students and, the overt mission of establishing a presence in areas that could most benefit from the objectives of the program. This conclusion is consistent with a majority of the related literature that includes Jordan (1998), the United States Conference of Mayors (1998), Blair (1999), and Corps Curriculum (1999).

2. The majority of administrative experience is located in the 2-5 year area
due mainly to the effect of General Colin Powell’s successful lobbying for an expansion of JROTC in 1992 (Powell, 1995). Overall, 24.1% of the respondents had their programs established shortly after the expansion, and given a 3 to 4 year timeframe to spread, 40 of the respondents had their programs established. Amazingly, 65 (71.7%) of the respondents have programs that were a direct result of General Powell’s initiative.

3. A significant number of principals provided responses to the survey instrument. However, if those who returned the survey did so because of a positive interest in JROTC, results could be biased toward the programs.

4. The responses came from a geographical cross-section of cities/communities with a wide range of populations. This indicates that the total responses were not biased by a preponderance of respondents having come from cities/communities of any particular size.

Recommendations

The following implications are drawn and recommendations made because of this study:

1. Because of the indicated agreement of respondents with the current official objectives of Marine Corps JROTC, both ideally and as a current reality, the present objectives and curriculum for Marine Corps JROTC should be maintained until they are shown to no longer be effective or valid.

2. Because of the finding that there are mixed beliefs by the respondents in regards to Marine Corps JROTC not having preparations for later entry into military service as one of its primary purposes, emphasis must be placed on presenting to present and potential school districts, and the general public, that the stated purpose of the
program, from the Standing Operating Procedures Manual, is to teach the qualities of
good citizenship and leadership, and not to be a recruiting tool.

3. Because of the high regard most principals have for their Marine Corps
JROTC instructors, and because Marine Corps JROTC instructors are not normally the
recipients of established teacher training programs, the Training and Education Division
should consider developing and conducting regional professional development
seminars/courses for new instructors during the summer months. Adequate
compensation should be allocated for the instructors to attend this development. Areas of
focus could include classroom management, record keeping, computer skills, presentation
skills, and other topics deemed appropriate.

In addition, every effort should be made to ensure that every school hosting a
Marine Corps JROTC unit has the required number of instructors hired. This is
particularly noteworthy for those programs that have more than 150 students enrolled and
are not allowed to hire additional instructors. Department of the Navy (1989b), Marine
Corps JROTC Standing Operating Procedures Manual, states:

A second Marine Instructor will be authorized when cadet enrollment exceeds
150 cadets... (p. 2-6)

4. Headquarters, United States Marine Corps should evaluate the policy,
stated in the Marine Corps JROTC Standing Operating Procedures Manual, that requires
the school district to not allow any student to be a member of the Marine Corps JROTC
unless that student is a citizen or national of the United States. If this policy was
enforced, a portion of the Marine Corps JROTC programs would be forced to disenroll a
significant number of their cadet population. Because the United States has a large influx
of foreign nationals entering school systems every year, not allowing them access to the program could be an embarrassment to the program and school. Presently few, if any schools, allow citizenship status to be a determining factor in curriculum selection.

5. Because of the positive effect that the designation of Honor School has on a school, and because this honor is a result of the annual inspection conducted by each Marine Corps District, a more efficient and fair evaluation process should be developed to ensure that the highest standards of instruction and administration is being maintained by the various programs. The present annual inspection by Marine Corps District staff is brief, normally lasting less than half a school day, and fails to adequately portray the success or failure of the instructors and the program. A specific evaluation instrument, void of subjective bias, could be created that would truly present the particular program in comparison to similar programs nationwide. As a result, those programs that are having difficulty in any area could learn from other programs that have overcome that obstacle. In addition, the senior Marine Corps representative during this inspection should review the Marine Corps JROTC Standing Operating Procedures Manual with the school district administration to ensure adequate compliance is being maintained by all parties involved with the program.

6. A cadet handbook should be procured and issued to every cadet upon entering the Marine Corps JROTC program. This handbook would cover areas of general information that every cadet is expected to have knowledge of over the possible four years of participating in the program. Similar documents, such as the Guidebook for Marines and the Candidate Regulations, are issued to Marine Corps enlisted trainees upon entering recruit training and Officer candidates upon arriving at Quantico, Virginia
for training.

7. Based on general indications that Marine Corps JROTC is not well-known outside the schools and communities offering the programs, each Marine Corps District should select, by local competition, the top three close order drill teams and the top three air rifle teams so that they may be sent to Parris Island, South Carolina and Quantico, Virginia, respectfully, to compete on a national level. Funding could be provided by the Training and Education Division instead of continuing support of the semi-annual orientation visit presently authorized. This would stimulate participation in both of these vital areas by more schools and would bring significant attention to the participating schools and the program in general.

8. Because of the very strong positive responses of the principals regarding the value of the program and the benefits derived by students who are in the program, and that present legislation allows for the establishment of 200 Marine Corps JROTC units, it is recommended that funding be made available to establish the remaining 22 units. With only 178 units presently established, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps reporting over 60 schools waiting to start (Congressional Hearings, 2000), this should be a priority.

In addition, school’s that are presently funded at 100 %, meaning the school does not pay a portion of the salary of the instructors, should be closely examined for practicality and, if the school is unwilling to adhere to the established standard of 50 % support, should be disestablished. Disestablishment of these schools could result in two new schools being established.

Recommendations for further Research

The following recommendations are provided as a basis for new research related
to this study:

1. Follow-up replications of this study should be completed at five year intervals for comparison of responses and recommendations for modification.

2. A study should be developed to deal in detail with the adequacy of the JROTC curriculum.

3. A study should be developed to examine the backgrounds and interaction of JROTC instructors and cadets involved in the program, to include the recruitment of students into the program.

4. A study should be developed to analyze the unique characteristics of successful JROTC programs and their activities.

5. A study should be developed to determine if there is any significant differences between the military basic training performance of prior JROTC cadets and regular enlistees.

6. A study should be developed to determine what role JROTC plays in the recruitment of future military enlistees and officers.

7. A study should be conducted to determine why 78 of the 178 schools that presently have MCJROTC units did not respond.

8. A study should be conducted to determine why the respondents have such a high regard for the instructional capabilities of their MCJROTC instructors.

In closing, The Marine Corps JROTC program is a highly-sought after and proud addition to the secondary school curriculum. In order to maintain this position, the program must develop and implement new initiatives, while refining present topics, which will reinforce its position as a “character development” course.
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Appendix A

Survey Instrument
Information Form

This U. S. Marine Corps JROTC Survey instrument is composed of five sections. Only the first section requires factual data. Sections two through four ask only your feelings; there are no right or wrong responses. Section five provides you with the opportunity to supply any positive or negative comments you might wish to make about any aspect of the Marine Corps JROTC program.

Your name is not required on this instrument. The name of your school is requested only as an administrative check. No attempt will be made to publicly identify your individual responses at any time.

All responses will be held in strictest confidence.

Please do not omit any question. Questions which may not apply to you in the first section should be marked as “N/A” meaning “not applicable”.

Please return to: Rodney J. Logan
20 Erica Lynne Way
Hamilton, New Jersey 08690
U.S. Marine Corps JROTC Survey

Below you will find a series of requests for information concerning yourself and your school. Please fill in the blanks to the best of your current knowledge.

Name of School __________________________

Total school enrollment for the 1999-2000 school year:

Male ____ Female ____

Marine Corps JROTC enrollment for the 1999-2000 school year:

Male ____ Female ____

Marine Corps JROTC demographic data:

African American ____ White ____ Hispanic ____

Asian American ____ Other ____

Population of your city/town ______________________

Your total years of administrative experience in schools with JROTC programs of any type ________________

Below you will find a series of six statements concerning the possible missions of Marine Corps JROTC. Please rate each item as to the extent you believe it should be emphasized and again as you believe it currently is emphasized at your school. Rate each item on the five-point continuum by circling the appropriate number, which corresponds to your beliefs.

1. The student will develop into an informed and responsible citizen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently is: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **The student will develop leadership skills.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently is: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **The student will strengthen his/her character.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently is: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **The student will develop an understanding of the basic elements of national security.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently is: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **The student will form habits of self-discipline.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently is: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **The student will develop respect for, and an understanding of, the need for constituted authority in a democratic society.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently is: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below you will find a series of statements regarding Marine Corps JROTC. Please rate each as to the degree to which you are in agreement with the statement.

1. Marine Corps JROTC serves a distinct purpose which no subject provides.

   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree
   1          2          3          4          5

2. I believe that the Marine Corps JROTC instructional program is adequate at present and should continue unchanged in the future.

   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree
   1          2          3          4          5

3. Marine Corps JROTC does not have preparation for later entry into military service as one of its primary purposes.

   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree
   1          2          3          4          5

4. Marine Corps JROTC is primarily considered to be general education (versus academic or vocational education).

   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree
   1          2          3          4          5

5. The name “Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps” is an accurate description for the course content of JROTC.

   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree
   1          2          3          4          5
6. Some branch of JROTC should be ideally made mandatory for all high school students.

   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

7. I, as chief administrator of my school, feel that I have been adequately informed of the philosophy and objectives of Marine Corps JROTC by its military representatives.

   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

8. I would like to see Marine Corps JROTC remain at my school for the next five years.

   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

9. I think my Marine Corps JROTC instructors are as good, or better than, other teachers of electives at my school.

   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

Below you will find a list of courses that are commonly considered electives in a secondary school. Please rank each of the following in the order you feel it is important as a curricular offering in any high school.

   The most important would be “1” and the least important would be “8”.

   ___ Chorus         ___ Yearbook
   ___ Home Economics ___ Marine Corps JROTC
   ___ Industrial Arts ___ DECA
   ___ Band           ___ Newspaper
Below you will find space to provide other comments you might wish to make regarding any aspect of Marine Corps JROTC or your feelings toward it. Please feel free to make either positive or negative comments should you desire to do so.

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please return to: Rodney J. Logan
20 Erica Lynne Way
Hamilton, New Jersey 08690
Appendix B

List of schools in the study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>06704-1296</td>
<td>Wilby High School</td>
<td>460 Buick Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>07112-3066</td>
<td>Weequahic High School</td>
<td>279 Chancellor Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10312-9299</td>
<td>Toomeyville High School</td>
<td>100 Luine Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11207-4799</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>08901-1944</td>
<td>Salem Peters High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahway</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>07065-1888</td>
<td>Rahway High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>13114-9597</td>
<td>Central High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxbury</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>02120-3198</td>
<td>Mexico Academy &amp; Vocational High School</td>
<td>338 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>01902-6999</td>
<td>Madison Park Technical School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindenhurst</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11757-2850</td>
<td>Lynn English High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10704-2723</td>
<td>Lincoln High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14213-2559</td>
<td>Grover Cleveland High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>01930-2595</td>
<td>Gloucester High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>07087-4888</td>
<td>Emerson High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>07202-0312</td>
<td>Elizabeth High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>12101-0670</td>
<td>Saratoga High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>School Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>23228-1907</td>
<td>8301 Hungry Springs Rd</td>
<td>Henricus High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>24502-2499</td>
<td>3020 Ward Fwy Rd</td>
<td>Henricus High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenup</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>41144-9616</td>
<td>2207 Ohio River Rd</td>
<td>Greenup County High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>22191-4704</td>
<td>14000 Smoketown Rd</td>
<td>Carthel Senior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisterstown</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>21136-3001</td>
<td>12000 Reisterstown Rd</td>
<td>Reisterstown High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Creek</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40291-2799</td>
<td>9115 Penn Creek Rd</td>
<td>Penn Creek High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>44305-4222</td>
<td>80ibr Ln</td>
<td>East High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnat</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>45247-7898</td>
<td>6375 Harrison Avnle</td>
<td>Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>22701-1699</td>
<td>14240 Achievement Dr</td>
<td>Culpeper County High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Hills</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>20748-3288</td>
<td>6901 Temple Hill Rd</td>
<td>Crossland High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poolesville</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>23703-2074</td>
<td>4301 Cedar Ln</td>
<td>Churhland High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>21221-7999</td>
<td>4101 Tunney Pk Rd</td>
<td>Chesapeake High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>19020-3898</td>
<td>4319 Humeville Rd</td>
<td>Bensalem High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>44342-9552</td>
<td>13187 State Rd # 7</td>
<td>Beaver Local High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>03842-2282</td>
<td>1 Alumi Dr</td>
<td>Wmunicnt Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocomoke</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1817 Old Virginia Road</td>
<td>202-853-3049</td>
<td>Pocomoke High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2660 Point Hollow Avenue</td>
<td>202-244-3300</td>
<td>Pocomoke High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3401 Kemwood Avenue</td>
<td>202-244-3799</td>
<td>Baltimore High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>8515 Old Mount Vernon Road</td>
<td>202-239-2015</td>
<td>Alexandria High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3800 Washington Ave</td>
<td>2229-9698</td>
<td>600 Old Six Mile Lane</td>
<td>202-239-4402</td>
<td>Jefferson High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2910 Pamun Road</td>
<td>1-800-435-5222</td>
<td>Jefferson High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>15 South Fork Avenue</td>
<td>410-141697</td>
<td>Madison High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Champion Building, 29th &amp; Spring</td>
<td>23205-1709</td>
<td>Champion Springs High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>9350 Goldsmith Lane Street</td>
<td>202-239-2790</td>
<td>Seneca High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1460 Corinnae Highway</td>
<td>202-244-3091</td>
<td>Seneca High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tennessee
37615-9740
Gray
1440 Sunset Drive
Danville Boone High School

Georgia
31786-8519
G富ville
1800 Park Avenue
Colquitt County High School

Florida
33764-6314
Clearwater
540 S. Hermitage Avenue
Clearwater High School

South Carolina
29440-3074
Georgetown
8189 Choppee Road
Chamberlain High School

Tampa
33612-7893
9401 North Boulevard
Champlain High School

South Carolina
29902-3899
Beaufort
1 Blue Dolphin Drive
Big Cypress High School

South Carolina
29803-2690
Aiken
419 McElwain Street
Aiken High School

Florida
32712-3596
Apopka
555 West Martin Street
Apopka High School

Florida
32444-5609
Lynn Haven
501 Mosley Drive
A CRAWFORD MOSLEY High School

Pennsylvania
19014-1893
Aviston
Panoram ic Drive
Panoram ic High School

Ohio
43555-1941
Spanglerville
700 S. Limehouse Street
Spanglerville High School

Maryland
21863-1299
Snow Hill
305 South Church Street
Snow Hill High School

West Virginia
25312-4444
Charleston
6100 Sissonville Road
Sissonville High School

Kentucky
40066-0069
Shelbyville
Frankfort Road
Shelby County High School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>3701 Winson Drive</td>
<td>Jean Ribault Senior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>Drawer 760</td>
<td>Jasper County High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>6201 Pueblo Drive, N. W.</td>
<td>J. Oliver Johnson High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>801 Femalee Boulevad</td>
<td>High Point Central High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>1001 Mainfield Street</td>
<td>Gilven Academy High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>2011 Lumpkin Road</td>
<td>Georgia Pruett High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Kissimmee</td>
<td>93 Panther Paws Trail</td>
<td>Gateway High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Fort Myers</td>
<td>225 Mann Road, E.</td>
<td>Fort Myers High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>3100 Edgewater Drive</td>
<td>Edgewater High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>44 South Lane Road</td>
<td>East Carolina High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>400 Macollum-Sharpsburg</td>
<td>East Carolina High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>1800 Peace Avenue</td>
<td>Dougherty High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Destin</td>
<td>910 S. W. 15th Street</td>
<td>Destin Beach High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>N.E. 1300 Montgomery Drive, Road</td>
<td>Eldorado High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>277 East Marion School Avenue</td>
<td>East Marion High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dona</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1/4 Mile East Wood</td>
<td>Donna High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1510 Emillio Drive, N. W.</td>
<td>Choir High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6300 Lee Street</td>
<td>Catholic High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3001 East 34th Street</td>
<td>Carpeck High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>252 A. H. Ebright Drive</td>
<td>Brigham High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amite</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>400 South Laurel Street</td>
<td>Amite High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4410 Cook Road</td>
<td>Alief Hastings High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>71072-1105</td>
<td>Alexandria Senior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams City</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>4625 East 69th Street</td>
<td>Adams City High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2600 Partridge Lane</td>
<td>Wescover High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>One Indian Avenue</td>
<td>Venice Senior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>11501 Loxahatchee Rd</td>
<td>University High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1800 S. W. 5th Place</td>
<td>St. Matthew High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38655-3416 Mississippi Oxford Bretonix 222 Bretonix Pkwy, #1470
78130-2559 New Texas Hewitt 2551 North Loop 337
76493-2670 New Texas Hewitt 200 Hewitt Drive
110312-9224 Texas Mesilla Valley 101 East Hackberry Street
78550-3898 Texas McAllen 3202 First Street
70448-3099 Louisiana Mandeville 100 Reserve Drive
87038-0076 New Mexico New Jeferson 26 Post Office Box 26
87122-2807 New Mexico Albuquerque 1001 W 7th Street Avenue
70119-8833 Louisiana New Orleans 4133 Banks Street
78520-4601 Texas Brownsville 314 West Los Ebanos
78601-9460 Texas Brownsville 4800 Jack C. Hays Trail
75061-4595 Texas Lufkin 900 Commerce Road
39207-1903 Mississippi Gulfport 100 Perry Street
87020-0008 New Mexico Grants 500 Mountain View, Box 8
70126-5499 Louisiana Franklin
70438-6156 Louisiana Franklin 1 Demon Circle
3059 Higgins Boulevard
250 Mountain View, Box 8
900 Commerce Road
100 Perry Street
314 West Los Ebanos
26 Post Office Box 26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>College Station</td>
<td>83837-2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>John F. Kennedy High School</td>
<td>95811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>John C. Fremont High School</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>James B. Castle High School</td>
<td>96814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes High School</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Rio Rico</td>
<td>Eisenhower High School</td>
<td>92376-3261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Crenshaw High School</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>Coolidge High School</td>
<td>85228-1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Campbell Union High School</td>
<td>95124-5699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Basic High School</td>
<td>89015-6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Washington High School</td>
<td>53210-2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>45-386 Kane'Aloha Drive</td>
<td>96814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>6715 Gihone Drive</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7676 South San Pedro</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>9433 Cahuenga Avenue, P.O.</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>5011 South Passons</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1321 North Lingle Avenue</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5010 South 11th Avenue</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>800 North Northam, P.O.</td>
<td>85228-1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>51021 Leish Avenue</td>
<td>95124-5699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>440 North Palo Verde</td>
<td>89015-6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>2525 North Sherman</td>
<td>53210-2999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

MCJROTC Project Office information request letter (3 December 1999)
Rodney J. Logan
20 Erica Lynne Way
Hamilton, New Jersey 08690

3 December 1999

Commanding General
Attn: MCJROTC Project Office
Training Programs Branch C462
3300 Russell Road
MCCDC, Quantico, Virginia 22134-5001

Dear Sir:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act.

I request that a copy of the documents that contain the following, most recent, information:

a. MCJROTC participating school’s addresses (by District)
b. Total number of MCJROTC cadets, by sex and ethnic origin
c. Graduate disposition of 1999 graduates
d. Pending applications for MCJROTC unit activation (by District)
e. FY 00 MCJROTC Budget

This information is to be used for dissertation research and will not be available for outside use. Disclosure of the requested information to me is in the public interest because it is likely to significantly increase the public understanding of the operations of the MCJROTC and is not primarily in my commercial interest. Confidentiality will be of the utmost concern.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Rodney J. Logan
Appendix D

Sample of instrument packet cover letter
10 April 2000

Principal
«Company»
«Address1»
«City», «State» »PostalCode»

Dear Fellow Educator:

The enclosed survey instrument is part of my Seton Hall University dissertation study now being conducted of all secondary school principals hosting a Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) program. This study seeks to determine current information about, and selected perceptions toward, the Marine Corps JROTC program. This survey has been approved for research by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, Dr. Robert C. Hallissey, Acting Chair, (973) 275-2974.

There is virtually no program data about Marine Corps JROTC offerings, and information about the perceptions of principals toward the Marine Corps JROTC program is severely lacking. This study is an attempt to collect data of major significance in both areas. Ultimately the information will be of value to both civilian educational institutions and the Department of Defense.

This survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete and your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Please complete the enclosed survey instrument as soon as possible. The return of the survey it in the enclosed, stamped self-addressed envelope will constitute your consent to participate.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Rodney J. Logan

Enclosures:

Self-addressed, stamped envelope
Survey Instrument
Appendix E

March 13, 2000

Rodney J. Logan  
20 Erica Lynne Way  
Hamilton, NJ 08690

Dear Mr. Logan:

The Institutional Review Board For Human Subject Research at Seton Hall University reviewed your proposal entitled “An Analysis of the Perceptions Held By Host Secondary School Principals Toward the Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) Program.” Your project has been approved as amended by the revisions submitted to the Chair of the IRB. Enclosed please find the signed Request for Approval form for your records.

The Institutional Review Board approval of the project is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. Any changes to the research protocol must again be reviewed and approved by the committee prior to implementation. Thank you for your cooperation. Best wishes for the success of your research.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Hallissey, Ph.D.  
Acting Chair  
Institutional Review Board

cc: Dr. John Collins
Appendix F

List of Principals’ Comments
The Senior Marine Instructor is an outstanding individual and the program is a great addition to our school.

Our JROTC has impacted our community and school in a very positive manner. The program is involved in all aspects. Our students have gained knowledge, discipline and manners through our program. I realize that what we have is unique if compared to other school programs. Our instructor is responsible for all the wonderful things happening to our students through our JROTC (you can’t have him, we need him here!)

It is a great program for freshman and sophomores. However, the program is more challenging for juniors and seniors causing big attrition. The basic training for Marines at San Diego is awesome, but not all high school kids can survive it.

I am very glad it is at my school. It has helped many students develop a better self-worth, character and leadership tools.

Corps teaches leadership principals, i.e. proficient, self-improvement, responsibility and timely decisions. Leadership Traits.

Our program is outstanding. It offers us another venue to reach young people.

My program is outstanding in all areas, one of the top programs in the U. S.

The JROTC program is exceptional! Would like to broaden into middle school level.

Our instructors are great! It is a wonderful program that teaches children to be the best they can be!

The JROTC program has been an excellent addition to our educational program.

Our program is an asset to our school and community.

JROTC is highly considered one of the 3 major avenues for post secondary direction.

I feel we have an outstanding group here. We need to stay current with student needs.

What makes our JROTC program so successful and valuable is the instructor(s). Their energy and enthusiasm have quickly made the program an integral part of our school.

I have had the opportunity to observe our program on numerous occasions. The instructors are outstanding and the impact on the students served is outstanding.

In my opinion, the JROTC is a great program for students.

We have a great program at ----. We just need to get more students enrolled.
Our MCJROTC program has a positive impact on our school campus. The presence and service to the school at school functions is greatly appreciated. We are especially proud of our program and all individuals involved from instructors to students.

Our JROTC program has been embraced by our faculty and administrators. It is why some of our kids come to school.

We have a great program, but just like in other areas, the people that run the program are the ones that make it successful.

The MCJROTC program provides the leadership and responsibility building essential to youth.

--- has had the MCJROTC program for 25 years and it has been a productive part of the overall curriculum.

The MCJROTC program is an excellent program. Levels III and IV are considered as part of the academic program of study.

Our MCJROTC program has constantly distinguished themselves as a much needed and top-notch organization of students who serve a vital role for our overall mission.

An outstanding program – very worthwhile! It provides students a great deal of worthwhile activities that unlocks their potential for classroom achievement and student leadership.

Our JROTC program has become a major component in our schools community service efforts. I feel it ranks as one of the key components of our JROTC program.

Excellent program. It has helped many young people find an appropriate means of leadership training and service to our community.

The MCJROTC touches a group of students that are not included otherwise. A very valuable program to our school. Instructors are great employees.

I feel that the MCJROTC program is the best-structured means of teaching survival skills as it relates to meeting the needs of the future.

Marine Corps JROTC is an integral and very important part of our high school. It provides a great service to our students and benefits our entire community. I do not feel, however, that it should be made mandatory because many students are ill suited for military style discipline - - even though they may need it!

MCJROTC is fundamentally a character building experience. JROTC students have better values, improved decision making capacity, increased problem solving ability and a greater sense of community.
Our JROTC program is exceptional due to the leadership of the instructor. Our program takes all students at all levels and gives them discipline many have never had.

Outstanding program. Has brought distinction and pride to our school.

Excellent program. It affords some who feel disenchanted an opportunity to "belong" to something.

Our program has so much more depth than this simple questionnaire. I really feel that you need to gather more in-depth data to see the true value of the program. Our students spend 40+ weekends in the community doing color guards, escorts, drill team performances, and volunteer work for many non-profit organizations.

We hold an annual awards banquet and the entire school board attends, the local mayor and city council members attend along with parents, families and our cadets. We come to honor our cadets because they give so much time to any school, community or people in need. Truly, an exceptional campus group. Solid leaders. Solid citizens and we are very proud of them.

The focus of the curriculum is good, but much of its content is outdated. It should be revised/updated.

We are the only high school in the county. Our MCJROTC unit is the backbone of all civic service and volunteer activity in the county. Were it not for JROTC, the community would suffer from lack of volunteers and would have to significantly cut back on many charitable events. JROTC is the most important public relations activity of our school system.

I believe JROTC is a vital program in our school and has a positive effect on the community. I think more resources at the federal level should be allocated for this program.

MCJROTC is an excellent program!

Very satisfied with the program.

MCJROTC has been a very positive influence in our school. They have taken part in many community activities and also activities at school.

Great program! Superior instructors and excellent role models. Very cooperative and helpful to us.

The --- High School MCJROTC is an excellent program. I support it 100%

JROTC is great – We are blessed to have an awesome set of instructors – They make the difference.
JROTC should be mandatory in all schools. The leadership is most necessary as it is lacking in our society.

During the 99-00 school year, we also ran a quarter semester class for 8th graders to encourage them to take JROTC in 9th grade. We serviced over 250 students.

A great program!

Our Marine Corps JROTC has been a tremendous asset to our school and to our preparation of students as informed and responsible citizens.

I would like for the JROTC SOP – Standard Operating Procedures manuals, to have more involvement in every school district. In many cases, school districts are not aware what SOP’s requires of the JROTC program and the individuals teaching in this area. If school district personnel were educated or introduced to the SOP, many existing problems could be ceased.

This program fills a niche and serves a group of students we were not able to reach in the past. These students become part of the school so; school becomes important to them. Their self-esteem is heightened which makes them more successful in school.

JROTC is a very good program. I feel that the instructors need some more training in classroom management for high school students.

Very pleased with our JROTC program and glad it is USMC.

Great program!

Best thing that has happened to our school!

The MCJROTC offers an alternative option for many students. It contributes in ways clearly not provided by other curricula and brings the added dimension of competitive and participatory activities.

JROTC program provides excellent opportunities for our students to learn leadership skills, discipline, and career awareness.

I am very proud of our JROTC program. They are a real asset in teaching leadership.

For 25+ years the Marine Corps JROTC program at —— offers an opportunity to develop self-discipline, self-confidence and leadership skills to students, many of whom are non-academic and need these skills.

MCJROTC is a well-structured informative and highly successful program at this school. Our program has made a significant impact upon the entire student population. It teaches far more than just military related information — it teaches students to have respect for
hard work and to be proud of their accomplishments. This program is the most productive element at — High School!
Appendix G

Sample of Follow-up Letter
Dear Fellow Educator:

An information packet containing a survey instrument was mailed to you and other secondary school principals hosting a Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) program. The purpose of this instrument was to determine current information about, and selected perceptions toward, the Marine Corps JROTC program. The responses have been very encouraging and I am hoping that yours may be included.

Since I have not received your reply, I am enclosing the packet of materials that was included in the initial mailing. I understand that you may not have received the first mailing or that it may have been misplaced. Please support this study by promptly completing the enclosed forms and returning them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Your participation is necessary to the success of the study and your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Rodney J. Logan

Enclosures:

Initial letter
Self-addressed, stamped envelope
Survey Instrument
Appendix H

Correlations
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will develop into an informed and responsible citizen (Should be)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.381*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will develop into an informed and responsible citizen (Currently is)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>.381*</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will develop leadership skills (Should be)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.351*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will develop leadership skills (Currently is)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>.351*</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will strengthen his/her character (Should be)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.422*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will strengthen his/her character (Currently is)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>.422*</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The student will develop an understanding of the basic elements of national security (Should be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.549*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student will develop an understanding of the basic elements of national security (Currently is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>.549*</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student will form habits of self-discipline (Should be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.322*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student will form habits of self-discipline (Currently is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>.322*</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student will develop respect for, and an understanding of, the need for constituted authority in a democratic society (Should be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.502*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student will develop respect for, and an understanding of, the need for constituted authority in a democratic society (Currently is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>.502*</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)